Health and Safety Commission (HSC) Strategy for Workplace Health and Safety in Great Britain in 2010 and beyond has, as one of its strategic aims, a workforce fully involved in the management of health and safety. The aim of the Fund is to encourage partnerships for creating the right conditions for workers to get involved and be consulted on health and safety. Findings from the interviews with workers and employers from the verification interviews and the end of year interviews with advisors and Lead Partners provide support for improvements in worker involvement and health and safety. These findings reinforce the validity of the quantitative findings and strongly suggest that positive changes occurred following WSA intervention. The funding cost per workplace is about £1000 each. It is recommended that a follow up survey is completed of the workplaces to explore whether the reported increases in worker involvement (and reported reductions in absence and injury) have been sustained after completion of the WSA visits.

This report and the work it describes were funded by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). Its contents, including any opinions and/or conclusions expressed, are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect HSE policy.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

HSC Strategy for Workplace Health and Safety in Great Britain in 2010 and beyond has, as one of its strategic aims, a workforce fully involved in the management of health and safety. The aim of the Fund is to encourage partnerships, creating the right conditions for workers to get involved and be consulted on health and safety. The WSA Challenge Fund provided monies over a three year period. This money was delivered through partnership working with a number of projects bidding for the money.

This report presents the findings from round 1 and round 2 evaluation of the WSA Challenge Fund. The WSA Challenge Fund will continue to operate in a third year (round 3), however, a decision was taken not to evaluate round 3. This was because it was felt by HSE that further evaluation would add comparatively little to the information already available, given the timescales for determining the future of the WSA initiative. It should be noted however, that the sustainability assessment recommended in page 84 of this report is planned to commence in the 2007-8 operational year, and will focus on selected projects from rounds one and two.

Based on these findings an assessment is made concerning the following:

- Does the WSA Challenge Fund lead to greater worker involvement in health and safety, and through this involvement better health and safety?
- Is the WSA Challenge Fund a cost-effective approach?
- What are the key aspects or features of an effective approach to deliver the WSA scheme?

Evaluation Method

A combination of evaluation methods was deployed seeking knowledge from all parties involved in the scheme (workers, employers, project partners and WSA), for example:

- A baseline and end of year questionnaires completed by employers, workers and the WSAs;
- Joint employer/WSA visit reports completed during the WSA projects;
- Quarterly logs completed by Lead Partners;
- End of year telephone interviews with employers, workers, partners, Lead Partners and WSAs.

Using a combination of methods to derive self-reported information from a number of sources enables corroboration of results and verification that the observed changes were occurring. The evaluation used subjective feedback and objective measures of change, for example, to management systems, and injury and absence data.
Outcomes

Findings from the interviews with workers and employers from the verification interviews and the end of year interviews with WSAs and Lead Partners provide support for improvements in worker involvement and health and safety. These findings reinforce the validity of the quantitative findings and strongly suggest that positive changes occurred following WSA intervention.

Results from the analysis of the data from the questionnaires show improvements in the indicators that the WSA scheme has had a positive impact on worker involvement and health and safety. For example:

- Employers, workers and WSAs perceive an improvement in worker involvement;
- There is an improvement in employer and worker attitude to worker involvement;
- There is an increase in formal consultation structures in place – such as 28% more organisations report having a worker representative and 25% more report having a H&S committee;
- WSAs, workers and employers perceive that there has been an improvement in health and safety;
- There is improved employer and worker knowledge of health and safety;
- There are more health and safety systems in place (29% more formal risk assessment procedures);
- There is a perception by employers that overall the scheme has been of benefit.

The most commonly cited benefits of the WSA scheme in health and safety procedures was the implementation of risk assessments. Employers and workers both stated that ‘risk assessments’ were now more formalised and carried out more frequently.

The most commonly cited improvement in worker involvement was that awareness had been raised amongst employees and better channels of communication opened. For example, health and safety was more likely to be a standard item on the agenda at staff meetings and in addition, H&S committees had been established.

As explained in the main report, the level of change between baseline and end of year questionnaire responses (both subjective and objective measures) has been translated into a rating of change from 1 to 5. As shown in Table 1 both rounds report a reasonable level of change (improvement) in both worker involvement and health and safety.

| Table 1: Overall rating of level of change from evaluation materials (where 5 = very substantial change, 4 = substantial, 3 = moderate, 2 = limited change, 1 = very limited change) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Worker Involvement                              | Round 1 – All   | Round 2 – All   |
| Health & Safety                                 | 3.41            | 3.82            |
| Overall                                         | 3.40            | 3.98            |
The injury and absence data is based on employer estimates reported in the evaluation materials at baseline or start of round 2, prior to WSA intervention, and then at feedback or end of WSA intervention. The following table presents the findings from the analysis of the evaluation materials to report any change in injury and absence rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Changes to incident and accident data per 100,000 workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total days absence per workers per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total number of all injuries per 100,000 workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total or injuries illness leading to more than three days off work per 100,000 workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst these results are indicative, and need to be treated with some caution due to sample size and uncertainties about reporting practice, the findings demonstrate a significant reduction in incidents and accidents. The level of reduction in injury rates is also similar to that reported in other research on the impact of worker involvement, providing some ‘face validity’ for the current findings.

**Issue 1 - To what extent does the Challenge Fund help to create a sustained increase in WSA capacity?**

Findings suggest that there was limited capacity building in terms of WSA development and partnership expansion. Two reasons why capacity building may be limited in these areas are:

1. Projects were more focused on delivering work place improvements.
2. The model used to deliver the scheme did not support capacity building because:
   - The scheme was delivered by a number of diverse projects that operated on a relatively small scale;
   - The majority of projects had relatively well developed partnerships and a pool of persons with pertinent experience;
   - WSAs were not trained en mass, and how training was conducted was left to the discretion of each partnership.

In round 2 Lead Partners reported that there was, however, an increase in employer demand for the WSA approach. This increased demand has encouraged a number of projects (SOHAS, UCATT, BPI and STUC) to consider alternative funding methods to continue delivering this type of service.

---

1 Improving worker involvement – Improving health and safety Consultation document, HSC
**Issue 2 - Were the round two projects more or less cost effective than round one – and if so why and how?**

The cost per workplace for round 1 and round 2 was approximately the same at around £1,000. In round two costs per worker were slightly higher but costs per visit were slightly reduced. Projects varied substantially in project costs and also cost effectiveness.

The cost per workplace was less than the WSA pilot. If the scheme in its present form is delivered to 10% of SMEs nationwide then the overall funding cost would be nearly £40 million. If up to ~38% of SMEs agreed to participate in this type of scheme (as our findings suggest), then if the level of uptake was universally achieved the cost would be closer to £160 million.

If the costs are considered in terms of the reduction to injury and absence rates then the funding cost of the scheme for round 2 of approximately £752,000 was outweighed by the estimated benefits of the reduction in absence days of approximately of £1 million.

**Issue 3 (a) - What does the experience of projects which have had two consecutive years of funding indicate regarding the cost-effectiveness, do they become more cost-effective over time?**

If we consider the cost of running the scheme per project in isolation, without evaluating the effectiveness of any outcomes, the projects with two years of consecutive funding do not become more cost effective over time and in fact, the funding cost for delivering the scheme actually increased. The projects with two years of consecutive funding showed marginal improvement in outcomes.

**Issue 3 (b) - What does the experience of projects which have had two consecutive years of funding indicate regarding the penetration rate of recruitment of employers, i.e. do the projects reach a maximum level of recruitment?**

The recruitment rate did not change noticeably between round 1 and round 2, for projects with 2 years of consecutive funding.

Although a number of projects with two consecutive years of funding reported recruitment did become more difficult in round 2, our evidence is that recruitment rates did not change. Those projects with low recruitment rates in round 1 also had low recruitment rates in round 2. Projects with higher recruitment rates in round 1 also had higher recruitment rates in round 2.

The evidence suggests that recruitment issues are related to other factors such as the characteristics of the sector and the recruitment methods.

As some projects with 2 years of funding reported very high recruitment rates in round 2, it is difficult to conclude what the ultimate penetration rate may be.

**Issue 3 (c) - What does the experience of projects which have had two consecutive years of funding indicate regarding the change in the effectiveness of WSA interventions within workplaces?**

The overall findings were mixed.
Projects with two years of consecutive funding do become slightly more effective regarding worker involvement but the rating of H&S did not improve.

Projects that only operated in round 2 were as effective as projects with two years of consecutive funding in terms of improvements to worker involvement and were more effective in terms of H&S. Projects only operating in round 1 were the least effective.

The improvements in round 2 are therefore less likely to be due to better project experience and more likely because projects in round 2 benefited from having 12 months of activity instead of the reduced time (6 to 9 months) in round 1.

**Issue 4 - Is there evidence that prior employer attitude and expectation of the project affect the outcome?**

The findings suggest projects engaging organisations with expectations to tackle worker involvement will be rated higher in terms of worker involvement outcomes, than projects that do not. This would suggest that prior expectation does have an impact on the outcome of the WSA scheme.

In contrast, however, employer attitude (prior enthusiasm and planning changes to health and safety or worker involvement) are less of a determinant of improvements following WSA intervention.

This is supported by qualitative reporting from both round 1 and 2 and suggests the WSA role may be most effective at facilitating worker involvement where employers have already made the decision to engage their workers in health and safety matters.

**Issue 5 – What are the characteristics of organisations and employers who participate in the WSA scheme?**

Some key features include:

- The majority of organisations engaged in both round 1 and round 2 were either micro (<10) or small organisations (<50);
- In round 1 nearly half (47%) of all beneficiary organisations engaged in the scheme were members of an organisation running the scheme, such as trade association. In round 2 this had fallen slightly to 41%;
- Trade union representation did not change between round 1 and round 2 and remained at around 8%. A number or projects, however, recruited organisations with surprisingly high levels of union representation, for example CVL 44% and STC 31%.
- In round 1 a similar range of sectors were engaged and there were again some projects focusing on one sector and other projects tackling a more diverse range of sectors. In round 2 there were fewer projects working in the voluntary sector and a greater focus on dealing with organisations involved in the manufacture, distribution and sale of food.
- In round 1 the projects engaged organisations with, on average, far poorer levels of basic H&S prior to intervention than in round 2;
• In both round 1 and round 2, projects operated in a range of locations. A number of projects were characterised by engaging organisations in large geographic areas, for example: FMB who operated in South West England.

**Issue 6 - In what way does the sector, size or organisation and type impact the effectiveness of WSA intervention?**

Overall, the findings suggest that organisational factors do have an impact on the effectiveness of WSA interventions. When these factors are considered together the projects dealing with the beneficiary organisations that are rated as the most difficult to engage have less effective outcomes particularly in terms of changes to health and safety.

The findings also suggest that projects engaging organisations with better basic levels of health and safety at the start of the scheme are associated with improvements to health and safety. In contrast, projects who engage organisations with good industry networks have a positive association with improvements to worker involvement.

Other factors, for example, workplace size in terms of worker numbers, prior union representation, the sector (diversity and type), belonging to an organisation running the scheme and location when considered individually, do not appear to be associated with a more effective WSA intervention.

**Issue 7 how do different WSA methods of working with employers and workers impact on outcomes**

When round 1 and round 2 WSA methods were compared the findings were similar. Some WSAs tended to focus more on worker involvement, with WSAs from other projects focusing more on health and safety.

When the methods for round 2 were analysed evidence from the joint visit report supported by findings from the qualitative feedback tend to show that worker involvement outcomes will be influenced by the different methods adopted by the WSA. For example: projects which adopted activities which are more likely to engender worker involvement (Health@Work Liverpool, STC and Park Royal Partnership) are associated with improvements in worker involvement.

The choice of method employed by the WSA is likely to be influenced by the characteristics of the workplace visited. An organisation with poorer basic health and safety may necessitate the WSA employing slightly different methods, for example, spending more time educating the management about health and safety legal requirements.

Self reporting from Lead Partners and advisors suggested that there were a number of activities that needed to be achieved to ensure worker involvement was improved and then sustained. Our interpretation is that these could form three main activities, that partners and advisors report often needed to be completed, as a sequence of steps, namely:

**Activity 1 – Implement basic health and safety**

• Baseline assessment of health and safety (creates the impetus for improving H&S);
• Demystify health and safety (easy to understand and more manageable - employers can begin to see how to tackle H&S issues);

• Improve H&S knowledge and awareness (duty holders better understand their responsibilities and what they need to do to comply with H&S legislation);

Activity 2 – Engage employers and workers

• Conducting joint risk assessments with employers and workers (demonstrate benefits of involving workers);

• Conducting H&S Training (gain employer ‘buy-in’, raise awareness, engage workers, generate feedback on H&S issues);

• Engaging workers either formally or informally (help to better understand their concerns and overcome any reservations about being more involved in H&S);

• Using a partnership approach to work jointly with employers and workers (demonstrates the benefits for both of co-operation as workers become empowered, with improved work conditions, and employers get help and support in tackling H&S);

Activity 3 – Sustain worker involvement

• Establish formal consultation structures (H&S committees, H&S representatives);

• Help managers with consultation skills (give employers the skills to continue and sustain the work of the WSA).

Our interpretation is that each activity represents a progression to achieve the key objective of sustained worker involvement and eventual long term improvements in health and safety. Completing each activity is seen as important by everyone but the focus of the WSAs time is influenced by the WSAs background, current circumstance and the safety culture of each engaged organisation.

**Issue 8 - What are the benefits and dis-benefits of WSAs focusing on worker involvement, as opposed to H&S per se?**

The benefits of the WSA focusing on worker involvement (explored under Issue 7), is that by improving worker involvement and knowledge of health and safety this facilitates self-sustaining H&S improvement. The dis-benefits are that there are fewer short term improvements in terms of overall health and safety arrangements or to health and safety features (written risk assessments or accident plans).

Strong support for the worker involvement approach was voiced by those delivering the scheme - the WSAs and Lead Partners. They gave unanimous support (evidence provided by the end of year interviews) for the Challenge Fund and the benefits of worker involvement. A number of projects also stated that they intended to use the worker involvement approach either to tackle health and safety within their own organisation or to add it to the existing services (training, consultation) they provide.
**Issue 9 - How do the different types of partnership & partnership arrangements impact on project outcome?**

Evidence suggest that projects with partners that contribute effectively, through, for example, proactively aiding with organisation recruitment, are associated with a greater impact on worker involvement and health and safety.

Other partnership arrangements when considered individually are less likely to impact on outcome.

**Issue 10 - What are the causes of any problems or difficulties during the WSA scheme?**

The main causes of problems or difficulties encountered by the projects in both round 1 and 2 were:

- Recruiting beneficiary organisations;
- Engaging with hard to reach workers;
- Key features of partnership management (proactively tackling issues and being adaptive in the chosen approach).

These problems or difficulties were not, however, insurmountable although if not overcome evidence suggests these can have a significant impact on delivering the scheme. Projects that encountered significant barriers are likely to be affected in terms of the ability to both recruit and then effectively engage with beneficiary organisations.

**Conclusions**

The findings suggest that there is added benefit in focusing on the WSA approach. This is because facilitating partnership working within the workplace and establishing the structures that enable workers and employers to work together on health and safety leads to better worker involvement and improved health and safety.

Partnership working also adds value to the projects particularly when partners make real contributions. For example, introducing or referring organisations for recruitment rather than just providing a list of members.

The WSA project also provides a way to engage small and micro organisations on health and safety matters that are normally difficult to reach. There is, however, a dichotomy because the overall costs of the scheme and the effectiveness of WSA interventions appear to be affected for the projects recruiting organisations in more challenging sectors.

The overall benefits, however, in terms of the estimated value saved in terms of reduced injury and absence rates would appear to be equal or higher than the funding costs of the scheme.

The main part of this report provides some feedback on the features of effective interventions and further development of this concept, such as the potential benefit of larger scale projects.
It is also recommended that a follow up survey is completed of the round 1 and 2 workplaces to explore whether the reported increases in worker involvement (and reported reductions in absence and injury) have been sustained.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The new HSC Strategy for Workplace Health and Safety in Great Britain in 2010 and beyond has, as one of its strategic aims, a workforce fully involved in health and safety. Ministers consider that the WSA Challenge Fund (WSA CF) can play an important role in this. The Right Hon Andrew Smith MP, then Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, announced new funding to promote greater worker involvement in health and safety at the Labour Party Conference on 2nd October 2003:

“A new Challenge Fund to extend workplace safety into small and medium sized companies – building on the proven success of the recent Worker Safety Adviser Pilot – and through partnership bringing health and safety advice to the areas that need it most.”

The Fund is there to encourage partnerships to create the right conditions for workers to get involved and be consulted on health and safety.

The WSA Challenge Fund has been funded for three rounds (three years).

This report provides a final review of the WSA Challenge Fund by reviewing the findings from the second round (April 2005 until May 2006) and the first round (April 2004 until May 2005). Please note, a fuller discussion of the outcomes of the first round are detailed in ‘WSA Challenge Fund Evaluation - Round 1 Technical Report - July 2005’. The WSA Challenge Fund will continue to operate in a third year (round 3) but a decision has been taken not evaluate round 3. This decision was taken because it was felt by HSE that further evaluation would add comparatively little to the information already available.

1.2 HSE EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

The same evaluation materials and information gathering plans used in round 1 have also been used in round 2. The suite of evaluation methods were developed to satisfy the Health and Safety Executive’s evaluation requirements which were to consider:

1. The impact of the fund – did it change worker involvement and health and safety?

2. Capacity building – did the WSA scheme create the supporting frameworks to deliver the worker involvement approach both now and in the future?

3. Value for money – did each project deliver improvements to worker involvement and health and safety cost effectively?
A key function of these evaluation materials was to look at the impact chain and measure how the intervention of the WSA might lead to changes in worker involvement and to health and safety arrangements.

The WSA, for example, brings different attributes such as H&S experience, facilitation skills and a fresh outside view. This can lead to a change in worker and employer attitudes towards worker health and safety. The workers and employers can begin to see the benefits of co-operating together to tackle health and safety, leading to increased worker involvement and eventually improvements to health and safety.

The evaluation materials seek, therefore, to measure the inputs of WSAs, employers and workers (what they bring to the intervention) and what might change (attitudes, knowledge, subjective opinion and objective changes to the workplace) both prior and then after intervention.

The impact chain is illustrated in figures 1-3 below.
The Impact chain (2) – What might change?

**Employees**
- Increased understanding of:
  - Risks in their workplace
- Increased ability to:
  - Contribute to risk assessment
  - Offer practical solutions

**Employers**
- Increased understanding of:
  - Rights and responsibilities of all
  - Risks in their workplace
- Increased ability to:
  - Effectively consult with workers
  - Implement changes

**WSA**
- Improved risk management and control

Figure 2: The impact chain – what might change?

The Impact chain (3) – What might change?

**Employees**
- More practical safe working systems
- Better structures for dialogue
- More explicit responsibilities allocated
- Better safety management systems
- Better leadership
- Trust & morale
- Information flow
- Sense of ownership of solutions

**Employers**

**WSA**
- Improved risk management and control

Figure 3: The impact chain – what might change?
1.3 **ISSUES**

A key requirement of HSE was also to develop a better understanding of what is the best approach or model to deliver the WSA scheme and to achieve improvements in health and safety through worker involvement. The method used to explore this requirement was to provide feedback on a series of issues identified in discussion with HSE.

These issues therefore, explore why changes to worker involvement and health and safety might have occurred and what the key features or aspects were that led to this change. Where appropriate, each issue will consider findings on a project per project basis and compare the findings from round one and round two.

1. To what extent does the Challenge Fund help to create a sustained increase in WSA capacity?

2. Were the round two projects more or less cost effective than round one – and if so, why and how?

3. What does the experience of projects which have had two consecutive years of funding indicate regarding:
   - Penetration rate of recruitment of employers, i.e. do the projects reach a maximum level of recruitment?
   - Change in the effectiveness of WSA interventions within workplaces;
   - Cost-effectiveness, do they become more cost-effective over time?

4. Is there evidence that prior employer attitude and expectation of the project affect the outcome?

5. What are the characteristics of organizations and employers who participate in the WSA scheme?

6. In what way does the sector, size of organization and type of organization impact the effectiveness of the WSA intervention – and what works best (recruitment of employers, working with employers etc) in each of these cases?

7. How do the different WSA methods (give details) of working with employers and workers impact outcomes such as:
   - Employers’ and workers’ attitudes towards worker involvement
   - Health & safety knowledge and competence amongst workers & employers
   - Improvements in health and safety arrangements in workplaces, either directly or via worker involvement prompted by the WSA?

8. What are the benefits and dis-benefits of WSAs focusing on worker involvement, as opposed to H&S per se?

9. How do the different types of partnerships, partnership arrangements, type of WSA, WSA competence and background etc impact the project outcome?

10. What are the causes of any problems or difficulties during the WSA scheme?
1.4 THE PROJECTS

The WSA Challenge fund is delivered through a number of project partnerships. These projects were selected following a vetting process. This was conducted by the Management Board who assessed and approved applications for Challenge Fund awards against the project eligibility conditions and published criteria, for example:

- Strong and viable partnership working;
- Bottom up worker involvement;
- Clearly defined WSA competencies and role;
- Clear and coherent objectives that are realistic and measurable;

This vetting process meant that the projects involved in the different rounds of funding were different, for example:

- Twelve projects were selected for round 1 and eleven projects were selected for round 2
- Six projects continued from round 1 receiving two years of consecutive funding. These were: FMB; Park Royal; Kirklees; Health@Work Liverpool; SOHAS and UCATT.
- Of these six projects four operated within the same area and with the same or similar types or organisations (FMB, Park Royal, Kirklees and Health@Work Liverpool), two projects (SOHAS and UCATT) expanded into new areas.

The details of projects involved in each round of funding are provided in Tables 3 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Lead Partner [abbreviations used]</th>
<th>Other partners</th>
<th>Project outline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Glass [BRG], (Not-for-profit Trade Association)</td>
<td>Ceramics and Allied Trades Union (CATU) (1 Partner)</td>
<td>Creating a partnership between trade associations, trade unions and the 40 glass and ceramic businesses based in Yorkshire and nationwide. The project aims to raise awareness of the importance of health and safety at both employer and employee levels. The project also aims to increase health and safety knowledge on topics such as risk management, hazard identification and training techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalfields Regeneration Trust [CRT] (Charity)</td>
<td>Community Ventures Ltd (CVL), TGWU (Trade Union) (2 Partners)</td>
<td>GB-wide – aiming for 20 voluntary and community workplaces (members of the CRT) and to provide a system of WSAs to promote a health and safety culture of involvement, consultation, co-operation and partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Ventures Ltd [CVL] (community enterprise charity)</td>
<td>Development Trusts Association (DTA), AMICUS (trade union) (2 Partners)</td>
<td>GB-wide aiming for 20 DTA member voluntary and community work places, and to provide a system of Worker Safety Advisers to promote a health and safety culture of involvement, consultation, co-operation and partnership working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Lead Partner [abbreviations used]</td>
<td>Other partners</td>
<td>Project outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enworks [ENW] (Voluntary)</td>
<td>Various Groundworks trusts with 6 BEAs (Business Environment Associations) / UNISON (Trade union) &amp; The Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) (8 Partners)</td>
<td>158 North West based construction, hospitality retail and voluntary Small Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs). The project aimed to create a service in the North West from which health and safety training, advice and support can be provided to small firms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Master Builders (FMB) [FMB] (Employer’s association)</td>
<td>Construction trade unions UCATT and the TGWU (2 Partners)</td>
<td>South West aiming at 175 construction SMEs. The project aimed to set up a sustainable WSA scheme for the FMB’s members and their employees, to engage with the workforce to increase its understanding of health and safety policies and practices on site, as well as develop communication between employers and workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB [GMB] (Trade Union)</td>
<td>ACAD – Asbestos Control and Abatement Division (of the Thermal Insulation Contractors Association) (1 partner)</td>
<td>Midlands - Project aiming to intervene in 19 asbestos removal businesses, through the promotion of worker involvement, to create a positive health and safety culture and increased self-regulation within the industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health@Work Liverpool [HWK] (Charity)</td>
<td>Liverpool Chamber of Commerce Liverpool City Council (1 Partner)</td>
<td>Working within Liverpool's hospitality and retail industry, the project aims to enhance the capacity of employers and employees in 40 workplaces to deal with health and safety issues. WSAs aim to work with employers and their staff to establish practices such as workplace safety representatives, risk assessments and disability access audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health at works Newham [HWN] (Voluntary)</td>
<td>London Borough of Newham UNISON/ Primary Care Trust/ African Caribbean Business Network / Newham chamber of commerce (5 Partners)</td>
<td>Working with 45 small firms in East London, the project aims to increase communication between employers and employees so that they can work together to improve health and safety standards. The project is particularly interested in promoting the use of 'body mapping' to help workers and their employers establish their occupational health needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council [KKK] (Local authority)</td>
<td>Huddersfield South and Central, and North Kirkles Primary Care Trusts (3 Partners)</td>
<td>West Yorkshire - The project will create an integrated occupational health and safety support service; aimed at (up to 70) small firms and provided at no cost. Working actively with both employers and employees, the project aims to help them work together with areas such as policy, risk assessment and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Royal Partnership [PRP] (Not-for-profit urban regeneration company)</td>
<td>GMB (Trade Union) (1 partner)</td>
<td>West London - Targeted at 30 small food firms in the West London food sector, the project aims to raise awareness of health and safety amongst the work force and increase communication between employers and their staff. To achieve this the project provides services such as practical advice on health and safety issues, legislation and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Lead Partner</strong> [abbreviations used]</td>
<td><strong>Other partners</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project outline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Occupational Health Advisory Service / Voluntary Action Sheffield (SOHAS), [SOH] (Charity)</td>
<td>Voluntary Action Sheffield (1 Partner)</td>
<td>To provide (50) voluntary sector organisations in South Sheffield with a framework, involving both employers and employees, for preventing accidents and ill health to both themselves and their clients. The project is to include services such as the provision of self-reporting systems and stress management techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Construction Allied Trades and Technicians [UCATT] [UCT] (Union)</td>
<td>National Federation of Builders (NFB) / Construction Confederation (2 Partners)</td>
<td>Working with up to 120 small firms in the West Midlands construction industry, this project aims to improve health and safety management. Utilising WSAs, the project aims to motivate workers to take an active role in preventing accidents and ill health in the workplace, and promote the benefits of worker involvement to employers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Round 2 project overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Lead Partner</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other partners</strong></th>
<th><strong>Project overview</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Printing Industries Federation (BPIF) [BPI] (Employer’s association)</td>
<td>Amicus (GPM) (1 Partner)</td>
<td>40 Small printing companies (&lt;30) in the South west of England and South Wales recruited from BPIF members. Use the BPIF Health-check to assess workplace H&amp;S arrangements and identify improvement areas. Plan to engage both workers and employers together and provide relevant health and safety information for the employer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Master Builders [FMB] (Employer’s association)</td>
<td>Construction trade unions UCATT and the TGWU (2 Partner)</td>
<td>132 Small Construction companies in the South West of England recruited from FMB members list. The aim, to improve consultation and communication between employers &amp; workers on H&amp;S and raise H&amp;S standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundworks Oldham &amp; Rochdale [GWK] (Business Agency)</td>
<td>Oldham MBC, Rochdale MBC, Asian Business Association, Kashmir Youth Project and Voluntary action Oldham (5 Partner)</td>
<td>15 SMEs based in Oldham &amp; Rochdale. Focusing on ethnic minority businesses in the retail and hospitality sector to improve health and safety through: enabling employees to have a greater role in health and safety management through consultation, skill development and improved access to information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health@Work Liverpool [HWK] (Charity)</td>
<td>Liverpool Chamber of Commerce trade &amp; industry, FSB (Merseyside Branch), North West TUC (educational unit), Knowsley Environmental health trading standards service, Liverpool PCT, Liverpool Business Partnership Group (7 partners)</td>
<td>To build collaboration and trust between employers, employees and partners as a cornerstone to sustaining health and safety and occupational health in 80 small business in the retail and hospitality sector in the Merseyside area; in addition to increasing the skills, knowledge and confidence or workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Lead Partner</td>
<td>Other partners</td>
<td>Project overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees Metropolitan Council [KRK] (Local authority)</td>
<td>Huddersfield South Primary Care Trust, Central Huddersfield Primary Care Trust, North Kirklees Primary Care Trust, Jobcentre Plus (4 Partners)</td>
<td>120, predominately SMEs, in the Kirklees Metropolitan area. Provide an integrated occupational health and safety support service. To improve health and safety in the workplace and improve the status of people with work related illnesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Royal Partnership [PRP] (Not-for-profit urban regeneration company)</td>
<td>Britain's General Union (GMB) (1 Partner)</td>
<td>To provide an innovative and effective mechanism for sustainable improvements in the health and safety standards of 40 SMEs based in the Park Royal area of West London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council [RHO] (Local authority)</td>
<td>Interlink CVC (1 Partner)</td>
<td>50 Voluntary sector workplaces in South Wales recruited from Interlink CVC members. The aim to assess H&amp;S needs and then identify and timetable identified training. Establish a positive H&amp;S culture by empowering staff through involvement in H&amp;S working groups/committees and consult with staff on policies &amp; procedures e.g. risk assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Occupational Health Advisory Service / Voluntary Action Sheffield (SOHAS) [SOH] (Charity)</td>
<td>Voluntary Action Sheffield, Voluntary Action Rotherham, Voluntary Action Barnsley, Doncaster CVS, Healthy Workplace Advisory Service, Workplace Health Advice Management Service (5 Partners)</td>
<td>To create the capacity within the voluntary sector to effectively manage occupational health and safety on a sustainable basis. Help 140 voluntary sector organisations in South Yorkshire to establish reporting systems, participatory solution seeking techniques, risk assessment, audit, identify training solutions and manage stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Trade Union Congress (STUC) [STU] (Union)</td>
<td>Scottish Council of Voluntary Organisations (SCVO), Employers in Voluntary Housing (EVH) and TUC Regional Education Service (3 Partners)</td>
<td>The aim of the project was to raise awareness of health and safety and initiate and improve health and safety dialogue in 25 voluntary sector organisations in the Glasgow metropolitan area. Building upon existing principles of partnership as promoted by the STUC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Construction Allied Trades and Technicians (UCATT) [UCT] (Union)</td>
<td>National Federation of Builders (NFB) / Construction Confederation (2 Partners)</td>
<td>90 Small construction firms (less than 25 employees) in the West and East Midlands using NFB members list. Use Safe Working Activity Plan SWAP to identify H&amp;S improvements and develop an action plan with the employer. Improve employee awareness and worker involvement with tool box</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 THE EVALUATION METHOD

2.1 OVERVIEW OF THE METHOD

2.1.1 Measuring change

The evaluation methods were developed using the impact chain model (presented in Figures 1-3) to assess how a WSA might be expected to catalyse change in worker involvement and thereby lead to improvements in health and safety. This includes likely interim changes necessary to achieve these positive outcomes.

The evaluation seeks to first benchmark a number of factors identified by the impact chain and then assess how these factors change after intervention, for example:

- Attitudes and knowledge towards health and safety (improved understanding of legal duties);
- Attitudes towards worker involvement (consulting workers);
- Types and extent of activities that support worker consultation (representation H&S committees);
- Change to health and safety (updated policies, enhancements to the work place).

Similarly, the evaluation methods outlined the types of changes that might be expected when a partnership develops over the duration of the project.

Broadly, therefore, the evaluation sought data at both workplace and partner levels both prior to, and then following, WSA intervention.

The chosen approach for all projects was to use self administered questionnaires. This was decided by HSE.

For workplaces, baseline data was administered and collected by the WSA during their first visit or the earliest opportunity after the first visit. The feedback data was administered and collected after their visits were completed. Information was also collected during visits detailing the different types of activities undertaken by the WSA and the types of outcomes that may have occurred.

For the partner/project level, baseline data was completed by the Lead Partner at the start of the year before WSA visits had begun in earnest. Information on different aspects of running the project such as recruitment progress and numbers of visits was then collected using quarterly logs and regular interviews, with a final up date at the end of the year.
2.1.2 Evaluation information sources

The evaluation information sources considered inputs and change at two levels (project and workplace) and at three key stages (baseline, ongoing and feedback – end of intervention). These information sources remained primarily the same in both round 1 and round 2, although improvements were made to rationalise and change the wording of some of the questionnaires.

The full suite of evaluation materials and methods used are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: Summary of evaluation materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 Baseline reporting</th>
<th>Stage 2 Ongoing information &amp; collection</th>
<th>Stage 3 Feedback reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form A – Employer questionnaire</td>
<td>Form D – WSA/Employer joint visit report</td>
<td>Form G – Employer questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form F – Employer drop out de-brief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form B – Worker questionnaire</td>
<td>Form H – Worker questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form C – WSA Observations</td>
<td>Form I - WSA Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with workers and employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form E Pt 1 – LP Baseline Log</td>
<td>Form E Pt 2&amp;3 – LP Quarterly log</td>
<td>Form E Pt 2&amp;3 – LP Quarterly log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with Lead Partners</td>
<td>Interviews with Lead Partners, partners and WSAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questionnaires and evaluation methods were used:

- Baseline (Form A & B) and End of Year questionnaire (Form G & H) for workers and employers, to allow comparison of worker involvement and health and safety between the start and finish of WSA intervention;
- WSA observation forms (Form C & Form I) provided WSAs’ views of worker involvement and health and safety in workplaces at the start and finish of WSA intervention;
- Joint visit reports (Form D) completed by WSA and employers which reported decisions made, resources, WSA activities and outcomes;
- A drop out de-brief (Form F) to explore the reasons why an organisation may have left the scheme prior to completion;
• A baseline and quarterly log (Form E) completed by Lead Partners provided evidence of progress and expansion in WSA capacity, along with the end of year telephone interviews;

• Over 80 end of year interviews with employers and workers provided feedback on the WSA interventions;

• Interviews conducted with the Lead Partners reported on progress during the scheme;

• End of year interviews conducted with Lead Partners and a selection of other partners, as well as at least one WSA from each project, explored a number of issues.

2.1.3 Other considerations concerning the evaluation

It should be noted that at the outset of the evaluation it was agreed that it would not be practical to ask organisations to record costs or estimate the business benefits of involvement on the scheme. Therefore, there was no requirement to do a full cost benefit analysis.

Though it is recognised that change to worker involvement and health and safety is measured partly through self reported improvements, the evaluation materials and interviews also seek changes in a number of more objective measures, for example the change to:

• structures that support formal worker consultation (committees, representative);

• worker involvement in risk assessments;

• health and safety features (change in risk control measures);

• injury and absence data; and

• the workplace and working practices (reducing trip hazards).

In addition to the questionnaires, Greenstreet Berman (GSB) also completed verification interviews with employers and workers at the end of the year. Respondents provided both a subjective view of changes to worker involvement and health and safety, and examples of physical changes to the systems and procedures and the workplace. In round 1 several case studies were also developed to help illustrate the impact chain and how WSAs were able to catalyse change.

The case studies and the verification interviews provide cross validation of the reported impacts.

2.2 THE RETURN OF EVALUATION MATERIALS

2.2.1 Benchmarking response rates

The responsibility for administering and collecting questionnaires rested with the WSA projects, although the evaluators did also carry out some telephone interviews of a sample of workers and employers.
To monitor the return of questionnaires the following benchmark was established:

- 0-20% very low
- 21-40% low
- 41-60% adequate
- 60-80% high
- > 80% very high

It was decided to select 41-60% as the adequate response rate because this is an expected response rate for internal or self-administered questionnaires (comparable to how the evaluation materials are being administered on the WSA scheme) and was also a similar response rate to the WSA pilot (46%).

A response rate of 21-40% for a project is considered low, but acceptable depending on attenuating circumstances, for example, a project that has recruited a large number of organisations. A response rate of below 20% would raise concern over the robustness of the data.

It should be noted that response rates for different evaluation materials will fluctuate. For example: ideally, for the worker baseline materials (Form B) more than one form would be expected for each beneficiary organisation recruited. In contrast, for the employer baseline (Form A) and WSA baseline observation (Form C) we would not expect to receive more than one form for each beneficiary organisation.
Table 6: Summary of response rates for round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Partnership</th>
<th>Bid</th>
<th>Number of workplaces engaged</th>
<th>Employer Baseline Form A</th>
<th>Total Worker Baseline Form B</th>
<th>WSA Baseline Observations Form C</th>
<th>Employer Feedback Form G</th>
<th>Worker Feedback Form H</th>
<th>WSA Feedback Form I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BRG</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>748%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CRT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>365%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CVL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>204%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ENW</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>291%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FMB</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GMB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HWK</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>123%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HWN</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. KRK</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PRP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>962%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SOH</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>265%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. UCT</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for R1</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>230%</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for R2</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>198%</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline evaluation materials

Feedback evaluation materials
Table 7: Summary of response rates for round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Partnerships</th>
<th>Bid</th>
<th>Number of workplaces engaged</th>
<th>Baseline evaluation materials</th>
<th>Feedback evaluation materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer Baseline Form A</td>
<td>Employer Feedback Form G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Worker Baseline Form B</td>
<td>Worker Feedback Form H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WSA Baseline Observations Form C</td>
<td>WSA Feedback Form I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. BPI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FMB</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GWK</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HWK</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. KRK</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PRP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>285%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RHO</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>276%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SOH</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. STU</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1428%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>696%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. UCT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for R2</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>198%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for R1</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>198%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Response rate and the robustness of the data

Overall, the response rates for round 1 and round 2, presented in Table 6 and Table 7 respectively were mixed, with a good response rate for the baseline and on-going forms but a lower response rate on the end of year feedback forms. The lower feedback response rate was because a large proportion of these forms were administered after interventions were completed. Projects therefore had less resource or time to chase up the forms and beneficiary organisations had less incentive to complete and return them.

Overall, the response rate was similar with a slight improvement on all round 2 forms with the exception of employer feedback forms where response rates remained the same.

For projects with two years of consecutive funding the projects that had successfully managed the evaluation in round 1 were also successful in round 2, for example, SOHAS and Park Royal. UCATT, who had a poor response rate in round 1, did however improve in comparison to round 2. Kirklees, FMB and Health@Work Liverpool struggled to manage the evaluation, particularly the feedback evaluation materials, in both round 1 and round 2.

Two projects (FMB & Kirklees) had lower response rates on both the baseline and feedback evaluation materials. Both these projects in round 2 also had the lowest percentage of engaged workplaces. One reason why FMB has a lower response rate may be because they only complete on average 2 visits per workplace providing less opportunity to administer and collect questionnaires.

In round 2, three projects also had lower response rates for feedback forms (Health@Work Liverpool, Lambeth and Rhondda). It should be noted however, that in the case of Rhondda the key individual who was acting as both WSA and LP went on long term sick leave after Christmas, and there were no more visits. Lambeth also had a WSA who was ill towards the end of the year.

The only project to struggle with the evaluation, from those projects that had just operated in round 2, was Lambeth.

In round 1, one project, GMB failed to return any feedback materials at the end of the year and struggled throughout to provide completed employer and worker questionnaires.

In round 1, to account for the lower response rate for feedback questionnaires the data was analysed in terms of total response and also as a ‘matched pair’ response (only considering data from respondents who had completed both baseline and feedback evaluation materials). The results from round 1 showed there was very little difference between ‘matched pairs’ and the overall response so this method was not used for the evaluation on round 2 data.
The validity of responses from projects engaged by Kirklees was affected in round 2. This was because the WSA scheme was conducted concurrently with ‘Better Health at Work’ pilot\(^2\) using the same organisations. It is difficult, therefore, to determine whether improvements to worker involvement and health and safety were a direct result of the WSA scheme.

There are a number of factors that have been identified from interviews with Lead Partners and WSAs that may have also had an impact on the return of questionnaires, for example:

- If projects or partnerships had developed a successful strategy for the return evaluation materials;
- The willingness and co-operation of employers and workers in completing and returning evaluation materials if there is limited incentive to do so;
- The WSAs resource to chase outstanding paperwork after completion of visits to beneficiary organisations particularly in a large or dispersed geographic area;
- The burden of completing additional evaluation materials for other HSE projects run concurrently with the WSA scheme.

Despite these issues, the information from the questionnaires still provides useful data which has added to the overall findings.

### 2.2.3 Injury and absence data

The injury and absence data questions asked employers to provide details of the total number of days lost due to absence, and number of injuries for April 2004 to March 2005 prior to WSA intervention and then in April 2005 to March 2006 after WSA intervention.

In round 1, the majority of respondents failed to complete questions on the evaluation materials regarding numbers of injuries and absence from work. It was also difficult to determine whether employers had left the question blank or had simply had no injuries. When the data was analysed results showed that injury rate was actually higher for the ‘last three months’ than the preceding years, suggesting a reporting problem. Therefore, it is uncertain whether the injury and absence data can be relied on.

For round 2, the wording of the evaluation material was revised and this has led to a much higher response rate with between 48%-58% of respondents who completed employer baseline and feedback questionnaires also completing injury and absence data.

The data was also reviewed to remove outliers and numbers that were significantly higher than expected, for example:

\(^2\) [http://www.whig.org.uk/groups/kirklees/](http://www.whig.org.uk/groups/kirklees/)
• All responses from employers with absence rates higher than 24 days per worker per year

• All responses from employers with injury/RIDDOR\(^3\) rates of more than 1 per employee per year

The results from the injury and absence data have been used to provide an additional measure of the overall benefits of round 2 of the WSA scheme. It has also been used to provide an estimate of the potential value these benefits might have resulted in. There were, however, insufficient responses to enable a project-by-project assessment of change to injury and absence rates.

It should be noted that a reduction in the reporting of injury and absence data might be due to changes in reporting on the part of the employer, however all data input was quality controlled to ensure accuracy. Finally, although matched pairs (comparison between the same organisations at baseline and feedback) were not used to analyse the data, results showed that 75% of employers who completed feedback evaluation materials also completed baseline data.

---

\(^3\) Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations
3 OUTCOMES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Findings were made with consideration to a number of data sources, for example:

- Quantitative and qualitative data from the evaluation materials;
- Quantitative and qualitative data from the end of year employer and worker verification interviews;
- Qualitative data from the WSA, partner and Lead Partner interviews.

The main findings are presented in this section, which reports on the changes in worker involvement and health and safety. The following section ISSUES then explores the factors that influence these outcomes.

3.2 OVERVIEW

Findings from the interviews with workers and employers, from the verification interviews and the end of year interviews with WSAs and Lead Partners, provide support for improvements in worker involvement and health and safety. These findings reinforce the validity of the quantitative findings and strongly suggest that positive changes occurred following WSA intervention.

Results from the analysis of the data from the questionnaires show improvements in the indicators that WSA scheme has had a positive impact on worker involvement and health and safety. For example:

- Employers, workers and WSAs perceive an improvement in worker involvement;
- There is an improvement in employer and worker attitude to worker involvement;
- There is an increase in formal consultation structures in place – such as 28% more organisations report having a worker representative and 25% more report having a H&S committee;
- WSAs, workers and employers perceive that there has been an improvement in health and safety;
- There is improved employer and worker knowledge of health and safety;
- There are more health and safety systems in place (29% more formal risk assessment procedures); and
- There is a perception by employers that overall, the scheme has been of benefit.

The most commonly cited benefits of the WSA scheme in health and safety procedures was the implementation of risk assessments. Employers and workers both stated that ‘risk assessments’ were now more formalised and carried out more frequently.
The most commonly cited improvement in worker involvement was that awareness had been raised amongst employees and better channels of communication opened. For example, health and safety was more likely to be a standard item on the agenda at staff meetings and in addition, H&S committees had been established. Full details of the evaluation material data results that provide evidence for these overall findings are presented in appendix A.

These overall findings strongly suggest that for both round 1 and round 2 of the WSA Challenge Fund there is an increase of worker involvement and improved health and safety.

3.3 BASELINE AND END OF YEAR QUESTIONNAIRES

This section of the report presents the results of the change in measures of worker involvement and health and safety from the employer, worker and WSA end of year evaluation materials.

3.3.1 Methods for measuring change in outcomes

The evaluation method derives knowledge of workplace changes through self-reporting using a suite of questionnaires and different interviews – as discussed earlier in the evaluation method.

The data derived from self-reporting was subjective in terms of perception. But also objective because it considered physical changes to the workplace. For example, methods to support consultation (see ratings B and C in section 3.3.2).

The data was used to assess change to both worker involvement and health and safety. Projects were rated out of five, depending on the degree of improvement or change from baseline to feedback, on a range of factors identified from the impact chain. For example, employers were asked to rate “how much involvement in health and safety issues do workers have in your workplace” from a rank of 1 (which equalled “none”) to a rank of 5 (which equalled “as much as possible”). If the overall benchmark for a project’s organisations was 2.8 (between “A little” and “Some”) and this increased at feedback to 3.3 (between “Some” and “A lot”) then the improvement would be the difference, e.g. 0.5. This level of change was described as moderate and was given a rating (3) based on the following scale see Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-0.19</td>
<td>(very limited change)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2-0.39</td>
<td>(limited change)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4-0.59</td>
<td>(moderate change)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6-0.79</td>
<td>(substantial change)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 0.8</td>
<td>(very substantial change)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using this common rating out of 5 enables cross comparison between the different factors that, when considered together, give an overall measure of how effective projects were in terms of outcomes. Each rating used for overall assessment of project outcome is presented below with the full details of how the ratings were determined in Appendix B.
3.3.2 Project ratings for Worker Involvement and H&S

The following ratings, of outcomes to worker involvement and health and safety, are presented in Table 9 and Table 10 for round 1 and round 2 respectively.

A=Perceived improvement of worker involvement from workers, employers and WSAs.
B=Rating scale based on the percentage decrease in ‘no consultation’ methods in health and safety.
C=Rating scale based on the percentage increase of workers represented.
D=Workers’ and employers’ perception of worker involvement.
E=Overall average rating of Worker Involvement
F=Rating scales based on WSA’s perception of health and safety
G=Workers’ and employers’ perception of health and safety improvements
H=Overall average rating of health and safety

3.3.3 Changes in measures of worker involvement and health and safety

The overall findings would suggest that projects in both round 1 and round 2 were effective in increasing worker involvement and health and safety.

**Table 9**: Rated level of change in round 1 projects (where 5 = very substantial change, 4 = substantial change, 3 = moderate change 2 = limited change and 1 = very limited change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Impact on Worker Involvement</th>
<th>Average of A - D</th>
<th>Impact on H&amp;S</th>
<th>Average of E - F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Rated level of change in round 2 projects (where 5 = very substantial change, 4 = substantial change, 3 = moderate change 2 = limited change and 1 = very limited change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Impact on Worker Involvement</th>
<th>Average of A - D</th>
<th>Impact on H&amp;S</th>
<th>Average of F-G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that:

- All projects that delivered the scheme had WSA interventions that led to improvement to both worker involvement and health and safety;
- No project in either round 1 or round 2 had any outcomes where health & safety or worker involvement actually became worse such that there was a negative rating between benchmark and feedback;
- Both round 1 and round 2 showed moderate to substantial increases in both H&S and worker involvement, for example:
  - In round 1 changes to worker involvement was rated on average 3.4 (between moderate and substantial change);
  - In round 1 changes to health and safety was also rated on average 3.4 (between moderate and substantial change);

4 Please note: Kirklees ratings are in grey because there is doubt over their result see earlier comments in the section response rates and robustness of data.
In round 2 changes to worker involvement was rated on average 3.8 (between moderate and substantial change);

In round 2 changes to health and safety was rated on average 4 (substantial change);

- Worker involvement and health and safety improved in round 2 compared with round 1;
- There is a variation between projects in terms of outcomes with some projects showing substantial changes to both health and safety and worker involvement, for example Park Royal, with other projects showing only limited change, for example GMB.

The difference between round 1 and round 2 and also the variation between projects is an important finding. It suggests that these variations exist because of different factors that may impact delivery of WSA interventions and hence on the outcome of the WSA scheme. This is explored further during the next main section ‘Issues’.

3.4 VERIFICATION INTERVIEWS

The outcomes from the baseline and end of year questionnaires are also supported by the findings from the self-reported verification interviews. These again show a rated improvement to worker involvement and health and safety.

**Table 11: Overall rating from the verification interviews (where 1 = A lot worse and 5 = A lot better)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1 - All</th>
<th>Round 2 - All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker Involvement</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the verification interviews conducted in round 1 there were a number of outcomes which were directly attributed to the interventions of the WSA. The majority of interviewees, for example, stated that there were greater opportunities for involvement because “H&S was now firmly an item on the team meeting agenda”.

A number of interviewees also describe how the confidence and knowledge of the workforce had increased and that there was better understanding of why they should be involved in H&S. Employers also reported they were more confident in tackling H&S. Almost all of the interviewees also cited some improvements to H&S such as changes to signage or fire drill procedures.
In round 2 the most commonly cited improvement in worker involvement was that awareness had been raised amongst workers. There were also better channels of communication for workers to report on H&S issues and again, it was reported that H&S is now a standard item at meetings. Half of those interviewed stated, that in addition they also formed new H&S committees.

In round 2 the most commonly cited improvement in H&S procedures was implementation of risk assessments. A number of interviewees stated that risk assessments were now more regular and formalised, with upgrades to their risk assessment procedures.

In round 1 and 2 all projects who had respondents to the verification interviews reported specific benefits that were a result of the WSA scheme, some specific examples include:

- Worker attitude and behaviour changed as a result of the WSA’s actions;
- Improvements in H&S practices and policies and also overall employee awareness, which would “set the ball rolling” on H&S issues in the future;
- The scheme “gave focus and raised awareness of H&S issues” there is a “better understanding of their roles and responsibilities regarding H&S”;
- Improved H&S controls and also better worker involvement;
- The scheme “helped people think about H&S in a different way”, it “had helped raise awareness, there was much more involvement in H&S issues from staff”;
  “Updated and better formulated policies”, “better able to identify hazards”, “increased staff involvement”;
- “Signs displayed for workers to wear their ear defenders” “workers now have improved the way they lift and stand since they took part in a manual handling course”;

H&S discussed at team meetings;
- Improvements in worker involvement and reporting that staff were now a lot more involved in conducting risk assessments;
- “Workforce now thinks more responsibly”, “More attention given to health and safety now in organisation than before visits”, “Better understanding of health and safety throughout organisation”;
- Health and safety control measures have improved and there is greater provision and use of PPE.

It should be noted, however, that even though overall the responses of those interviewed were very positive, there were a number of cases in both round 1 and round 2 where respondents, when asked, did not recognise the WSA scheme. Although details of recognition is not provided for all projects several do standout as having surprisingly high levels of unfamiliarity even when the scheme was explained to the interviewee in some detail for example:
• Lambeth in round 2 – 76% of 34 interviewees contacted were unfamiliar with the scheme;

• Healthworks Newham London in round 1 – 63% of 8 interviewees contacted were unfamiliar with the scheme;

• Kirklees in round 1 – 41% of 22 interviewees contacted were unfamiliar with the scheme.

There may be reasons for unfamiliarity, other than the quality of the WSA visit. For example:

• Respondents from ethnic communities where English is not their first language may misunderstand or been reticent about discussing H&S matters;

• Some larger organisations may have had some employers or workers who did not partake in the scheme;

• Some organisations may have completed their visits earlier on in the scheme and subsequently employers and workers who were closely involved may have changed jobs.

The full detailed responses for both round 1 and round 2 of the verification interviews are presented in Appendix D.

3.5 INJURY AND ABSENCE RATES

The injury and absence data is based on employer estimates reported in the evaluation materials at baseline or start of round 2, prior to WSA intervention, and then at feedback or end of WSA intervention. Even though the following calculations use reported data, they are also based on estimated values and are therefore subject to interpretation. Theses findings, therefore, only provide an indication of the possible costs/benefit of the WSA scheme.

3.5.1 Changes in injury and absence rates

The weakness in the injury and absence data from the first round means that a comparison cannot be made with round 2.

When the injury and absence data for round 2 was analysed, with consideration to responses per number of workers, the results showed a:

• 9% reduction in average total days absence per workers;

• 48% reduction in average total number of all injuries per 100,000 workers;

• 56% reduction in average total number of injuries or illness leading to more than three days off work per 100,000 workers.

When the value of these improvements are estimated the findings suggest that the overall benefits of the WSA scheme in terms of injury and absence days averted in the first year, would seem to be comparable to the actual funding costs of running the scheme.
The following Table 12 presents full details of the reported change in injury and absence rates.

### Table 12: Changes to injury and absence data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average total days absence per workers per year</td>
<td>6.9 (n=204)</td>
<td>6.3 (n=107)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total number of all injuries per 100,000 workers</td>
<td>5570 (n=300)</td>
<td>2665 (n=132)</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total of injuries or illness leading to more than three days off work per 100,000 workers</td>
<td>1225 (n=305)</td>
<td>690 (n=131)</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst these results are indicative, and need to be treated with some caution due to sample size and uncertainties about reporting practice, the findings demonstrate a significant reduction in incidents and accidents (around 50%). This concurs with a consultative document commissioned by HSC\(^5\) that explores improved health and safety through worker involvement. This document cites a study\(^6\) that estimates manufacturing organisations, with trade union representatives on safety committees, have injury rates 50% lower than those without such arrangements. Although trade union representatives are not the same as worker safety advisors, they can fulfil a similar role. For example: raising awareness; helping to get workers more involved and establishing structures that support this involvement.

#### 3.5.2 Value of averted injuries and absence

To calculate the possible value of averted injury or absence the results have been considered in conjunction with information provided by HSE\(^7\) to help duty holders make judgements on the possible costs of injury and of days lost through absence, for example:

- A one week absence due to minor illness is valued at £530 per week or £106 per day;
- A slight injury involving minor cuts and bruises with a quick and complete recovery is valued at £300 per injury;
- A RIDDOR (more than 3 days of work) incident is valued at, as follows:
  - Fatality £1,440,000 (occurrence 0.15% per RIDDOR);
  - Serious £40,000 (occurrence 20.04% per RIDDOR);

---

\(^5\) *Improving worker involvement – Improving health and safety Consultation document, HSC*

\(^6\) *Unions, Safety Committees and Workplace injuries, City University Department of Economics*

\(^7\) *Values for RIDDOR are taken from Directors’ Duties in Health and Safety Regulatory Impact Assessment (Initial) and for injury days and absence from Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) Checklist*
Over three days injury £6,000 (occurrence 79.82% per RIDDOR).

The reduction in injury and absence data was extrapolated to provide estimation for both respondents and non-respondents so it is a more representative value for all workers engaged in the scheme as a whole. For example:

1. The estimated reduction in absence days 0.6 multiplied by the estimated number of workers engaged on the WSA scheme (0.6 x 16126);

2. The estimated reduction in injuries per 100,000 workers 2905 calculated for the estimated total number of workers actually engaged on the WSA scheme (2905 x 16126 / 100000);

3. The estimated reduction in RIDDORs per 100,000 workers calculated for the estimated total number of workers actually engaged on the WSA scheme (535 x 16126 / 100000).

The results from this extrapolation are presented in **Table 13**

**Table 13**: Changes to incident and accident data per worker engaged on the scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Estimated total days of averted absence for all workers engaged on the scheme (16,126)</td>
<td>9666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Estimated total number of injuries averted for all workers engaged on the scheme (16,126)</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Estimated total number of injuries or illness leading to more than three days off work for all workers engaged on the scheme (16,126)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the total reductions in injury and absence for round 2 of the WSA scheme as a whole are multiplied by the values of injury and absence rates provided by HSE, then the potential benefits might be estimated as follows:

**Potential benefit in absence days**

The potential benefit estimated for absence days averted for organisations engaged on the WSA scheme, in round 2 = £1,024,597

Calculation:

The potential benefit has been calculated by multiplying the number of absence days averted (9666) by the estimated cost of daily absence (£106)

9666 x £106 = £1,024,597
**Potential benefit in injuries averted**

The potential benefit estimated for injuries that have been averted by organisations engaged on the WSA scheme in round 2 = £1,400,058

Calculation:

The potential benefit for injuries has been calculated by considering the cost of the number of injury days averted (468) less the RIDDOR (more than 3 day reported injury or illness) (86) multiplied by the estimated cost of a slight injury 468 - 86 = 382 x £300 = £114,662

This figure was then added to the potential benefit of the number of RIDDORs (more than 3 day reported injury or illness) averted (86) multiplied by the proportional cost of a RIDDOR depending on whether it leads to a fatality, serious injury or over 3 day injury.

- Fatality (86 x 0.15% = 0.129 x £1,440,000) = £181,193
- Serious injury (86 x 20.04% = 17.27 x £40,000) = £691,212
- Over 3 day injury (86 x 79.82% = 68.8 x £6,000) = £412,990

£114,662 + £181,193 + £691,212 + £412,990 = £1,400,058

If the RIDDOR reported injuries and illness do not include serious injuries or fatalities then benefits of averted three day injuries are calculated as (86 x 6,000) = £516,000 and total cost of injuries are calculated as £114,662 + £516,000 = £630,662

The potential benefits of days of absence averted and injuries averted cannot be combined because absence days potentially include days lost due to injury and so would be likely to double count the cost of an injury.

**3.5.3 Comparison of costs benefit**

The potential benefits of the WSA scheme do not consider the cost of engagement. One barrier to the scheme cited by a number of WSAs and Lead Partners was that there was a cost to organisations in terms of employer and worker time.

The average number of visits was 3.5 per workplace and the average length of the visit was 3.7 hours. The average time spent, was therefore, approximately 13 hours or around 2 days of time per organisation. The WSA visits generally involved more than one person so the total time spent during the actual visit is calculated as 2 people spending 2 days of work time or 4 days of work time in total.

If the same calculated value for absence rate (£106) is also used to determine the cost to an organisation in terms of worker and employer time, then the cost of the scheme per workplace is £424 and the total cost to the organisations engaged is £297,224.

Most organisations spent additional time and resource outside of the WSA visits. Consideration of the joint visit report suggests that time spent varies widely with some organisations spending only a matter of hours and other organisations claiming they have spent up to 6 weeks. The
estimated additional time spent was approximately 2 days per visit so an additional total of 7 days per organisation. If 2 or more people were involved then the total cost for all organisations would be £1,040,284.

WSAs and employers were also asked to provide details of the actual monies spent in round 2 on, for example, new equipment or training. This was calculated as a total of £44,000 for all organisations engaged on the scheme.

The estimated total cost to organisations engaged on the scheme was therefore:

- Additional levered in resource = £44,000;
- Time spent (4 days) by employers and workers during WSA visits = £297,224;
- Additional time spent (14 days) outside of WSA visits = £1,040,284.

If the benefits of the scheme in terms of injury and absence days averted are compared with the total cost to organisations, then cost to benefit is approximately the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14: Cost benefit analysis of the WSA scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total estimated cost to all organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1.38 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings would suggest that although there is a cost to industry, of participating in the WSA scheme, these costs are balanced against the probable potential benefits of reduced absence and injury rates.

Even though results would appear to be cost neutral, there are many other potential improvements to business that could result from WSA intervention, for example, better motivation, morale and communication which are not quantifiable.

### 3.6 QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Findings from the interviews with workers and employers, from the verification interviews and the end of year interviews with WSAs and Lead Partners, provide support for improvements in worker involvement and health and safety. These findings reinforce the validity of the quantitative findings and strongly suggest that positive changes occurred following WSA intervention.

Some of the outcomes that emerged from the interviews and joint visit reports include:

---
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3.6.1 H&S Knowledge

- Bringing workers and employers together to educate both at the same time on basic H&S requirements and the benefits of worker involvement;
- Employees briefed on health and safety which is included in induction packs;
- Signposting sources of information on H&S;
- Improved intranet communication of H&S documentation.

3.6.2 Attitudes & Behaviours

- Change in worker attitudes and a willingness to become more involved in health and safety;
- Encouraging the managing director to take more direct responsibility for H&S and provide support and H&S training for their H&S manager;
- Staff showing a real commitment to H&S with workers jointly completing relevant risk assessments.

3.6.3 Training & Certification

- Assisting the employer to source specialist training;
- Managers and workers receiving CIEH Foundation Course in Health & Safety;
- Workers and employers having training and practical sessions in manual handling, risk assessments and general health and safety;
- Workers given 30 min talks on different aspects of work and H&S that may concern them each month;
- Workers and managers taking on-line TUC health and safety training courses;
- Company considering getting CSCS Accreditation for all its workers;
- C.I.T.B safety awareness training in place.

3.6.4 Awareness

- Explaining to workers the rights of consultation and the benefits of H&S training and representation;
- Improvement in knowledge, skills and awareness of employees in regard to H&S;
- Workers showing more awareness of health and safety by raising issues either through the health and safety representative or through managers;
- Improved management awareness of record keeping (up to date and in more detail);
• Improvement of health and safety awareness and system implementation;

• Helping to raise the profile of health and safety issues through meetings with the managing director;

• More employer discussion on H&S with workers leading to better awareness.

3.6.5 Worker consultation

• Improved communication and trust between management and workers;

• Additional resources and networks made available to organisations, to ensure worker involvement can be maximised;

• Identified safety representatives;

• Introduced workplace health and safety champions;

• Managers and workers attending health and safety committing meetings;

• Workers have been giving presentations at the seminars to share good experiences of worker involvement.

3.6.6 Consultation skills

• Providing advice to managers on how to conduct toolbox talks;

• Providing prompt cards to help managers engage workers on health and safety;

• Improving H&S manager confidence to come forward and discuss what they need with the managing director or duty holder.

3.6.7 H&S systems and procedures

• Health and Safety Policies created and updated by employees and management in consultation with each other;

• New library of health and safety information;

• Consolidation of current information. H&S an agenda at AGM;

• Managers have been asked to complete risk assessments; updated H&S policy which is now on intranet;

• Health & Safety policy completed and distributed to all staff; the company has formed a health and safety committee; HSE poster updated;

• Weekly risk assessments;

• Meeting with council head of H&S & fire officer to review fire procedures for people with mobility problems.
3.6.8 Work environment

- Fire safety precautions overhauled and alarm system modified; upgrading of volunteer induction pack; ear protection information; work station assessments;

- Changes to the work environment following input from workers, for example, better provision of safety equipment for workers;

- Health and safety signs have been bought; new fire plan in place;

- Health and safety poster displayed; health and safety signage increased; fire extinguishers mounted;

- Work surface in telephone room lowered as a result of work station assessment;

- Following audit plans creation of a new no smoking area;

- New safety signs; fire training; manual handling operations have started to be reviewed; enforcement of PPE.

3.7 CHARACTERISTICS OF MORE SUCCESSFUL PROJECTS

Feedback from Lead Partners and WSAs reported that they felt different characteristics of their project, for example, the region they were operating in, had made their job, in terms of delivering the Challenge Fund, either easier or more difficult.

The following characteristics were identified as being more likely to contribute to successful delivery of the scheme, for example:

1. Skills of the WSA:
   - A basic health and safety qualification (e.g. NEBOSH or TUC Stage 1 certificates) a more advanced qualification was not thought to be necessary;
   - Good communication skills, with ability to build trust and be impartial;
   - Experience (two years was mentioned by a few) of visiting and advising SMEs;
   - The confidence and credibility to approach and talk on equal terms to both management and workers

2. Qualities of the WSA – belief and understanding of the benefits of worker involvement and the chosen approach;

3. Extensive and well networked partnership – aid with recruitment;

4. Effective partnership management:
   - Lead Partner has time and resource to proactively manage the project;
   - plan project costs and time requirements;
   - WSAs are offered adequate support and guidance;
   - scoping and preparation prior to visits to establish what is being offered and how best to deliver it;
o Good open communication with partners;

5. Quality of the partner relationship – provides strategic support and advice, materials, office space, liaison with WSA or recruited organisations;

6. Operate in a small geographic region such as a metropolitan area - reduces travel time, easier to rearrange appointments, networking opportunities;

Based upon our interpretation of the evidence, whilst all of the characteristics are important points, 1 to 3 are prerequisites to a successful delivery of the scheme; whereas points 4, 5 and 6 aid efficiency and effectiveness.

It is not believed that possessing all the above characteristics guarantees success but it is likely that having a predominance of these characteristics is likely to give projects an advantage in terms of scheme delivery.

3.8 CASE STUDIES THAT EXEMPLIFIED WSA ACTIVITY AND OUTCOMES

Three case studies, identified in January 2005, for round 1, exemplify the work of WSA and the outcome of their activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A British Glass participant | **Introduction**: 30-40 employees, dealing with refractory material (for glass manufacture).

**WSA activities**: The WSA helped to set up an H&S committee, initially meeting monthly.
Through discussions with the WSA, two workers took on the role of H&S champions and were given training in auditing and inspection. The WSA used the more informal ‘Tool box’ talks approach to raise awareness and seek ideas for improvement from the shop floor. This also established a way for the H&S champions to sustain raised H&S awareness and to continue cascading H&S information to the factory floor.

**Outcomes**: The key outcome is much increased worker involvement including the new joint H&S committee. This has already identified a number of H&S issues and led to a number of changes to work practices e.g.:

- Reduction in the weight of bags manually lifted & training in safe lifting.
- Use of a less dusty type of refractory material
- Improved machinery guarding
- Introduction of ‘sound booths’ to provide respite from noisy working conditions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A Kirklees participant** | **Introduction:** Dewsbury & Batley Society for the Blind is a support centre for local blind and partially sighted people, with 6 full time and 17 part time employees and over 50 volunteers.  
**WSA activities:** The initial WSA assessment and joint workplace tour showed inadequate H&S Policy, no risk assessments, no transport policy and no one person with responsibility for H&S. With WSA help an action plan was drawn up with suggested improvements, for example: training needs and recruiting a competent person to take on board health and safety issues and the need for worker consultation and worker feedback, for example by committee. The organisation acted on this.  
**Outcomes:**  
- A H&S committee comprising management, workers & volunteers – with an agreed programme of meetings;  
- The development of a Health and Safety Policy;  
- A worker acting as a Health and Safety champion;  
- Funds provided improvements to the building and car park and to implement a Transport Policy;  
- A competent person identified; a volunteer with recognised H&S qualifications and experience (RSP, MIOSH, Dip SM) to assist with risk assessments. |
| **A Park Royal Partnership participant** | **Introduction:** 8/9 employees, food manufacturer and distributor. English is not the first language of the workers. The WSA observed that H&S was minimal but they were keen to improve. However, they lacked the confidence and the knowledge to tackle H&S.  
**WSA activities:** On the first visit the WSA spent time developing a rapport with the employer, discussing the scheme, legal H&S requirements and the benefit of involving workers. The WSA then carried out a checklist to identify potential hazards to demonstrate how, with the WSA’s help, they could begin to reduce the risks in their workplace.  
On the second visit the WSA talked to the workers about H&S and explained how they could have an important role and help improve H&S in their workplace. Workers became more knowledgeable and also were more comfortable about doing their work within H&S guidelines. They also gained confidence and welcomed the opportunity to be trained to carry out risk assessments.  
On the third visit five workers and the person in charge of H&S were brought together and provided with risk assessment training.  
**Outcome:** After the training, the H&S manager and workers conducted their risk assessments without the WSA being present. Much improved awareness of issues plus the confidence and practical skills to assess and improve health and safety standards jointly. Five workers and one manager received risk assessment training. Physical changes to the workplace as a result of joint employer/worker risk assessments, for example, removing rubbish from the kitchen area. Worker involvement is maintained with a new H&S committee, where all staff meet once a month. |

### 3.9 THE BENEFITS OF THE SCHEME

During the verification interviews, employers were asked to select a statement that reflected what their organisation thought about the benefits of being involved in the WSA scheme.
Table 15: Verification interviews - employer view of benefits of being involved in the scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1 (n = 30)</th>
<th>Round 2 (n = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. It has <em>very much</em> benefited our business (or will shortly)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The benefits have probably been more than the costs to our business</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The benefits to our business have been about the same as the costs of being involved / we are unsure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The costs have probably been more than the benefits to our business</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The costs of being involved have been <em>very much</em> more than the benefits.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same question was asked in the feedback questionnaire.

Table 16: Employer feedback questionnaire - employer view of benefits of being involved in the scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1 (n=224)</th>
<th>Round 2 (n = 218)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. It has <em>very much</em> benefited our business (or will shortly)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The benefits have probably been more than the costs to our business</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The benefits to our business have been about the same as the costs of being involved / we are unsure</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The costs have probably been more than the benefits to our business</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The costs of being involved have been <em>very much</em> more than the benefits.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall attitudes were very positive towards the scheme with around 80% of the employers stating that the benefits outweighed the costs.

Comparing both rounds, the benefits of the scheme had improved slightly in round 2, for example:
• In round 2 around 20% more employers believed that the scheme had very much benefited their organisation;

• In round 2 only around 4% of employers felt the cost of the scheme outweighed the benefits a slight reduction on round 1.

The majority of Lead Partners and WSAs also commented that they believed that the scheme had been of benefit to the organisations involved. For example: Of the 22 WSAs interviewed 20 believed the WSA scheme was an effective way of increasing worker involvement and only 2 were not sure or didn’t know.

Some commonly expressed views by Lead Partners and WSAs on the benefits include:

• The Lead Partner from British Glass believed that the WSA scheme had many benefits:
  
  o “Improves bottom line – better H&S procedures & protocol”;
  
  o “Improves worker relations immensely, a lot more appreciated”;
  
  o “Structured process for workers to contribute on a strategic level”;

• The Lead Partner from CVL thought the scheme was beneficial and helped to involve workers.

• The Lead Partner from ENWORKs felt there were no dis-benefits of the WSA scheme. Communication and partnership working improves H&S and morale “In our experience it has been successful in that respect”.

• The WSA from Healthworks Newham felt the WSA scheme was good for business and interventions that change views or culture are beneficial.

These findings again provide support that the scheme is beneficial and an effective method of helping small to medium sized businesses to achieve a better standard of health and safety.
4 ISSUES

4.1 SUSTAINED INCREASE IN WSA CAPACITY

Issue 1 - To what extent does the Challenge Fund help to create a sustained increase in WSA capacity?

4.1.1 Overall findings

WSA capacity is the supporting framework that enables the delivery of WSA intervention at the workplace. There are three main ways that WSA capacity can be developed or increased:

- Project or partnership development e.g. new partners;
- WSA development e.g. training, improve skills competency;
- Demand for WSA services and expansion of the scheme.

Findings suggest that firstly, although capacity building did occur it was limited and secondly, although partnership development and employer demand continued to develop in round 2 WSA development was actually reduced.

Reporting from Lead Partners and WSAs also indicate that the difficulty of recruiting competent WSAs might have an impact on the future delivery of the scheme.

The increase in employer demand in round 2, however, has encouraged a number of projects (SOHAS, UCATT, BPI & STUC) to consider alternative funding methods to carry on delivering this type of service.

4.1.2 Detailed findings

The projects in round 1 and round 2 were given a subjective rating of 1-5 for capacity building where 1 = ‘none’ and 5 = ‘as much as it is possible’. The ratings were based on self-reporting by Lead Partners and the WSAs. These ratings are presented in Table 17. The evidence for the ratings is provided at the start of Appendix B – Qualitative reporting (Lead Partner, partner and WSA interview findings).
Table 17: Project rating of capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>WSA scheme capacity building</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>WSA scheme capacity building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (average)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall results indicated that capacity building was rated at 2.5 in round 1 (limited to moderate capacity building) increasing slightly to 2.7 in round 2.

The increase in capacity building in round 2, was chiefly due to the increase in employer demand. This increased demand is likely to have been a secondary product of delivering workplace improvements. In round 1 two projects (CRT and CVL) were more focused on developing WSAs, which contributed to their high capacity building scores. These two projects did not continue into round 2. It should be noted that both CRT and CVL had higher costs per workplace in comparison with other projects operating in round 1 see Table 19.

Another reason capacity building may be limited to demand may be a result of the model used to deliver the scheme in both round 1 and round 2, for example:

- The scheme was delivered by a number of diverse projects that operated on a relatively small scale;
- The majority of projects had relatively well developed partnerships and a pool of persons with pertinent experience, for which capacity building was not a priority;
- Some centralised training for WSAs was offered through IOSH in round 2 but WSAs were not trained *en mass*, and training was left to the discretion of each partnership.
**Project or partnership development**

Even though capacity building was limited, there was some expansion of the project partnership between round 1 and round 2, for example:

- There were 35 partners involved in round 2 compared to 29 in round 1;
- All the partners engaged in round 1 whose partnership continued into round 2, remain involved in the scheme;
- Of the six projects to gain two years of consecutive funding three have increased the number of partners engaged;
  - Health@Work Liverpool (HWK) from 2 partners to 7,
  - SOHAS (SOH) from 1 partner to 5,
  - Kirklees (KRK) from 3 partners to 4.

It should be noted that reporting from Lead Partners of projects with two years of funding that did not expand, for example FMB, UCATT and Park Royal, stated that they were focused on consolidating and improving the existing partnership.

A key driver for partnership expansion can be attributed to new partners offering additional recruitment opportunities. This was particularly evident for Health@Work Liverpool who were necessitated to engage new partners, such as Crime Direct, when they had unexpected recruiting difficulties in round 1. SOHAS also planned partnership expansion in round 2 so they could engage with a greater number of voluntary organisations in the Yorkshire area. Similarly, Groundworks engaged a range of new partners in round 2 to help them break into a new sector and deliver the WSA scheme to ethnic minority businesses.

**WSA development**

The level of WSA development appears to be limited in both years, but better in round 1:

- In round 1, it was estimated that there were twelve new WSAs (after excluding persons already able and committed to the role) in round 2 it was estimated that there were five new WSAs (Groundworks, STUC, SOHAS x 2 and UCT);
- In round 1, out of the twelve WSAs interviewed five stated their skills and competencies had developed ‘a lot’; in round 2 one of the ten interviewed felt their skills had developed ‘a lot’;

Consideration of wider factors also tends to support the notion that WSA development is likely to have been less in round 2, for example:

- Six projects carried on from round 1 and were therefore more established partnerships, four of these employed the same WSAs;
• Two projects in round 1 (CVL and CRT) specifically recruited WSAs without recognised H&S qualifications and then provided them with H&S training and additional H&S support;

• There were more stringent requirements in round 2 for the recruitment of WSAs with a minimum level of H&S qualifications, than in round 1 – potentially limiting the scope for increased WSA development;

• In round 1 there were 33 equivalent full time WSAs and only 19 in round 2 and so fewer WSAs gained relevant experience;

Evidence suggests that in both round 1 and round 2 a number of projects reported difficulties recruiting WSAs. For example, British Glass, Healthworks Newham, UCATT and Health@Work Liverpool. In the case of Healthworks Newham, these difficulties seriously affected the delivery of the scheme and they were required to reduce the number of workplaces they were planning to engage. A number of other projects were also unfortunate to have WSAs fall ill or leave the scheme, for example, FMB, Kirklees, Rhondda and Lambeth. This evidence suggests that the potential lack of individuals, capable of fulfilling the Worker Safety Advisor role, may be an issue for any future plans to deliver the WSA scheme.

Demand for WSA services and expansion of the scheme

The demand for WSA service in round 2 has reportedly increased in comparison with round 1. This is illustrated by a number of findings, for example:

• At the start of the project in round 1 only one project would have attempted to launch a similar scheme without the Challenge Fund. In round 2 this had increased with two projects stating they would have launched a similar scheme;

• Of the new projects engaged in round 2, four projects were specifically created for the Challenge Fund compared to one project in the previous round;

• Nine out of eleven, of the round 2 projects, stated that they will continue to deliver the WSA scheme or an equivalent in comparison to seven out of twelve in round 1;

• Of these nine, three projects (STUC, SOHAS and BPI) are considering alternative ways to seek independent funding outside of the scheme with SOHAS and BPI already with well developed business cases;

• One project, UCT, has also developed a business plan to deliver the WSA on a national basis and is looking at other funding methods if the WSA Challenge Fund does not continue after round 3.

The increased demand for the scheme was also reported by the WSAs and Lead Partners during interviews and this is illustrated by paraphrased comments from a number of different projects, for example:
• The Lead Partner from STUC noted they massively oversubscribed;

• Even though UCATT have dis-continued working in the East and West Midlands the second WSA reported that strong demand remained in the West Midlands;

• The Lead Partner from SOHAS stated that WSAs report strong employer demand and therefore they are looking at providing a continued service, such as risk assessment training paid for by the employer;

• This proposed continuation of the scheme has been driven because it was recognised by BPI that there was a strong demand from workplaces for this kind of approach (worker consultation) and also H&S training.

• The Lead Partner from BPI felt there was an obvious need for this kind of service as demonstrated by how the scheme had been enthusiastically embraced by the participating workplaces.

One explanation as to why demand has increased in round 2 may be because projects had the full 12 months to engage with beneficiary organisations and so had more time to generate interest.

It is clear that some projects, for example Kirklees and FMB, were not able to generate the same level of demand for the WSA scheme. This may be due to a number of factors, for example, the sector the projects were operating in, the partnership characteristics and the methods used to recruit and engage with organisations. These factors are discussed later in this report under the appropriate ‘Issue’ heading.

4.2 THE COST OF THE CHALLENGE FUND

Issue 2 - Were the round 2 projects more or less cost effective than round 1 – and if so why and how?

4.2.1 Overall Findings

This section considers the cost of funding the WSA scheme and its relative affordability. It does not make a comparison of cost versus outcome to determine whether the scheme was cost effective per se.

The funding costs of running the scheme per workplace in round 1 and 2 were on average an improvement on the WSA pilot.

Overall, the funding in both round 1 and 2 were very similar, for example:

• The cost per workplace for round 1 and round 2 was approximately the same, around £1,000;

• In round 2 the cost per worker was slightly higher but costs per visit were slightly reduced;

• As per round 1, projects in round 2 varied substantially in project costs;
Even though project costs between round 1 and round 2 are similar, evidence suggests that round 2 projects had better outcomes in terms of impact to worker involvement and health and safety.

4.2.2 Comparison with the WSA pilot

The comparison with the WSA pilot only considers how much it cost to actually set up and establish both the WSA Challenge Fund and the WSA pilot. It does not include an estimate of any additional costs, such as those incurred by the employer or the project partners.

The results from the comparison, presented in table 18, show that the overall funding cost of the WSA scheme in round 1 and 2 were lower than the WSA pilot.

Table 18: Comparison of round 1 and round 2 with the WSA pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WSA pilot (estimated salary &amp; expenses of £164,195$^D$)</th>
<th>WSA CF round 1 (£710,925 project cost claim)</th>
<th>WSA CF round 2 (£752,187 project cost claim)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per workplace</td>
<td>About £1563 (105 workplaces)</td>
<td>~£1,097 (648 workplaces)</td>
<td>~£1,073 (701 workplaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per worker</td>
<td>£63$^A$</td>
<td>~£39$^B$</td>
<td>~£47$^B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per visit</td>
<td>About £432 (380 visits)</td>
<td>About £364 (1948)$^C$</td>
<td>About £344 (2190)$^C$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Comparison of round 1 and round 2 project funding costs

The following table presents the costs incurred by each project engaged in both round 1 and round 2, to deliver the WSA scheme. This allows for a consideration on a project per project basis and also between round 1 and round 2.

$^A$ In the absence of figures from the pilot we have taken the Challenge Fund figure to estimate this cost per worker. This is an assumption and so the comparison of costs per worker between the pilot and the CF is approximate.

$^B$ This assumes 24 workers per workplace as reported in round 1 and 27 workers per workplace in round 2.

$^C$ This value of the number of visits is based on Lead Partner reporting and employer estimates.

$^D$ The cost of the WSA pilot is estimated from the reported salary cost of £261 per visit (with 380 visits = £99180), £143 expense per workplace (with 105 workplaces = £15,015), giving a total cost of £114,195 as quoted in the evaluation report. To this is added about £50,000 which is an estimation of HSE staff time for recruiting workplaces to the WSA pilot.
### Table 19: Comparison of project costs (£)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Org</th>
<th>Overall cost</th>
<th>Cost Per workplace</th>
<th>Cost per worker</th>
<th>Cost per visit</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Org</th>
<th>Overall cost</th>
<th>Per workplace</th>
<th>Per Worker</th>
<th>Cost Per visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>92379</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56374</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64116</td>
<td>2788</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43989</td>
<td>2933</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59532</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99590</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25961</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29561</td>
<td>3285</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47595</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39784</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73772</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>93034</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69837</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85641</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37275</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62136</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63078</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78632</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29983</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>92132</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>51603</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67100</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>710925</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>752543</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The round 2 projects claimed total costs of £752,187 in comparison with round one £710,925. With eleven projects in round 2 and twelve projects in round 1 average spend per project was as follows:

- **round 1** £59,243;
- **round 2** £68,386;

This indicates that average spending per project was around 15% higher, despite only 8% more workplaces engaged. However, more site visits were undertaken in round 2 than in round 1 and the size of organisations visited in round 2 were slightly smaller in terms of workers employed than in round 1.

These findings per workplace are slightly against expectation because it was presumed that costs would be lower in round 2 for a number of reasons, for example:

---

9 *Due to the involvement of organisations on the Better Health at Work scheme overall project costs may have been lower for Kirklees*
• The projects in round 2 had the full 12 months to deliver the scheme.

• Six projects had continued from round 1 into round 2 and would have greater experience in delivering the scheme and learning the lessons from round 1;

• New projects in round 2 may also have better knowledge of the scheme, learning from other projects and gaining knowledge from other sources (HSE, GSB, PNE and the Management Board);

• Round 2 projects were more established than in round 1 and therefore had a greater focus on delivery of the scheme rather than building WSA capacity;

A probable reason why the costs to deliver round 2 were only marginally improved was because the model for delivery has not ostensibly changed and the same type and diversity of projects were involved in both round 1 and round 2.

Some projects in round 2, that had two years of funding, also reported that the costs were increased because they had problems recruiting, although other evidence does not support this.

Although the cost of funding remains the same, evidence suggests that round 2 projects were more effective in terms of the impact of the scheme. This is demonstrated by the improvements to worker involvement and health and safety. These issues are considered in more detail under the next section: 4.3 ‘Do projects become more cost effective over time?’

### 4.2.4 Mainstreaming the WSA scheme

The following Table 20 provides an estimate cost of offering the WSA project to a larger number of SMEs. The average penetration rate in round 2 was around 40%. Thus to estimate the possible up-take of the Challenge Fund nationwide the total cost of delivering the WSA scheme was calculated for 40% of the 385,750 SMEs in the UK.
Table 20: The cost of mainstreaming the WSA scheme in the UK based on cost achieved by round 1 and round 2 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round one</th>
<th>Reported cost per workplace achieved by WSA projects $^10$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£484 (Lowest)  £1682 (Average)  £3285 (Highest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost for 40% of 385,750 SMEs</td>
<td>£74.7m  £259.5m  £506.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year if 40% of SMEs are spread over 10 year period</td>
<td>£7.87m  £25.9m  £50.6m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round two</th>
<th>Reported cost per workplace achieved by WSA projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£683 (Lowest)  £1325 (Average)  £2933 (Highest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost for 10% of 385,750 SMEs</td>
<td>£105.3 m  £204.4m  £452.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year if 40% of SMEs are spread over 10 year period</td>
<td>£10.5 m  £20.4 m  £45.2 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Reported cost per workplace achieved by WSA projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost for year if 40% of SMEs are spread over a 10 year period as an average of round 1 and round 2</td>
<td>£ 9.2m  £23.2 m  £47.9m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that although cost in round 2 is somewhat reduced the cost per project for delivering the scheme is still significant, although some projects have lower costs than others.

The two main conclusions made from round 1 (presented in the round 1 technical report) are therefore the same for round 2:

- Affordability of ‘mainstreaming’ the WSA scheme projects varies greatly according to which costs per workplace the cost is calculated on;
- It is possible that costs could fall if a different model is used i.e. the scheme is delivered by larger projects.

Each project requires running costs, such as administrative costs, Lead Partner support, admin support etc and this is likely to increase when the burden of the work is shared across a number of projects. Conversely, if WSAs are supported across fewer projects, economies of scale will increase and consequently it is likely that costs will reduce.

The impact of economy of scale was highlighted in the round 1 report. The similar findings for cost of funding in round 2 would again seem to support this.

---

$^10$ This figure is the average of the workplace cost for each project rather than the total fund divided by the total number of workplaces engaged
A number of Lead Partners in both round 1 and 2 also alluded to this issue as a consequence of the current delivery mechanism.

The Lead Partner for BPI felt that WSA expertise and information is generic, therefore the cost effectiveness of the scheme would be improved if the recruitment and training of the WSAs had been standardised along with supporting materials offered centrally.

The Lead Partner for FMB stated that the scheme would be improved if funding for the WSAs was longer term and more sustained.

The Lead Partner for UCATT felt the cost effectiveness of the scheme could be improved by recruiting on a larger scale.

The Lead Partner for STUC noted that due to the small number of organisations they were dealing with (25), they had to be realistic in that their contribution could only make a small difference. There are hundred’s of voluntary organisations out there and they were only targeting a very small proportion of them.

The Lead Partner for ENWORKs believed that the size of their project and economies of scale enabled far more resource to be delivered at the workplace and this made it cost effective.

The Lead Partner for Health@Work Liverpool stated that one year of funding makes recruiting Worker Safety Advisors more difficult.

The cessation of funding for a number of projects in round 1 may have also reduced continuity of scheme delivery and the existing structures to support the WSA.

There are a number of possible cost benefits associated with revision to the existing WSA model. These were originally cited in the round 1 technical report and repeated here:

- Continuity of funding avoids the need for a ‘start-up’ period of funding and capacity/partnership development;
- Longer term funding, more than one year, enables lessons to be learnt and new ways of working implemented;
- Adopt a more common WSA model for which training and support can be provided on a larger and more economical basis;
- In order to achieve the economy of scale expected by the WSA pilot, partnerships need to aim for a caseload of workplaces per WSA that is large enough to achieve a ‘reasonable’ cost per workplace, as discussed below.
4.3 DO PROJECTS BECOME MORE COST EFFECTIVE OVER TIME?

4.3.1 Overall Findings

**Issue 3 (a) - What does the experience of projects which have had two consecutive years of funding indicate regarding the cost-effectiveness, do they become more cost-effective over time?**

If we consider the cost of running the scheme in isolation, without evaluating the effectiveness of any outcomes, then the projects with two years of consecutive funding do not become more cost effective over time.

When only the projects with two years of funding are compared between round 1 and round 2 the cost for delivering the scheme has actually increased, for example:

- Overall cost per workplace for projects with two years of consecutive funding increased from £873 in round 1 to £991 in round 2;
- Funding costs per workplace increase for four of the six projects;
- Overall cost per worker funding increased from £31 in round 1 to £43 in round 2;
- Overall cost per visit increased from £302 in round 1 to £312 in round 2.

Of the six projects with 2 years of consecutive funding only two projects Health@Work Liverpool and Park Royal reduced their costs in round 2.

4.3.2 Detailed Findings

The full details of project costs are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Overall cost</th>
<th>Overall cost per workplace</th>
<th>Overall cost per worker</th>
<th>Overall cost per visit</th>
<th>Overall cost</th>
<th>Overall cost per workplace</th>
<th>Overall cost per worker</th>
<th>Overall cost per visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>£73772</td>
<td>£777</td>
<td>£86</td>
<td>£388</td>
<td>£93034</td>
<td>£1257</td>
<td>£140</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWL</td>
<td>£69837</td>
<td>£1995</td>
<td>£143</td>
<td>£1042</td>
<td>£85641</td>
<td>£1173</td>
<td>£107</td>
<td>£368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>£37275</td>
<td>£621</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£194</td>
<td>£62136</td>
<td>£851</td>
<td>£39</td>
<td>£275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>£63078</td>
<td>£2426</td>
<td>£29</td>
<td>£315</td>
<td>£78632</td>
<td>£1966</td>
<td>£79</td>
<td>£447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>£29983</td>
<td>£484</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£167</td>
<td>£92132</td>
<td>£693</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>£384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>£51603</td>
<td>£543</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£206</td>
<td>£67100</td>
<td>£704</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>£133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>£325548</td>
<td>£873</td>
<td>£31</td>
<td>£302</td>
<td>£478675</td>
<td>£991</td>
<td>£43</td>
<td>£312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The underlined figures in red show how costs have increase from round 1 to round 2 for projects with two years of consecutive funding.
Only one project, Health@Work Liverpool, showed a reduction in all three areas of workplace, worker and visit costs. Park Royal did reduce costs in terms of the number of workplaces but the cost per visit and per worker increased. Of the remaining projects only UCATT showed a reduction in costs in terms of visits, with three projects SOHAS, Kirklees and FMB increasing project costs in all areas.

SOHAS, in contrast to previous assumptions regarding the economy of scale, did not reduce costs even though they significantly increased the number of workplaces recruited. This can be partly explained because although the size of the project doubled the monies spent increased threefold from just under £30,000 to over £90,000.

One explanation for the increased costs, given by several Lead Partners, was the limited penetration of the WSA scheme because projects reached a maximum level of recruitment. Other evidence, however, does not support this explanation. This issue is discussed next.

4.4 PENETRATION RATE OF PROJECTS

Issue 3 (b) - What does the experience of projects which have had two consecutive years of funding indicate regarding the penetration rate of recruitment of employers, i.e. do the projects reach a maximum level of recruitment?

4.4.1 Overall Findings

Evidence from the Lead Partner logs that provide details of recruitment suggests that projects that cited recruitment difficulties in round 2 also experienced the same or similar problems in round 1.

It is likely therefore, that limited penetration does not, in itself, present a significant barrier to recruitment of beneficiary organisations and by extension cost effectiveness.

Some projects with 2 years of funding reported very high recruitment rates in round 2. It is therefore difficult to conclude what the ultimate penetration rate may be.

4.4.2 Detailed findings

The theme that there may be a limited penetration - the ability to successfully contact, recruit and gain the opportunity to influence workplace attitudes towards H&S and worker involvement - first emerged around the mid point of round 2. In a report submitted to HSE\(^1\) it was proposed that there was “a cost required in recruitment which may detract from a project’s overall ability to improve health and safety through worker involvement”.

Evidence from comparison of cost between rounds show a number of projects cost more to deliver the WSA scheme in round 2 than in round 1. Self-reporting from FMB and Kirklees stated, when interviewed, that recruitment difficulties had resulted in their projects being less cost effective and a barrier to the successful delivery of the WSA scheme.

\(^1\) Year 2 Midpoint Review & Opinion from the Challenge Fund Evaluators 2006
The reason claimed by the Lead Partners for both Kirklees and FMB for the recruitment difficulties was that they had used the same target areas to recruit in both round 1 and 2.

The Lead Partner from FMB supported this view and commented in terms of lessons learnt that if they were to carry out the scheme again in round 3 they would choose another area. “Don’t fish in the same pool twice in terms of recruitment”. For round 3 FMB have changed their location to operate in the Glasgow metropolitan area rather than the South West.

The WSA for Kirklees also stated that recruitment was much harder in round 2. The Lead Partner believed this to be the case because they were targeting the same geographical area and had engaged all those interested in joining the scheme in round 1. This meant more work was required to convince those who were not so interested in joining, to sign up.

The WSA from UCATT also reported that although there had been strong demand in the new West Midlands area it was becoming increasingly more difficult to engage new organisations in the East Midlands, where the scheme had operated during round 1.

Further evidence for the difficulties experienced by FMB and Kirklees is provided ipso facto that both projects were substantially down on their bids in round 2, for example:

- FMB recruited 56% of their proposed target for beneficiary organisations;
- Kirklees recruited 61% of their proposed target for beneficiary organisations.

Table 22 provides details of recruitment in both round 1 and round 2 for projects with two years of consecutive funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Approximate numbers of organisations invited to take part</th>
<th>Number of workplaces engaged</th>
<th>Organisations engaged as a percentage of organisations invited to take part</th>
<th>Approximate numbers of organisations invited to take part</th>
<th>Number of workplaces engaged</th>
<th>Organisations engaged as a percentage of organisations invited to take part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Reported by the Lead Partner in the Lead Partner quarterly log
The findings suggest that contrary to reporting, Kirklees and FMB struggled to recruit beneficiary organisations in round 1 as well as in round 2. This indicates that recruitment did not become more difficult over time. The details of recruitment also suggest that the projects that were more successful at recruitment in round 1, for example Health@Work Liverpool, UCATT and SOHAS were also successful in round 2.

SOHAS and UCATT operated in new geographic areas in round 2. Park Royal, like Kirklees and FMB, remained in the same area using the same population of organisations. In contrast to Kirklees and FMB, however, they reached their target bid of 40 recruited organisations by the end of the third quarter of round 2. During the end of year interviews, the Lead Partner stated that the reason for their relative success was because:

- They employed a telecommunications company at the start of round 2 to cold call organisations;
- They had developed a very good reputation from round 1 and organisations had been enthusiastic about getting involved during round 2.

Health@Work Liverpool also remained in the same area and targeted the same population of organisations. They believed, however, that this had only begun to have an impact towards the end of round 2. They contributed their successful recruitment to their strong and extensive partnership networks and again the reputation they had garnered in round 1.

The evidence suggests that recruitment problems experienced in round 2 are not limited to penetration of the WSA scheme. It is likely that other related factors will also impact on recruitment, such as the characteristics of the sector and the recruitment methods applied. It is also possible to tackle the issue of penetration through effective project management, for example:

- Proactively use telesales to recruit organisation;
- Engage partners that can provide alternative populations of organisations;
- Develop a good reputation;
- Provide an incentive for beneficiary organisations to engage on the scheme.

4.5 IMPACT OF 2 YEARS FUNDING ON EFFECTIVENESS

**Issue 3(c) - What does the experience of projects which have had two consecutive years of funding indicate regarding the change in the effectiveness of WSA interventions within workplaces?**

4.5.1 Overall Findings

The overall findings were mixed, with projects with two years of consecutive funding becoming slightly more effective regarding worker involvement but remaining the same for health and safety, for example:
• Project rating of worker involvement (for projects with two years of consecutive funding) increased from 3.4 in round 1 to 3.7 in round 2;
• Project rating of health and safety (for projects with two years of consecutive funding) stayed the same at 3.7 in rounds 1 and 2.

Employers rated the overall benefits of the scheme increased slightly for projects with two years of consecutive funding from 2.9 in round 1, to 3 in round 2.

Projects that only operated in round 2 were rated the most effective in terms of WSA interventions with projects just operating in round 1 being the least effective.

The improvements in round 2 are unlikely to be due to better project experience. They are more likely to be a consequence of projects in round 2 benefiting from having a full 12 months of activity instead of the reduced time (6 to 9 months) experienced by projects in round 1.

### 4.5.2 Detailed findings

Full details of project ratings are presented in

**Table 23** below. The key indicators of worker involvement and health and safety improvements have been duplicated to allow comparison with round 1.

Kirklees have not been included in the overall ratings for round 2 because the organisations they worked with were also involved on the Better Health at Work Scheme. It is therefore difficult to ascertain whether any rated improvements were due to the WSA scheme or the Better Health at Work Scheme.

**Table 23: Comparison of project ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Worker involvement</th>
<th>H&amp;S</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Worker involvement</th>
<th>H&amp;S</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1 only</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>R2 only</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWL</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Please note Kirklees ratings are in grey because there is doubt over their result see earlier comments in the section ‘Response rates and robustness of data’
The result that the effectiveness of WSA interventions improved in round 2 is largely expected. What is more unexpected is that projects that had two years of consecutive funding were no more effective than projects that only operated in round 2. This would tend to suggest that the key determiner of project effectiveness was less to do with project experience and more to do with other factors that differentiated round 1 with round 2.

The main factor that was different between round 1 and round 2 was the time scale of delivery. In round 1, because the WSA Challenge Fund was a new scheme it took time to establish and therefore the majority of projects delivered the scheme in a reduced 6-9 month period. In round 2 projects had the full 12 months to deliver the scheme. The impact of this was:

- The round 1 projects could not complete all of their forecasted visits;
- There was less time between WSA visits for employers to implement ideas or follow WSA advice.

One reason for the lower improvements to health and safety for projects with two consecutive years of funding (when compared against their performance in round 1 and the projects who were just involved in round 2) may reflect that these projects were focusing more on improving and sustaining worker involvement. Comments made in round 1 suggest WSAs were often drawn into being H&S consultants due to employers wanting help to tackle the H&S basics. WSAs with two years of funding may have learnt from this experience.

### 4.6 PRIOR EMPLOYER ATTITUDES AND EXPECTATIONS

**Issue 4 - Is there evidence that prior employer attitude and expectation of the project affect the outcome?**

#### 4.6.1 Overall Findings

The findings suggest that there is evidence from round 2, and to some extent round 1, that prior employer expectations (focusing on improving worker involvement rather than health and safety) does appear to have an impact on the outcome of the WSA scheme.

In contrast, however, employer attitude (prior enthusiasm and planning changes to health and safety or worker involvement) is less of a determiner of improvements following WSA intervention.

This is supported by qualitative reporting from both round 1 and 2 and suggests the WSA role may be most effective at facilitating worker involvement where employers have already made the decision to engage their workers on health and safety matters.
4.6.2 Detailed Findings

Employer expectation

The projects were rated to determine expectation to improve either worker involvement or health and safety - see 7.1.2 Appendix B. These ratings were then correlated with outcome. If expectation affects outcome then employers from projects selecting statements that show a focus to improve worker involvement should show greater improvements to worker involvement than health and safety and vice versa.

When looking at outcome against expectation three projects in round 2 with the highest percentage of organisations hoping to improve worker consultation (Healthworks, STUC and Park Royal) were also the projects with the highest rated impact on worker involvement.

To show whether there is a significant relation for all projects on the scheme, different expectation was correlated with outcome. The results show that expectation to improve worker involvement was significantly correlated (0.56), at 5% confidence (p>0.05), with worker involvement outcomes. However, when expectation to improve health and safety is correlated with health and safety outcomes, there was no significant correlation (0.40). These results were also presented as scatter plot diagrams.

![Expectation to improve worker involvement](image)

**Figure 4:** Expectation to improve worker involvement plotted against worker involvement outcome

---

14 Correlations are rated from zero to one with a higher number representing a stronger correlation. The value is considered to be significantly correlated if the critical value is within a 5% confidence.
The scatter plots help to illustrate how worker involvement expectation is associated with better worker involvement in contrast to health and safety expectations with health and safety outcomes. This would tend to show that there are greater benefits if the employer and the WSA have the same expectation.

Qualitative reporting from both round 1 and 2 provide evidence that the WSA needs to win over the employer at the outset of engagement before they can begin to involve workers. This is achieved by selling the benefits of worker involvement creating ‘buy in’, identifying & overcoming barriers and building trust. If the WSA has the support from the employer at the outset then it is probable they can use their time more effectively to immediately start to implement change to improve and sustain worker involvement.

From the verification interviews in both round 1 and round 2 a number of employers stated that they arranged with the WSA, during initial discussions, how much time they wanted to devote to either health and safety or worker involvement. Some employers acknowledged that they already had good H&S knowledge so their agreed objectives with the WSA was to focus more on worker involvement activities as it would not have been effective to spend time on H&S.

Working with employers who want to understand/improve worker involvement is likely to make the WSA intervention more powerful as they are working directly in line with the organisation’s (management) aims. The WSA role may therefore be most effective facilitating worker involvement where employers have already made the decision to engage their workers on health and safety matters.
**Prior attitude**

Employers at the start of the scheme were also asked to state their prior attitude, for example, how enthusiastic or otherwise were they about signing up to the scheme? The projects, as with prior expectation, were then given a rating presented in Appendix B.

The rating of prior attitude for both rounds 1 and 2 were then correlated with health and safety and worker involvement outcomes.

The findings show that better outcomes are not correlated with a positive attitude to participating in the scheme:

- Worker involvement outcomes when correlated with prior attitude = (-0.15)
- Health and safety outcomes when correlated with prior attitude = (-0.10)

The projects were also rated in terms of whether they were planning to tackle health and safety prior to signing up to the scheme, again presented in Appendix B. A number of projects in both round 1 and round 2 had a high percentage (70% or more) of organisations planning changes to H&S or worker involvement prior to joining the scheme, for example: CVL, Groundworks Kirklees, Park Royal, SOHAS and STUC. Organisations that are already planning to tackle health and safety may be more receptive to WSA advice and support and therefore this may also have an impact on the outcome of the scheme.

When planned changes, however, were correlated with outcomes, again there was no significant correlation:

- Worker involvement outcomes when correlated with planned improvements = (0.06);
- Health and safety outcomes when correlated with planned improvements = (0.26).

### 4.7 CHARACTERISTICS OF ORGANISATIONS

**Issue 5 – What are the characteristics of organisations and employers who participate in the WSA scheme?**

#### 4.7.1 Introduction

The aim of this section is to better understand what different types of organisations participated in the WSA scheme and how this might impact on its delivery. To do this, a number of key organisational characteristics were identified. These characteristics were then rated, details provided in Appendix B, and then these were correlated against outcomes. The results of the correlation are presented under the next issue heading: Issue 6 - In what way does the sector, size or organisation type impact the effectiveness of WSA intervention’

Differences between round 1 and round 2 were also considered to determine whether the types of beneficiary organisations recruited and engaged had changed.
**Overall Findings**

Some key features include:

- The majority of organisations engaged in both round 1 and round 2 were either micro (<10) or small organisations (<50);

- In round 1 nearly half (47%) of all beneficiary organisations engaged in the scheme were members of an organisation running the scheme, such as trade association. In round 2 this had fallen slightly to 41%;

- Trade union representation did not change between round 1 and round 2 and remained at around 8%. A number of projects, however, recruited organisations with high levels of union representation, for example, CVL 44%, STUC 31% and Healthworks Newham 28%;

- In round 1 a similar range of sectors were engaged and there were again some projects focusing on one sector and other projects tackling a more diverse range of sectors. In round 2 there were fewer projects working in the voluntary sector and a greater focus on dealing with organisations involved in the manufacture, distribution and sale of food;

- In round 1 the projects engaged organisations with, on average, far poorer levels of basic H&S prior to intervention than in round 2;

- In both round 1 and round 2, projects operated in a range of locations. A number of projects were characterised by engaging organisations in large geographic areas, for example: FMB who operated in South West England.

### 4.7.2 Detailed Findings

**Organisational size**

Overall, the size\(^{15}\) of beneficiary organisations recruited to the WSA scheme is approximately the same between round 1 and round 2 as shown in **Table 24**.

---

\(^{15}\) *The size of organisations are rated as follows (Micro: less than 10 employees, Small: 10 – 49 employees, Medium: 50-249 employees, Large: above 250 employees)*
The data indicates that projects, as per the scheme objectives, were engaging a greater proportion of small or micro sized organisations. Two projects in particular Lambeth (88%) and Groundworks (86%) recruited the largest number of micro organisations.

Overall, there was a slight increase in micro organisations recruited in round 2, compared with round 1, and a corresponding decrease in the percentage of small firms recruited in round 2. The percentage of medium and large firms recruited remained largely the same.

When considering the change between projects engaged in both round 1 and round 2 there are fluctuations in the size of organisations recruited but no distinct trends, for example: SOHAS and Kirklees recruited fewer micro firms in round 2 and more small firms. In contrast, Park Royal and Healthworks Newham recruited more micro firms and fewer small firms in round 2.

**Membership of a trade organisation**

The overall percentage of organisations who are members of a trade association or organisation running the scheme was slightly reduced from 47% in round 1 to 41% in round 2 see Table 25.

![Table 24: The size of organisations recruited as a % of project total](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round one</th>
<th></th>
<th>Round two</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNW</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25: Member of an organisation or trade association connected to the partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Trade organisation</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Trade organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Glass</td>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENWORKS</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENWORKS</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthworks Newham</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Healthworks Newham</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In round 2, for example, UCATT recruited fewer organisations that were members of a trade association. This may reflect that the WSAs were using their own leads rather than referrals from their partner National Federation of Builders (NFB), to recruit organisations in round 2.

In contrast, however, Park Royal and SOHAS increased the beneficiary organisations that belong to a trade association or organisation running the scheme. This may indicate that they were both successful at promoting the success and benefits of the WSA scheme within their membership and those of their supporting partners.

**Trade union representation prior to WSA intervention**

The effect of union representation is unclear and two opposing conclusions can be drawn regarding its impact on the outcomes of WSA interventions:

- Organisations with union representation would have better worker involvement at the start of the scheme and might lessen the impact of WSA intervention
- Organisations with union representation might have employers who are more familiar and supportive of enhancing worker involvement further.

The following Table 26 provides details of projects with trade union representation prior to WSA intervention both in round 1 and round 2. It should be noted that the original idea of the WSA Challenge Fund was to intervene in workplaces where there was less union representation.
Table 26: Detail of Trade Union representation at baseline, prior to WSA intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Round one</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Round two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the overall percentage of organisations with union representation is fairly low, at around 8%, there were a number of projects with high levels of union representation, for example: CVL 44%, STUC 31% and Healthworks Newham 28%

**Sector**

There are two factors pertaining to sector or trade that may impact upon a project’s overall performance and the outcome of WSA intervention.

- The type of the sector a project is operating in
- The diversity of the sectors that a project is operating with

**Type of Sector**

There is a belief amongst Lead Partners, and also a more general recognition within the health and safety community, that certain groups\(^{16}\) are more difficult to engage with in terms of health and safety and, by extension, worker involvement.

Lead partners in round 1 and round 2 stated that within the construction sector there were several factors that made their industry difficult to engage on health and safety matters. For example, the peripatetic nature of the workforce, the separation between office and work site and a degree of ambivalence towards health and safety and risk taking.

In contrast, the voluntary and government sector organisations are closer to the central function of promoting health and safety and are more familiar with paperwork and assessments that go hand in hand with tackling health and safety.

\(^{16}\) ‘Successful interventions with hard to reach groups’ – HSE 2004
**Sector diversity**

Successfully delivering the scheme, as reported by WSAs and Lead Partners, is partly based on the WSA’s credibility in the eyes of the organisation, in terms of health and safety expertise and their knowledge and experience of a sector. The projects that delivered to a diverse range of sectors may therefore be at a disadvantage.

The following **Table 27** provides details of the different sectors and trades that each project is working with in both round 1 and round 2.

**Table 27: Sectors and trades engaged by project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Printing</th>
<th>Hospitality Service industry</th>
<th>Food Manufacture</th>
<th>Retail &amp; wholesale</th>
<th>Healthcare social &amp; service</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Transport &amp; Distribution</th>
<th>Financial &amp; banking</th>
<th>Government/LAs</th>
<th>Entertainment/leisure</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In both rounds a similar range of sectors were engaged by the projects with some focusing on one sector (British Glass, CRT, CVL, FMB, GMB SOHAS and UCATT) and other projects tackling a large number of sectors (ENWORKS, Kirklees, Park Royal and Healthworks Newham). The key change between round 1 and round 2, however, is that in round 2 there were fewer projects working in the voluntary sector and a greater focus on dealing with organisations involved in the manufacture, distribution and sale of food.

**The overall level of H&S at the workplace at baseline**

Projects who recruit beneficiary organisations with better H&S at the outset might be at an advantage. This is because the WSA can focus on interventions to enhance worker involvement rather than establishing the H&S basics such as risk assessments, developing H&S policies or accidents books.

The following Table 28 provides project per project details for both round 1 and round 2 of all the average level of organisations’ H&S prior to engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Round one</th>
<th>Round two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent or Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data indicates that projects, as per the scheme objectives, were engaging a greater proportion of organisations with poor or very poor levels of H&S. Two projects, in particular, GMB and FMB (in round 2) had over 80% of their recruited organisations with either poor or very poor levels of health and safety.
Overall, the projects operating in round 1 recruited organisations at the start of the scheme with far poorer levels of H&S. In round 2 there was a 41% reduction in beneficiary organisations recruited with poor or very poor levels of H&S.

In contrast to this reduction, FMB in round 2 actually increased their proportion of organisations with poor or very poor health and safety. This may reflect the WSA’s claims that they had recruited and signed up the organisations with better health and safety and those more willing to participate in round 1.

**Location**

Reporting from projects in round 1 suggested that the geography or location was likely to have an impact on the delivery of the WSA scheme. Projects that were required to cover a large area were at a disadvantage in terms of travel time and resources.

For example, FMB and UCATT delivered the scheme in a large geographical area where organisations tended to be more spread out and visiting employers often required travelling long distances. If appointments were cancelled, or the organisations could not engage with the WSA because of work commitments, then a journey might also have been wasted. In contrast, Park Royal predominantly engaged organisations on the Park Royal estate in West London. The proximity of the organisation together on the same estate reduced travel time and gave visiting arrangements more flexibility.

Projects have been rated from 1-3 (where 3 = difficult location and 1 = easy location) depending on where the project operated, see Appendix B.

**Employer networking**

Reporting from round 1 suggested that one characteristic that may impact on successful delivery of the WSA scheme was how well organisations were networked within a business community. Employers that are highly networked have an opportunity for people to meet, talk and discuss issues that impact on their work. Reporting from Lead Partners in both round 1 and round 2 supports the benefits to projects of engaging organisations that are networked, for example:

- In round 2 BPI were able to overcome initial suspicions by engaging a BPI representative in the South West, who used their network of contacts to reach organisations willing to participate in the scheme;
- In round 1 British Glass were over subscribed towards the end of the engagement because the success of the project was spread by word of mouth in the glass and ceramics industry through business networks;
- In round 1 CRT delivered risk assessment training to a number of organisations together in the same building;
- In round 2 STUC held seminars, using voluntary scheme networks, where both employers and workers who were engaged on the WSA scheme were invited to speak out about how workers have been involved in health and safety;
With consideration to reporting from Lead Partners, partners and knowledge of the sector, each project has been provided with a network rating 1-3 (where 3 = poor business network opportunities and 1= good networking opportunities) – see Appendix B.

4.8 IMPACT OF ORGANISATION CHARACTERISTICS ON OUTCOME

Issue 6 - In what way does the sector, size or organisation type impact the effectiveness of WSA intervention?

4.8.1 Overall Findings

Overall, the findings suggest that organisational factors do have an impact on the effectiveness of WSA interventions. When these factors are considered together, the projects dealing with the beneficiary organisations that are rated as the most difficult to engage, have less effective outcomes particularly in terms of changes to health and safety.

The findings also suggest that projects engaging organisations with better basic levels of health and safety at the start of the scheme are associated with improvements to health and safety. In contrast, projects who engage organisations with good industry networks have a positive association with improvements to worker involvement.

Other factors, for example, workplace size in terms of worker numbers, prior union representation, the sector (diversity and type), belonging to an organisation running the scheme and location, when considered individually, do not appear to be associated with a more effective WSA intervention.

4.8.2 Detailed findings

It was determined from round 1 that a number of characteristics were believed to impact on the success of WSA intervention. These characteristics, discussed in Issue 5, have been rated –see Appendix B – for each project and then correlated against outcome.

The ratings are detailed in the following Table 29: The impact of organisational characteristics on outcomes. It should be noted that for diversity, network, location, type and diversity of sector and prior level of H&S, a higher rating would indicate a factor that might adversely affect the delivery of the scheme.
### Table 29: The impact of organisational characteristics on outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Member of</th>
<th>TU rep.</th>
<th>Diversity (1-3)</th>
<th>Employer Network (1-3)</th>
<th>Location of org (1-3)</th>
<th>Prior level of H&amp;S (1-5)</th>
<th>Type of sector (1-5)</th>
<th>WI</th>
<th>H&amp;S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>avg (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Correlation both HS/WI | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.28 | 0.02 | 0.51 | 0.27 | 0.62 | 0.36 |
| Correlation WI         | 0.13 | 0.07 | -0.21 | -0.21 | -0.50 | -0.03 | -0.23 | 0.02 |
| Correlation H&S        | -0.01 | -0.35 | -0.24 | 0.15 | -0.37 | -0.33 | -0.68 | 0.48 |

17 Please note Kirklees ratings are in grey because there is doubt over their result see earlier comments in the section 'Response rates and robustness of data'
When health and safety and worker involvement outcomes for both round 1 and round 2 are correlated with each characteristic then the most significant correlation is between better prior levels of health & safety and improvements to health and safety outcomes (-0.68) p>0.05.

When the overall findings from round 1 and round 2 are compared, levels of health and safety are noticeably better in round 2 (1.91) than in round 1 (2.83). Other characteristics, however, remain similar.

When worker involvement and health and safety outcomes are considered, projects in round 2 do better, particularly regarding improvement to health and safety. This association would, therefore, support the finding that workplaces with better levels of basic health and safety tend to benefit more from engagement on the WSA scheme.

This finding is surprising because organisations with poorer health and safety at the beginning of the scheme might be expected to show more improvements in health and safety following intervention. One explanation for the result might be that employers with better basic health and safety are more suited to the benefit the scheme can offer. Conversely, organisations where health and safety is worse may benefit less from the scheme because they are in conflict with the aims of the WSA, who is looking to facilitate worker consultation rather than resolving basic health and safety issues. It might be argued, therefore, that for the scheme to have maximum effect WSAs should target organizations which already show a degree of awareness of health and safety issues.

The next strongest significant correlation is (-0.50) p>0.05 showing a positive association between better employer networks and improvements to worker involvement. Employer networks are seen as bringing many benefits and anecdotal evidence suggests organisations that are well connected tend to do better in terms of tackling health and safety. A report by HSL on behalf of HSE stated that “SMEs might benefit from working with other organisations, whether through networking, partnerships or by sharing good practice”. Park Royal who had good outcomes from both round 1 and 2, engaged with workplaces based on the Park Royal Business Estate. These organisations benefited from close proximity, were supported with a magazine & website and were also brought together for joint H&S training sessions.

Other characteristics are not individually associated with outcome. If however, the ratings for sector (type, diversity), employer network, location and prior level of H&S are totalled and correlated with outcome then again for health and safety there is a significant correlation (-0.61) p>0.05. This would seem to support the assumption that projects recruiting organisations that are rated as the most difficult to engage have less effective outcomes.

This would also seem to be supported from comments made during the end of year interviews. The FMB Lead Partner, for round 2, reported that they had struggled to make an impact because of the reducing population of potential beneficiary organisations but also for a number of other reasons, including:
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• Engaging with micro organisations that may have only one or two employees and therefore worker involvement is less of an issue;

• The large geographical area of the South West and the impact on travelling on cost and scheme delivery;

• The peripatetic nature of the workforce and their dislocation between office and where the work is conducted;

• The construction sector which is more resistant to health and safety.

Other projects engaging organisations that may have presented more of a challenge were Healthworks Newham, Health@Work Liverpool and Kirklees. This may also have had an impact on the outcomes of their WSA interventions.

4.9 WSA METHODS

**Issue 7 - How do different WSA methods of working with employers and workers impact on outcomes?**

The previous discussions on what may have impacted on the outcome of the WSA interventions have focused on project arrangements, organisational characteristics and employer attitudes and expectations. This section considers whether a key determiner affecting outcome of WSA intervention was the activities undertaken by the WSA during their visits.

4.9.1 Overall findings

When round 1 and round 2 WSA methods were compared the findings were similar in that some of the WSAs from some projects tended to focus more on worker involvement with WSAs from other projects focusing more on health and safety.

When the methods for round 2 only were analysed evidence from the joint visit report, supported by findings from the qualitative data, tends to show that worker involvement outcomes will be influenced by the different methods adopted by the WSA. Projects which adopted activities that are more likely to engender worker involvement, for example, Health@Work Liverpool, STUC and Park Royal, will also be more likely to achieve better worker involvement outcomes.

The number of visits or the total time spent does not seem to impact on outcome in either round 1 or round 2

Methods employed by the WSA that were viewed as being either necessary steps or essential to improve workers involvement were identified to be:

• Baseline assessment of health and safety (creates the impetus for improving H&S);

• Demystifying health and safety (easy to understand and more manageable - employers can begin to see how to tackle H&S issues);
• Improving H&S knowledge and awareness (duty holders better understand their responsibilities and what they need to do to comply with H&S legislation);

• Conducting H&S Training (gain employer buy-in, raise awareness, engage workers, generate feedback on H&S issues);

• Engaging workers either formally or informally (help to better understand their concerns and overcome any reservations about being more involved in H&S);

• Using a partnership approach to work jointly with employers and workers (demonstrates the benefits to both of co-operation; workers are empowered with improved work conditions and employers get help and support in tackling H&S);

• Helping managers develop consultation skills (give employers the skills to continue and sustain the work of the WSA).

4.9.2 Detailed Findings

Average number of visit:

In round 2 according to feedback from employers, the average number of visits per workplace was 3.5 slightly higher that the average number of visits in round 1 (3.2). This was expected because round 2 projects had longer to deliver the scheme.

The project with the highest number of visits was Park Royal (round 1 7.96 & round 2 4.4). Other projects with higher than average number of visits included UCATT in round 2 and British Glass and GMB in round 1. A number of projects operating in either round 1 or round 2 only managed two or fewer visits per workplace FMB, SOHAS, CRT, CVL, Health@Work Liverpool and Healthworks Newham.

When number of visits is correlated with health and safety and worker involvement outcomes there is no association (worker involvement = 0.18 and health and safety = -0.02)

Average length of visit:

In round 1 the average length of WSA visits was 2.92 hours, this had increased to 3.65 hours in round 2. This is again expected because of the longer time period for round 2 projects to deliver the scheme.

Projects with the longest average visits were STUC 6.2 hours and British Glass 5.2 hours. A number of projects had visits which had an average visit length of 1.5 hours or less (FMB, Groundworks, Healthworks Newham and Kirklees)

When length of visits is correlated with health and safety and worker involvement outcomes there is no association (worker involvement = 0.18 and health and safety = 0.25)

The findings suggest that neither the number of visits nor the time spent impact on the outcome of WSA intervention. A key determiner may instead be the quality of the visit and the methods employed by the WSA.
**WSA methods**

Reporting from WSAs in round 1 suggests that they adopted different approaches when visiting different workplaces. For example, some WSAs found themselves addressing health and safety issues rather than facilitating worker involvement.

Reporting from round 1 identified two instances how this might occur:

- Some WSAs, to get buy-in from both the employer and workers, identified and tackled a number of H&S issues by using a basic & brief audit/checklist. This approach was valuable in persuading a reluctant employer of the potential benefits but risked that the WSA at the outset of the intervention might be drawn into acting as a health and safety consultant.

- Some WSAs identified that employers and workers were not knowledgeable about H&S and the organisation did not have the H&S basics, like an H&S policy. They believed it necessary to develop the H&S basics before tackling worker involvement. If the visits were curtailed, as could happen, the WSA would not have sufficient time to move forward onto promoting worker involvement.

These instances from round 1 are supported by interviews with projects in round 2 and in a similar way some projects were forced by circumstance to apply different methods being less focused on worker involvement, for example:

- The WSA for Groundworks found it difficult to persuade the employer to release workers and so spent more time with the employer;

- The WSAs for FMB dealt primarily with micro organisations (<10) and perceived worker involvement to be less of an issue and were, therefore, more focused on raising H&S awareness.

To allow a comparison between WSA activity and outcome, projects were rated out of 5 (where 5 is the highest score) in terms of WSA activities that were perceived to promote worker involvement. These were then correlated against outcome. The detail of how this rating was determined is provided in Appendix B. The ratings are presented in the following **Table 30**: 

---
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The ratings for activities to promote worker involvement were correlated with a number of outcomes, for example:

- Impact on worker involvement;
- Impact on attitude towards worker involvement;
- Impact on health & safety knowledge;
- Impact on improvements in health and safety arrangements.

**Impact on worker involvement**

The results show a weak association between activities to promote worker involvement and better worker involvement outcomes (0.53) \( p > 0.10 \).

This result is largely to be expected and it is not entirely surprising that the projects with the highest rating for activities that promote worker involvement (Health@Work Liverpool, STUC and Park Royal) also had the highest rated outcomes for worker involvement.

**Impact on attitudes towards worker Involvement**

When the ratings for activities to promote worker involvement are correlated, with the project rated outcomes from changes to attitudes to worker involvement, the correlation is actually negatively associated (-0.34). This would suggest that WSAs who focus more on worker involvement actually have a negative impact on employer and worker attitudes. This anomaly might, however, be explained because promoting worker involvement makes both employers and workers realise that they need to do more and this may be reflected in their change of attitude after intervention.
**Health and safety knowledge and health and safety arrangements**

When project ratings for activities that promote worker involvement, are correlated with outcomes to health and safety knowledge there is a weak association (0.55) p>0.10.

This finding is more expected as spending more time with workers and employers to promote health and safety involvement is also likely to improve knowledge of health and safety. Conversely, if a WSA is focused on promoting worker involvement rather than tackling health and safety problems directly in the workplace then there is likely to be less improvement to health and safety outcomes.

This is supported when outcomes to health and safety arrangements (updated H&S policy, formal risk assessments) are correlated with activities to promote worker involvement. The results show only limited relationship and no significant association (0.38)

**4.9.3 Feedback on effective WSA methods from interviews**

The self-reporting has also been used to identify and consider methods that were effective in terms of engaging workers on health and safety. These methods were broadly the same for both round 1 and round 2.

**Baseline assessments of health and safety**

One important WSA method used by the majority of WSAs in both round 1 and round 2 was to make an assessment of workplace health and safety prior to starting intervention. This enabled the WSA to gauge how well an organisation was tackling health and safety and could also be a useful tool to help illustrate health and safety deficiencies to an employer. These assessments could be informal but a number of projects provided their WSAs with a formal method for auditing workplaces. For example, BPI a project operating in round 2, used BPIF ‘Healthcheck’. This was a software tool that provided a database of questions to enable a workplace to compare their H&S arrangements with current H&S legislation and good practice. This was used to benchmark H&S, identify improvements and then rate employer performance at the conclusion of WSA intervention. This system was extremely popular with the organisations engaged by BPI and one workplace had used the tool to demonstrate to an insurer the changes they had made. This helped them to keep their insurance premiums at the same rate as the previous year.

**Demystify health and safety; make it manageable and easy to understandable**

The WSAs from SOHAS ensured that H&S was made easier to understand by breaking it down into ‘bite size’ pieces, so as not to overwhelm employers and to a lesser extent the workers.

**H&S Training**

Another common technique adopted widely by a number of WSAs, particularly in round 2, (BPI, Kirklees, Park Royal, Rhondda, SOHAS and UCATT) was to provide different types of health and safety training to workers. STUC also provided on-line training on health and safety for managers.
Providing free training was initially viewed as a very good way to gain employer buy-in because they could see the tangible benefits of increasing worker knowledge and awareness of health and safety. Evidence of raised awareness was given by the WSA from Rhondda. They observed two workers, following an M/H training session, practising good lifting techniques as well as discussing the training with other workers who had not attended the session. Training was also viewed positively by the WSA because it provided a forum to talk and discuss health and safety informally with workers. A ‘reporter’ from UCATT stated that ideas emerging from these discussions were fed back to employer and this had led to health and safety changes, for example, a new floor surface reducing tripping hazards. This helped to demonstrate how worker consultation can help tackle health and safety issues.

The popularity of health and safety training as a method to create buy-in with employers, raise awareness and identify issues has led several projects, for example BPI, SOHAS and STUC, to explore how they can use training to continue the scheme without government funding.

Informally engaging workers

A number of WSAs (STUC, FMB and Lambeth) also stated that a key method they employed was to engage with workers through a number of informal methods, for example, talking to them during a tour of the workplace or during tea breaks. WSAs would usually also use formal engagement methods as well but it would depend on circumstance.

Formally engaging workers (presentations, toolbox talks)

WSAs from a number of projects also used more formal methods as well as informal methods to engage workers (UCATT, STUC, FMB, Health@Work Liverpool and Park Royal). Popular methods were to hold toolbox talks and give presentations. The WSA for Park Royal also used photographs taken during their visit to help illustrate health and safety issues during presentations. This approach was reported as a good way to overcome language barriers. Two formal approaches only used in round 1 (body mapping and hazard mapping) also use pictorial representations to illustrate health and safety issues.

Partnership approach working jointly with employers and workers

A central aim of the WSA scheme and a commonly adopted method, used by the majority of WSAs, was to involve both workers and employer together to tackle health and safety issues. A popular way to do this was through conducting joint risk assessments. A number of WSAs commented that it was important to ensure that the employer or duty holder retains credibility in front of workers. It was important therefore that, if necessary, some time was spent initially to provide them with the basics of H&S.

Improve H&S of the key duty holder

A number of WSAs (BPI, FMB, Health@Work Liverpool, Rhondda and SOHAS) recognised that it was important to build up and improve management H&S knowledge and competence. This meant that one method employed by the WSA was to explain to the duty holder their responsibilities and legal requirements. This was seen as an important first step prior to bringing workers and employers together. It also gave the employer more confidence to tackle H&S and helped them to ensure they did not ‘lose face’ in front of their workers.
**Helping managers with consultation skills**

The WSA from BPI helped managers to improve consultation skills. They explained the purpose of toolbox talks and also provided managers with job cards (crib sheets) that covered a number of topics, for example PPE. The crib sheet on PPE contained:

- An explanation of legislation;
- When PPE should be used e.g. ‘last resort’;
- An explanation of roles;
- Example questions to help stimulate discussion.

**Issue 8 - What are the benefits and dis-benefits of WSAs focusing on worker involvement, as opposed to H&S per se?**

The benefits of the WSA focusing on worker involvement (explored under Issue 7), is that by improving worker involvement and knowledge of health and safety this facilitates self-sustaining H&S improvement. The dis-benefits are that there are fewer short term improvements in terms of overall health and safety arrangements or to health and safety features (written risk assessments or accident plans).

Without a control group\(^\text{19}\) it is difficult to state unequivocally that worker involvement is a more effective approach than simple health and safety interventions. The reported outcomes may be due to the presence of the WSA who provides a starting point and focus to help begin the process of tackling health and safety. Strong support for the worker involvement approach was, however, voiced by those delivering the scheme - the WSAs and Lead Partners. They gave unanimous support (evidence provided by the end of year interviews) for the Challenge Fund and the benefits of worker involvement. A number of projects also stated that they intended to use the worker involvement approach either to tackle health and safety within their own organisation or to add it to the existing services (training, consultation) they provide.

**4.10 PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS**

**Issue 9 - How do the different types of partnership & partnership arrangements impact on project outcome?**

**4.10.1 Overall Findings**

Evidence suggests that projects with partners that contribute effectively through, for example, proactively aiding with organisation recruitment, are associated with a greater impact on worker involvement and health and safety.

Other partnership arrangements when considered individually are less likely to impact on outcome.

\(^{19}\) A group exposed to the same conditions but using a different approach to worker involvement, for example, direct H&S interventions
4.10.2 Qualitative feedback

Reporting from round 1 suggest that different aspects of the partnership might have an impact on the outcome of the success of the WSA. For example:

- The previous experience of the projects working together (understanding roles and responsibilities);
- The size of the partnership (providing a range of attributes and different contributions);
- The different types of contributions (aiding recruitment of WSAs or beneficiary organisations);
- How the partnership was managed (Had the partnership planned and managed their approach or adapted to unforeseen issues and barriers that arose?);
- The supporting networks (Does the partnership have contacts with other agents outside of their partnership that can bring added benefit to the scheme?);
- The Quality of the partner relations (Do the partners have a vested interest or benefit for being involved?);

Reporting from Lead Partners, partners and WSAs in both round 1 and round 2 help to illustrate how these different factors can help to improve project delivery and make a positive impact on outcomes.

In round 1, for example, the Lead Partner for British Glass commented on the strength and quality of the partner relationship. Both individuals had worked together previously on similar projects and considered each other to be a friend. The partnership was characterised by close working and regular meetings and significant partner contributions, for example, supplying H&S materials, providing strategic advice, aiding the recruitment of organisations through face-to-face visits, promoting the scheme, and monitoring and reviewing the WSA visits.

In round 1 CRT had a very close working relationship with the key individual at their partner organisation (CVL). This key individual was able to bring critical H&S expertise to help support WSAs via telephone contact and direct visits.

In round 1 Health@Work Liverpool were able to adapt their approach and engage with different partners to overcome difficulties experienced with recruitment.

In round 2 SOHAS had a larger more extensive partnership helping to advertise and promote the benefits of the WSA Challenge Fund to local organisations.

The Lead Partner for ENWORKS commented that the size of the project brought with it significant communication structures, admin support and management resource. This economy of scale enabled far more of the fund to be delivered at the workplace and this made it more cost effective.
Fuller details of each project and partnership characteristics are detailed in the end of year interviews with Lead Partners, partners and WSAs in Appendix C qualitative reporting (Lead partner, partner and wsa interviews).

### 4.10.3 Quantitative analysis

Each of the aspects identified above were considered in turn for the projects engaged on round 2 and they were then rated accordingly. The ratings are judgements based on evidence from interviews with Lead Partners and WSAs and the lead logs. The ratings, presented in Table 31, were then correlated against the outcome of the scheme to see whether these factors either together or individually impact on the outcomes of the WSA interventions. Apart from the numbers of partners, each rating is based on either a five point or three point scale where 1 indicates a lower value which might adversely affect the outcome of the scheme.

To consider how well a partnership is established the following rating system was used:

- A new partnership created for the scheme with no previous collaboration = 1;
- A new partnership with some limited previous collaboration or individual experience of delivering similar projects = 2;
- A relatively new partnership but with some previous collaboration or experience of the WSA scheme = 3;
- A developing partnership with a few years previous collaboration and experience of delivering the WSA scheme = 4;
- A well established partnership with previous experience of the WSA scheme = 5;

The full details of all the ratings, and how they were determined, are provided in Appendix B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Established Partnership 1-5</th>
<th>Number of partners</th>
<th>Partner Contribution 1-3</th>
<th>Partnership management 1-3</th>
<th>Supporting networks 1-3</th>
<th>Quality of partner relations 1-5</th>
<th>WI</th>
<th>H&amp;S</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 31:** Rating of project characteristics for round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Established Partnership 1-5</th>
<th>Number of partners</th>
<th>Partner Contribution 1-3</th>
<th>Partnership management 1-3</th>
<th>Supporting networks 1-3</th>
<th>Quality of partner relations 1-5</th>
<th>WI</th>
<th>H&amp;S</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor WI</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor HS</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor Av</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the outcomes from the WSA interventions are correlated with each of the project characteristics/arrangements, the only significant correlation (0.47) p.0.05 is between partner contributions and the overall average of both work involvement and health and safety outcomes.

These findings would tend to suggest that projects with partners that can make significant contributions to the project (providing additional resource, aiding with recruitment, providing materials) may have some impact on WSA outcomes.

When the overall project characteristics are totalled and then correlated with outcome the results do not show an association (0.09). The quantitative findings do not, therefore, lend support to the belief that projects with more positive characteristics would lead to better outcomes after WSA intervention. Additionally it would be expected that partnerships would develop and improve over time and that projects with two years of consecutive funding would have better and more effective partnership arrangements. It should be noted that projects that just operated in round 2 had the best outcomes overall in comparison with projects with two years of consecutive funding. It is likely therefore that other determiners have a more significant effect on WSA interventions, than partnership characteristics, such as employer expectation or an organisation’s prior level of health and safety.

4.11 BARRIERS TO INTERVENTION

Issue 10 - What are the causes of any problems or difficulties during the WSA scheme?

During discussions with Lead Partners, partners and WSAs, a number of potential barriers to delivering the WSA scheme were identified. The most frequently cited barriers are presented next with a more detailed project-by-project account provided in Appendix D – ‘Qualitative reporting’.

4.11.1 Overall findings

The main causes of problems or difficulties encountered by the projects in both round 1 and 2 were:

- Recruiting beneficiary organisations
- Engaging with hard to reach workers
- Key features of partnership management

These problems or difficulties were not, however, insurmountable, although if not overcome evidence suggests they can have a significant impact on delivering the scheme.

Projects that encountered significant barriers are likely to be affected in terms of the ability to both recruit and then effectively engage with beneficiary organisations.
4.11.2 Detailed findings

Recruitment of WSAs

In round 1 several projects encountered difficulty recruiting WSAs, notably Healthworks Newham. This was reported to have affected their ability to deliver the scheme. In round 2 although recruitment problems were not reported to the same extent, it was recognised that WSA recruitment was difficult and a potential barrier that might impact on future expansion of the scheme. A number of WSAs and Lead Partners commented that the recruitment of WSAs was made more difficult because of the short term funding of the scheme. One WSA also reported that it was a challenge to recruit WSAs when wages in the construction industry were currently so competitive.

Under estimating project resourcing needs

In round 1 a number of projects committed additional time and resources to the project due to unforeseen calls on their time, often this was as a result of failing to foresee the need to be more proactive in recruiting beneficiary organisations or providing admin support and resource to the WSA. This problem was experienced again in round 2 but to a lesser extent.

Partnership features and change in project management

Two projects in round 1 UCATT and CRT, had a change of partnership management. In round 2 UCATT was again affected by a change in project management. This was recognised by the WSA and Lead Partner as causing some disruption, for example, to the administrative support the WSA was receiving. A number of other projects reported planned changes in round 2 project management (Park Royal, FMB) at the start of round 2 but these were believed not to have had an impact on the partnership or affected the delivery of the scheme.

Another feature of project management is the ability to deal with and overcome the barriers encountered. This might mean that the partnership can be flexible in its approach and change work methods in response to the changing demands of the scheme. It should be noted that in round 1 Health@Work Liverpool encountered severe difficulties with recruitment. Through engaging different partners, however, and using innovative approaches they were able to overcome this problem. In contrast, FMB, due to constraints imposed by the partnership, did not alter their approach when encountering a similar problem and did not seek to recruit organisations outside of the FMB membership list.

Another feature is how well supporting organisations fulfil their role. In round 1 for example, Healthworks Newham had hoped to work with Newham Chamber of Commerce (NCoC), to better engage businesses in the Newham area. They reported at the end of the scheme that this did not happen and this may have added to the difficulties they experienced recruiting organisations.

Hard to reach workers

Some projects (CVL, SOHAS) in round 1 reported ‘hard to reach worker’, such as home workers. In round 2 one project in particular, Groundwork, had significant difficulty gaining access to workers in ethnic minority businesses in the retail and hospitality sector. This was chiefly because employers were reluctant to release workers during work time. The language
barrier experienced by the WSA at Groundworks was also reported to have affected their ability to engage with workers. FMB also found it somewhat difficult to get access to workers, if, for example, on the day of the visit employees were required to complete unexpected work. Workers were also at different site locations and so it was difficult to speak to them together and often resource intensive in terms of travel time.

**Understanding the WSA role**

A number of WSAs in round 1 stated they were unsure of their role in round 1 and it took a period of time before they had a clear grasp of the most effective approach. This problem was not encountered to the same extent in round 2 possibly due to a number of WSAs continuing over from round 1. In round 2 there was also more time for Lead Partners to brief the WSAs prior to the commencement of the scheme.

**Location of beneficiary organisations**

A number of WSAs in round 2, notably FMB and UCATT, operated in large geographical areas. This was cited as a barrier to the scheme because travel impacted on their resources and time that they could have spent with the beneficiary organisations.

**Recruitment of workplaces**

The difficulty to recruit beneficiary organisations was one of the most significant barriers reported by a number of projects in both round 1 and round 2 (FMB, Kirklees, Health@Work Liverpool, Healthworks Newham) The two key reasons given for why employers did not sign up to the scheme were:

- The time that both employers and workers were required to commit to the scheme;
- Suspicion of the unknown and a free service.

It should also be noted that several projects in round 2 reported, through the end of year interviews, that their project had encountered none or only barriers that were easily overcome, for example BPI and STC. Other projects, for example, FMB and Kirklees stated that the barriers, particularly regarding recruitment, had significantly affected their delivery of the scheme.

**4.11.3 Lessons learnt**

The following section considers possible solutions that have been applied or suggested by the projects as possible measures to overcome the barriers cited above:

Provide longer term funding and offer incentives like accredited training to improve WSA recruitment.

Spend more time at the outset of the project to plan resourcing needs.

WSAs should be flexible to the needs of the organisation, for example, meeting workers after a shift ends (this also demonstrates commitment to win over reluctant employers).
Ensure partners and Lead Partners are fully aware of their role and responsibility and the time they will be required to commit.

Pre-plan and ensure good communication to remind employers of up-coming visits and grouping visits together to reduce travel.

Ensure that WSAs are fully briefed about the purpose of the scheme and what they should be aiming to achieve. During the scheme, provide support to the WSA and an opportunity for them to feedback on how their visits are going; and to discuss their approach.

A number of projects applied different methods to overcome recruitment barriers, for example:

- Recommendation - referrals through word of mouth;
- Incentives – offering benefits such as free training;
- Referrals – being provided with leads from other bodies such as Environmental Health Officers;
- Introductions – being introduced by an individual familiar with the business;
- Proactive recruitment – using an agency to recruit organisations at the start of the scheme.
5 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 OVERALL CONCLUSION

The findings suggest that there is benefit in focusing on the WSA approach and enhancing worker involvement. This is because facilitating partnership working within the workplace, and establishing the structures that enable workers and employers to work together on health and safety, leads to better worker involvement and improved health and safety.

Without a control group\(^{20}\), it is difficult to state unequivocally that worker involvement is a more effective approach than other types of health and safety interventions. The reported outcomes may be due to the presence of the WSA who provides a starting point and focus to help begin the process of tackling health and safety.

In the opinion of Greenstreet Berman, however, there would seem to be merit in using an approach that looks to engage with workers. Using such a partnership approach can help to spread the burden of tackling health and safety and provide management with new insight into the health and safety issues that might be affecting their business.

Strong support for the worker involvement approach was also voiced by those delivering the scheme - the WSAs and Lead Partners. They gave unanimous support (evidence provided by the end of year interviews) for the Challenge Fund and the benefits of worker involvement. A number of projects also stated that they intended to use the worker involvement approach either to tackle health and safety within their own organisation or to add it to the existing services (training, consultation) they provide.

Partnership working also adds value to the projects, particularly when partners make real contributions. For example, introduce or refer organisations for recruitment rather than just providing a list of members.

The WSA project also provides a way to engage small and micro organisations on health and safety matters that are normally difficult to reach. There is, however, a dichotomy because the overall costs of the scheme and the effectiveness of WSA interventions appear to be affected for the projects recruiting organisations in more challenging sectors.

Projects that recruit organisations with prior expectation to improve worker involvement and better basic H&S appear to have better outcomes. This would suggest that WSA has greater impact when targeting specific types of organisations. It might be argued, therefore, that for the scheme to have maximum effect WSAs should target organizations which already show a degree of awareness of health and safety and a willingness to improve. Alternative strategies (outside the scope of this research) may be more effective for organisations that are less willing to improve or have less developed levels of health and safety.

\(^{20}\) A group exposed to the same conditions but using a different approach to worker involvement, for example, direct H&S interventions
The quantitative findings also show a benefit of the estimated value saved in terms of reduced injury and absence rates. These would appear to be equal or higher to the costs of funding the scheme. There are also likely to be additional benefits brought by the WSA scheme, such as improvements to employee morale, which are more difficult to quantify. It is again difficult, as discussed previously, to say for certain whether these benefits are a direct consequence of using worker involvement instead of an approach that just tackles health and safety.

5.2 WORKER INVOLVEMENT AND H&S MATURITY

Our interpretation is that there is evidence that employers are more willing and able to engage workers if they are more aware of H&S hazards and have achieved ‘basic’ H&S arrangements, such as having an H&S policy, and have:

- A positive attitude towards health and safety and meeting legal requirements;
- A commitment to tackling health and safety and can see the benefits of involving workers.

It is important to note that this does not prohibit engaging workers from the outset and in some instances, there may be benefit to early engagement, for example, engaging with workers to help develop the safety policy. It is believed, however, that employers may lack confidence to fully engage workers until they have developed some understanding of H&S.

5.3 SUSTAINED IMPROVEMENTS

A key aim of the WSA approach is to create arrangements within workplaces that are sustained after the WSA has completed their work. It is difficult to determine whether observed improvements continue after WSA intervention on the evidence available at this time. The current study has not included a check on workplaces after the WSA intervention is completed. It is therefore recommended that a follow up survey is completed of the round 1 and 2 workplaces to explore whether the reported increases in worker involvement (and reported reductions in absence and injury) have been sustained.

5.4 FUNDING OPTIONS

The evaluation does indicate that the cost per workplace could challenge the mainstreaming of the WSA concept, i.e. make it difficult to offer to a larger number of SMEs. In addition, continuity of funding and the scale of projects are important issues. Therefore, there would be value in reviewing funding options of delivering the scheme in order to make it more viable on a nationwide basis. Some options include:

- Longer and greater continuity of funding, i.e. funding for more than 1 year (such as 5 years);
- Using a smaller number of larger scale projects/partnerships that aim for a larger caseload of workplaces per WSA that is large enough to achieve economies of scale;
- Providing centralised training and support for WSAs;
- Integrating the WSA approach into other H&S support schemes such as Workplace Health Connect.
6 APPENDIX A

The tables presented in this appendix show the improvements in measurements taken before and then after WSA intervention. They demonstrate the positive impact of the scheme on worker involvement and health and safety.

6.1.1 Worker involvement

The following table shows the employer, WSA and worker rated level of worker involvement in H&S both prior to and then after WSA intervention.

Table 32: Rated level of worker involvement in H&S baseline and end of year respondents (where 1 = none and 5 = as much as possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th></th>
<th>End of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>WSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.2 Employer and worker attitude to worker involvement

The following table shows the WSAs’ rating of attitude to worker involvement before and then after intervention.

Table 33: WSAs’ rating of employer and worker attitudes to worker involvement and the WSA scheme (1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th></th>
<th>End of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.3 Joint risk assessments

The following table shows the percentage of both workers and employers responding, “yes” to the question, “Have you completed or reviewed any risk assessments with workers or their representative within the last year”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th></th>
<th>End of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34: Comparison of workers’ and employers’ view of worker involvement in review of any risk assessment with workers or their representatives within the last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employers’ baseline</th>
<th>Employers’ end of year</th>
<th>Workers’ baseline</th>
<th>Workers’ end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.4 Improvement in health and safety

The following table shows the WSAs’ rating of the level of Health and Safety before and then after intervention.

Table 35: How do you (WSA) rate the overall level of H&S at the workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of H&amp;S</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1 - Poor or very poor H&amp;S</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2 - Poor or very poor H&amp;S</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.5 There are more health and safety features

Some example of improvements in H&S features are summarised below in Table 36.

Table 36: Proportion of employers’ reporting cited health and safety features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature (n = 115 to 121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.  An up-to-date &amp; signed health and safety policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.  A written risk assessment for any significant risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.  A written plan for what you are going to do to make health and safety improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature (n = 115 to 121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.  An up-to-date &amp; signed health and safety policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.  A written risk assessment for any significant risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.  A written plan for what you are going to do to make health and safety improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.6 There is a perception by employers that overall the scheme has been of benefit.

When the perception of the benefits of the scheme are analysed responses from both the evaluation feedback and the verification interviews show that the majority of employers believed their business very much benefited from participating on the scheme.

Table 37: Employer feedback on the benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of respondents agreeing with the statement, ‘it very much benefited our business’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification interviews</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Feedback</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 APPENDIX B – RATINGS

7.1.1 Ratings used to determine overall outcome

A: Perceived improvement of worker involvement from workers, employers and WSAs.

An overall rating was calculated based on workers’, employers’ and WSAs’ perceptions of worker involvement at the beginning and at the end of intervention. The amount of improvement was calculated by first working out the difference in average between baseline and feedback results for workers, employers and WSAs. An average was then calculated of all three scores for each project and rated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.19</td>
<td>(very limited change)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 - 0.39</td>
<td>(limited change)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4 - 0.59</td>
<td>(moderate change)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6 - 0.79</td>
<td>(substantial change)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 0.8</td>
<td>(very substantial change)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: Rating scale based on the percentage decrease in ‘no consultation’ methods in health and safety.

Prior and then after intervention employers were asked to record what different methods of health and safety consultation they currently employ. This percentage change was then rated on a scale of one to five where:

1 = < 0%
2 = 0 – 15%
3 = 16 – 30%
4 = 31 – 45%
5 = ≥ 46%

C: Rating scale based on the percentage increase of workers represented.

Prior and then after intervention employers were asked if their workers were represented by a health and safety representative or by a trade union. The percentage change was rated on a scale of one to five where:

1 = < 0
2 = 0 – 15
3 = 16 – 30
4 = 31 – 45
5 = > 46
D: Workers’ and employers’ perception of worker involvement.

Following intervention workers and employers were asked to rate the level of worker involvement improvements since the start of the scheme. Originally in round 1, a five point ranking scale was used where 1 = A lot worse to 5 = A lot better. The scale has been revised so the rating indicates a score above 3 (no change) as follows:

1 = 0 - 0.19
2 = 0.2 – 0.39
3 = 0.4 – 0.59
4 = 0.6 – 0.79
5 = ≥ 0.8

Project ratings for Health & Safety

F: Rating scales based on WSAs’ perception of health and safety from WSAs.

WSAs were asked to rate their perceptions of improvements in H&S. The scale was a five point scale where 1 = ‘poor’ and 5 = ‘excellent’. The amount of improvement was calculated by taking the difference in average between baseline and end of year results.

1 = 0 – 0.19
2 = 0.2 – 0.39
3 = 0.4 – 0.59
4 = 0.6 – 0.79
5 = ≥ 0.8

G: Worker and employers’ perception of health and safety improvements

Following intervention workers and employers were asked to rate the level of H&S improvement since the start of the scheme. Originally in round 1, a five point ranking scale was used where 1 = A lot worse to 5 = A lot better. The scale has been revised so the rating indicates a score above 3 (no change) as follows:

1 = 0 – 0.19
2 = 0.2 – 0.39
3 = 0.4 – 0.59
4 = 0.6 – 0.79
5 = ≥ 0.8

Overall ratings

H: Overall average rating of Health and safety

This is an average of F and G to give an overall rating of the impact on health and safety.

E: Overall average rating of Worker Involvement

This is an average of the ratings for points A to D, to provide an overall rating of the impact on worker involvement.
7.1.2 Issue 4 Employer attitude and expectation ratings

Employers at the start of the scheme were asked to select 3 statements that reflected what they hoped to get from the scheme. These statements were then identified as either showing expectation to improve worker involvement or health and safety, for example:

- Expectation to improve work involvement: (‘we want to improve managers’ ability to consult with and listen to workers/we want to get our workers more involved in health and safety where identified’) or
- Expectation to improve health and safety (‘we hope to get some free health and safety advice/we want to make sure we are complying with current health and safety law’)

The following tables provide rating for prior employer expectation and attitude.

**Expectation**

Table 38: Employer expectation in round 1 prior to participating in the scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Expectation to improve worker involvement</th>
<th>Expectation to improve health and safety</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Impact on WI</th>
<th>Impact on H&amp;S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Expectation to improve worker involvement</th>
<th>Expectation to improve health and safety</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Impact on WI</th>
<th>Impact on H&amp;S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Attitude**

The employer questionnaire also provided different indicators of prior attitude, for example, whether employers were enthusiastic about signing up to the scheme and whether they were already planning some form of change to worker involvement or health and safety changes – see Table 39 & Table 40. Depending on employer response a measure of prior attitude and planned change can be determined and then correlated with worker involvement and H&S outcomes.

**Table 39: Employer attitude in round 1 prior to participating in the scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BRG</th>
<th>CRT</th>
<th>CVL</th>
<th>EW</th>
<th>FM</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>HW</th>
<th>HW</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>Total r²</th>
<th>Total R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Enthusiastic (%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worth trying (%)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Some concerns (%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Major concerns (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Only doing this because we have to (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned changes to worker involvement or H&amp;S (%)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 40: Employer attitude in round 2 prior to participating in the scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BPI</th>
<th>FMB</th>
<th>GWK</th>
<th>HWK</th>
<th>LAM</th>
<th>KRK</th>
<th>PRP</th>
<th>RHO</th>
<th>SOH</th>
<th>STU</th>
<th>UCT</th>
<th>Total R2</th>
<th>Total round 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Enthusiastic (%)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worth trying (%)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Some concerns (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Major concerns (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Only doing this</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned changes to</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worker involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or H&amp;S (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.3 Issue 6 – Organisational characteristics ratings

Organisational size

The figure presented in Table 29: The impact of organisational characteristics on outcomes for organisation size is the average median size of beneficiary organisations recruited for each project in round 1 and round 2

Membership of a trade organisation

The figure presented in Table 29: The impact of organisational characteristics on outcomes for trade organisation is the overall percentage of organisations recruited for each project who are members of a trade association or organisation running the scheme in round 1 and round 2

Trade union representation prior to WSA intervention

The figure presented in Table 29: The impact of organisational characteristics on outcomes is the overall percentage of organisations recruited for each project with trade union representation prior to WSA intervention for both round 1 and round 2.

Sector (type)

There is a belief amongst Lead Partners, and also a more general recognition, that certain sectors are more difficult to engage with in terms of health and safety and by extension worker involvement.
Reporting from Lead Partners within the construction industry state that there are several factors that make their sector difficult to engage on health and safety matters. For example, the peripatetic nature of the workforce, the separation between office and work site and a degree of ambivalence towards health and safety and risk taking.

In contrast, the voluntary and government sector organisations are closer to the central function of promoting health and safety and are more familiar with paperwork and assessments that go hand in hand with tackling health and safety.

The sectors that have been engaged have been given a value, 1 being the hardest and 5 being the easiest, based on the types of assumptions described above. This process of comparing these sector values against outcomes will also help to test the validity of these assumptions.

Construction/Building = 5 (very difficult)
Service Retail/Hospitality/Entertainment/leisure = 4 (difficult)
Manufacturing/Printing/Transport =3 (medium)
Voluntary/Healthcare/Financial or banking = 2 (easy)
Government/LA/Education = 1 (very easy)

**Sector (diversity)**

Some projects tended to focus on delivering the scheme to a particular sector where they had previous experience of delivering similar projects in the past, for example BPI, FMB, UCT SOH, RHO and STUC. Other projects, as illustrated in the table above, targeted the delivery of the scheme in a number of similar sectors, for example, GWK, HWK and LAM. Finally, two projects, PRP and KRK, covered a broad range of sectors.

Successfully delivering the scheme, as reported by WSAs and Lead Partners is partly based on the WSA’s credibility in the eyes of the organisation in terms of health and safety and also their knowledge and experience of a sector. The projects that delivered to a diverse range of sectors may therefore be at a disadvantage. To provide a way to assess the possible impact of sector diversity projects have been given a value based on the criteria discussed above where 1 is the easiest or least diverse and 3 is the hardest or most diverse, for example:

- Projects operating in one sector, or two or more very similar sectors = 1
- Projects operating in two different sectors = 2
- Projects operating in three of more different sectors = 3

**The overall level of H&S at the workplace at baseline**

Projects who recruit beneficiary organisations with better H&S might be at an advantage. This is because the WSA can focus on interventions to enhance worker involvement rather than establishing the H&S basics such as risk assessments, developing H&S policies or accidents books.
The following rating was used to rate projects from 1 to 5 in terms of the basic level of H&S of the organisations they recruited prior to WSA intervention. A rating of 5 is the poorest basic level of H&S and a rating of 1 is the best.

- 80% or more organisations engaged = 5
- 60-79% organisations engaged = 4
- 40-59% organisations engaged = 3
- 20-39% organisations engaged = 2
- less than 19% organisations engaged = 1

**Location**

Reporting from projects in round 1 suggested that the geography or location was likely to have an impact on the delivery of the WSA scheme. Projects that were required to cover a large area were at a disadvantage in terms of travel time and resources. Projects have been rated from 1 to 3 in terms of the ease or difficulty of their location with 1 being the easiest and 3 the most difficult, see Table 41.

For example, FMB and UCT delivered the scheme in a large geographic area where organisations tended to be more spread out, and visiting employers often required travelling long distances. If appointments were cancelled, or the organisations could not engage with the WSA because of work commitments then a journey might also have been wasted. In contrast, PRP predominately engaged organisations on the Park Royal estate in West London. They were therefore closer together. This reduced travel time and made arrangements more flexible.

The following table provides comment and a rating of the possible impact of location.

**Table 41: Rating of location impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>Recruited nationwide but predominately in Yorkshire &amp; Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Recruited nationwide but a number of WSAs operated out of satellite offices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>Recruited nationwide but a number of WSAs operated out of satellite offices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>Operated in the North West region but out of a number of BEA offices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>One WSA operated in the East Midlands area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>Operated in the Borough of Newham in East London</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>Operated in both rounds in SW England (WSAs based in Bristol and Plymouth)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>Operated in both rounds in the Merseyside area</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>Operated in North Yorkshire</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>Operated on the Park Royal business park in West London</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>Operated in South Sheffield in round 1 expanding to South Yorkshire in round 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>Operated in the East Midlands in round 1 and the West Midlands as well in round 2</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>Operated in the South and South West</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>Operated in the Rochdale and Oldham area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>Operated in South London</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>Operated in South Wales Rhondda valley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU</td>
<td>Operated in the Glasgow metropolitan area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Employer networking**

With consideration to reporting from Lead Partners, partners and knowledge of the sector each project has been provided with a network rating 1-3 (where 3 = poor business network opportunities and 1= good networking opportunities).

**Table 42: Rating of employer networking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>Over subscribed due to word of mouth, participating organisations with access to a discussion forum and the opportunity to network with other companies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Group training sessions, and the sharing of ideas through networking. Some engaged organisations were CRT own regional offices</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>The majority of organisations were DTA own regional offices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENW</td>
<td>Project delivered to a diverse group of organisations some with contacts through existing network of business environment associations.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>No evidence of employer networks other than through ACAD/TICA membership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWN</td>
<td>Organisations who were engaged on the scheme were provided with networking opportunities but there was poor attendance.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>Organisations dispersed across South West with little evidence of employer networks other than through membership of FMB</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>Organisation took advantage of networking opportunities provided by partner organisation (LCoC) Evidence of referrals and the success of the scheme spreading by work of mouth between Merseyside organisations in the leisure entertainment sector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>Some cross referral from the better Heath at Work project</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>Referrals, joint training and evidence that project benefits have spread via word of mouth. Engaged organisations predominately operated out of one business park with own newsletter and considerable networking opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>The formation of H&amp;S committees with representatives from different organisations. Sharing of H&amp;S policies and knowledge between employers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>Evidence of networking through sub contractors and also benefits of the scheme spreading by word of mouth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>Cross referrals between organisations on same business park and the exchanging of H&amp;S knowledge and materials between organisations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>No evidence of employer networks, although some possible additional network opportunities for organisations via the ‘Business Environment Association’.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>Some evidence of employer networking through partner organisations such as CTA and Salon Strategies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>Partner forum (Interlink) provides networking opportunities for employers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU</td>
<td>Networking events, for example, a discussion seminar have been well attended by employer and workers participating on the scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.4 Issue 7 - WSA activities to promote worker involvement ratings

Data from the joint visit reports, which detailed WSA activity, was considered on a project-by-project basis. The joint visit report also provided the WSA to indicate who they spent their time with engaging in that activity, for example:

0= Carried out by self
1=Participation by manager
2=Participation by worker
3=Joint participation

A lower number, for example, between 0 and 1 would indicate that the majority of time spent on the activity was carried out by themselves or just with the manager. A higher number, for example, around 2 would indicate more joint participation either with the workers or both manager and workers. A higher number shows, therefore, that more time was spent with workers and therefore might be a predictor of improvements to worker involvement.

The results from the joint visit report were analysed and the overall percentage of time spent on each activity, along with who the activity was conducted, has been presented in Table 43.

- Numbers in column A represent with whom on average the activity was conducted
- Numbers in column % represent the percentage of time spent on the activity
**Table 43: Details of Round 2 WSA activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>BPI</th>
<th>FMB</th>
<th>GWK</th>
<th>HWK</th>
<th>KRK</th>
<th>LAM</th>
<th>PRP</th>
<th>RHO</th>
<th>SOH</th>
<th>STU</th>
<th>UCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>A %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing regarding the WSA scheme</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing how the WSA project is progressing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying out risk assessment or hazard spotting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing/checking/auditing or inspecting H&amp;S arrangements or performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on necessary (or best) H&amp;S control measures</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on new/adjusted health and safety management arrangements</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on new/adjusted health and safety consultation arrangements</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning how to implement health and safety / consultation improvements</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating and reviewing lessons learnt from incidents or accidents</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information or advice on health and safety control measures</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information or advice on health and safety management</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information or advice on how to involve workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>UCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advice on health and safety legal rights and responsibilities</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving employees’ complaints about health and safety</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating group discussion or activity about health and safety</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as “go-between” between workers and employer</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing health and safety training needs</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering training in risk assessment</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering training in hazard awareness and control measures</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering training on health and safety management</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering training in consultation, representation, negotiation etc.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, please describe (include referrals to other help/consultancy)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The projects were rated from 0-5 to indicate whether activities were likely to promote worker involvement with 5 being the highest rating. The rating was determined using the following scoring system presented in the table below.

**Table 44: Rating of WSA activities to promote worker involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who the activity was carried out with</th>
<th>score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrying out risk assessment or hazard spotting</td>
<td>1.5 or above</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing/checking/auditing or inspecting health and safety arrangements or performance</td>
<td>1.5 or above</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on necessary (or best) health and safety control measures</td>
<td>1.5 or above</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information or advice on how to involve workers</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving employees’ complaints about health and safety</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating group discussion or activity about health and safety (e.g. body mapping)</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as “go-between” between workers and employer</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering training in risk assessment</td>
<td>1.5 or above</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering training in hazard awareness and control measures</td>
<td>1.5 or above</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering training in consultation, representation, negotiation etc. skills</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings were considered together with evidence from the self reporting of WSA methods identified during the end of year interviews and presented in **Table 45** below.

**Table 45: Rating of WSA activities to promote worker involvement with consideration to self reporting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>Self-reporting suggested a key activity undertaken at the start of the scheme was to audit or assess H&amp;S. This may reflect one of the key aims of the project which was to use the BPIF ‘Health-check’ (reference) to assess workplaces H&amp;S arrangements and identify improvement areas. Training was also reported as a key activity and probably provided the main avenue for the WSA to discuss issues with workers concerning how they could become more involved in heath and safety. The WSA spent time on presentations and joint risk assessments and helped to facilitate discussions between workers and employer. Self-reporting stated that time was also spent with employers to help them improve consultation skills by providing prompt cards.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>Most of the WSA’s time was spent providing information or advice on health and safety control measures, safety management and legal rights and responsibilities. This again might reflect that the WSA spent more time with the employer to improve the health and safety basics before tackling worker involvement. The WSA also spent time with workers but focused more on raising H&amp;S awareness than involving them in activities that might promote more worker involvement like joint risk assessments.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>Self-reporting suggests the WSA spent most time with employers tackling health management and control measures. Less time was spent with workers primarily because of language issues and because employers were reluctant to release workers from day-to-day work. These were identified as key barriers by the WSA and Lead Partner to engagement with workers.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>The WSAs from HWK spent some time balanced between engaging workers using toolbox talks &amp; risk assessments and with employers reviewing H&amp;S arrangements, ways to involve workers, and legal rights and responsibilities. The WSA was also a go-between feeding back concerns raised with workers to the employer. The WSA also focused on building the confidence of workers to tackle H&amp;S and also showcasing to the employer how workers could help on H&amp;S and reduce their burden.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>Due to organisations recruited by KRK also being involved in the ‘Better Health at Work’ scheme it is difficult to know to what degree WSA activities might have impacted on the outcome of the WSA scheme. A brief review, however, suggests that they distributed time between activities that would promote worker involvement and also improve health and safety. A key aspect of the WSA’s work was to facilitate discussion between workers and employers and provide support and information on health and safety to raise awareness.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>Self-reporting statements made by the Lead Partner and WSA suggest that training provided to workers in areas such as risk assessment and manual handling were a large component of the work carried out by the WSA. This is not supported, however, by the quantitative analysis of methods used. (It should be noted that early on in the scheme WSAs did not complete the joint visit reports at the time of conducting visits and were required to complete these retrospectively in quarter three and four. This might have had an impact on the quality of reporting). The Lead Partner also reported that they engaged with micro businesses, often family run, which meant that discussions with employers and workers were often informal. The WSA was also focused on raising H&amp;S awareness of workers to dangers in the workplace.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>Self-reporting suggests that after winning over senior management to the scheme the WSA spent a large proportion of their time with workers. Using interactive methods they were able to effectively engage with workers, for example, through joint risk assessments, presentations involving photos of the workplace and giving workers checklists so they could be more involved with assessing health and safety. Workers were also provided with basic H&amp;S training. The WSA was also able to feedback concerns to managers and then provide website links, for example to M/H, to help them tackle these concerns.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RHO
The WSA for RHO also used H&S training as a method to engage and consult with workers and also to raise H&S awareness. The WSA also recognised that a key issue was to engage with the senior duty holders not just the H&S manager which meant time was spent helping to improve H&S management and control measures. The WSA therefore spent time with both management and workers and felt a balanced approach was the best method for increasing worker involvement.

| SOH | The WSA again used a balanced approach to deliver, advice, support and training on both health and safety and worker involvement. Time was spent at the outset with management to assess needs and then de-mystifying health and safety and by also breaking it down to make it more manageable and easier to understand. Workers were again engaged through training in risk assessment M/H and basic H&S. |
| STU | Self-reporting from the WSA states that they were focused on promoting worker involvement through presentations and involving workers in joint risk assessments. They also used activates that engaged both workers and employers together. Less time was spent with employers on H&S management which may reflect that the beneficiary organisations engaged had quite a good basic level of H&S. They did however spend time with employers, providing advice on how to involve workers more. |
| UCT | WSAs focused on training which was seen as an avenue to talk to and consult with workers about H&S issues. Training sessions were used to feedback concerns to employers and self-reporting suggests this led to H&S changes. The other methods used, which WSAs report as being both effective and popular, were presentations and toolbox talks. Overall, self-reporting and evidence suggests that the WSA spent more time with workers than employers after initial briefings about the scheme. |

#### 7.1.5 Issue 9 partnership characteristics ratings
Apart from numbers of partners, each rating is based on either a five point or three point scale where 1 indicates a lower value which might adversely affect the outcome of the scheme.

**Established partnership**

- A new partnership created for the scheme with no previous collaboration = 1
- A new partnership with some limited previous collaboration or individual experience of delivering similar projects = 2
- A relatively new partnership but with some previous collaboration or experience of the WSA scheme = 3
- A developing partnership with a few years previous collaboration and experience of delivering the WSA scheme = 4
- A well established partnership with previous experience of the WSA scheme = 5

**The number of partners**

This value is expressed as the actual number of partners collaborating in the scheme.
**Partner contributions**

A three point scale is used to rate project contributions based on the evidence of the Lead Partner, partner and WSA interviews and presented in Appendix D.

- Limited contribution - strategic advice, bi-monthly meetings, one of the following (resource/admin support/aided with recruitment/materials) = 1
- Reasonable contribution – good collaboration, monthly meetings, more than one of the following (resource/admin support/aided with recruitment/materials) = 2
- Substantial contribution – excellent collaboration, frequent meetings, actively aiding recruitment, several of the following (resource/admin support/aided with recruitment/materials) = 3

**Management of the scheme**

The following rating is based on the interviews and Lead Partners’ logs. It considers the quality of pre-planning and preparation and how projects managed and adapted to problems that may have arisen.

- Evidence that potential problems were not foreseen, limited contingency planning and limited flexibility to overcome issues = 1
- No barriers encountered or some evidence of ability to change when problems/barriers encountered = 2
- Excellent pre-planning and contingency or flexible management meant that arising problems and issues were successfully controlled = 3

**Supporting networks**

A three point scale was used to rate the supporting networks outside of the partnership based on the evidence of the Lead Partner, partner and WSA interviews and presented in Appendix D:

- No evidence of networks outside of the partnership providing additional support = 1
- Some evidence of limited networks outside of the partnership providing additional support = 2
- Evidence of extensive additional networks outside of the partnership providing additional support = 3

**Quality of partnership relationships**

Partnership rating has been established from the reporting in the Lead Partner log. Based on a five point scale it asked the Lead Partner for a rating at the start of the project of their understanding of the ‘needs & aims of key partner organisation’ and the ‘communication & trust at the start of involvement’

- Not at all/very poor = 1
- A little/poor = 2
- Somewhat/acceptable = 3
- Quite well/Good = 4
- Very well/excellent = 5
7.1.6 Issue 10 - Project ratings of the impact of problems or difficulties during the WSA scheme?

Because of the difference in project experience the projects have been rated in terms of barriers experienced, using the criteria presented in the following:

**Table 46: Criteria for rating the impact of barriers encountered by projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of barriers</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no barriers encountered</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some minor barriers encountered but overcome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major barriers encountered but overcome with only slight impact on delivering the scheme</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major barriers encountered not overcome, significantly impacting on the delivery of the scheme</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 47: Rating of barriers encountered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>No major barriers encountered, some initial suspicion to recruitment but overcome using introductions from BPI representative in the South West</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>Recruitment was significant barrier with suspicion towards the initiative. Workers were difficult to access due to site location and a large area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWK</td>
<td>Limited access to workers due to work commitments and language barrier</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWK</td>
<td>Some problems with recruitment towards the end of the scheme, but were able to largely overcome with help from partners, and starting to recruit in a new sector. They also experienced with a WSA leaving the scheme after briefly joining which may have had a slight impact on the delivery.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRK</td>
<td>Recruitment was a major barrier. They were also short of resources with a WSA leaving the scheme due to maternity – they were not replaced. There was also less support from partners in terms of leads to organisations.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>The WSA working with the Chinese take away community did not commence until half way through the scheme. A second WSA also fell ill. These both had an impact on the delivery of the scheme.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>No barrier encountered</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO</td>
<td>A number of factors including pressure to fill a demanding role as both WSA and Lead Partner affected the ability of the WSA to deliver the scheme. It may have also contributed to the extended absence of the WSA due to illness by the third quarter.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOH</td>
<td>No barriers encountered</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU</td>
<td>Some minor barriers in terms of WSA resource and admin support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>Some difficult with WSA recruitment at the outset delaying the start of the scheme in the West Midlands. Change of Lead Partner after Quarter 2. WSA spent time cold calling due to poor leads towards the end of the scheme</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 APPENDIX C QUALITATIVE REPORTING (LEAD PARTNER, PARTNER AND WSA INTERVIEWS)

The following information is a summary of the interviews conducted with WSAs, Partners and Lead partners, unless otherwise stated. Conclusions drawn from the interviews are reliant on self-reporting by WSAs and Lead Partners and the interpretation of the interviewer. This information is further summarised and used to provide a subjective rating of worker involvement and capacity building for each project.

8.1 SUBJECTIVE RATINGS OF WORKER INVOLVEMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING

The following table provides subjective scores (rated from 0-5) to aid assessment of ‘project’ worker involvement and capacity building. The ratings given are based on the evidence from the Lead Partner, partner and WSA interviews summarised above. These ratings should not be considered in isolation but with consideration to the other ratings provided.

**Table 48**: Round 1 subjective rating of worker involvement and capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</th>
<th>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRITISH GLASS</td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 4&lt;br&gt;Ease of sector: Medium - Manufacturing, membership for recruitment but tackled those with poor H&amp;S (predominately small)&lt;br&gt;Number of beneficiaries: Medium 40&lt;br&gt;Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - Hazard mapping and toolbox talks, audits with employer and worker&lt;br&gt;Evidence of increased WI: Yes - Workplace interventions after suggestions from shop floor&lt;br&gt;Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes - H&amp;S committees, H&amp;S champions, business improvement plans.&lt;br&gt;Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - Guidance on WI to be shared with industry</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 2.5&lt;br&gt;Building WSA skills competencies rating: 2/5. 3 WSAs with previous experience as H&amp;S practitioner and with H&amp;S qualifications. Limited training provided but gained auditing skills, &amp; experience of dealing with SMEs. Strong desire to continue, however, Lead Partner reports it is unlikely that pool of expertise has increased and WSA believes they gained only ‘a little’ experience.&lt;br&gt;Partnership development rating 3/5&lt;br&gt;Existing partnership with strong partner relations with excellent collaboration but from an initially high base new partners identified (FENSA) but no expansion. Wider impact in terms of ideas shared with larger organisations across glass &amp; ceramic industry. Not awarded round 2 funding and no plan to continue with the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 3&lt;br&gt;Ease of sector: Easy - Voluntary (receptive) &amp; previous links to organizations (predominately micro)</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 4&lt;br&gt;Building WSA skills competencies rating: 5/5. 6 WSAs without previous experience (recruited from CRT staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</td>
<td>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CVL</strong></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: Small 23</td>
<td>were provided with H&amp;S qualification (IOSH) and training (risk assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - Joint RA, H&amp;S workshops involving workers &amp; employers</td>
<td>Strong desire to continue and the agreement of the Lead Partner and WSA that the pool of WSAs had increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Some – Improved worker confidence and engagement with employer</td>
<td><strong>Partnership development rating 3/5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI Yes - H&amp;S safety reps &amp; committees</td>
<td>Existing partner &amp; number of new partners identified. Good relations with other partners and evidence of collaboration. Self-reported better relations &amp; communications. Wider impact via CRT procedure for awarding grants and business advice. No planned continuation of the scheme without funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Some - Bringing different organisations together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall WI rating = 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall CB rating = 4.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ease of sector: Easy voluntary – receptive &amp; previous links (predominately micro)</strong></td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating: 4/5. H&amp;S training provided to five WSAs without existing experience, very positive about success of the scheme reporting a strong desire to continue. One WSA is pursuing own further H&amp;S training (NEBOSH certificate). The WSA agreed that skills and competencies improved a lot and the Lead Partner thought that the pool of WSAs had increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of beneficiaries Small: 23.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partnership development rating 5/5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI :Yes – Demonstrating joint RA, building worker confidence</td>
<td>Existing partner - no new partners recruited. Partner reported improvement in relations and good collaboration. Evidence of the continuation of the scheme without funding. Evidence of an impact of WSA practices on DTA business services. H&amp;S arrangements and the process for recruiting DTA associates (build assessment of H&amp;S and worker involvement into DTA ‘Health check’). Changes to current DTA work practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Yes - Partnership working between workers and employers, for example conducting joint risk assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes - H&amp;S safety reps, committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes change to partner procedures DTA ‘health-check’, impact of the WSA involvement on other agents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall WI rating = 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall CB rating = 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENWORKS</strong></td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 4</td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating: 2/5. 23 WSAs with previous experience and H&amp;S qualification, no training, some induction. WSAs desire to continue and believe that skills had improved but Lead Partner felt there was limited development of WSA expertise and that the pool of WSAs has not increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ease of sector: Mixed - Voluntary and private SMEs, some previous links through WSA contacts and own offices</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partnership development rating 2/5. No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of beneficiaries: V. High 157</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Some Joint risk assessments and awareness raising sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</td>
<td>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Yes – case studies, industry quotes,</td>
<td>Further development of partner relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes Safety reps, H&amp;S committees</td>
<td>from a previously strong position. New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - Lessons from WSA scheme used by BEAs in current work.</td>
<td>partner UNISON was less involved. New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contacts through North West regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>groups and HSE. No continuation without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 2</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sector: v. difficult - construction links through FMB</td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership (predominately micro)</td>
<td>1/5. 4 WSAs with previous experience as safety representatives. No training and limited induction. WSAs did not show a strong desire to continue even though their skills had developed a little. The Lead Partner felt some development of WSA skills but doubted there had been an overall increase in the pool of WSAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: High 95</td>
<td>Partnership development rating 3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Some- Discussion with</td>
<td>Existing partnership with evidence of good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>workers using HSE booklet &amp; importance of their involvement</td>
<td>collaborative working. The Lead Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Some - Emphasis on improving H&amp;S awareness</td>
<td>reported that the partnership improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and encouraging workers to raise H&amp;S issues</td>
<td>notably due to tackling issues surrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Limited - workers referred to H&amp;S training</td>
<td>the project. &quot;Sort of people you would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: No</td>
<td>have a pint together down the pub with”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 1</td>
<td>No new partners identified but closer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sector: v. difficult - Construction, asbestos removal</td>
<td>cooperation with the FMB South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(predominately small) using membership links and existing relations</td>
<td>regional office and future links to agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: V. Small 9</td>
<td>in Scotland. Continuation in round 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Some - Promoting discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between workers and employers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes - Identifying safety reps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</th>
<th>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HEALTH@WORK LIVERPOOL | Overall WI rating = 3  
Ease of sector: difficult - Retail, new sector (predominately micro-small)  
Number of beneficiaries: Small 35  
Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Some joint risk assessment  
Evidence of increased WI: Some Increasing worker responsibility and confidence to be involved in H&S  
Evidence of sustainable WI Yes - Identifying safety reps, H&S committees, Awards event  
Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Some - Spreading WSA message through partner network & cross referrals | Overall CB rating = 3  
Building WSA skills competencies rating: 2/5. 1 WSA had previous experience as H&S practitioner, H&S qualifications, no training, induction & advice provided. Desire to continue Lead Partner feels pool of WSAs has not increased and WSA feels ‘a little experience’ gained  
Partnership development rating 4/5  
New partnership, strong relations, good collaboration and communication. Clear evidence of wider impact of WSA scheme across partnership organisations in the Merseyside area (networking events – regional/national) Continuation of the scheme in round 2. |
| HEALTHWORKS NEWHAM    | Overall WI rating = 2  
Ease of sector: Medium - Mixed voluntary, and private (retail, hospitality) SMEs new sector (predominately micro-small)  
Number of beneficiaries: Small 23  
Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - Body mapping, joint risk assessment, promoting worker & employer discussion  
Evidence of increased WI: Yes - workers more aware of H&S role and discussing H&S issues between themselves and with greater confidence to raise H&S issues with employer  
Evidence of sustainable WI: No  
Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: No  | Overall CB rating = 2  
Building WSA skills competencies rating: 3/5. 2 WSAs with previous experience as H&S practitioners and with H&S qualifications. Some basic H&S training and induction provided. Have a desire to continue plus a better |
| KIRKLEES              | Overall WI rating = 2  
Ease of sector: Medium – different types of SMEs, in Kirklees area, some referrals (predominately micro some small)  
Number of beneficiaries: High 60  | Overall CB rating = 2  
Building WSA skills competencies rating: 2/5. 2 WSAs with previous experience as H&S practitioners and with H&S qualifications. Some basic H&S training and induction provided. Have a desire to continue plus a better |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</th>
<th>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK ROYAL PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Some - Focus on promoting WI through employer understanding of legal responsibilities, initial focus on H&amp;S audit and H&amp;S issues</td>
<td>understanding of worker involvement. Lead partner agrees pool of WSAs has increased and WSA feels they have gained ‘a little experience.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Some - Workers encouraged to voice opinions, for example during H&amp;S committee</td>
<td>Partnership development rating 2/5 Existing well established partnership but with new Lead Partner. Evidence of collaboration and pooling of resources through involvement in ‘Better Health at Work’ scheme with referrals and a cross over of knowledge. Self-reporting that there has been a wider impact in terms of other partners more strongly persuaded that worker involvement will positively help businesses in Kirklees area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI Yes - H&amp;S reps &amp; H&amp;S committees</td>
<td>Partnership development rating 3/5 New partnership, number of new partners identified, focus on developing new partnership. Evidence of the development of a strong partnership with excellent communication. Good collaborative working with balanced contributions from both partners. Some evidence of wider impact, WSA steering group from round 1 and promotion of the scheme through newsletter. Only project to gain funding for rounds 2 &amp; 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Some - Partner organisations have better awareness of worker involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall WI rating = 3</td>
<td>Ease of sector: medium ethnic/minority food sector (retail, hospitality) language difficulties but with existing links to partner (mixed micro-medium)</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 3 Building WSA skills competencies rating: 3/5 1 WSA’s previous experience as a safety rep. Training provided by GMB including risk assessment, implemented during the scheme, plus additional advice and induction. Desire to continue, Lead Partner unsure if pool of WSAs has increased and WSA feels they have gained ‘a little experience’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: Small 26</td>
<td>Partnership development rating 3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - Joint risk assessment, risk assessment training</td>
<td>New partnership, number of new partners identified, focus on developing new partnership. Evidence of the development of a strong partnership with excellent communication. Good collaborative working with balanced contributions from both partners. Some evidence of wider impact, WSA steering group from round 1 and promotion of the scheme through newsletter. Only project to gain funding for rounds 2 &amp; 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Some - Workers more aware of H&amp;S role and discussing H&amp;S issues between themselves and with greater confidence to raise H&amp;S issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI Yes H&amp;S reps &amp; H&amp;S committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Some - Referrals, promotion (Park Royal Newsletter).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHAS</td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 4 Ease of sector: Easy - Voluntary, new sector, (micro-small) but located in traditionally deprived area</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 2 Building WSA skills competencies rating: 1/5 2 WSAs with previous experience as safety representatives and H&amp;S practitioner experience with H&amp;S qualifications. Limited training and advice. Desire to continue, Lead Partner thinks it is unlikely to have increased the pool of WSAs and WSA felt they had gained only ‘a little’ experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: High 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes, joint risk assessment, WSA helped and enabled workers to find solutions to H&amp;S issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</td>
<td>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UCATT   | Evidence of increased WI: Yes partnership working and joint approach to tackling H&S issues. H&S policy development with worker input  
Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes multi organisation H&S committees, building WI into H&S policy  
Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Some over subscribed with referrals and scheme spread by word of mouth | Partnership development rating 3/5. Existing partnership but little development during year. Limited evidence of collaboration in round 1 or developing partner relations. Substantial expansion of partnership with 5 new partners identified for round 2. Continuation of the scheme through round 2 CF funding |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall WI rating</th>
<th>Overall CB rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WSA rating: 3/5 The induction training & qualification of 1 WSA with some previous safety rep experience. Some desire by the WSA to continue. Belief by the Lead Partner and WSA that there has been only a limited increase in pool of WSAs.

Partnership rating 2/5 New partnership. Changes to personnel at the outset possibly leading to some communication difficulties. The partnership is enthusiastic about the WSA scheme offering wide support and promotion with the likelihood of leading to a wider impact. The project received funding for round 2.

---

**Table 49:** Round 2 subjective rating of worker involvement and capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</th>
<th>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BRITISH PRINTING INDUSTRY FEDERATION | Overall WI rating = 4  
Ease of sector: Medium, manufacturing  
Number of beneficiaries: 40  
Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - informal shop floor discussions  
Evidence of increased WI: Yes – Joint risk assessments | Overall CB rating = 3  
Building WSA skills competencies rating: Very experienced H&S rep and practitioner but additional H&S training and presentation skills. Working with another project in the South West for round 3 - 3  
Partnership development rating: New partnership which has developed but not expanded. Likely future collaboration - 2 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</th>
<th>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDERATION OF MASTER BUILDERS</td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes - H&amp;S qualifications for key personnel. Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - employer funded WSA service and H&amp;S training/ Wider interest in ‘Health check’ audit</td>
<td>Demand: Strong demand from employers engaged has encouraged BPI to develop self/industry funded WSA scheme - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 1</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sector: v. difficult – micro construction</td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating: No additional training but additional experience gained from working on the WSA scheme. Not continuing in the role following move of the project to Scotland - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: 74</td>
<td>Partnership development rating: The existing partnership remains strong. For round 3 developing relations with Glasgow City council via TGWU- 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Some – focus was on building worker knowledge and changing attitudes towards H&amp;S that might encourage more worker involvement.</td>
<td>Demand: Round 2 was categorised by poor employer demand which had an impact on the delivery of scheme. Plans to with continue WSA scheme with CITB if funding in round 3 is not secured - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: No - micro organisations already had frequent dialogue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: No - Formal structure such as committees not appropriate for micro firms, larger organisations already had H&amp;S structure in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - FMB strong supporters of this approach and will seek to work with unions and managers in future ventures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUNDWORKS</td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 2</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries Small: 15</td>
<td>Partnership development rating: Existing partner - New partnerships created in a difficult sector. Good participation from partners helped to deliver the scheme - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Little - WSA put up health and safety notice boards and spoke with employers to encourage them to get workers involved in health and safety.</td>
<td>Demand and expansion of the scheme: The Business Environment Association is providing continued support to organisations engaged on the WSA scheme - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Yes – Workers have been nominated as safety representatives and workers are now getting involved in the risk assessment process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Some – further support on H&amp;S, if required, provided through Business Environment Association.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</td>
<td>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH AT WORK</td>
<td>Evidence wider impact of WSA WI: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 3</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sector: Hard – Retail &amp; Hospitality Sector</td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating: WSA received food hygiene training and ergonomics training. Also learnt from EH Officers – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: 80</td>
<td>Partnership development rating: Strong and developing partnership looking to further expand into EMB sector in the Merseyside area. - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes – Tool box talks to all staff, built worker knowledge of the issues, instilling confidence to deal with problems and talk to management.</td>
<td>Demand and expansion of the scheme: Reduced demand in the Merseyside area, not able to reach planned target audience which impacted delivery of scheme. Plans to recruit in different sector or spread scheme to different areas - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Some-better communication between management and workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes - H&amp;S Committees, regular meetings between employee reps and management, creation of workplace champions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - H&amp;S Training, resources supplied by HWK, inquiries for additional support and information. EH Officers will continue to visit to ensure WI is allowed to continue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKLEES</td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 2</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sector: Medium, non specific businesses</td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating: 1 WSA is now NVQ Level 4 in Occupational Health and Safety. The Lead Partner felt the WSA skills had developed. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: 61</td>
<td>Partnership development rating: Existing partnership with evidence of good collaborative working. The Lead Partner noted that the partnership relationship had strengthened over the year and in addition to this had started working with more business organisations such as the Local Chamber of Commerce – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes – setting up committee meetings, providing training in manual handling/general H&amp;S training/ CIEH H&amp;S training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Yes - workers nominated as safety representatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Some – the only evidence that worker involvement will continue is from last year’s round 1 businesses; who are phoning up Kirklees to obtain further</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</td>
<td>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advice and support a year on from the project finishing. Indicating that these businesses are carrying on with worker involvement. This suggests they needed longer to be able to participate fully in the scheme. Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: No</td>
<td>Demand and expansion of the scheme: Barriers to recruitment in round 2, however, demand from organisations from round 1 for continued support – 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAMBETH COLLEGE**

Overall WI rating = 3

**Ease of sector:** difficult – Hair & Beauty Sector, Food Sector  
**Number of beneficiaries:** 100  
**Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI:** Yes - Group meetings, informal meeting with all staff, Training and ongoing advice and supporting information packs.  
**Evidence of increased WI:** Yes - Salon Strategy recruits have begun to share their knowledge and experiences with local salons and at hair & beauty training courses. Regular Committee meetings are taking place and all staff are participating in improving health and safety in the workplace. Disability ramps are being introduced and regular skin checks are just a few additions brought about through workers engaging with employers.  
**Evidence of sustainable WI:** Yes - H&S committees, Safety database.  
**Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI:** Yes - Continual development of safety database for Salons. Employees sharing their knowledge and experience with trainees outside of the workplace. No real evidence in the Food Sector though.

Overall CB rating = 2

**Building WSA skills competencies rating:** No additional training received. 1 WSA was hospitalised for a long period of the project. The other 2 remaining WSAs did not begin work until the third quarter - 1  
**Partnership development rating:** The partnership between Salon Strategies and the Lead Partner was very strong with regular contact and meetings with one another. However, the partnership with the CTA was very poor, with the CTA being absent for half of the project and not providing a detailed explanation for the absence - 3  
**Demand and expansion of the scheme:** Demand from the salons was high, but there were limited numbers to recruit from. The demand from the takeaways was difficult to judge as many respondents claimed that they had to participate in the scheme – 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</th>
<th>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PARK ROYAL PARTNERSHIP  | Overall WI rating = 4  
Ease of sector: Medium – manufacturing  
Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - Group discussions with employees and management. Visually aided discussions to help illustrate the problems and reduce language difficulties  
Evidence of increased WI: Yes - Workers are attending training events in their own free time and engaging employers. Local community support has grown with organisations sharing their experiences and knowledge with neighbouring businesses.  
Evidence of sustainable WI : Yes - H&S Committees established, continued training available through GMB  
Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - Plans to continue the training schemes and support for organisations. GMB offering support and advice.                                                                                                                   | Overall CB rating = 3.5  
Building WSA skills competencies rating: WSA received UK Legislation, EU Legislation, Risk Assessment and Food Hygiene Training. Did not recruit another WSA for the round 2 - 3  
Partnership development rating: Partnership has been in place for 3 years now and has become stronger and stronger. Partners will be working together for Round 3 also. Have recruited no additional partners to the scheme - 2  
Demand and expansion of the scheme: Demand has been very high; target reached in third quarter. Moving into new sectors to help spread the benefits of the WSA scheme to further advance the business community - 5                                                                                       |
| RHONDA                  | Overall WI rating = 4  
Ease of sector: Easy - voluntary  
Number of beneficiaries: 38  
Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - Lead partner believed H&S training was an effective method to increase WI.  
Evidence increased WI: Yes - Workers more engaged and encouraged to come forward on health and safety.  
Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes – Workers after M/H training discussed good lifting techniques and advised others who did not attend.  
Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - Plans to continue to use Interlink forum to spread worker involvement message.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Overall CB rating = 2  
Building WSA skills competencies: rating: Planned training but none conducted, WSA unwell towards the end of the scheme. Very demanding role, as Lead Partner and WSA, may have impacted on development - 1  
Partnership development rating: No expansion of the scheme or collaboration beyond original partners. Focus on building existing relationship - 2  
Demand and expansion of the scheme: Verification interviews indicate strong desire for organisations to continue where visits had been cut short due to the illness of the WSA - 3                                                                                       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</th>
<th>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOHAS</strong></td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 3</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sector: Easy - Voluntary</td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating: WSA received IOSH training and certification. Two additional WSAs were recruited to aid in Round 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: 240</td>
<td>Partnership development rating: Partnership is very strong, with all members having worked with one another before and will continue to do so in a number of other projects. Additional Partners were added to the scheme this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - Meetings between management and employees, health and safety champions selected, risk assessment training, stress training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: No</td>
<td>Demand and expansion of the scheme: Demand was high in Doncaster and Rotherham; however, they were not able to fully recruit all the numbers they had planned to. Demand in Sheffield has dried up, but the project had been running in the area for 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes - Stress training meant that people would be aware of the signs and pass on the knowledge they acquired to new starters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH TRADE UNION CONGRESS</strong></td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 4.5</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sector: Easy - Voluntary</td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating: During the scheme the WSA undertook an IOSH qualification and attended an EVH seminar and a care commission conference to gain knowledge regarding the voluntary sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: 25</td>
<td>Partnership development rating: There has been no expansion but relations with their partners had grown significantly in strength during the WSA project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes – WSA handed out hazard sheets to encourage workers to start spotting hazards, WSA facilitating discussions between workers and employers regarding H&amp;S.</td>
<td>Demand and expansion of the scheme: STUC will be funding further WSA support to businesses that still need help. Their project was so oversubscribed this year that they already had enough organisations interested to fill up round 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Yes – Safety representative appointed and H&amp;S committees established.</td>
<td>Demand and expansion of the scheme: STUC will be funding further WSA support to businesses that still need help. Their project was so oversubscribed this year that they already had enough organisations interested to fill up round 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes - STUC have tried to incorporate changes to worker involvement into organisations’ health and safety policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - Employees presented at seminars organised by STUC to share good practice in worker involvement in H&amp;S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Subjective rating of the impact by the project on worker involvement (WI)</td>
<td>Subjective rating of capacity building (CB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCATT</td>
<td>Overall WI rating = 5</td>
<td>Overall CB rating = 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sector: v. difficult – Construction</td>
<td>Building WSA skills competencies rating: H&amp;S training provided for 2 WSA = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of beneficiaries: 90</td>
<td>Partnership development rating: Expansion focus is on consolidating this innovative partnership between union and trade associations. The project has suffered with frequent changes to key personnel which will have affected development but overall, both partners view the collaboration as a success = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of WSA activities to promote WI: Yes - toolbox talks provide workers with confidence to discuss H&amp;S</td>
<td>Demand and expansion of the scheme: Good employer demand in West Midlands. Looking to develop the participatory approach to tackling H&amp;S on a national basis and currently looking at alternative funding streams = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of increased WI: Yes - Improved employer and worker attitudes leading to H&amp;S improvements following consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of sustainable WI: Yes - Formal consultation structures established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impact of WSA WI: Yes - Improvements to safety culture in one organisation led to improvements with sub contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2  BRITISH GLASS (BG)

8.2.1  Summary

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner, a partner and a WSA.

**Key inputs**

- A strong partnership, characterised by good collaboration. Early planning leading to the successful recruitment of beneficiary organisations.
- 3 WSAs recruited with H&S consultancy experience

**Key outcomes**

- Establishing structures and processes in the workplace to sustain worker involvement.
- Workplace interventions, through worker involvement, to improve H&S.
- Developing a support pack to help others within the glass and ceramics manufacturing industry improve worker involvement and H&S.
Key Lessons learnt

- Provide help to businesses so they can tackle occupational health issues which may emerge from worker consultation.

- Need to understand the unique qualities of small & medium sized enterprises (SMEs) and their motivations, for example, consideration for workers is driven through traditional family values or a moral obligation rather than through understanding that there is a legal duty of care.

8.2.2 Details

Project aim

The aim of the project was to target SMEs in the glass and ceramics manufacturing sector and improve H&S through engaging both employers and workers, raising H&S awareness with, educational material, training and hazard mapping.21

The project identified three H&S practitioners (2 full time/1 part time) although the original plan was to recruit union safety reps. The Lead Partner believed this may have been beneficial to the scheme because the WSAs:

- Were very professional with good report writing skills;

- Had the confidence to approach all levels of an organisation from the Managing Director to workers and could represent both employers and workers;

- Had experience delivering training, presentations and giving advice.

The partnership aimed to, and succeeded, in recruiting 40 SMEs. Beneficiary organizations were selected because they were non-chartered members and often had little H&S structures or procedures in place. The recruitment drive proved very successful with the partnership eventually oversubscribed meaning they were able to cherry pick more suitable beneficiaries. The Lead Partner believed the success of the recruitment was because of early planning and preparation in setting up the scheme. The WSAs, marketing, and employer database were all in place during the summer. The Lead Partner also felt that ensuring WSA budgets were pre-planned e.g. agreeing fixed expenses & costs with the WSAs whilst they were contracted to the scheme, helped to make the project more cost effective.

Partnership

The partnership has been established for a number of years and the individuals representing CATU and British Glass had worked together previously on similar projects. The Lead Partner and main partner both commented on the strength and success of the partnership and considered each other to be a friend.

The partnership was characterised by close working and regular meetings. Significant contributions were made from CATU, the main partner organisation, for example:

21 Different coloured pens are used to mark potential hazards on a map of the workplace
• The supplying H&S materials;
• Strategic thinking;
• Recruiting beneficiary organisations through face-to-face visits;
• Promoting the scheme;
• Monitoring and reviewing the WSA visits.

Project Outcomes

The other partner viewed the tripartite system (WSA, workers & employer) as working extremely well. Collaboration between all groups has been excellent. He also felt the response from both employers & workers has been very positive. The relationship between partners had also developed and they will look to maintain contacts and offer support to employers engaged on the scheme.

A number of project outcomes were identified:

• Work is currently in progress to develop a support pack (lessons learnt; presentation to be given to workers; guidance on H&S committees; how to get workers involved & survey material) to disseminate knowledge from the scheme to large employers in the glass and ceramics industry.

• Identified a new partner: FENSA (links to 8,000 micro businesses);

• Provided beneficiary organisations with membership of the glass charter and ceramics pledge programmes (newsletter with legislation updates, access to a discussion forum and the opportunity to network with other companies);

• The WSA remarked that they had a better appreciation on involving workers when tackling H&S issues and that mentoring employers was very rewarding.

Workplace Inputs

The workplaces engaged received six days support, which followed a structured programme of work.

• Initial H&S audit - done with liaison person;
• Train workforce so they can use the audit tool plus certification;
• Select nominated worker to champion health & safety;
• Hazard mapping and tool box talks\(^{22}\) with workers to raise H&S awareness

---

\(^{22}\text{A topical H&S issue is presented to workers prior to them commencing their days work with the aim of increasing H&S awareness and stimulating discussion.} \)
• Additional free time was used to tackle any other issues raised in previous sessions.

**Workplace outputs**

• Provided a CD ROM - sign post tool which pulls together H&S information for the employer;

• Used the initial H&S audit and score sheet to develop a safety improvement plan to show the gaps and the way forward for the employer;

• Identified workers to champion H&S in the workplace;

• Established H&S committees;

• Changed work procedures and the provision of new equipment after suggestions from the shop floor in response to WSA activities, for example, improved machine guarding and the introduction of ‘sound booths’ - to provide respite from noisy working conditions.

**WSAs competencies**

The Lead Partner viewed the key competencies as:

• NEBOSH general certificate;

• Experience of training & advising;

• Facilitation skills;

• Communication skills;

• The ability to deal at multi levels “adopt an appropriate persona depending on whoever you are dealing with”

• Good written skills.

**Barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner felt there was initially suspicion of the scheme. It was viewed as being: “too good to be true – what’s in it for you”. They were also: “sceptical of HSE badge” had a “negative perception of union involvement” and were “unsure of the benefits of getting workers involved”.

Most barriers were seen, however, as being surmountable, but required the WSA to sell the benefits of participation, build knowledge and dispel any mistrust the employer may have had towards the WSA and the scheme so that they were willing to get the workers involved.
The WSA felt resistance from workers was overcome with quick wins, for example, light-bulbs replaced, toilets cleaned etc. The Lead Partner also felt that the WSAs were robust in ensuring workers got involved quickly. These quick wins demonstrated the benefits of the scheme and were seen as more important than having a policy in place because workers could see how their involvement in H&S was making a physical difference to their work environment. The WSA from their experience felt the workers warmed to the concept of worker involvement sooner than the employer, once permission was granted to go onto the shop floor.

**Benefits of the scheme**

The Lead Partner believed that the WSA scheme had many benefits:

“Improves bottom line – better H&S procedures & protocol”

“Improves worker relations immensely, a lot more appreciated”

“Structured process for workers to contribute on a strategic level” - instead of simply going to work, then going home just doing a job, they can now see how their contribution fits in to the business as a whole and the ways they can participate to make it better.

**8.2.3 Lessons learnt**

The other partner thought the WSA scheme, and the running of their project, had been excellent. One issue however is that once you have raised awareness there is a no provision in the scheme to tackle them, for example, if you identify stress as an issue through worker consultation you should provide employers with an Occupational Health plan to help them tackle the issue.

Even though their planning was good, the Lead Partner claims they might have benefited from even more preparation time and an earlier start to visits. Their success at raising H&S awareness and getting workers involved meant there was a large demand on WSA time to deal with enquiries and research H&S topics in response to requests from employers, workers and working groups. They were only just able to complete the project on time because the Lead Partner was “‘rotweillering the WSAs” as they were more inclined to give the extra support demanded by beneficiary organisations than to stick to the visit schedule.

Both partners commented on the success of the launch event and they had planned to repeat it for round 2.

The Lead Partner believed that, unlike big companies, SMEs will be less likely to tackle H&S unless they get a visit from the HSE or are offered assistance. Consideration for workers is driven through traditional family values or a moral obligation rather than the understanding of a legal duty of care. There is a need to understand these differences and the special requirements of SMEs and be flexible, patient and understanding, for example, re-arrange visits around SMEs.

Finally the WSA suggested that to avoid employers not being fully committed to the scheme or messing the WSAs about (cancelling appointments, not releasing workers) that they could pay money up front and be refunded at the conclusion of the scheme if they complete all visits within the allocated time frame.
8.3 COALFIELDS REGENERATION TRUST (CRT)

8.3.1 Summary

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and the detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner and a WSA.

Key Inputs

- Established partnership with links to beneficiary organisations making recruitment straightforward. Slow start to visits probably due to poor allocation of management resource, improving after Christmas.

- Six WSAs were recruited, five from CRT staff. The CRT staff received H&S training and were awarded H&S qualifications (IOSH).

Key Outcomes

- The project significantly increased the pool of competent WSAs.

- Possible future impact on CRT procedures for awarding grants.

- Better reporting systems for workers who might want to be engaged but do not have the confidence, for example, H&S committee and identifying workers to champion H&S.

Key Lessons learnt

- The WSA should focus on incremental improvements in H&S management systems rather than improving specific hazards.

- Improve networking and encourage participation and the sharing of ideas by bringing people from different organisations and even sectors together through methods such as joint risk assessment.

- Sustain worker involvement by, writing it into H&S policy, and by building both employer & worker H&S knowledge and trust.

8.3.2 Details

Project aim

Develop a network of voluntary and community sector practitioner WSAs and promote a culture of involvement & cooperation between employers and workers to identify hazards and implement appropriate control measures.

This was delivered by six WSAs (five recruited from CRT staff). Five undertook training (being awarded an IOSH Certificate) and one was already qualified. The WSAs (2 full time equivalent) were part time, sharing with other work commitments such as the grant funding role at CRT.

23 beneficiary organisations took part in the scheme, made up of CRT’s own satellite offices and a number of other external workplaces. The organisations involved were predominately voluntary. There were no problems encountered with recruitment.
Partnership

The Coalfields Regeneration Trust (CRT) was in partnership with the Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU) and Community Ventures Limited (CVL). The partnership was not created specifically for the scheme but has worked together for the last 3-4 years on human resource and H&S issues. The Lead Partner described the relationship with CVL and the main contact as good and they provided technical expertise on H&S to the WSAs. The WSAs commented that the individual representing CVL was very supportive.

There was a slow start to the programme of visits and this may have been due to the development of WSAs plus their dual role as grant funders combined with a lack of impetus from the management team to move things along. The original Lead Partner, who GSB found hard to contact, conceded that due to workload they were experiencing difficulties committing time to manage the project. The Lead Partner who took over responsibilities at Christmas also recognised that the original Lead Partner had been busy with other commitments and this could have had an impact on the project’s momentum.

Project Outcomes

The focus of the project was more towards building WSA capacity and this is reflected in the project and workplace outcomes:

- Increasing the pool of WSAs providing H&S and RA training plus IOSH certification for CRT staff;
- Developing WSA skills through the experience of engaging with employers, workers and managers and securing improvements through co-operation;
- WSAs enjoyed their role and found it rewarding because they were warmly welcomed by employers who felt they had their company interests at heart;
- Possible future impact on CRT procedures for awarding grants, for example, new funding assessments may take into consideration H&S;
- The provision of H&S expertise might become a useful adjunct to the trust’s existing role;
- The intention by one employer - a voluntary sector ‘umbrella’ organisation - to cascade the WSA message down through their membership (200 organisations).

Workplace Inputs

The Lead Partner identified that a key element of their work was conducting risk assessment training, for example, a two-day programme of work spent working in groups to undertake supported risk assessment across three companies based in the same site.

The Lead Partner also described workshops as another method to bring together volunteers, managers, trustees, trainees and staff to discuss H&S issues and agree appropriate joint actions.

The WSA felt that they had used a broad common sense approach to the issues rather than being caught up in the custom or practice of delivering H&S advice. Providing workplaces with a
common sense steer in the right direction. They also felt they spent slightly more time with management discussing how to involve workers and the need to get the right systems before greater participation could happen.

**Workplace Outputs**

The Lead Partner stated that the project has achieved a variety of outcomes by addressing several issues, for example:

- Updating health and safety policies;
- Getting health and safety discussed as a regular agenda item at meetings;
- Stimulating engagement between workers and managers;
- Improving worker interest and knowledge in H&S;
- Overcoming a culture of procrastination;
- Bringing people from different organisations and even sectors together.

The Lead Partner also identified a number of concrete outcomes for example, better reporting systems for workers who might want to be engaged but do not have the confidence (H&S committee & identifying workers to champion H&S).

**WSAs competencies**

The Lead Partner viewed the key competencies as:

- Confidence to say: ‘I don’t know about an issue’ and ‘to find the solution together’;
- Patience;
- Understanding the nature of SMEs;
- Good communication;
- Negotiation skills;
- Conflict management;
- Building trust;
- Flexibility.

**Barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner felt time and resource were the only barriers encountered. To a lesser extent literacy and language skills were identified by the Lead Partner as other potential barriers to worker involvement but they could be overcome through, ‘up-skilling’ and buddy systems - one spots the hazards the other writes them down. Overall, however, because beneficiaries were in the main publicly funded they welcomed the approach.
The WSA stated that some workers simply don’t want to know, they don’t feel they are paid enough to get involved. This could be changed by explaining to them that it is their responsibility and it is integral to their job. They need to feel empowered rather than overburdened so their job is better and safer and their role in participating in H&S is creative. The message needs to be communicated that they should not leave a work place any less safe or healthy than when they walked in the door.

The WSA also identified time as a barrier but this could be overcome by explaining to managers that by delegating and empowering staff it will ultimately give them more time to manage. It was important to explain that worker involvement does not diminish or weaken management but in fact improves it, and to get effective H&S policies and procedures in place they need input from workers.

The WSA believed management support was critical. Without it, encouraging long term worker involvement would not get anywhere. It is essential to overcome negative employer attitudes towards the scheme, such as, the fear that workers will use a better knowledge of H&S against them. Likewise, it is also important to overcome negative worker attitudes. The WSA reported that workers sometimes feared that more involvement would increase their responsibility and they did not want to be “imperilled” by carrying out a bad risk assessment.

**Benefits of the scheme**

The WSA reported that worker participation could help to make a business more cost efficient. Employers and workers were receptive and were open and happy to cooperate. They could get the message across because they were viewed as being friendly, supportive and non-threatening; more benign than HSE, helping rather than having the power to shut an organization down. The pay-off, however, is that people don’t feel compelled to take your advice.

The Lead Partner believed the scheme was a success although thought it was too early to say for certain and it would take time for the true outcomes to emerge. One warning, however, was that the scheme could uncover other issues, for example bullying which you may not have the expertise or time to tackle. The danger is bringing an issue into the open and then taking the view “I am not here to deal with that”.

**8.3.3 Lessons learnt**

The WSA also felt that when a WSA has a lot of technical knowledge they might see danger and hazards everywhere but can’t do everything. It is better instead to focus on incremental improvements in H&S management systems rather that improving specific hazards. Often smaller companies which have expanded to employ 6-9 people still have a cottage industry mentality and in fact what they require are proper systems and procedures to help them tackle H&S.

The Lead Partner believed that bringing different organisations together through activities like joint risk assessment in a real work setting enhanced participation. This is because when individuals are taken out of their own workplace and placed in another they are pulled out from their normal comfort zone. They are happier to engage, are more stimulated and there is the added benefit of a cross over of ideas. It illustrates the benefits of networking and also helps workers and employers to think about how to address H&S.
The Lead Partner believed to sustain worker involvement it needs to be written into the H&S policy. For example, ways to report/feedback on H&S like a newsletter so the subject is not forgotten. Also, ensure managers have the right skills because those promoted do not always have the people skills required. They thought knowledge and application of H&S good practice should be an everyday skill that’s integral to good management like the ability to demonstrate financial acumen.

The Lead Partner suggested conducting H&S review at end of year with a review of accounts, as you would do financial matters and or personal appraisals.

The Lead Partner felt that for the WSA’s approach to be successful they needed to ensure everyone was involved and that both employers and workers were “clued up” to the benefits that involving workers in H&S can bring. They need to ensure that both sides trust each other and will not abuse each others’ confidence. For example, a worker who brings up poor H&S is not seen as a trouble maker. One WSA interviewed suggested mistrust might be overcome by developing a contract between the employer and the workers.

The WSA felt they needed more clarification on the WSA role at the start of the scheme and should have scheduled more regular meetings between the other WSA and Lead Partner.

8.4 CVL

8.4.1 Summary

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner, a partner and a WSA.

**Key Inputs**

- Established partnership with good collaboration although it might have benefited from clearer allocation of partner roles. Pre-existing links to beneficiary organizations making recruitment straightforward.

- Five WSAs recruited from DTA staff (two Full time equivalent). One WSA had an existing H&S qualification four received in-house H&S training.

**Key Outcomes**

- WSA capacity building with one WSA continuing their H&S training.

- Impact of the scheme upon DTA’s own work.

The partnership is actively considering how they might continue the WSA scheme without government funding.

Development of a learning hub and provision of employer funded training to enable workers to get their construction skills certificate scheme (CSCS).

**Key Lessons learnt**

- Stream partner roles.
• Increase employer awareness and competencies whilst empowering workers.

8.4.2 Details

Project aim

The aim of the project was to develop a network of voluntary and community sector WSAs to work with employers and workers and promote improved management arrangements; tackling H&S through addressing business and social issues.

This was delivered by five WSAs (two full time equivalent) recruited from DTA business advisors. One WSA had IOSH ‘managing safely’. Additional H&S in-house training and technical support were provided to the WSAs by the Lead Partner - both in person (occasionally) and over the telephone (regularly).

20 beneficiary organizations were recruited (DTA own offices and other external businesses) from around the country.

Partnership

The main partner organisations have collaborated previously over the last four years with the aim of improving human resources and health and safety in the voluntary sector. Both Lead Partner and main partner interviewed described the relationship between the individuals as good and that it had been enhanced by the scheme.

The partnership did not look to develop or recruit additional partner organisations. The Lead Partner believed that a possible barrier to partnership expansion was that the voluntary sector is fiercely competitive: “one pot of money and every one is fighting for it”. This makes it self-interested & wary of collaboration.

The Lead Partner and other key partners shared joint authority over the work of the WSAs. The Lead Partner recognised that he sometimes failed to deliver H&S technical expertise due to workload.

Project Outcomes

Reporting suggests that a key outcome of the partnership has been building sustainable WSA capacity, evidenced by the project outcomes outlined below:

• The partnership is actively considering how they might continue with the WSA scheme with a meeting scheduled to discuss future funding options;

• There was a shared belief by those interviewed that the scheme could be built into the existing business service offered by the DTA;

• One WSA is actively continuing with the initiative and is in the process of getting his NEBOSH certificate;

• Through networking and building up contacts one WSA reported the scheme has spread by word of mouth and created an impetus both for him and the employers, for example:
  - Companies have shown a desire to go beyond minimum H&S requirements.
They are in the process of developing an employer learning hub at Ryde on the Isle of Wight, delivering H&S training for advisors and key workers.

Training will be provided to help construction workers get their construction skills certificate scheme (CSCS) with employers offering to cover some of the costs of the training because they see the business benefits in helping to secure work contracts.

- The experience and knowledge from the WSA scheme is helping DTA develop ‘healthcheck’.

- In light of lessons learnt on the scheme the DTA have revised their own ways of working, for example, increasing management support to field operatives.

**Workplace Inputs**

The WSAs, with predominately soft skills, were supported by the Lead Partner who provided the technical H&S advice.

The WSA stated that the workplaces they visited had basic H&S they just needed to improve the quality of H&S documentation and procedures, for example, introducing rating and probability to risk assessment through practical demonstrations in the workplace. They also believed that the majority of their time was spent on promoting worker involvement.

The Lead Partner described a more structured process with the first visit conducted with them being present – as a H&S specialist - plus employer and workers to identify hazards. H&S guidance was then provided and staff shown by the WSA how to carry out a risk assessment.

**Workplace Outputs**

The WSAs interviewed reported that they felt they had been able to improve and sustain worker involvement, recounting a number of workplace outcomes;

- Identifying workers willing to take on more H&S responsibility to build on existing qualifications and develop their skills;

- Encouraging workers and employers to work in partnership to tackle H&S, for example, by conducting joint risk assessments;

- Reporting that other organisations outside of the scheme were receiving the impact of their interventions;

- Increasing knowledge of H&S by spending time talking to workers;

- Developing and encouraging beneficiary organizations to employ quick weekly H&S checks (fire, first aid, new issues);

---

23 A practical way to help organisations review how you are doing and where you want to go, for example: “is your H&S good enough”?
• Ensuring managers are aware of their accountability to their workforce and the implications if they do not tackle H&S issues or consult with workers;

• Getting H&S up the agenda during staff meetings and formalised reporting of H&S concerns.

**WSA’s competencies**

All those interviewed for this project shared the belief that soft skills and previous experience of approaching SMEs to offer advice and support, and the ability to quickly assess and determine the needs of visited workplaces and organisations, were seen to be more important than the technical H&S knowledge (which could be provided from elsewhere). Some basic grounding was deemed important. The WSA stated that it was not important to know H&S by the ‘book’. The same WSA felt that not having specialist H&S technical expertise was actually an advantage in terms of being consistent with the Challenge Fund’s objective of sustaining worker involvement. They felt it avoided the temptation for the WSA to undertake the work on behalf of the employer and instead inclines the WSA to encourage the employer and / or workers to find H&S solutions themselves. It also demonstrates that H&S is not intimidating and can be tackled by a lay person with the right guidance – sign posted by the WSA.

One assumption is that the WSA may still require an H&S qualification such as a NEBOSH certificate to provide credibility. CVL used business advisors who already had this credibility with the beneficiary organisations, for example, one WSA was viewed by the Lead Partner as having a very powerful name in the voluntary sector which opened doors and gave her “tremendous power”.

**Barriers to the scheme**

The WSAs and partners thought the beneficiary organisations approached were in general receptive. The main barrier was time, resource and access to hard to reach workers such as those working from home. It was also important to get commitment from the employer to support the scheme.

It was reported by one WSA that they felt the employers are aware of what they should be doing. The issue is getting them to do more and take responsibility for H&S. This also applies to staff as well. There should be a focus on promoting “Ownership and taking responsibility for actions”

**The benefits of the scheme**

The Lead Partner thought the scheme was beneficial and helped to involve workers.

The other partner interviewed thought the WSA scheme helped to bring out problems the work force may not normally be able to express, for example, lack of support for lone workers. They also stated that in light of the WSA scheme they have changed their own structure and introduced another regional assistant director to provide one in the North and one in the South to offer their staff better support.

A second WSA was very enthusiastic about the scheme and saw its benefits to the voluntary sector and how it would build into existing business advice/consultancy service they already
offered. They felt that the scheme enabled employers to better realise the business benefits of improving H&S, for example, by helping them to secure work contracts.

### 8.4.3 Lessons learnt

The Lead Partner felt they had now drawn up an approach that would work and saw three key issues:

- Employer accountability & competence;
- Empowering workers;
- “sign-posting giving people the means to get the knowledge and the information”

The Lead Partner had a substantial role offering admin/financing and technical H&S support. In future he suggested he would separate these roles and “stream the link” between the Lead Partner and the WSAs ensuring better discipline and structure to their approach.

A view from one WSA was that it would be beneficial to get workers and employers from different businesses together to network at specially arranged events.

### 8.5 ENWORKS

#### 8.5.1 Summary

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner, a partner and two WSAs.

**Key Inputs**

- Experience of this type of project delivery and associated support mechanisms, large number of beneficiary organisations offering good economy of scale.
- 23 WSAs recruited from Business Environment Advisors, with existing H&S qualifications.

**Key Outcomes**

- Business and environment advisors (BEAs) likely to build the experience of delivering the WSA project and worker involvement into their pre-existing advisory role.
- Workplace structures put in place like: H&S committees and key workers to help sustain worker involvement.

---

24 Please note: with a large number of WSAs only a small sample of opinion could be canvassed.
Better provision of H&S information and training, for example, risk assessment.

**Key Lessons learnt**

- Sustain worker involvement by giving workers the opportunity to take ownership of H&S structures and processes.
- It is possible and even desirable to tackle worker involvement early on.
- The WSAs’ role required creative solutions to involve workers and therefore it was sometimes easy to be drawn into doing the work for the employer.

**8.5.2 Details**

**Project aim**

The project aim was to engage with a range of SMEs in North West England targeting sectors shown to be at risk. Empower employers/workers to realise their responsibility in relation to safe working environments creating a more constructive partnership approach to H&S.

The key feature of the project bid was its size employing 23 WSAs (ten approx full time) operating part time drawn from an existing network of business advisers’ (BEAs) targeting.

A diverse range of 157 beneficiary organisations were engaged on the scheme including a small number of their own satellite offices. Recruitment was relatively straightforward.

**Partnership**

ENWORKS is made up of sub regional partners (six at the outset) in the form of business environmental associations (BEAs). The links and delivery mechanism are well established and this element of the partnership worked like a homogenous single partner. The other partners were UNISON and the Construction Industry Trade Body (CITB). UNISON provided some strategic advice and a few referrals. CITB were less involved.

ENWORKS are very familiar with this type of delivery and provide business and environmental support to around 1000 SMEs per year. The Lead Partner commented that this brought with it significant communication and management resource to support the scheme. The Lead Partner also believed that the size of the project and economies of scale enabled far more resource to be delivered at the workplace and this made it cost effective.

The dual role of the WSA/BEAs brought with them H&S technical expertise and project management skills. This also led to a cross referral of work but a payoff may have been banner recognition by employers of the WSA CF scheme.

**Project Outcomes**

There were a number of project outcomes:

- BEAs found the scheme rewarding and benefited from the experience of involving workers, one WSA felt they had “learnt completely new aspects about H&S approaches” - leading to the prospect of BEAs continuing to promote worker involvement in their normal job;
• Developing networks with other parties delivering similar H&S strategies in the North West;

• Raising the profile of the WSA scheme across a wide group of intermediates through, for example, its association with UNISON.

**Workplace Inputs**

Employers welcome help with H&S and are normally aware of the legal obligations to tackle H&S issues. They are, however, daunted by the task of tackling H&S and ignore the issues or make excuses that they do not have sufficient time to spare. Feedback from the WSAs was that once beneficiaries were engaged they were eager for advice and often requested more of WSA time than originally anticipated.

A varied approach was used by the WSAs depending on the nature of the organisation. Common themes identified however are:

• The use of audit/H&S inspection and GSB questionnaire - to identify problem areas and also workers who might wish to be willing to be more involved in H&S;

• Generate an action plan and focus on a number of specific issues;

• Awareness raising sessions - joint risk assessment with worker & manager;

• Establish ways to report H&S issues (committees, H&S on the meeting agenda).

Overall, joint risk assessments were considered to work well because workers felt they were being involved and listened to.

**Workplace Outputs**

The Lead Partner reports that the WSA programme has resulted in:

• The implementation of safe systems of work;

• Establishment of H&S committees;

• Key workers identified;

• H&S policy updates and improvements to assessment procedures;

• H&S meetings, staff notice boards, H&S law posters etc H&S information provided through the intranet;

• Worker induction in H&S

• Many businesses have undertaken H&S training, for example, risk assessment.

• Workers happy to participate once the WSA had demonstrated how H&S related to their job and the benefits of discussing H&S issues in finding solutions;

• Involvement of workers in H&S management & improvement initiatives.
Quotes:

“Raising awareness in Health & Safety is fundamentally important to our business. With the help and support of Groundwork we have been able to make progress at a far greater speed than doing it on our own. Health & Safety is now firmly on the agenda for all employees and accepted as part of everyone’s jobs.”

Joanna Colin – Operations Manager, Northern Stage Services

“Involvement in the Worker Safety Advisor project has benefited both the Association and our employees. It has provided us with real focus and encouragement to make H&S improvements that can be sustained in the long-term. Asking our employees for their opinions and involving them in training sessions has led to great improvements and enthusiasm in the day-to-day management of H&S.”

Heather Parker, PA to Chief Executive, Ashiana Housing Association

**WSAs’ competencies**

The Lead Partner stated that WSAs require:

- Level 3 NVQ in H&S or equivalent to give them the respect & credibility;
- People skills;
- The ability to be persuasive;
- Good negotiation skills rather than being confrontational;
- Experience of visiting businesses;
- Being responsive to different company cultures & attitudes;
- The ability to offer the features and benefits of the scheme in an attractive way to different organisations.

A WSA also stated that a WSA needs the experience of project management and to be clear about what the project entails and its benefits. They need the experience of talking to different levels of people within an organisation and be familiar with the environment they are working in.
Barriers to the scheme

One WSA reported that there were no major barriers that he encountered to employers involving workers as at recruitment they were required to sign up to the scheme and were made aware of what it entailed. They did state, however, that access to workers could sometimes be difficult in terms of getting them released from their work, for example, being taken out of production which costs the employer money. They also encountered some worker apathy - don’t care about the issue of H&S. This is because of how H&S has been presented to them before - “you must do this or wear this”. Some workers also had previous bad experience of reporting concerns, like litter or unclean toilets and nothing was ever done, even when they had been through correct reporting procedures (raised concerns in H&S meeting). More involvement on H&S was also possibly seen as a threat to established working practices and a ‘chore’ that created extra work.

Benefits of the scheme

- The Lead Partner felt there were no dis-benefits of the WSA scheme. A programme to improve communication and partnership working improves H&S and morale “In our experience it has been successful in that respect”.

- One WSA concurred saying that an advantage of the scheme was how they could offer both the worker and employer independent advice not taking sides but promoting team working.

8.5.3 Lessons learnt

The Lead Partner felt it was possible and desirable to tackle worker involvement early on because tackling the H&S basics goes hand in hand with involving workers e.g. the basic H&S structures can be set up through consultation. “Not having basic H&S in place is not a prerequisite for improving worker involvement”

One WSA said from his experience it was easy to be viewed by the employer as an H&S consultant and drawn into doing the work for the employer e.g. a free resource, although they felt most of their time was spent on worker involvement. They need to be realistic as to what can be achieved and prioritise. They also believed that worker involvement can be used to tackle H&S basics like helping write H&S policy, getting workers to supply ideas and do RA to identify key workplace dangers that will be addressed in the H&S policy.

Another WSA stated that in their role as a BEA they had more experience of engaging with managers so found engaging with workers more difficult. They needed to find creative solutions to involve workers rather than simply identifying that no H&S policy existed and then providing one. Worker involvement was now more in the fore front of their mind and also, they believe, the other WSAs participating on the project.

The Lead Partner commented that when businesses supported communication with workers and were willing to establish structures to support these communications (H&S committees, risk assessments); and workers were given the opportunity to take ownership of these structures, this led to a change in business culture sustaining the work of the Challenge Fund.
A WSA felt that offering a free service means maybe people treat the scheme less seriously than if they have paid for it and the employer can therefore abuse the service as they have nothing to lose. A way around this may be for employers to pay a reduced rate, for example, services costing £1,500 are priced at £100.

8.6 FMB

8.6.1 Summary

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner and a WSA.

Key Inputs

- Well established partnership with previous experience on the WSA pilot and also links to beneficiary organisations through FMB membership. But struggled with forecasted recruitment and the requirements of the evaluation.

- Four WSAs were recruited with safety representative experience and a minimum of 25 years work experience in construction or similar areas of work.

Key Outcomes

- The partnership was strengthened between FMB with TGWU through resolving issues connected to the evaluation.

- Focus on raising worker awareness and changing worker attitude towards H&S.

Key Lessons learnt

- Employers are well intentioned but ill-informed, the key is getting employers to recognise they can get help on H&S through involving workers.

- More admin support was required to support WSAs.

- The WSA must be flexible; they can’t impose a method/approach/manner.

8.6.2 Details

Project aim

The aim of the project was to improve knowledge and understanding of health and safety and improving communication/consultation between workers and employers on H&S in construction SMEs and provide a sustainable WSA network.

The aims were delivered by four full time WSAs - safety representatives – with a minimum of 25 years work experience in construction or similar areas of work. The scheme was delivered to 95 beneficiaries revised from 175 which despite being well short of the original forecast is still a sizeable achievement considering the large number of beneficiary organisations targeted, per WSA, who were dispersed across the South West of England.
Partnership

The partnership was viewed as being well established. The Lead Partner felt it became stronger due in part to dealing with emerging issues, the most significant being the resistance of some of the WSAs to the evaluation materials supplied by GSB. This may have stemmed from the experience of using previous materials at the outset of the project which were then changed in September. The need to tackle this issue meant that the Lead Partner and representative partner from TGWU spent some time working closely together.

The WSAs revealed that communication between the WSAs based in the South West and the Lead Partner in London was hampered by having limited access to email. Communication and distribution of materials was done via post.

The project experienced difficulty recruiting beneficiary organisations at the outset and they were required to allocate greater resource to tackling this issue. This situation did, however, lead to additional support being provided by the FMB’s South West regional office.

Project Outcomes

The Lead Partner stated that they used experienced reps with existing skills to enable a better impact in the workplace rather than building WSA capacity. Project outcomes identified were:

- The strengthening of existing partner relations;
- Better established administrative support of WSAs;
- Development of an information pack (HSE leaflets) to support WSAs.

Workplace inputs

The WSA stated their frustration with the admin required and the time it took to secure appointments - that might be cancelled at short notice. This contributed to reducing their impact at improving worker involvement and H&S in the workplace.

There was consensus between the WSA and Lead Partner that after the initial visit to discuss the scheme with the employer they engaged with workers. The WSA felt the most successful approach was to use the HSE publication ‘essential safety tool kit’ which summarises key construction hazards. This helped to frame discussions and to encourage workers to talk about relevant issues.

The WSA had the belief that in SMEs dialogue already exists between workers and employers. It was important, therefore, to focus on improving H&S knowledge, so workers better appreciate that H&S is their concern and not just the boss’s or the HSE’s. A key issue was, therefore, getting workers to appreciate the relevance of tackling H&S and provide the means and awareness to spot possible hazards.
The Lead Partner suggested that the scheme was sold as offering free H&S advice to enable them to get in the door and to improve recruitment prospects. This may have had an impact on the receptiveness of the employers but hampered the chance to build communication between workers and employers and sustain worker involvement. The WSA believed that it was common practice for the types of SMEs they were approaching to bring in outside H&S consultants.

**Workplace Outputs**

The Lead Partner thought that there exists in the construction industry a concern that if H&S issues are raised by a worker then they are viewed as a trouble maker. Industry culture makes workers uncritical of the bad practice and what they see around them. Young apprentices follow the lead of the ‘old boys’ even if procedures are unsafe. The workforce is transitory or casual and not interested in H&S. They want to do the work, get paid and get out. This was the main issue and statements made by the WSAs suggest their biggest impact was in changing worker attitude towards H&S, for example:

- Increasing worker awareness of H&S issues and their own responsibilities;
- Encouraging workers to question their own work practices and colleagues’;
- Signposting workers and employers to H&S guidance;
- Getting employers to refer workers to H&S training courses.

Interviews with one of the WSAs suggests they believed the impact of their involvement would not be sustained without further WSA intervention or at least some form of remaining presence in the workplace to keep H&S on the agenda, for example, through nominated safety representatives.

**WSA’s competencies**

The Lead Partner stated that ideal WSA competencies were:

- Equal ability to gain the confidence of both the worker and employer and understand both sides, for example, see problems of workers but also the pressure of the employers;
- Threshold of H&S qualification, not as detailed as NEBOSH or IOSH. Instead Basic grounding in H&S e.g. union certification;
- Personal character is important plus discipline & motivation;
- Understanding the importance of the administration and paperwork e.g. expenses and evaluation forms.

The WSA felt that a basic level of H&S, sector experience and soft skills (communication, negotiation and facilitation) were essential, but felt that more advanced H&S qualifications were not important.
**Barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner and a WSA felt that salary and lack of people with the H&S skills necessary to deliver the WSA scheme in the construction sector may be a barrier to building WSA capacity. “Need to match what people earn in construction industry”

The WSA also felt the scheme was inhibited by logistical factors, for example:

- The time and cost of releasing workers;
- Difficulty of getting workers together, and with employers, as often at different locations.

**Benefits of the scheme**

The Lead Partner is convinced of the value and viability of the scheme seeing it without disadvantage and the best method of reaching SMEs. Getting the message across on site is the only way of involving managers and workers together.

In contrast, two WSAs interviewed were unsure whether the scheme was a success and felt that the target beneficiary organisations e.g. members of FMB were the cream of the construction sector in terms of H&S who already saw the need to tackle H&S but lacked the time and resource to address it. They felt the scheme was missing out on tackling the more difficult cases.

**8.6.3 Lesson learnt**

Employers were keen on the scheme and saw its benefits. They are well intentioned but ill-informed. Want to do the right thing but do not have the knowledge to do it. They don’t set out to put the workers at risk. Employers want help tackling H&S and it is getting them to recognise they can get this through worker involvement.

The Lead Partner recognised that more admin support was required and that it was important to get in early with recruitment. It was also necessary to be flexible because it is not advisable to impose a method/approach/manner in the way WSA interacts with the workplace as they need to use their own discretion.

**8.7 GMB**

**8.7.1 Summary**

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner and a WSA.

**Key Inputs**

- The Lead Partner was changed twice leading to likely disruption and lack of clarity about WSA CF objectives.
- One WSA was recruited with considerable experience of working in the asbestos industry and as a safety representative.
**Key Outcomes**

- Raising the awareness of Derby City Council to the dangers of asbestos removal.
- Raising worker awareness of H&S.
- Identified H&S representatives.

**Key Lessons learnt**

It takes time to build trust and establish partnership working especially in a mobile industry which is time and money driven.

**8.7.2 Details**

**Project aim**

The aim of this project was to raise employee awareness of asbestos hazards and safe ways of working for those working in construction, asbestos removal and local authority. Promoting worker consultation and empowering workers to question unsafe working practices and make suggestions for improvement. A secondary aim was to raise awareness in the local communities and with local employers (especially schools through parent governors) on asbestos and safe asbestos removal.

The delivery of the project was via one full time WSA (safety representative with 25 years experience and member of the Asbestos liaison group) to 19 ACAD members. Eight employers and Derby city council were engaged and participated on the scheme.

**Partnership**

GMB and ACAD have worked together in partnership for many years. The project suffered several changes at the start with the person originally due to manage the project leaving. The work was then inherited by a representative of GMB but circumstances outside his control meant he could not devote the time to project management and the responsibility of Lead Partner was eventually accepted by a representative of ACAD.

The Lead Partner devoted about 20% of their time (provided outside of the CF budget) managing the scheme and stated they were on their own in terms of operational aspects of the project. Evidence from both partners suggests GMB were not actively involved in the project except through the provision of the WSA who was in regular contact with the Lead Partner.

Initially the Lead Partner expected recruitment of beneficiary organisations would be relatively straightforward but this was not the case and more than half of the ACAD members identified failed to sign up to the scheme. The Lead Partner believed this was partly due to the association with HSE and the fear of prosecution. It is not clear whether the partnership attempted to recruit other beneficiary organisations to make up for the short fall in planned recruitment.
Project Outcomes

The Lead Partner, who has subsequently left ACAD, completed one of the three required Lead Partner reports and was not available for final interview. It has been difficult, therefore, to be confident in stating project outcomes. In the course of previous conversations the Lead Partner stated they believed the project is unique and has not sought help/advice from elsewhere. No additional partners were brought into the scheme.

The Lead Partner reported that:

- It may be possible to offer the WSA scheme as an add-on to existing member services, but this would need to be financed through increased subscription fees or obligatory membership training.

Two project outcomes reported by the WSA were:

- Promotion of the scheme by the WSA at the Asbestos Liaison Group meetings;
- Negotiation skills have improved and they are better at breaking down hostilities and promoting partnership working.

Workplace Inputs

The WSA reported that it took time at the outset to build trust and gain the confidence of the employer. He used his reputation within the industry to make an initial approach and agree a visit with the employer to discuss asbestos but with H&S also on the agenda.

The WSA described that their approach was to sell the scheme to the employer on:

- Cost benefits (expensive to have employers off work sick);
- His own work experience;
- Legal compliance.

Once the employer was engaged by the WSA a session was agreed with the workers and then through discussion about asbestos H&S issues were raised such as skin complaints and the inherent dangers of removing asbestos.

The aim was to get the workers listening and then talking about common H&S issues such as using PPE. The WSA looked to get quick wins or a small change to H&S which benefited the workers to improve their confidence in the scheme. The sessions also raised H&S awareness enabling workers to better see the need and advantage of having correct H&S procedures in place. The WSA looked to identify a worker safety representative and then together discuss with the employer H&S concerns with outcomes fed back to other workers.

Workplace Outputs

Indications are that the WSA was able to achieve a number of workplace outcomes, for example:

- Highlighting the hazards of asbestos removal;
• Identifying safety reps and workers willing to take on more H&S responsibility;
• Improving worker awareness of H&S;
• Creating dialogue between the employers and workforce;
• Re-invigorating existing reporting structures.

The WSA felt these outcomes from round 1 would not be sustained as worker involvement is a concept and it takes time to get the message across and one year is not enough to ensure any changes brought about by the WSA are made permanent.

**WSA’s competencies**

The WSA stated that a number of competencies were essential, for example:

• A minimum level of H&S experience
• Negotiation skills
• Facilitation skills
• Communication skills

The WSA felt that a commitment to workers’ rights, and a union background, because of the supporting material provided for free, were also important.

**Barriers to the scheme**

The WSA felt that the problems encountered by their project were because key personnel at the HSE left, leaving the WSA scheme without direction or ownership. It had little structure and was confusing. This may have been compounded by the changes to the Lead Partners for this particular project.

**Benefits of the scheme**

The WSA stated that there were no downsides to the scheme. It helps to create open and honest dialogue between workers and employers because the WSA is a conduit by which both can come together to discuss H&S.

**8.7.3 Lessons learnt**

The key learning point discussed with the WSA was the time required to gain the trust of employers and workers and build confidence in the scheme and get across the concept of partnership working. Trust can only be built slowly and cannot be rushed or pressurised. Also, the approach a WSA needs to take cannot be prescriptive they must use a varied approach and provide the beneficiaries with what they need.
8.8 HEALTH AT WORKS LIVERPOOL (HWL)

8.8.1 Summary

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner, a Partner and a WSA.

Key Inputs

- Progressive partnership with open communication and good collaboration who found interesting ways to engage with partners & beneficiary organisations in a new sector.

- One WSA with H&S consultancy experience and H&S qualification.

Key Outcomes

- Significant partnership growth and development.

- The development of two way referrals, for example, if a fire exit is locked there may be a crime issue so refer business to ‘Crime Direct’ for help and advice.

- Recruitment of safety representatives and referrals to H&S training.

Key Lessons learnt

- The benefits of partner openness and sharing of ideas.

- A key issue is building trust and an employer who empathised with the workers and could see their perspective.

8.8.2 Details

Project aim

The aim of this project was to increase worker involvement in workplace health, safety and welfare enhancing H&S within hospitality and retail sector SMEs in the Merseyside area. Also, to create a network of workplace safety representatives and develop a sustainable network of strategic partners.

The delivery of the project was via one WSA (H&S practitioner, NEBOSH qualified) to 30 businesses mainly in the hospitality and retail sector across the Merseyside area.

Partnership

HWL was in partnership with Liverpool City Council Environmental Health Department and the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce (LCoC). A partner representing LCoC believed the partnership was strong because HWL had been willing to share information and be open in a very positive way. This has enabled them to build added benefits onto the WSA scheme. The LCoC were keen to promote the WSA scheme because it was in their interest to support their businesses and help them to develop H&S structures and processes because this gave them an advantage especially when applying for public sector contracts.
HWL made a decision at the outset of round 1 to focus on building the links in the existing partnership, because they were tackling a new sector. However, because they experienced some difficulty recruiting beneficiary organisations they were required to look at making new contacts outside the partnership to find alternative ways to recruit and engage with SMEs. This led to new partners being identified and brought into the scheme, for example, Crime Direct.

**Project Outcomes**

The Lead Partner and other partner reported that engagement in the WSA CF required HWL to extend its network of contacts and use innovative approaches to engage with employers in a notoriously difficult to reach sector with a high staff turnover and employers who traditionally do the minimum on H&S.

The Lead Partner and main other partner has identified a number of project outcomes:

- Leading by example and promoting an open community to engage with other organisations;
- Expansion of the partnership, the recruitment of Knowsley Council EH to the partnership;
- Building and strengthening networks, for example, participating in regional and national H&S events;
- Developing an award system for employers who complete the WSA scheme to be presented by the chief EHO;
- Developing a recruiting system to engage employers to the WSA scheme;
- Developing two way referrals, for example, if a fire exit is locked there may be a crime issue so refer business to Crime Direct for help and advice;
- Spreading the message and information about the WSA scheme through existing networks and other project work.

**Workplace Inputs**

The WSA reported that the first meeting involved them discussing the scheme with the staff and manager and then a second visit was arranged so they could look more closely at H&S arrangements (policy, risk assessment). They then conducted an H&S audit together with the staff. A number of issues were identified from this audit such as the need to add H&S to regular meetings and developing the H&S policy. Also, a nominated person was given greater H&S responsibility. The WSA also discussed H&S with workers through relaxed and informal tool box talks on relevant issues and providing examples of good practice in other organisations.
The Lead Partner said that a successful approach was to focus on an issue pertinent to the staff and management, for example, conflict resolution, smoking or crime. These popular issues have relevance to H&S and worker involvement and so they could use these routes in to engage and then to deliver on a range of other H&S issues. HWL were not a traditional statutory body, therefore they had a unique position to deliver on a broad range of other topics relevant to H&S such as crime. This, and their access to both employers and workers, made them popular attracting new partners with links to beneficiary organisations.

**Workplace Outputs**

Reporting has found a number of workplace outcomes, for example:

- Seventeen safety reps have been recruited;
- Three joint H&S training courses were arranged for businesses engaged on the WSA scheme;
- Improved worker awareness of H&S which gave them the opportunity to share views and take on more responsibility;
- Using joint risk assessments to demonstrate how workers can be involved in tackling H&S reducing the burden on the manager.

The WSA felt that changes to the workplace would be sustained if the good practice and systems discussed with business are adopted and incorporated into day to day procedures - across all levels of the organizations - monitored on a regular basis.

The Lead Partner viewed that the critical factor was employers understanding the benefits of worker involvement and sharing workload but not responsibility. Employers need to also appreciate that workers are well placed to do the risk assessments because they know the job.

**WSA’s competencies**

The Lead Partner stated that important WSA skills were:

- Experience of working with SMEs and an understanding of their special requirements which are different to those of large organisations;
- The ability to be able to sell the idea of worker involvement and be a good communicator;
- Being open minded not dogmatic, and being flexible and patient getting in the door - solving worker involvement and H&S issues is not black & white.

The WSA saw basic H&S qualification, experience and soft skills (negotiation, communication) as essential coupled with confidence and a strong personality.

**Barriers to the scheme**

Time and trust were viewed by the Lead Partner as being the main barriers “It’s like letting someone into your house”.
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The WSA felt that a barrier was suspicion (nothing is for free) and also the fact that workers were taken away from daily duties costing employers money. With workers, it was lack of H&S knowledge and not wanting more workload.

A key barrier was the difficulties encountered at the outset of the scheme with recruitment. They were forced to be more imaginative and proactive with the marketing of the scheme, and to get their foot in the door they sold the scheme as giving free H&S advice. The WSA also gave the example of other retail and hospitality outlets that had signed up to the scheme, from notorious bars with a bad reputation for trouble to prestigious bars with a high profile in the city.

**Benefits of the scheme**

The Lead Partner, partner and WSA viewed the scheme positively. By focusing on workers it improves their knowledge and also informs employers as well. They shared the belief that employers do not set out to be bad. The scheme improves their H&S knowledge and helps them to understand that it benefits them to involve workers as it helps with the H&S workload and improving their business.

**8.8.3 Lessons learnt**

There needs to be more sharing on ideas not just at an employer level e.g. businesses cooperating together but also on a project/partner level. For example, the WSA lessons learnt from round 1 shared with round 2.

The Lead Partner felt they would, in hindsight, plan to avoid periods when it is difficult to engage employers, for example the lead up to Christmas in the retail sector.

The WSA considered the key issue was building trust and felt it took time and could only occur with small steps.

The Lead Partner felt that the employer could benefit from additional skills but this was not essential and it was more important that they empathised with the workforce and could see their perspective.

**8.9 HEALTHWORKS NEWHAM (HWN)**

**8.9.1 Summary**

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner, a partner and a WSA.

**Key Inputs**

- Problems at the outset with WSA recruitment, engaging new partners and engaging employers in a challenging sector.
- One WSA seconded from their job as an enforcement officer, with previous safety representative experience and relevant H&S qualifications.
**Key Outcomes**

- Significant development of WSA competencies especially soft skills like communication because they were required to: recruit employers, organize and promote launch events and deal with a wide range of businesses and people;

- Some workplace attitudinal change – workers confident to discuss issues and address concerns to their employer.

**Key Lessons learnt**

- Simplify & tailor audit tool used by the WSA.

- Focus earlier on worker involvement.

- Adapt approach to be better tailored to partners’ business sector.

- Body Mapping is a good approach to engage workers and raise H&S awareness but need to reassure employer that it will not give ammunition to workers to use against them.

**8.9.2 Details**

**Project aim**

The aim of the project was to target small firms in deprived areas with ethnic/minority communities promoting communication between employers and employees building competence, confidence, trust and a partnership approach to tackling health and safety.

The delivery mechanism was to use two WSAs to 40 targeted beneficiaries but this was reduced to one WSA and 23 target beneficiaries. The recruited WSA was an enforcement officer with previous safety representative experience and H&S qualifications (NEBOSH certificate).

Originally the scheme was to be delivered by two WSAs but HWN struggled with the recruitment of a second WSA. The Lead Partner reported spending additional time interviewing and selecting candidates – two candidates initially agreed to the post and then turned it down - and also conducting some WSA visits themselves. The Lead Partner had feedback from potential WSA candidates that the problem was primarily wage related.

**Partnership**

This was an ambitious project considering the target area and what they were hoping to achieve. Much of their bid was based on long term outcomes and delivery over 3 years. It comprised 5 other partners, London Borough of Newham, UNISON, Newham Primary Care Trust, Newham Chamber of Commerce and the African Caribbean Business Network.
The partnership varied in its success. With the London Borough of Newham there was already a strong relationship established that continued to develop. In contrast, there was little involvement of Newham Chamber of Commerce (NCoC) despite efforts by HWN. This may have been due to other commitments to pre-existing networks and other similarly funded bodies. UNISON provided training on Body Mapping but this occurred later on in the lifetime of the project rather than at the outset.

**Project Outcomes**

A consequence of the failure to recruit a second WSA and the time spent by the Lead Partner on this and other commitments left the WSA to fend for themselves and although they had regular contact with the Lead Partner they were on their own in terms of recruiting employers, planning their time etc. They also felt that they did not really grasp the nature of the scheme until later on into the project. They also felt they lacked the confidence to sell the scheme and gain the necessary commitment from the beneficiary organisations they were approaching. It was not until the end of the scheme that they felt they had acquired the necessary competencies or worked out the best approach to recruiting employers or carrying out their role effectively.

Identified outcomes were:

- Development of WSA competencies - the WSA and Lead Partner reported that the WSA was required to use their own initiative and improve skills like communication because they were required to: recruit employers, organise and promote launch events and deal with a wide range of businesses and people;

- A new informal partnership developed with the Voluntary Sector in Tower Hamlets;


- Future promotion of the scheme across other local authorities through association with the director of Newham’s environmental health and trading standards department.

**Workplace Inputs**

To get a foot in the door of employers the WSA sold the scheme on the H&S audit, which helped to win the employer over. At the start of the scheme the WSA’s approach was more conservative but towards the end they felt he had the confidence about saying up front that employers needed to get workers involved from the start.
On the first visit the WSA stated that they carried out an audit to identify hazards with a manager and a worker. They also looked at the accident book and H&S policy. The WSA then carried out a joint risk assessment on the premises helping to identify problems like slips, trips and falls, demonstrating the benefits of applying H&S procedures. Identified issues were further discussed with the manager and workers to find out how they might tackle them. On second visits the WSA looked to involve workers in a ‘body mapping’ exercise to identify common ill health symptoms (stress and back pain) and possible causes, for example, work pressures. Body mapping was not used with all beneficiary organisations.

**Workplace Outputs**

The WSA and Lead Partner reported a number of workplace outcomes, for example:

- Body mapping helped workers be more open about discussing H&S, highlighted the importance of assessing risks;
- Identifying the need for better communication between the staff and manager, for example, informing workers about updates to the H&S policy;
- Workers welcomed involvement in H&S - they were enthusiastic because someone was showing an interest in them;
- Workers reported that they were discussing H&S issues amongst themselves;
- Workers now saw that there were collective concerns and were more confident to approach the manager about H&S issues;
- Workers now saw how they could be part of the process for making improvements in H&S;
- Getting H&S on the agenda at meetings.

**WSA’s competencies**

The WSA felt confidence to approach a range of individuals from shop floor to company director was important. A WSA also needs the ability to communicate effectively and understand the WSA role and an H&S background was necessary.

The Lead partner felt a NEBOSH certificate or equivalent was required with 2 years minimum experience as a safety representative (actively engaged rather than as just a title) because the same skills were required, for example, negotiation, experience of applying H&S in a practical work setting (risk assessment, knowledge of regulations etc). It was also important to have the confidence to approach, and have credibility with, both workers and senior managers. It is also sometimes necessary to be ‘bolshy’ and persistent to get what you want – this is why a recognised qualification is necessary because it lends authority.

---
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**Barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner felt they were not able to engage new partners and use their resources or business contacts and this had made recruitment of beneficiary organisations more difficult. For example, they were not able to utilize fully the Newham Chamber of Commerce business breakfast until late on into the scheme.

The WSA identified that for the workers of one company they were not keen on body mapping. He believed this may have been because they were mainly Asian women and he was a man.

Other barriers were the limited time scale of the project. It was difficult to establish a partnership, recruit new WSAs and have an impact in the workplace in one year. The Lead Partner suggested a minimum of 5 years would be more appropriate.

The WSA found that the move from local government to private voluntary sector was a bit of a shock and it took time to adjust. Also the inability to recruit another WSA had put them under greater pressure. Ideally, they would have liked more support from the Lead Partner but understood the limitations on their time through other commitments.

**Benefits of the scheme**

The Lead Partner felt that the scheme gave a chance to work with the hard to reach businesses and encourages them to take time out and think about H&S. The WSA scheme was good for business and interventions that change views or culture has to be beneficial. It is important to raise consciousness about H&S and break bad habits by challenging routine and bad practice. The WSA believed the impetus for change had to come from inside the company and be supported by several individuals to ensure H&S concerns are sustained. If the impetus comes purely from the outside to change the organisation then it will not be sustained.

**8.9.3 Lessons learnt**

The Lead Partner stated in hindsight they needed to adapt their approach to suit demand in the partner’s business sector, for example, The African Caribbean Network were keen to focus on the Hair and Beauty Sector. This would have helped to encourage more help/advice/knowledge/engagement from partner organisations.

The Lead Partner and WSA wanted more feedback from HSE and GSB so the WSA could refine their approach.

The Lead Partner and WSA both believed in the advantage of involving workers from the start. By tackling the basics together with the workers, you are in fact creating joint ownership of H&S and the two do not need to be tackled separately. The Lead Partner stated that in the bid they viewed tackling H&S basics and worker involvement separately and this may have had an influence on their approach of trying to deal with H&S first and then worker involvement second. It was still important to explain H&S but the concept is not complex, for example, even keeping an area tidy has an H&S aspect. And it is possible to explain what H&S is and make them begin to think in H&S terms.
The WSA felt that the scheme was sold on the benefits of doing the H&S audit but now recognises that the audit should have gone hand in hand with the body mapping rather than afterwards.

The WSA saw Body Mapping, BM, as a “brilliant approach” as it is informal and relates to the workers and gets them thinking about how they might prevent injury and illness but workers can be ‘shrewd’ and there is a small danger they will play the system. Need to be careful not to provide workers through BM with a list of issues or concerns. It should be used to highlight aspects of the workplace that might be improved.

The WSA also felt that they could not be prescriptive and use an ‘off the shelf’ approach.

The Lead Partner in hindsight believed they could improve WSA recruitment by offering a better wage package.

The WSA wanted a simplified questionnaire/audit tailored to the scheme. This would have made it easier for them to devote more time in dialogue with workers & employer. They felt that in hindsight they had used the audit to do an overhaul of H&S but instead should have got the worker/employer to identify 3-5 priority issues. Once they have tackled together a few issues and overcome the barrier of getting started the remaining issues could be a target to tackle at a later date without WSA assistance.

8.10 KIRKLEES (KRK)

8.10.1 Summary

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner and two WSAs.

Key Inputs

- Established partnership but with new personnel and premises. Cross over resource with parallel HSE funded project
- Two WSAs recruited with consultancy experience and relevant H&S qualifications

Key Outcomes

- Changes to workplace H&S processes and structures.
- Other partners now have a better appreciation of the benefits of the WSA scheme.

Key Lessons learnt

- Less time on auditing and time spent by the WSAs tackling H&S issues.
- Utilise advisor time more efficiently by planning visits and engaging organizations earlier.
8.10.2 Details

Project aim

The aim of the project was to build the WSA service into an integrated occupational health and safety support service already offered to SMEs in the Kirklees area. The WSA scheme will be used to build capacity for workers and employers to work together to improve health and safety.

Two full time WSAs both with previous experience as H&S practitioners and both with NEBOSH Certificates delivered the scheme to 70 (revised 61) beneficiary organisations covering a range of different organisations in the Kirklees district.

No real difficulties were encountered by the partnership except recruitment of employers which was initially slow and led to some workplaces being recruited as late as February. They used referrals from local authority enforcement and regulation advice team. This probably made the beneficiary organisations they selected harder to engage and might explain, along with the ambitious bid and diverse range of SMEs, their struggle to meet their recruitment target.

Partnership

The partnership links Kirklees Metropolitan Council with three local Primary Care Trusts (PCTs). The Lead Partner stated that because the WSA scheme is running in parallel with another HSE scheme – ‘Better Health at Work’ – resources supplied by the partnership were shared across both, for example, marketing, recruitment, H&S knowledge and support staff & services. The WSA scheme also benefited from the partnership in terms of cross referrals from the other HSE scheme and referrals from local enforcement officers.

The Lead Partner viewed the partnership as good, having worked together previously with other partner bodies providing lots of support, regular contact plus there were good relationships with the key contacts within the PCTs. The team, including the Lead Partner, were recently appointed and it took time get started. The Lead Partner recognised it had been a challenge working in a new team (office, Lead Partner & WSAs) and it had been hard pulling everything together at roughly the same time. This may have cancelled out the advantages gained by the cross over benefits discussed earlier.

Project Outcomes

The Lead Partner stated they had identified a need and were keen to involve trade unions to aid with recruitment in round 2, and also to make unions aware of the service being offered by the Kirklees partnership. They were also continuing to consider ways of developing links with ‘jobcentre plus’

- Although only limited basic internal H&S training was offered to the WSAs, who already had H&S expertise, one WSA remarked that they had learnt about the benefits of worker involvement;
- Word of mouth has meant employers are approaching the partnership to be engaged on round 2;
- Cross referral - three businesses were engaged from the ‘Better Health at Work’ project launch.
• Lead partner claims PCT partners have a better appreciation of the scheme and the benefits of engaging with workers;

• A new partner was identified for round 2 - Jobcentre plus.

Workplace Inputs

One WSA felt it was important to get to the key decision maker/duty holder early and win them over to the scheme.

One WSA described their approach:

• Use an audit review of policies and procedures (identify hazards and assess worker consultation);

• Produce an action plan;

• Emphasise legal requirement for worker consultation;

• Make suggestions for improvements, for example, training needs and recruiting a competent person to take on board health and safety issues and the need for worker consultation and worker feedback.

One WSA thought the best overall approach was through structured meetings with management and staff and to provide information on their legal obligations.

Both WSAs shared good practice and did occasional joint visits and this they thought was of benefit because they learnt from each other in terms of them using different approaches.

Workplace Outputs

• Workers have attended health and safety training;

• WSAs helped to improve H&S Policy developed with input from workers;

• WSAs helped to set up H&S committee;

• WSAs identified workers to champion health and safety;

• WSAs encouraged workers to voice opinion during H&S committees which provides a safer forum where management will listen to ideas;

• WSAs reduced wariness of employers towards the HSE.

WSAs’ competencies

Both WSAs saw key competencies as H&S background at certificate level rather than diploma, and good communicator skills. One WSA also thought that planning and time management plus report writing were important along with the ability to sell the scheme. The Lead Partner viewed a NEBOSH qualification or NVQ level 3 in H&S as important as well as communication skills and the confidence to go out and speak to employers.
**Barriers to the scheme**

One WSA stated that employers feared that worker consultation/involvement meant involving unions. But this was overcome by explaining how consultation did not need union representation. Another barrier was workforce apathy and apprehension: "if anything goes wrong I might get the blame". Also the location of the WSA project based with enforcement officers may have increased suspicion towards the scheme.

One WSA felt that employers sometimes had the wrong impression about the purpose of the visits and what the WSA scheme was offering. Sometimes, but not always, they could overcome this misunderstanding at recruitment. Also the WSA name suggests someone offering advice on safety rather than promoting worker involvement.

The other WSA stated other barriers were time and workers fearing they would be given more responsibility. They also encountered apathy towards H&S. The same WSA also felt that the one year funding of the scheme was also a barrier.

**Benefits of the scheme**

One WSA concluded that the WSA scheme is a great way to promote H&S to the normally hard to reach businesses. The Lead Partner stated that they felt that the scheme was a good way to get workers involved and has helped both the WSAs and partners to see the benefits of worker involvement.

Both WSAs said they would definitely continue with the scheme because it was varied and interesting.

**8.10.3 Lessons learnt**

One WSA felt that they would have been helped by some publicity, to promote the scheme and increase employer knowledge of the service being offered. They also suggested that a meeting with other advisors would be beneficial to share knowledge and that additional training would have also been useful.

Another WSA suggested that their H&S background encouraged them at the start of the project to complete a full audit because they had the skills to do it. This took too much of their time and so they changed their approach reducing how much they were doing on behalf of the employer. In hindsight, they thought it was important to establish the aims of the scheme during recruitment or early as possible to ensure employers set aside sufficient time.

The WSAs and Lead Partner felt it was important to plan and time the visits around busy periods such as Christmas. It was also a good idea to target a sector at a time and then move to the next to be more efficient with research time and resources. It would have also been of benefit to start employer recruitment and engagement earlier.

**8.11 PARK ROYAL PARTNERSHIP (PRP)**

**8.11.1 Summary**

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner, a partner and a WSA.
**Key Inputs**

- A new partnership with good communication, collaboration and shared contributions.
- One WSA with safety representative experience who was hard working and passionate about delivering the scheme. Provided with H&S and risk assessment training.

**Key Outcomes**

- Providing risk assessment training.
- Raising H&S awareness, updating H&S policies & procedures to improve worker involvement.

**Key Lessons learnt**

Develop mutual business support groups - get workers/employers from different organisations to share ideas and good practice so they can learn from their peers and maintain momentum.

Sell the business benefits that the manager does not have to do all the work themselves and by involving the workers can get help.

Provide incentives for employers to increase worker involvement and make employers more accountable by making them partly finance the scheme.

**8.11.2 Details**

**Project aim**

The aim of the project was to help introduce adequate health and safety standards in targeted SMEs (ethnic businesses in the food sector), raising awareness of health, safety and welfare and levels of consultation between workers and employers. The bid is relatively simple which compliments the complex & difficult business sector selected.

One WSA was recruited with appropriate language skills and safety representative experience. Additional basic H&S and risk assessment training were provided by GMB. 30 SMEs were recruited with 26 participating fully in the scheme.

Recruitment was slow but with steady progress, using the existing business links in a small geographical area.

**Partnership**

GMB approached PRP with the WSA scheme and because they had the business links it was agreed they would be nominated as Lead Partners. GMB helped with the recruitment of the WSA providing training and supplying H&S materials and technical H&S support.

The partnership even though it was newly established was considered by both the partners to be strong with an open and honest communication with regular meetings also involving the WSA. They both agreed that they were willing to listen and learn accepting advice where appropriate, for example, if one of them had the greater experience. There was also regular contact between them and the WSA.
The WSA also concluded that the partnership was characterised by good team work with both partners supporting him very well.

The partnership encountered no significant issues although they were time pressured and it took longer than planned to secure visits. Many of the beneficiary organizations had little or no H&S in place.

No new partners were identified.

**Project Outcomes**

- The only project to win two years of funding;
- Promotion of the scheme through two case studies in the Park Royal Newsletter;
- Development by GMB of H&S guidance for small businesses, translated in a number of Asian languages with the support of the WSA;
- Creation of a steering group from round 1 participants with the aim of meeting every quarter to share good practice and to keep worker involvement a priority;
- The WSA was more confident in approaching managers, for example, overcoming employer fears about workers standing up for their rights.
- The WSA was provided with basic H&S and risk assessment training.

**Workplace Inputs**

The WSA described that they spent significant time on initial visits to develop a rapport with the employer and to help them to get basic H&S in place, for example, updating H&S policies and explaining about risk assessments.

The WSA used a basic checklist to identify problem areas and then discussed these issues with the manager. This helped them to illustrate the importance of H&S and encouraged the employer to involve workers. Often the WSA met workers on a one-to-one basis and helped them to complete the questionnaires. During these meetings further issues were identified by the WSA.

The next step was to conduct a risk assessment involving both workers and the manager. After a demonstration they were left to conduct a risk assessment without the WSA being present.

**Workplace Outputs**

The WSA and Lead Partner reported a number of workplace outcomes, for example:

- Risk assessment and manual handling training provided for staff and employers;
- Establishing H&S committees
- Recruiting H&S representatives;
• Raise H&S awareness, update H&S policies & procedures and improve worker involvement through joint risk assessments;

• Improve employer/manager confidence in tackling H&S;

The WSA was concerned that he was visiting workplaces with very poor H&S which meant he spent more time covering H&S basics. This, in conjunction with the compressed time scale of year 1, meant he had less time to ensure worker involvement was sustained.

Quotes:

“It has been very, very useful. Staff now have a much better understanding of what is required and it has undoubtedly raised standards”

Raj Radia - Managing Director of Raj Foods

**WSA’s competencies**

The WSA believed that when engaging these types of SMEs a Technical H&S qualification is not necessary. It is more important to have good communication skills (patience/listening/flexible/cool minded). They need to be able to converse with the workers, extract key H&S issues and then sit down and diplomatically communicate these to the employer. Additionally having observation skills, to identify other workplace issues is important.

The partner felt that a WSA simply needed to be a competent person as outlined in the HSE’s Management Regulations. To be a competent person is not dependant on H&S qualification. The desirable competencies are listening skills, ability to understand organisational needs of SMEs and communication skills (language if necessary). They concluded the skills were similar to those of a school teacher.

The Lead Partner concluded that the right level of H&S knowledge is important as the WSA is a facilitator and if you have too much expertise there is a temptation to interfere, without letting the employers and workers do it for themselves.

All agreed the WSA needed to be flexible in their approach and could not be too prescriptive as each business will have different requirements.

**Barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner stated that the major barrier was how many workers the employer could make available - level of release. “Every man minute is worth a sandwich”. They need to sell the cost benefits it is worthwhile for the business but there is a paucity of real information e.g. statistics to show the real business case for H&S.

The WSA felt that some employers were reluctant about involving workers because they worried they would stand up for their rights and cause trouble. The WSA felt they had no power to get access to work premises or to ensure agreed actions are undertaken, for example ensuring workers were released to spend time and or be trained by the WSA. The WSA thought the best approach to overcome this was to sell the scheme on its business benefits and also that the manager does not have to do all the work on H&S alone if they involve workers.
The WSA saw the fact that employers cancelled or delayed visits as a barrier although it was an expected issue when dealing with SMEs.

**Benefits of the scheme**

The WSA observed that the workers were very keen to be involved. They thought this was because the workers could see the effort being made by the WSA to meet their needs (translating H&S materials, flexibility of visits). Often it was also the first time they had been listened to or that someone had shown an interest in their concerns.

The Lead Partner believed that by engaging on the scheme the employer was demonstrating to the staff that they wanted to involve them more and were interested in their views - improving relations. However, there was a need to be careful that the employer does not exploit the workers and the WSA, who should make it clear that responsibility for H&S still resides with the employer.

**8.11.3 Lessons learnt**

The WSA stated that people need a stick, if there is no stick then it becomes a lower priority. Currently employers are tackling H&S because it is a free service and the WSA raises the priority. In the long term there needs to be more incentive for it to be sustained. For example, with food hygiene if it is poor then you lose your customers.

The Lead Partner thought the WSA scheme could be improved if it was partly financed by business. Cost should be bearable but having paid for a service would create more incentive for employers to keep appointments.

Mutual business support groups. Get together all workers/employers to share ideas and good practice to learn from peers and maintain momentum. Perhaps bring in an outside source to feed in other ideas.

**8.12 SOHAS (SHS)**

**8.12.1 Summary**

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner and a WSA.

**Key Inputs**

- The partnership has been established for two years. SOHAS and the Lead Partner are experienced at delivering this type of scheme. No difficulties were encountered and they were able to engage more beneficiary organisations than originally planned.

- Two WSAs recruited with H&S consultancy experience and relevant H&S qualifications.

**Key Outcomes**

- Significant expansion of partnership for year 2 and have identified demand for training from beneficiaries’ organisations.
• Encouraged a number of organisations under one umbrella; organisations to work together on developing H&S policy & procedures.

**Key Lessons learnt**

• The voluntary sector know they need to improve H&S but are not sure how.

• An effective approach is to engage groups of organisations in one premise encouraging organisations to work together and share good practice and knowledge, for example, develop common policies and procedures.

8.12.2 Details

**Project aim**

Create capacity to manage health and safety effectively in the Sheffield voluntary sector using a participatory approach to problem solving.

The project was delivered by two WSAs and to 62 beneficiary organisations, higher than originally forecast (50). The WSAs had H&S qualifications and experience as both safety reps and H&S practitioners.

**Partnership**

This year the partnership with Voluntary Action Sheffield (VAS) was more in name than action. They were kept informed of progress but had little input into the scheme. This was due to a key contact moving on and the individual who took over was less suited to the requirements of the WSA scheme. The Lead Partner did not think this was a disadvantage to the project as the relation with VAS was viewed as long term and they have a ‘service level agreement’ with VAS over the next three years agreeing future contacts to beneficiary organisations in the S. Yorkshire region.

The partnership is also linked to the wider health at work network that includes Health Works Newham and Health Works Liverpool.

**Project Outcomes**

Post round 1 discussion has led SOHAS to identify a need for H&S basic awareness and risk assessment training. They are currently looking at possible funding options, such as from employers.

Project outcomes are as follows:

• Expansion of the partnership – five new partners identified and brought into the scheme;

• Identified demand for training from beneficiaries – offering H&S foundation course and risk assessment training (look at a self funding option);

• Future WSA training – occupational health training for round 2 so WSAs can provide additional stress training;
• One WSA reports that they now have more confidence in own ability and people skills and also have gained the experience of dealing with businesses in the voluntary sector.

**Workplace Inputs**

The Lead Partner felt the key to a successful intervention by the WSA was to be impartial - cannot be seen to take sides. Need to identify H&S issues and provide the solutions and tools to deal with these issues. It is also important to demystify H&S because it is not rocket science. Make the message simple and go straight to the heart of the problem.

The Lead Partner saw the role of the WSAs was to “Help and enable” – whether this is through setting up a committee; getting the manager to acknowledge the importance of worker involvement & H&S; putting workers on training courses. These approaches can all be correct. Organisations will need different solutions, for example, stress is a major issue for the voluntary sector because of the funding regime so stress awareness training would be a viable solution.

The WSA saw an informal atmosphere as important where peoples’ opinions are valued and also stated that they also thought it was necessary to demystify H&S, for example by simplifying risk assessment and through practical demonstrations: “strip away all the magic and mystique surrounding them. Bring it down to a level that people understand”

**Workplace Outputs**

The Lead Partner & WSA stated there were a number of workplace outcomes:

• The scheme had generated a joint approach to tackling H&S between workers and managers;

• Encouraged a number of organisations under one umbrella organisation to work together on developing H&S policy & procedures;

• Formation of multi-organisational H&S committees;

• Helping to improve H&S policies developed with input from workers;

• Generating employer demand for H&S training.

**WSA’s competencies**

The Lead Partner considered the first key competencies were to be totally impartial and then mediation skills. They need also to understand complex problems powers of analysis and be able to help and enable organisations to help themselves. Good at getting information across and critically, demystify H&S. The WSA needs 2 or 3 years experiential skills in same or similar work and a grounding in H&S basic principles such as offered by NEBOSH CERT/5 day course or TU study centres safety representatives course.

The WSA felt a working knowledge of H&S such as a NEBOSH cert was a benchmark but not having this qualification should not preclude a WSA who might have strong people skills. Other competencies were communication skills the ability to facilitate discussion and maintain impartiality between employer and worker.
**Barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner claimed there were no major barriers to employer recruitment encountered by the partnership and they were, in fact, oversubscribed. A seminar they ran worked particularly well and it had a long lasting impact of getting beneficiaries to sign up plus news of the scheme was spread by word of mouth.

The Lead Partner felt one minor barrier, however, to worker engagement was down to the types of organisation recruited and the difficulty in getting everyone together at the same time. SOHAS will address this issue in round 2 by being more flexible e.g. holding sessions in the evenings and on Saturdays.

The WSA thought that because the scheme was by invitation only then inevitably some employers would decline to participate.

The Lead Partner felt strongly that 1 year funding was simply not a viable way to run the scheme and made WSA recruitment virtually impossible - people have a choice of jobs. Business expectations were also raised by HSE as to what can be delivered but this has not been followed through. There is therefore a credibility issue for the projects delivering the scheme.

**Benefits of the scheme**

The Lead Partner felt the WSA scheme has no obvious dis-benefits as long as WSAs get across the message of the benefits of worker involvement and improved H&S awareness.

The WSA saw the scheme as a really useful tool if used properly to improve H&S in the workplace but it has to happen by invitation.

**8.12.3 Lessons learnt**

The WSA felt that an effective approach is to engage groups of organisations in one premise. This encourages organisations to work together to share good practice and knowledge, for example: develop common risk assessments.

The voluntary sector do know they need H&S but not sure how to bring that about.

**8.13 UCATT**

**8.13.1 Summary**

The following is based on regular contact throughout the year and detailed final interviews with the Lead Partner and a WSA.

**Key Inputs**

- A new partnership that was unsettled through changes to key personnel. Some difficulties were encountered recruiting a full time WSA and beneficiary organizations.
- One WSA full time who was provided with H&S training and two part time WSAs - seconded from their current jobs.
**Key Outcomes**

- Development of one WSA (training & certification).
- Impact on worker attitudes, recruitment of H&S representatives.
- Training provided to help workers acquire their construction skills certificate CSCS.

**Key Lessons learnt**

The WSA CF scheme is a good way to get culture change in the construction industry because it simultaneously addresses the company, employer and workforce and even though construction is traditionally viewed as a difficult sector to engage, in terms of H&S, it was felt employers approached were receptive to the WSA scheme.

A partnership needs to be clear about the service they provide, understand each other and support the WSA.

**8.13.2 Details**

**Project aim**

The aim of this project was to improve the management of health and safety amongst small employers in the construction industry through active participation by the workforce.

This work was delivered by two part time WSAs seconded from their duties as safety representatives and one full time WSA recruited later in September (equivalent of 1.5 full time WSAs). There were 95 beneficiary organisations engaged from the East Midlands region short of the 130 estimated in their bid.

Recruitment of beneficiary organizations was slow at the outset. The project was required to change their approach allocating more resource and by being more proactive, for example: utilising a NFB member service to sell the WSA scheme on face-to-face visits.

**Partnership**

The Union of Construction and Allied Trades and Technicians (UCATT) acted as Lead Partner organisation managing the project with the National Federation of Builders (NFB) providing help with publicity, promotion and recruitment of employers. The Construction Confederation (CC) offered a similar but secondary role to that of the NFB.

The partnership was unsettled at the outset with change in individuals co-ordinating the project. The Lead Partner stated there was also an underestimation of the time required to set up a practical working partnership between UCATT and NFB. There was also difficulty recruiting the full time WSA who was eventually only appointed in late September.
The Lead Partner also acknowledged that there was insufficient resource in terms of Lead Partner time, admin and support to deliver the scheme and there was the belief, wrongly, that they could simply role across from their early involvement in the WSA pilot. More time was needed to plan the approach and understand the concept of the scheme and the service specification, for example, what the WSA provides and what the beneficiary organizations will get.

Reporting suggests that both NFB and UCATT recruited new members during the WSA scheme and this may have affected the openness of partnership communication. The recruitment of workers to union membership was recognised as a barrier to employer engagement by both the Lead Partner and full time WSA. This issue, along with the changes to key personnel, may have affected recruitment of beneficiary organizations and the support and guidance (acknowledged by the Lead Partner) provided to the full time WSA. The impact of these issues may, however, have been mitigated by the enthusiasm of the partners towards the benefits of the WSA scheme and the considerable effort and commitment demonstrated by the full time WSA.

**Project Outcomes**

No new partners were identified. There were a number of other outcomes:

- The full time WSA received training for the NEBOSH certificate exam plus TUC stage 2 - safety rep and CITB site safety manager course;
- The development of H&S materials, for example, ‘Safe Working Action Plan’ – basic steps in carrying out safe working activity planning and risk assessment;
- Increased profile of the WSA scheme through large publicity events, for example, at Villa Park football stadium.

**Workplace Inputs**

Approaches varied across WSAs and beneficiaries’ organizations but overall the full time WSA felt they had spent more time with workers. The WSA reported that beneficiary organisations welcomed the approach especially once they had grasped the concept of the scheme and saw how it could benefit their company. This could sometimes take time especially overcoming and breaking down barriers for example, fear of workers joining unions and the time and resource that the employer was required to commit.

Once the employer had been convinced of the benefits of the scheme and was participating, the WSA reported that their time was spent chiefly with workers delivering toolbox talks, providing training to help workers get their CSCS (construction skills certificate scheme) and demonstrating types of practical H&S interventions. One of the WSAs also focused on Body Mapping.

**Workplace Outputs**

The key outcome from the project was to raise awareness of H&S issues with workers through toolbox talks and body mapping sessions. The WSAs and partner were positive these were good ways to stimulate interest with workers and improve their knowledge of H&S issues. Additional outcomes were:
• Safety representative recruited – it was felt it best to target young apprentices who were already familiar with H&S from college;

• Helping employers to understand their legal responsibilities and duty of care;

• Helping construction workers to become certified as part of the CSCS scheme;

• Improving worker awareness of H&S in the workplace;

• Identifying and discussing worker training needs;

• Improving H&S policy and signage.

**WSA’s competencies**

The Lead Partner suggested that it was important for the WSA to be able to communicate and have credibility with both the employer and worker. Personal organisation and business skills are also important whereas H&S skills are not as important although they need the basics. The Lead Partner went on to suggest working in teams of two WSAs one with soft communication skills and one offering technical support.

This was echoed by the WSA who said a background in H&S was sufficient and that it was more important to have the confidence to walk into a building site and approach people. Also needed to be dedicated, sell the scheme and be thick skinned to take the knock backs.

**Barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner felt the main barrier to employer engagement was suspicion and not understanding the scheme. This was overcome by allocating extra resource from NFB membership services’ department to provide context to the scheme and explain how they could benefit from a free service rather than paying for consultation - common for small companies who tend to buy in a lot of add on services.

The Lead Partner and WSA also felt the UCATT banner on the H&S material used may have been a barrier to employer recruitment.

The Lead Partner also felt that the nature of the construction industry e.g. how work is contracted and sub contracted and the fact that workers are peripatetic was a barrier. It is also an informal and very mobile industry.

Short contracts made it difficult to recruit WSAs.
**Benefits of the scheme**

The Lead Partner saw the benefits of engagement with workers, because the nature of construction means H&S often does not fit well with current work practices. For example: get the work done quickly to get more money or finish the job earlier ignoring the perceived red tape of H&S procedures. A core element of the WSA scheme was to get the employers to understand the regulations and then find measures to get workers to adhere to right procedures, for example wear their PPE. He was convinced that the WSA CF scheme is a good way to get culture change because it simultaneously addresses the company, employer and workforce. If the three are not tackled together there is unlikely to be a culture change.

**8.13.3 Lessons learnt**

The Lead Partner concluded that “employers don’t mean to be bad”, but construction is all about ‘getting the job done’ and there is a lack of H&S education or training of the workforce, which erodes H&S culture. There is a need to change this culture and the WSA approach is a way to achieve this but need to:

- Define the aim of the WSA scheme and what it offers - so that partners and WSAs understand their roles and can sell its benefits to employers;
- Consider the logistics e.g. structure of industry, planning visits; travel arrangements plus access to employers & workers;
- Ensure WSA is provided with support

**8.14 BRITISH PRINTING INDUSTRY FEDERATION (BPIF) [BPI]**

**8.14.1 Summary**

**Inputs**

- Health check BPIF audit tool\(^{26}\) used to benchmark and assess Health and Safety;
- Established partnership with good links within printing industry making recruitment very effective.

**Outcomes**

- Strong demand from engaged organisations leading to likely self funded scheme to continue to deliver improvements to H&S and work involvement.

**Lessons learnt**

- The key learning point was that in the future the best way of getting the H&S message across is to combine a bottom up and top down approach;

---

• The Lead Partner felt that the cost effectiveness of the scheme could have been improved if elements like materials and training for the WSA, were offered centrally;

• Worker involvement could be improved by continuing occasional visits, for example every six months. This time could be used to set milestones and check on progress.

8.14.2 Project details

Project background

Type of sector: Manufacturing Printing Industry.

Workplace: 40 small printing companies (<30) recruited from BPIF members.

Location: South West of England and South Wales identified as regions where workplaces did not actively seek advice from the BPI

Partners: Amicus GPMU (Graphic and Paper & Media Union)

WSA: One - NEBOSH General Certificate, IOSH Managing Safety, 8 years experience as a safety representative and H&S practitioner.

Project aim

Use the BPIF ‘Health-check’27 to assess workplace H&S arrangements and identify improvements areas. Engage both workers and employers together and provide relevant health and safety information where required.

Partnership

Background

The BPIF and AMICUS have previously worked together on a number of initiatives but it was felt that the WSA scheme was a good way to enhance this relationship.

Partnership characteristics

The key individuals leading for AMICUS and BPI were in regular contact both on the phone and via Printing Industry Advisory Committee (PIAC) meetings. Communications surrounded ‘idea generation’ and feedback on how the work was progressing and discussion of any emerging issues. The partnership encountered no obvious problems or difficulties.

Contributions

AMICUS have assisted by:

• Aiding with the recruitment of the WSA;

• Providing lists of branch members and company names;

---

27 Health-check provides H&S assessments accompanied by individual company scores and ranked action plans
• Helping to identify areas without safety reps where the WSA project could have the most impact;

• Strategic thinking;

• Providing feedback and reassurance that the project was on track;

• Helping through discussion to identify the type of support workplaces might require.

Project Outcomes

Partnership development

In terms of partnership development there has been no expansion, instead there has been a focus on developing the existing partnership. The Lead Partner believes that the regular contact has led to improved relations between the key individuals representing the partners, for example, he is now more comfortable discussing potentially sensitive issues such as industrial relations. Both partners also now have a better understanding of what the other has to offer which is likely to lead to future collaboration. No additional resources have come from outside the existing partnership.

WSA development

The WSA has 16 years experience in H&S, including being a safety representative and practitioner. During the scheme the WSA has attended BPIF forums and seminars to become more familiar with BPIF methods and procedures.

The Lead Partner strongly felt they had increased the competencies of the WSA by providing them with training in:

• General Health & Safety;

• Manual Handling - train the trainer course;

• Accident investigation;

• Risk assessment;

• Presentation skills.

Even though the BPIF did not secure round three funding the WSA has continued his role for a different project base in the South West of England. The WSA felt the scheme has broadened his H&S knowledge, his experience in dealing with different companies and his confidence.

Demand for services & expansion of the scheme

The Lead Partner stated that the BPIF are looking to continue the WSA scheme without funding. They are currently sending out invitation letters to workplaces who were involved offering free H&S advice and support. They will also offer an H&S consultancy service offering, for example, manual handling training (exact costs have not been detailed but a notional figure might £1,000 per employer). This proposed continuation of the scheme has been
driven because it was recognised that there was a strong demand from workplaces for this kind of approach and also H&S training.

There has been strong interest from other parties about the approach of using the BPIF ‘Healthcheck’ to benchmark H&S and show improvements. Organisations can then demonstrate to good effect the improvements they have made. One BPI project used evidence from the Healthcheck and participation in the WSA scheme to keep insurance premiums at the previous years rates.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

Once the employer was engaged the WSA introduced the scheme; its objectives (develop worker involvement, legislative requirements and best practice) and the planned number of visits.

The key method used by the WSA was the BPIF Health and Safety ‘Healthcheck’. This is a software tool that provides a database of questions to enable a workplace to compare their H&S arrangements with current H&S legislation and good practice. This was used to benchmark H&S, identify improvements and then rate employer performance at the end of WSA intervention. If the workplace scored a high mark then the benefit of continuing the engagement would be discussed. If the workplace did continue then an individual would be identified to co-ordinate with the WSA, usually the managing director.

Types of activities carried out by the WSA in response to the Healthcheck include:

- Bringing workers and employers together to educate both at the same time on basic H&S requirements and the benefits of worker involvement;
- Giving presentations on key identified H&S topics, e.g. fire prevention;
- Holding practical sessions that involved worker participation, e.g. manual handling;
- Carrying out risk assessment (Display Screen Equipment [DSE] Control of Substance Hazardous to Health [COSHH] etc);
- Providing advice to managers on how to conduct toolbox talks^28;
- Helping to establish and attend H&S committees;
- Helping to identify and establish safety representatives;
- Attending and facilitating group discussions.

---

^28* A topical H&S issue is presented to workers prior to them commencing their days work with the aim of increasing H&S awareness and stimulating discussion.*
**Workplace outputs**

There have been a number of reported outputs following WSA intervention these include, for example:

- Workers assisted and helped to conduct risk assessments;
- Manual handling and fire prevention training in 14 workplaces (100 workers);
- A number of workplaces are proposing H&S qualifications for key H&S personnel;
- Conducted noise readings;
- Provide H&S information (Printers guide to H&S & HSE leaflets, backs companion);
- Set up 20 safety committees;
- Improved safety record keeping – accident book;
- Providing managers with job cards (crib sheets) on a particular topic (PPE) to help them engage with workers. They contain, for example:
  - Explanation of legislation;
  - When PPE should be used, e.g. ‘last resort’;
  - Explain roles i.e.; workers role;
  - Example statements to help to stimulate, for example "We don’t wear PPE because its uncomfortable discuss”.
- Provided assistance for the manager on conducting toolbox talks and in getting simple advice across;
- Briefed workers on how to do risk assessment;
- Developed action plan for the next 12 months using the results from the final Healthcheck (what they have improved and also what is left to do).

**Desirable WSA competencies & approach**

In terms of desirable WSA competencies and approaches the Lead Partner felt it was less about the qualification and more good communication skills. The Lead Partner felt that H&S can be a very ‘dry’ subject and it is important to be able to engage with people and make it relevant to them. The WSA should therefore be willing to acknowledge their limits and have access to a good H&S resource which they can refer and direct the employer to.

The Lead Partner also felt good time management was a necessary skill as it is very easy to be drawn into doing too much at one workplace at the expense of another. The Lead Partner also felt that the safety representative experience of the WSA helped him to prioritise and deliver practical and useful H&S advice.
The WSA felt it was essential to have an easy going approach and to be able to make H&S interesting. He also felt it was important to approach the organisation on the right level. If this is misjudged then employers might become fearful and be reluctant to fully participate. The WSA also felt it was important to be aware of company resources so that suggested improvements are realistic and achievable.

**The barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner stated that overall there were very few barriers encountered by this project and that the majority of workplaces invited to take part were forward thinking and keen to be involved. The Lead Partner did, however, identify that there was some initial suspicion about the scheme which meant that it was difficult at first to persuade organisations to sign up. To improve this issue they got help from a BPIF advisor in the South West who was able to identify the workplaces that he was familiar with and that might benefit from the scheme. The Lead Partner stated that it became much easier to win the employers confidence because they were familiar with the advisor and were more trusting. This was thought to be better than “ringing out of the blue”.

The WSA also stated that there were no significant barriers to convincing employers about the scheme and worker involvement. Often it was simply a case of correcting the mistaken belief that H&S was the responsibility of one person and explaining the benefits of improving worker involvement.

The Lead Partner did identify, however and rather worryingly, that several workplaces reported that they knew H&S was bad but did want to raise the profile of their poor H&S with the workers. They were concerned that this might lead to a civil action by a worker who might have poor health after years of negligence on the part of the employer.

Finally both the Lead Partner and WSA suggested that another initial barrier was the concern often by workers that they didn’t want to be involved with H&S because they thought they might be blamed if something went wrong. The Lead Partner also felt it should be recognised that Health & Safety was often an extra burden on the workers time.

**The benefits the scheme can bring**

The Lead Partner felt there was an obvious need for this kind of service as demonstrated by how the scheme had been enthusiastically embraced by the participating workplaces. The scheme provided the opportunity to engage with workplaces that would not normally come to the BPIF for advice.

The Lead Partner stated that the WSA scheme was a ‘hand holding’ approach which provides employers with the training, tools and importantly the confidence to tackle H&S.

**8.14.3 Lessons learnt**

The Lead Partner felt, that overall, their chosen approach was good and had worked well. The key learning point was that in the future the best way of getting the H&S message across is to combine a bottom up and top down approach and they will seek to continue working with both manager and unions together in the future.
The Lead Partner felt that the cost effectiveness of the scheme could have been improved if the recruitment and training of the WSAs had been standardised, for example through set salaries and costs. Also training and materials could have been offered centrally as the majority of the expertise and information is generic. The Lead Partner felt it was to some extent down to luck that they were able to recruit such a good WSA.

Even though both the WSA and Lead Partner felt the majority of the workplaces would keep up the level of worker involvement both felt it could be improved by occasional visits, for example every six months. These visits could be used to set milestones and check on progress.

The Lead Partner also had an innovative idea which might help organisations tackle Health and Safety in the future. The Lead Partner suggested training sessions live over the internet – similar to the Open University. Perhaps a different H&S topic (selected by consensus) could be covered every month with questions posed and answered via email during the session.

8.15 FEDERATION OF MASTER BUILDERS (FMB) – ROUND 2

8.15.1 Summary

**Inputs**
- Established and experienced project partnership and WSAs.

**Outcomes**
- Raising employee awareness and improving attitudes to health and safety.

**Lessons learnt**

The Lead Partner felt that they learnt some key lessons which are being implemented in round 3:
- Operate within a tighter geographical area such as a City;
- Do not engage predominately micro organisations;
- Change location to enhance engagement of beneficiary organisations.

The Lead Partner also felt it was important to reduce the administrative burden on the WSA or provide additional support in terms of time and resource.

8.15.2 Details

**Project background**

**Type of sector:** Construction

**Workplace:** 132 small printing companies (<25 employees) recruited from FMB members list

**Location:** Staying in the South West of England as round 1 of the WSA scheme but widening the geographic area around Bristol and Plymouth.
Partners: Union of Construction and Allied Trades & Technicians (UCATT) & Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU)

WSA: Three

Two WSAs were previously TGWU safety representatives with over 20 year experience in their respective trades and TUC Health & Safety representative courses. One WSA had the same background but is a UCATT safety representative with an additional 5 years experience as a trainer specialising in occupational health.

Project aim

The aim of the project was to improve consultation and communication between employers & workers on H&S and raise H&S standards. This was intended to be achieved using partnership working, and the provision of safety information tailored to the hazards relevant to particular companies within the industry.

Partnership

Background

FMB have worked with TGWU for over 20 years and with UCATT for three. This partnership has worked together previously on the WSA pilot and the first year of the WSA challenge fund, as well as co-operating on other training and wider health & safety issues.

Partnership characteristics

The partnership is well established. Some difficulties were encountered by the WSAs in delivering the evaluation during round 1 and again in round 2. This, however, helped to strengthen the partnership because it necessitated close co-operation and regular contact with the key individual at TGWU. The relationship with UCATT is less clear although it is understood from the Lead Partner that they also speak regularly and meet through other forums.

It is our view that even though UCATT are another Lead Partner on the WSA scheme there has been less partnership working than might have been expected. For example, to our knowledge there has been no reported sharing of H&S materials. This may be due to the geographic separation with the WSAs from FMB operating in the South West and from UCATT in the Midlands.

Contributions

The partners have contributed to the project in the following ways during round 2:

- TGWU have provided office space for 2 WSAs in the Bristol area and access to computers, phones, and photocopying;
- UCATT have provided similar support for the WSA based in the Plymouth area;
- TGWU partner has helped liaise with the WSAs;
• TGWU have provided strategic support.

**Project Outcomes**

**Partnership development**

There has been no external expansion of the partnership during round 2. There has been, however, a change of delivery location for round 3 from the South West to Glasgow. This has led the project to approach Glasgow City Council via TGWU. The Lead Partner stated that Glasgow Council might be able to benefit from the association with the project and in return provide local experience to support the WSAs.

Internally there was also significant collaboration with the FMB Southwest office based in Bristol, who provided assistance in the recruitment drive through the telephone and posted information.

The FMB Lead Partner felt they had contributed a significant amount of additional time to the WSA challenge fund which had taken them away from their other portfolio of FMB work and internal projects.

**WSA development**

The three WSAs were recruited because of their considerable experience and practical knowledge of implementing H&S in the construction sector. It was felt that this gave them credibility as well as good communication skills to successfully deliver the scheme to both workers and employers.

No training was provided to the WSAs. The Lead Partner felt the WSA already had the necessary competencies, but had gained from the experience of working on the scheme.

The WSA interviewed also felt that they had learnt from the scheme but chiefly in terms of understanding the needs and requirements of micro building organisations whilst improving their knowledge of H&S regulations. The WSA wanted to continue in their role and enjoyed talking to the workers and engaging with them on H&S matters.

**Demand for services & expansion of the scheme**

The project, in round 2, struggled to engage the proposed number of workplaces even though a telephone representative was employed after Christmas to increase demand. Figures provided by the Lead Partner log indicate that only 56% of the planned beneficiary organisation were actively engaged and received visits from the WSAs before the conclusion of round 2 at the end of March.

Reports by the WSA and Lead Partner suggest that this situation may have occurred because they had exhausted the pool of possible workplaces willing to sign up to the scheme. FMB unlike some of the other projects from round 1 who carried into round 2 used the same member list and location which may have limited the number of suitable beneficiary organisations.

The demand for this project may also have been affected because it is recognised that the construction sector is a challenging area to deliver help on H&S. FMB also encountered a number of logistical issues which affected delivery, for example:
• The difficulty of contacting employers – often only available in the evening;
• The separation between office and work location;
• Visits cancelled at short notice;
• The distances travelled by the WSAs.

The FMB had developed a plan for working with the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) if funding had not been secured. There was no other reported impact of the scheme beyond the immediate participants.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

Once the workplace had agreed to participate the first visit was to explain the scheme to the employer alone, to establish their level of H&S and to help them to get the basics in place. The WSA also felt it was important to discuss and brief the employer first about H&S so as not to “show them up” in front of the workers which may undermine their status and credibility.

Once the employer had been reassured about the benefit of the scheme the next step was to meet workers to discuss H&S and the likely risks and hazards they might face. The WSA would then make a judgement on attitudes to H&S and tailor their work appropriately; this might mean presenting on different relevant topics of changing the approach. For example:

• Discussing the impact of an injury on potential future earnings;
• Using shock tactics like showing pictures of injuries at work;
• Discussing the health implications;
• Making a persuasive argument for the wearing of PPE.

The delivery mechanism used to facilitate discussions with workers on H&S was the HSE publication ‘essential safety tool kit’. This was seen by the WSA as crucial in helping to establish a two way conversation on health and safety and generating discussion between workers.

Another useful method employed by the WSA was to get experienced worker to explain the dangers in the workplace to colleagues. The WSA was also available to discuss with individuals any concerns they might have like solo working.

**Workplace outputs**

Interviews with the WSAs suggested that the micro organisations they were engaging already had frequent dialogue between employers and workers and worker involvement was already apparent. Formal H&S structures, such as committees or safety representatives were also less appropriate when dealing with such micro firms. When they did encounter larger organisations they tended to be the better employers in terms of tackling H&S. This led the WSAs to focus their work more on changing employer and work attitudes towards H&S.
Outputs for the WSA visits tended therefore to be more focused on changing belief systems or winning hearts and minds towards H&S rather than concrete outcomes, for example:

- Raising worker awareness of H&S;
- Explaining to workers what H&S activities need to be undertaken, for example, conducting risk assessments;
- Explaining to workers the rights of consultation and the benefits of H&S training and representation.

**Desirable WSA competencies & approach**

In terms of desirable WSA competencies and approaches the WSA interviewed felt that trade union background was beneficial and gave them the experience and confidence to talk to employers and workers and gain an understanding of why in practice H&S is not addressed. This was thought to be more important than a paper qualification. They also felt negotiation and representation skills were important although this was not applicable for every situation, for example with small family firms where the boss might also be a worker.

The Lead Partner felt it was essential for the WSA to have key construction experience to avoid the response “who are you to tell me what to do” and they also needed to be up-to-date with regulations. The Lead Partner felt they needed to have an easy going and personable manner to put people at ease and could not afford to be aloof or dictatorial. They also felt it was important to be a good communicator with the skills to convey clearly and concisely regulations, H&S risks and what can be done to manage those risks. Finally the WSA felt it was necessary to be persistent.

**The barriers to the scheme**

A main barrier to delivery of the project was the active engagement of beneficiary organisations. There are a number of possible reasons for this, but the key factor is probably the limited pool of potential suitable beneficiary organisations willing to sign up to the scheme.

The Lead Partner stated that this situation may have arisen because FMB operated in the same geographic areas and using the same membership list as round one commenting that if they were to carry out the scheme again they would choose another area. “Don’t fish in the same pool twice in terms of recruitment”. It should be noted that in round 3 FMB have changed their location to the Glasgow Metropolitan area.

The Lead Partner felt that this issue had be compounded by additional factors such as travelling distances, the micro size or organisations being approached and the telephone support the WSAs were still providing to the workplaces engaged on the scheme. Delivery of the scheme might have also been affected because the WSA based in Plymouth could not participate fully in the scheme for a number of months because of family commitments.

During round 2 even though an estimated 1200 workplaces were contacted by FMB via mail shot and direct cold calling and invited to take part and only 74 workplaces were actively engaged when the scheme concluded in March. This figure provides evidence of the cost of recruitment and underlines that fact that it was a significant barrier to the delivery of the scheme.
The FMB felt that the necessity of the evaluation and the way it was conducted was also a barrier because it diverted resource and may have deterred some workplace from participating. The Lead Partner stated a number of reasons why it was difficult to deliver the evaluation, for example:

- Low literacy rates;
- SMEs have limited time and resources;
- Bureaucratic overload: construction is one of the most heavily regulated industries and they do not appreciate further bureaucratic burdens;
- Fear of Government - anecdotal evidence suggests that many SMEs regard the government with fear and suspicion;
- FMB is membership driven – FMB is dependant on their member organisations and as such there is only so much pressure which can be applied to encourage form completion;
- Structural tension - there is an inherent tension between the scope of the Challenge Fund and its requirement for a standardised evaluation;
- Wide geographical distribution – collection of materials was more difficult with members spread across the whole of South West England;
- The WSA balancing act - firm insistence on completion of materials may provoke their withdrawal from the scheme;
- Transient work force - there is no guarantee that the worker responding at the beginning of the project will still be with the firm at the end;
- Shifting geographical location of the work place: Unlike those working in factories or offices, the work place of construction workers changes;
- In defence of the Employers – there is cost for the employer/workers associated with the time to complete the paperwork.

Even though there were a number of significant barriers to initial engagement the WSA felt that there were no major issues surrounding convincing either employers or workers of the benefits of worker involvement. An earlier concern that employers would be overly against worker involvement and fear union pressure was unfounded. A key barrier alluded to earlier, was rather one of logistics or the practicality of delivering the scheme, for example:

- Getting workers together as often they were working on different sites;
- Changing workforce (sub contracted labour and peripatetic labour);
- Engaging with workers at often remote sites;
- The demands of the job would sometime prevent the workers from being able to make time for an arranged WSA visit.
The benefits the scheme can bring

The WSA felt that the challenge fund was an effective way of increasing worker involvement. They did however, also suggest that the scheme could be more successful with greater powers to access workplaces, for example: similar to the roving safety representative scheme (introduced in New South Wales Australia) who have legal right of access.

The WSA felt the scheme was very well received by workers and employers but was unsure whether it could be sustained due to employers shouldering the burden of the costs.

The Lead Partner was supportive of the scheme but was uncertain about its sustainability. They felt it was in the hands of the employer and that there is only so far you can go in terms of providing outside help and the day-to-day decisions need to be taken by the employer.

The Lead partner felt the WSA scheme is good at: “showing them the way but it’s up to them to do it”. It is likely therefore that some may slip into old habits.

8.15.3 Lessons learnt

The Lead Partner felt that they learnt some key lessons which are being implemented in round 3:

- Operate within a tighter geographical area such as a City;
- Do not engage predominately micro organisations;
- Change location to enhance engagement of beneficiary organisations.

The Lead Partner also felt it was important to reduce the administrative burden on the WSA or provide additional support in terms of time and resources. It was important to be more hands on with the WSA to better understand their methods and the constraints and difficulties they were potentially encountering.

The WSA felt that it was important to have willing social partners and supporting organising, along with competent WSAs. They felt that because pay was good in construction it was difficult to recruit good WSAs on the current short term funding and that the pay for WSAs needed to be better, longer term and more sustained.

The WSA did feel that they would change their approach. The Lead Partner however, felt there would be more workplace impact with a focus on recruiting fewer beneficiary organisations and spending more time at each workplace.

8.16 GROUNDWORKS OLDHAM AND ROCHDALE (GWK)

8.16.1 Summary

Key Inputs

- The partnership aided the recruitment process by providing direct links into businesses;
• WSA provided businesses with health and safety leaflets in the relevant language of the employees;

• One WSA with previous training in CIEH Advanced Health and Safety and CIEH Risk Assessment.

Key Outcomes

• WSA capacity building;

• Increased awareness of health and safety in workers through training;

• Targeting those hard to reach people whose first language is not English by providing training and health and safety information materials in their own language.

Key Lessons Learnt

• It was highlighted that when working with small and medium sized enterprises it is important to be flexible;

• Involving partners in the recruitment process is vital to the success of the project.

8.16.2 Project details

Project background

Type of sector: Retail and hospitality sector

Workplace: 15 SMEs recruited in the retail and hospitality sector

Location: Recruited in Oldham and Rochdale

Partners: Oldham MBC, Rochdale MBC, Asian Business Association, Kashmir Youth Project and Voluntary Action Oldham

WSA: One – with previous training in the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health’s (CIEH) Advanced Health and Safety and CIEH Risk Assessment. The WSA was also a qualified environmental auditor and experienced provider of health, safety and environmental support.

Project aim

The aim of this project was to target SME in the retail and hospitality sector particularly focusing on ethnic minority businesses to improve health and safety, through: enabling employees to have a greater role in Health and Safety Management through consultation, skill development and improved access to information.
**Partnership**

**Background**

The partnership had been established prior to the participation of the WSA scheme. The Lead Partner noted that the relationship with their partners had strengthened as a result of the WSA scheme and has led them to work together on other projects.

**Partnership characteristics**

The partnership aimed at recruiting 15 SMEs. At the start of the scheme Groundworks found recruitment challenging, however, together with the help of one of their key partners ‘Ethnic Minority Business Support’, they were able to meet their targets. The WSA believed that the reason for the success of the recruitment when helped by their partner was because the ethnic businesses they were approaching trusted the ‘Ethnic Minority Business Support’ who were able to introduce the WSA face to face and actively encourage them to participate in the scheme.

The partnership encountered no other problems or difficulties. Groundworks worked together effectively with their partners and communication over the year has strengthened. In light of the WSA scheme these partners are now working together on other projects.

**Contributions**

The main role of the partners in this scheme has been with recruitment. They were able to provide Groundworks with a list of businesses that they thought would benefit from the scheme and who would be willing to help. The partners also visited several of the business with Groundworks to introduce the WSA and try and recruit them. Other contributions include health and safety materials provided as well as rooms.

**Project Outcomes**

**Partnership development**

The partnership strength has grown over the period of the WSA scheme and has led to new partnerships forming. The new partnerships have been formed as a result of the WSA scheme and include Ethnic support and Botham PC trust. No additional resources have come from outside the existing partnership.

**WSA development**

This work was delivered by one WSA and was appointed from one of the Groundworks team currently employed at Groundworks. The WSA had advanced Health and Safety qualification from the CIEH. Since joining the WSA scheme the WSA has undertaken IOSH training in Occupational Health and Safety and is currently studying for a Diploma in Occupational Safety and Health.

The Lead Partner believed that the WSA skills have developed over the last year and although one WSA may not have had that much of an impact to increasing the pool of competent WSAs in the UK, they have made a big difference in the Oldham and Rochdale areas.

**Demand for services & expansion of the scheme**
Groundworks are continuing to offer some support to their businesses last year by putting them in contact with ‘Business Environment Association’.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

On the first visit to businesses the first activity that the WSA undertakes is an audit of their current health and safety. Based on this audit the WSA then produced a detailed action plan for each workplace listing all the changes that needed to take place and prioritising them in order of importance. This method would have helped the employer to target key areas of H&S that needed work.

Some of the key WSA activities are listed below:

- Providing training (able to deliver in several different languages depending on what was needed) on manual handling, risk assessment, general H&S;
- Setting up staff meetings in which to discuss H&S;
- Setting up notice boards – this was identified to communicate with more members of staff. It was noted that due to the nature and size of the businesses Groundworks were targeting, the WSA would often not get to meet with the workers. Therefore by setting up a notice board the WSA was able to convey information to the rest of the staff;
- Provided workplaces with relevant advice leaflets printed off the HSE website in English and the first language of those workers;
- Provided posters as a guide for employers on what they should be doing in terms of H&S;

**Workplace outputs**

There have been a number of reported outputs following WSA intervention these include, for example:

- Workers being given more responsibility in H&S (for example the election of a fire warden);
- Workers being involved in risk assessments;
- Workers and employers having training in, manual handling, risk assessments and general H&S;
- Employers and managers talking at meetings about H&S;
- Employee representatives have been nominated;
- Managers and workers receiving CIEH Foundation Course in Health & Safety.

**Desirable WSA competencies & approach**

The Lead Partner thought that the most desirable competencies or skills of a WSA should include:
• The ability to engage with people on all levels from managers to shop floor workers;
• Need to be up to date with the legislation;
• Need to be approachable

The WSA considered the following competencies key to being a successful WSA:

• To be empathetic to people’s businesses, for example, meeting with the managers after shop hours;
• To be able to pick up quickly what it is the business needs in terms of H&S;
• WSAs should encourage managers and motivate them to get workers involved in H&S;
• The WSA noted that the ability to speak in plain English without overcomplicating H&S for the workers was very important;

Although appropriate qualifications are important both the Lead Partner and WSA felt the most important competencies of a WSA appear to be the softer skills such as being able to communicate with people on all levels and facilitate discussion.

**Barriers**

There were three main barriers that Groundwork faced during the WSA project. Firstly, Groundworks had an initial problem with recruitment. They found that methods of recruitment, such as leaflets and press releases, were not successful. However, when they involved the partners in recruitment they were able to achieve full subscription to the scheme.

The second problem that was apparent throughout the whole project was accessibility to workers. The WSA noted that due to the nature and the size of the businesses that they were targeting as part of the WSA scheme, it was difficult for employers to release employees from their day to day tasks to be involved in the WSA scheme. The WSA also noted that many of the businesses involved the manager actually working on the shop floor themselves. Therefore the WSA had to do their visits after hours at which time there were no employees to speak with. In these cases the WSA communicated with the employees through a health and safety notice board that they had set up in most work places.

The third main barrier that Groundworks encountered was the language barrier. Due to the fact that Groundworks were targeting ethnic minority groups many of the employees did not speak English as their first language. In order to overcome this, the WSA provided training and H&S leaflets in their first Language.

**The benefits the scheme can bring**

It was noted by both the WSA and the Lead Partner that there was a real need for H&S improvements in this sector, and any changes they can have will be a positive influence.
8.16.3 Lessons learnt

It was highlighted that when working with small and medium sized enterprises it is important to be flexible and empathise that it may be difficult to release workers (and even managers) from their day to day routine to help participate in this scheme. Quite often the managers are working on the shop floor for the majority of the day. Therefore the WSA had to be willing to carry out their visits after shop hours.

Having all materials prepared in advance of each meeting with businesses kept the meetings as productive as possible. This was one method of keeping businesses interested and on board with the scheme.

When targeting ethnic minority businesses it is important to be flexible around specific times of year such as Christmas or specific festivals celebrated by certain ethnic minorities.

A key part of the Groundworks project involved working closely with their partners. At the start of the project it was not realised just how key the partners would be in terms of recruitment. However, due to the nature of the businesses that Groundworks were targeting, having a trusted link into these businesses proved vital.

8.17 HEALTH@WORKS LIVERPOOL (HWK) – ROUND 2

8.17.1 Summary

Inputs

• Food Hygiene training courses;

• General Health & Safety training courses.

Outcomes

• Positive feedback from participatory organisations;

• Looking to develop further sustainable initiatives;

• Examining future funding opportunities and reviewing feedback from engaged organisations.

Lessons learnt

• Increase the partnership with more ethnic organisations;

• Expand the field of operations outside of the Merseyside area;

• Follow-up visits would benefit the organisations involved and help sustain worker involvement.
8.17.2 Project details

Project background

Type of sector: Hospitality & Retail Sector

Workplace: 80 small businesses

Location: Merseyside

Partners: Liverpool Chamber of Commerce Trade & Industry, FSB (Merseyside Branch), North West TUC (educational unit), Knowsley Environmental Health Trading Standards Service, Liverpool PCT, Liverpool Business Partnership Group

WSA: One WSA. (Full-time) – Diploma in Safety, Health & Environmental management, NEBOSH Certificate, Qualified to deliver Manual Handling, Display Screen Equipment and Basic Health and Safety Training

Project aim

To build collaboration and trust between employers, employees and partners as a cornerstone to sustaining health and safety and occupational health in small business in the retail and hospitality sector in the Merseyside area; in addition to increasing the skills, knowledge and confidence or workers.

Partnership

Background

Health@Work (HWK) Liverpool and the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce have previously worked together on a number of initiatives. The Lead Partner and other participating partners felt that the WSA scheme was a good way to enhance and strengthen this relationship and improve the effectiveness of the scheme.

Partnership characteristics

Health@Work Liverpool has had a long running and close relationship with the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, having worked with one another on a number of previous projects and campaigns, such as the ‘Smoke Free Liverpool’ campaign, as well as during the first year of the Challenge Fund Project.

The Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) has also had a long standing relationship with HWK and has helped provide recruitment opportunities and open up additional networks for the scheme.

Project partners are in regular contact and meet monthly to discuss the project’s development, review current objectives and discuss opportunities that may have arisen.
Contributions

There have been no financial contributions from any of the partners in this year’s project. However, they have assisted in other ways:

- Environmental Health Officers (EHO) have proved invaluable in spreading the message about the WSA Challenge Fund to organisations they have visited and have been incredibly successful in recruiting workplaces to the scheme;
- The FSB has helped provide networking options and lists of organisations to recruit;
- Offered additional training materials to organisations and access to different courses.

Project Outcomes

Partnership development

The partnerships have continued to grow. EHO’s have been able to provide information to organisations about other schemes available to them, training events and campaigns. In addition, the project this year was able to involve local politicians and build on the community based action that the scheme champions.

Partners meet monthly with one another to discuss the project and to plan how best to continue the work; as well as to report any areas of concern. Some partners were recruited to add weight and legitimacy to the scheme attracting a wider range of organisations.

Muslim Enterprises are project partners for the third year project, but were brought in during the third quarter to help engage and recruit ethnic organisations.

WSA development

The WSA has over 5 years of experience working with SMEs and working in H&S.

The WSA has attended a number of courses this year, including a food hygiene course which he is now qualified to deliver to other organisations, to help further his experience in the hospitality sector.

In addition to this, due to the recruitment of Chinese and Muslim businesses, the WSA was placed on an Ethnic Minority training course, better equipping him to deal with the cultural aspects and subtleties of entering a new business and a new culture.

Demand for services & expansion of the scheme

Demand for services in the Merseyside area was good, organisations were very receptive to the scheme and no major issues were reported.

HWK concentrated their efforts in the Merseyside area and towards the end of the scheme struggled on the recruitment front. This is because this area has been their target area for recruitment for the past 2 years. The Lead Partner reports that they have exhausted their options in this area. HWK brought in Muslim Enterprises (a partner in the third round) in the third quarter, to help generate additional recruits from more ethnic organisations.
Due to strong demand from beneficiary organisations HWK have been looking into the issue of future funding after the WSA Challenge Fund is over. They are currently mailing organisations for feedback on the project and enquiring as to how much an employer would be willing to pay to receive such a service in the future.

HWK have received funding for a third year project where issues of sustainability will be examined further. This year, the project will spread from the Merseyside area examining demand for this service around a greater area.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

This section details the WSA activities and workplace inputs:

- WSA has provided a toolbox approach this year, speaking to all workers about a particular section of health and safety, which has proved to be very successful;

- Generated a very relaxed and friendly atmosphere and allowed the workers to get more involved, splitting them into smaller groups to discuss H&S concerns and allow room for debate;

- Questions and answers session was held allowing workers to raise the issues they had and discuss those issues with a qualified health and safety expert;

- Management were given notes and feedback from these events, so that they could be kept in the loop as well as hear the concerns and views of their employees;

- Training sessions on basic health and safety were provided and were attended by a number of participants from different organisations. This had the added effect of getting the community talking and sharing ideas with one another.

Other workplace activities included:

- Food Hygiene training courses provided;

- Health & Safety training courses provided;

- Getting the manager to take a day off, this worked in two ways:
  - Demonstrated to management that their employees were responsible and that the business could run successfully without them needing to be there all the time;
  - Built the confidence of the employees up, demonstrated that management had confidence in them and thus helped improve relations and communication between the two parties.
Workplace outputs

There have been a number of outputs from this year’s project, including:

- Workers assisting and completing Risk Assessments;
- Basic Health & Safety Training;
- Health and Safety committees established in the majority of organisations;
- Improved communication and trust between management and workers;
- Health and Safety Policies created and updated by employees and management in consultation with each other;
- Improved discussions between employees and management;
- Improvement in knowledge, skills and awareness of employees in regard to H&S;
- Additional resources and networks made available to organisations, to ensure worker involvement can be maximised by having readily available access to information;

Desirable WSA competencies & approach

Both the Lead Partner and the WSA felt that to be successful, it was less about an individual’s qualification and more about their personality and ability to gain trust and convey their message clearly and concisely. However, they agree that it is still of paramount importance that the WSA be conversant in H&S and know the subject matter when on visits. However, this holds less importance when trying to recruit organisations to join the scheme.

Having good project management processes in place is key in being able to keep on top of the scheme and its requirements. Managing the workload is important as it is very easy to fall behind in visits. The WSA felt that having a friendly and confident attitude worked best, helping to instil confidence in management and build trust within the workforce.

The barriers to the scheme

Overall, the project encountered very few and minor barriers. HWK reached the limit of organisations they could recruit in the Merseyside area with their current set of partners. It was decided that for future projects the partnership would be increased to include more ethnically diverse organisations as well as expanding the field of operations.

There was an issue with WSA recruitment, with a part time WSA being employed to help out with visits and recruitment. However, after only a few months, this WSA left the project to find employment elsewhere. As such, the effectiveness of this WSA, to the scheme, was very difficult to gauge in relation to the whole scheme.

On occasion, management would not give the time required to fully involve the employees in the scheme, often being hesitant to allow employees to take time off for additional training and not fully backing the WSA in bringing about health and safety reform. There has also been the odd occasion where organisations simply joined the scheme in order to receive the free health
and safety advice offered, wanting the WSA to come around and “fix” any H&S issues, rather than engage the workforce and educate them in H&S.

**The benefits the scheme can bring**

The Lead Partner has been extremely pleased with the way the project was run this year, and both the Lead Partner and WSA feel that the Challenge Fund is a good method for increasing worker involvement.

The scheme recruited a number of ethnic minority organisations who have helped spread word of the scheme throughout their local community and help to raise awareness for future campaigns and initiatives. Word of mouth has played an increasing role in recruitment throughout the year, which the Lead Partner feels is a tribute to the work they have done.

**8.17.3 Lessons learnt**

Overall both the Lead Partner and WSA feel that their approach has been extremely successful this year because:

- Projects recruitment drive was successful, despite the limited pool of organisations to recruit from.

In addition, the Lead Partner learnt that good project management and communication was the key to performing well, through:

- Holding regular meetings between Lead Partners and WSA’s are vital, to ensure that the project is on course and to keep all members aware of developments and issues;

- Holding regular meetings with project partners is vital as it keeps the partners informed of new developments in the project. These meetings also allow relationships to develop helping to expand on pre-existing networks and discover new avenues for exploration. The regular meetings also offers partners the chance to offer new skills and resources to the project, as well as making them feel more involved in the project overall.

WSA felt that, although the majority of workplaces were likely to continue with their current levels of worker involvement, having occasional ‘follow-up’ visits would be of great benefit and would solidify the lessons learnt during the scheme.

One lesson learnt by the WSA was learning not to promise so much to organisations and to not get so heavily involved in the business. The fear was that if the WSA said no, it might strain relations; however it is fairer to employees, management and the WSA if ground rules are agreed before the visits start in earnest.

The amount of paperwork involved in the evaluation also proved difficult on occasion. Often taking up a lot of the WSA’s time, meaning there was less availability to get involved in pursuing increased worker involvement. However, WSA freely admits that his record keeping contributed to this problem. One key lesson learnt by the WSA was in respect to their time keeping.
8.18 KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL (KRK) – ROUND 2

8.18.1 Summary

*Inputs*

The types of activities that the WSA has been involved with include:

- Helping setting up health and safety committee meetings and providing managers with advice on how to set up health and safety committees;
- Facilitating communication between workers and employers.

*Outcomes*

There have been a number of reported outputs following WSA intervention these include, for example:

- Managers and workers attending H&S committing meetings;
- Employees involved in risk assessments and developing safety procedures.

*Lessons learnt*

- Kirklees found the most effective method of recruitment was by word of mouth;
- Would offer free health and safety advice to organisations to get them ‘on-board’ and them sell them the idea of work involvement at a later date.

8.18.2 Project details

*Project background*

**Type of sector:** SMEs from a variety of businesses (not specific).

**Workplace:** 120

**Location:** The North

**Partners:** Huddersfield South Primary Care Trust, Central Huddersfield Primary Care Trust, North Kirklees Primary Care Trust, Jobcentre Plus.

**WSA:** Two – One with previous NEBOSH Certificate and post graduate Diploma in Occupational Health. The other WSA had a TUC certificate in Occupational Health and Safety and NEBOSH Certificate. Other relevant experience that this WSA had included: Trade Union Brach coordinator, Trade Union Reps stage 1 and 2 and Trade Union Negotiating skills.

*Project aim*

The aim of this project was to provide an integrated occupational health and safety support service. To improve H&S in the workplace and improve status of people with work related illnesses.
**Partnership**

**Background**

The Lead Partner noted that they have worked together previously on other projects with their partners and that the WSA scheme has helped their relationship strengthen. This year Jobcentre Plus is a new partner and was bought in to encourage employers who may wish to offer apprenticeships the opportunity to improve their H&S standards to those required by the colleges.

**Partnership characteristics**

The partnership worked well and there were no reported problems reported. It was reported that the partners met every three months.

**Contributions**

Kirklees have had the following contributions from their partners:

- Training for WSAs;
- H&S material produced.

**Project Outcomes**

**Partnership development**

The Lead Partner noted that the partnership relationship had strengthened over the year and in addition to this had started working with more business organisations such as the Local Chamber of Commerce.

**WSA development**

During the WSA scheme the WSA’s were carrying out an NVQ level 4 in Occupational Safety and Health which was part funded by the WSA scheme and part funded by the department for Environmental Services.

The WSA felt that the WSA scheme had helped develop his training skills and his project management skills. The WSA noted that this was because “of the number of different things going on”.

**Demand for services & expansion of the scheme**

There is still a demand for the WSA scheme; therefore Kirklees are going to continue to provide a limited service in the form of a H&S advisory service. This service will provide businesses with some continued support in terms of their H&S and also how to get workers involved in H&S. However, they will not be able to provide the level of support they have done over the last couple of years.

The WSA noted that there is still a need to support their businesses - “Especially those who were struggling with health and safety before the scheme.” The WSA noted that due to there
being many changes in regulation, often businesses do not know how to keep on top of these changes and do need continued support.

The Lead Partner noted that they have several phone calls from businesses they were working with during round one. These businesses still need support and Kirklees were able to provide this on limited basis. It was felt that the WSA scheme is too short for a lot of businesses and that sometimes they needed longer to be able to implement some of the changes suggested by the WSA.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

The types of activities that the WSA has been involved with include:

- Helping setting up H&S committee meetings and providing managers with advice on how to set up H&S committees;
- Identifying training needs in each organisation;
- Delivering H&S training sessions to raise awareness of H&S in the work place including manual handling courses (some courses were translated into Urdu);
- Encouraging employers to have an employee representatives elected;
- Working with businesses on H&S policy and risk assessment;
- Facilitating communication between workers and employers;
- Generally providing support and information on H&S;
- Providing support for the production of safety induction packs;

**Workplace outputs**

There have been a number of reported outputs following WSA intervention these include, for example:

- Managers and workers attending H&S committing meetings;
- Safety representatives being elected and attending safety meetings;
- Employees involved in risk assessments;
- Workers involved in COSHH assessments;
- Workers involved in developing safety procedures;
- Managers and workers receiving H&S training - CIEH Foundation level;
- Employees briefed on H&S which is included in induction packs;
- Forklift truck refresher training for specific workers.
**Desirable WSA competencies & approach**

The Lead Partner noted that one of the key WSA competencies should be the ability to be able to communicate and engage with people on all levels, from workers on the shop floor to the owners and managers of the businesses which they are engaging with. The Lead Partner also noted that other key WSA competencies are: good communication skills and having a firm knowledge of H&S practices and legislation.

The WSA noted that the key competencies of the WSA should be having a “good grounding in health and safety, having negotiating and some sales experience and also the knowledge that different types of organisations have different needs.” The WSA also noted that it is not important to have previous experience in the types of businesses that WSAs work in.

**The barriers to the scheme**

There were several barriers encountered. The first and most obvious one was recruitment. The WSA noted that this was their second year of funding and recruitment was much harder this year. The Lead Partner believed this to be the case because they were targeting the same geographical area and had engaged all those interested in joining the scheme in round 1. They therefore had to work harder to convince those who weren’t so interested in joining the WSA Challenge Fund.

The Lead Partner also noted that in round 1 Kirklees were able to use their partners as routes into businesses. However, this year they had no routes into businesses and therefore their recruitment involved more cold-calling. The Lead Partner also noted that one of the main reasons for their difficulty in recruiting businesses was because SMEs are a difficult group of businesses to reach and even if they are engaged have very little time spare.

Another main barrier the Kirklees faced was a problem with resource. They were without a project officer at the beginning of the project. This slowed them down in terms of recruitment. A WSA also left to go on maternity leave which affected the delivery of the project and the number of businesses they were able to recruit and engage with.

The third barrier to the Kirklees WSA Challenge Fund was the Better Health at Work project which ran concurrently with the WSA Challenge Fund and used the same organisations. This project, like the WSA Challenge Fund was also being evaluated and many of the organisations complained about the additional forms they were required to complete and in some cases refused to complete two sets of forms.

**The benefits the Challenge Fund can bring**

The Lead Partner felt there was an obvious need for this kind of service. This has been highlighted by the number of businesses from Round One that got back in touch with Kirklees for additional support. One success story from Kirklees has been the number of businesses that have recommended this Challenge Fund to other businesses.

**8.18.3 Lessons learnt**

The Lead Partner noted that they found recruitment hard and that the best form of recruitment in the end was by word of mouth. The short term funding for this project was difficult, many businesses did not think they could do enough in the allocated time.
The Lead Partner noted that many businesses just wanted advice from the WSA and were not interested in worker involvement. If they were to run the project again they would sell the health and safety advice first to businesses to get them involved in the project initially and then introduce the idea of worker involvement later on after they have been working with the business for a while.

8.19  LAMBETH COLLEGE (LAM)

8.19.1 Summary

Inputs

- H&S Database for Salon Studio Partners.

Outcomes

- Strong demand from Salon Strategies’ members;
- Sharing of information to others outside of the Challenge Fund and at hair and beauty teaching events, by the employers engaged in the Challenge Fund.

Lessons learnt

- Keep in regular touch with partners;
- Keep on top of project management

8.19.2 Project details

Project background

Type of sector: BME Businesses in the service industry (take away and beauty salon)

Workplace: 50

Location: London


WSA: 3 Worker Safety Advisors

Institute of Meat Graduate, Advanced Food Hygiene (Salford University), MSC Quality Management (Salford University), Lead Auditor Training (People First)

Chinese Takeaway Association (CTA) WSA’s started late (3rd Quarter), so there is no information about their skills and experience.
**Project aim**

The aim of the project was to map, up skill and increase the involvement of Owner Managers and their employees in the identification and introduction of safer working practices, concentrating on the British Minority Enterprises (BME) Business sectors of hair and beauty, nail bars and Chinese takeaways in the London area; in addition to improving health and safety at these organisations.

**Partnership**

**Background**

There is no direct background to this partnership. Neither organisation has worked with one another before.

**Partnership characteristics**

The partnership was formed specifically for this project with a number of arrangements in place to ensure that the partnership was effective. Monthly meetings were held, in addition to the Lead Partner holding regular telephone calls and keeping one another appraised of any developments or problems.

Salon Strategies and the CTA drew upon their existing membership networks to identify organisations to promote the WSA challenge fund to. Access to these membership networks aided the recruitment process significantly, allowing a more focused approach to be taken. Organisations were specifically targeted, based on the information available from the networks and recruitment was made easier due to the backing received by both Salon Strategies and the Chinese Takeaway Association.

**Contributions**

Salon Strategies aided the project by:

- Compiling a database for use by all members, providing detailed guidance and information sheets for all the products used in the sector, such as shampoo, conditioner, gel, etc;
- This database helped organisations plan for and understand their COSHH requirements;
- Provided resources to any organisation that required additional material for improving H&S.

Business Link:

- Provided details of organisations the Lead Partner could recruit;
- Provided online resources and material to help aid worker involvement and improved H&S.

CTA contributed no additional resources outside of the original bid.
Project Outcomes

Partnership development

The development between the Lead Partner and Salon Strategies was incredibly strong. Both partners were in regular contact with one another, holding monthly meetings to discuss strategy, plan workload and consider sustainability options for the future.

Relations with the project’s other main partner, the Chinese Takeaway Association, were strained from the outset of the project. Originally, work was supposed to begin at the start of the first quarter; however, the main partner in the CTA was called back to China for several months and did not return until the beginning of the third quarter, 6 months after the work was supposed to have begun. This had a number of consequences on the Challenge Fund, which included, placing considerable strain on the Lead Partner to re-organise the targets and deadlines as well as the other partners involved in the project. Salon Strategies had to move their targets forward, recruiting and visiting more organisations than was originally anticipated, meaning that they had less time to concentrate on sustainability issues and project management.

CTA began work in the third quarter and the relationship quickly developed. CTA attended regular monthly meetings and were informed of the work that was expected of them, the targets they had to hit and the timescales they had to complete the work. The late start had an impact on the Challenge Fund in terms of the quality of engagement with beneficial organisations, which is supported through the findings of the verification interviews.

WSA development

No WSA’s received any additional training that would have brought added benefit to the Challenge Fund.

The Salon Strategies (SS) WSA has had over 5 years experience working in the hair and beauty sector and is a qualified H&S practitioner. During the Challenge Fund the WSA attended and ran training events as well as aiding in the creation of the Information database. However, during the third and fourth quarters, the SS WSA was hospitalised for long periods of time, effecting their overall development.

The CTA WSAs were stretched from the beginning of the project (due to them only beginning work in the third quarter). As a result there was little time for professional advancement as their workload was incredibly tight and they simply had to concentrate on performing all the visits required of them.

Demand for services & expansion of the Challenge Fund

The demand for this type of service in the area appears to be high. There seems to be a growing interest from the Salons within the area, due to the mail outs by Salon Strategies and the increasing reputation of the Challenge Fund through word of mouth. However, a number of the Takeaways in the area have reported that they only got involved in the Challenge Fund because they “had to”, making the ability to judge demand in that area very difficult. The project was successful in recruiting the desired number of organisations.
The Lead Partner reported a strong demand for services in the hair and beauty organisations. A number of training events were held, where turnout from the salons was very high. They have also taken on board the lessons they have learnt and are eagerly improving their workplaces and teaching the skills to trainees and other employees. The Lead Partner reported that the organisations engaged by the CTA were less responsive to the approach of the WSA's.

The Lead Partner and Salon Strategies have contacted their members, asking for feedback on the Challenge Fund and testing the desire for a paid service from their members.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

The WSAs have taken a number of approaches this year in educating and improving H&S. The majority of organisations are micro-business’ employing less than 5 workers, this has required a more informal approach than would have been anticipated. For example, meetings were held with all the workers together with managers, where they would sit around having group discussions about H&S in their workplace. Workers would then be made aware of the issues commonly affecting their workplace and would be trained in:

- Performing risk assessments;
- Performing disability audits;
- Creating Health and Safety Information Database;
- Training Courses were provided;
  - Food Hygiene;
  - Skin Care Training;
- Employees learnt about COSHH Assessments;
- Introduced Health and Safety Policies;
- Employees learnt about manual handling and how to protect against it;
- Employees learnt about repetitive strain injury and how to protect against it.

**Workplace outputs**

The Lead Partner reported that the attitudes of employers and employees have been excellent, in those organisations recruited by Salon Strategies. All parties have showed a willingness to learn and participate in the Challenge Fund and have attempted to get as much out of the project as possible, often on occasions going above and beyond what was expected of them, such as making the workplace more suitable for disabled customers to access areas.

The Lead Partner also reported that some workers have also started to train in night classes (hair dressing schools) and have introduced a basic H&S package into the classes, so that students do not just learn about hair styling, they also learn about the issues (health and safety) that will effect them in this sector, and learn methods on dealing with these issues.
Workers and employers have:

- Aided and assisted in Risk Assessments;
- Created H&S Policies;
- Conducted training in: COSHH, food hygiene and work related upper limb disorders
- Held regular H&S meetings;
- Improved management and awareness – records are being kept up to date and contain greater amounts of detail;
- Provided guidance on H&S legislation;
- Introduced workplace H&S Champions.

There have been no reported significant workplace outputs by those organisations engaged by the CTA.

**Desirable WSA competencies & approach**

The Lead Partner has reported that a WAS should have:

- A detailed knowledge of the sector and the issues that can effect that particular sector;
- Good communication skills, be friendly and approachable;
- Good time and project management skills;
- Reliability (very important if you are to gain a level of trust in small organisations).

**The barriers to the Challenge Fund**

The Lead Partner reported no real issues in terms of recruitment. There were already good networks in place and a number of organisations had signed up to the Challenge Fund by the first quarter. The attitudes of all involved have been excellent and the feedback from the training events has been extremely positive. The only real issues that affected the Challenge Fund were the late start of the CTA and the hospitalisation of Salon Strategies WSA.

**The benefits the Challenge Fund can bring**

The Salon Strategies WSA reported that the scheme had helped bring the salons and nail bars in the Lambeth area together. The Salon Strategies WSA commented that “there seems to be a real sense of community spirit, illustrated in the training workshops that the staff who attended them.”

The scheme has also developed, throughout the year, a COSHH database which will be of real benefit to small organisations that do not have the time and resources to spend on chasing down the ingredients to their products. This is a real motivator in getting companies to continue the good work they have been doing on improving worker involvement in H&S.
8.19.3 Lessons learnt

The Lead Partner believes that to be successful, you should always have a reserve plan, just in case things go wrong. The Lead Partner believes that the project went well overall, and had it not been for the CTA only beginning work in the third quarter and the Salon Strategies’ WSA being hospitalised, then they would have had more time to work with the organisations and have provided a more robust and successful project.

The Lead Partner believes that keeping in regular touch with the organisations and the WSA’s is very important as it can be extremely easy to miss out on what is happening on the front line of the project and at the organisations. The Lead Partner noted that keeping on top of the project management side of things is important and would have been more prioritised in the future.

8.20 PARK ROYAL PARTNERSHIP (PRP) - ROUND 2

8.20.1 Summary

Inputs

• Strong partnership and effective recruitment drive;

• Good support from project partner;

• Provided visual training to maintain interest and break communication barriers.

Outcomes

• Successfully and prematurely recruited remit of organisations;

• Strong demand for services within the area, leading to examination of future funding initiatives.

Lessons learnt

• Plan recruitment drive well;

• Maintain deadlines;

• Maintain regular contact between partners and WSA.

8.20.2 Project details

Project background

Type of sector: General

Workplace: 85 small businesses

Location: London
Partners: Britain's General Union (GMB)

WSA: One

Six years experience in H&S. Three years experience as a safety representative, three years experience as a H&S practitioner. GMB (Health & Safety Certificate) Health and Safety Training on UK and EU Legislation

Project aim

The project aim was to improve H&S participation and to provide an innovative and effective mechanism for sustainable improvements in the health and safety standards of SMEs based in the Park Royal area of West London.

Partnership

Background

Park Royal Partnership has worked in collaboration with GMB in round 1 of the WSA Challenge Fund project. PRP have hired a telemarketing company to help with the recruitment process, cold-calling organisations to accompany the mail-shots that have been produced.

Partnership characteristics

The partnership has continued to improve from the first round, having moved from strength to strength. The original difficulties experienced in the first year project have been overcome.

- Regular meetings are held between the Lead Partner and the WSA (who is a member of GMB);
- Communication has been constant throughout the year, in the form of regular monthly meetings and ongoing telephone communication as and when required;
- GMB have devoted more time in aiding the WSA with resources and providing help and advice in the training sessions;
- Good relations and constant communication with telemarketing company which was a new partner for this year’s project;
- No problems have been reported this year, in part due to the success had with recruitment.

Contributions

There have been no financial contributions from GMB in this year’s project. However, they have assisted in other ways:

- Offered resources and office space to the WSA;
- Have provided training materials and DVDs for WSA visits;
- Have offered assistance and support to the WSA.
Project Outcomes

Partnership development

There have been no additional partners added to the scheme this year. The project did employ a telecommunication company to help assist in recruitment. Recruitment drive was so successful that they have been included in the third year project too.

The partnership is the same as it was in round 1 of the scheme, but has developed in a couple of ways. There was a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of each partner, a more co-ordinated schedule and a better understanding of the methods and successes of the scheme.

GMB provided some additional material to organisations and to the WSA. There were health and safety training DVDs provided to assist in educating the workforce, as well as GMB helping with and providing office rooms to hold the training events.

WSA development

The WSA was already very experienced in H&S, having worked with GMB for a number of years, having over 3 years experience as a Safety Practitioner and as a Health & Safety Practitioner.

The Lead Partner holds that one of the most important skills the WSA possesses, is his ability to communicate with all the different organisations, bridging language barriers and being friendly and open with both management and employees.

WSA attended a food hygiene training course this year to help with the number of food related organisations that have been recruited. Additionally the WSA received H&S training on UK Legislation, EU Legislation and Risk Assessment training.

Demand for services & expansion of the scheme

Park Royal Partnership tried a new approach this year in their recruitment drive, employing the services of a telecommunications company to cold call organisations to enquire whether they were interested in participating in the scheme. The Lead Partner reports that this tactic proved incredibly successful, with a success rate of 32% and with PRP recruiting their full capacity of organisation by the end of the third quarter, demonstrating the high demand for services within the area.

Training sessions were held at the end of the quarters, with the aim of attracting and training 40 organisations and 200 employees. The training sessions also proved to be a success with good turn out at every event. At the end of the year, Park Royal had exceeded their target, having trained over 215 employees.

The Lead Partner believes that the demand and growth for WSA services and support is in part due to the close nature of the organisations in the Park Royal scheme. The majority of recruited organisations are on the same industrial site, so word of mouth is helping raise the profile of the scheme and attract a greater audience. Once the workers of one organisation discover what the scheme is about and what it does, they are quick to sign their organisation up to it also.
All this, combined with the positive feedback, has led Park Royal to enquire into maintaining some sort of service in the future. At present, Park Royal are enquiring as to how much organisations are prepared to pay for the continued support of the WSA. They are running a third year project, so have not finalised any future plans as they will include the feedback from this third year into their decisions.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

The types of activities and workplace inputs have included the following:

- Informal meeting with Directors to brief them about the scheme and highlight the benefits it can bring;
- Talk to the workforce to gauge interest;
- WSA would walk around the workplace taking photographs, then hold meeting with the employees, using the images as a visual tool to illustrate H&S problems and show the employees. This approach also reduced any language difficulties;
- Print out and supply numerous bits of information on different subject matter from the business link website on issues such as manual handling and repetitive tasks;
- Gave workers a checklist of issues to consider allowing them to determine which they thought was most important, getting them more involved in the processes and thinking about future H&S changes.

**Workplace outputs**

There have been a number of reported workplace outputs:

- Organisations have been very keen to get involved in this years’ evaluation, in some part due to the success and reputation gained from the round 1 evaluation;
- The WSA reported that worker involvement has increased with a notable change in attitudes, willingness and reception towards changing and becoming more involved in H&S;
- H&S meetings, both inside and outside the workplace have had good attendance records and the WSA has noted that there was a dramatic change in workplace attitudes in comparison to the first years’ evaluation project;
- Workers carried out risk assessments and attended H&S meetings. Discussions at these meetings were always lively and there seemed to be very few people who were taking the training lightly;
- The WSA reported that workers have started to think more “outside the box”:
  - Producing a H&S policy, recording information and;
  - Producing and updating risk assessments;
  - Improving the workplace and making conditions more comfortable for themselves, having chairs positioned at every work station
Targeting more specific H&S concerns, such as, taking regular and in some cases mandatory breaks after a certain amount of time.

**Desirable WSA competencies & approach**

The Lead Partner and WSA believe that to be a successful WSA, you must:

- Have a good level of knowledge and experience, as well as having previous experience of working within the particular sector;
- Be approachable and reliable;
- Having the confidence to say no is important and not to do every bit of work for the organisation, but know when they may be taking liberties;
- Have excellent organisational skills are incredibly important.

**The barriers to the scheme**

There were no real barriers to the scheme reported by the Lead Partner.

- The recruitment drive went extremely well, with the project successfully managing to recruit all their numbers by the third quarter;
- The attitudes of the workplaces were positive and the majority of organisations engaged were genuine about wanting to improve H&S;
- The WSA’s utilisation was an initial problem, but this was cleared up by the second quarter with the WSA being told to be more forceful with organisations, and not to spend so much time with them.

**The benefits the scheme can bring**

The Lead Partner believes that the scheme has helped bring the community of organisations together. Through the training events that have been held, a number of companies have now formed relationships and continue to work with one another, sharing ideas and improvements.

The scheme has also provided a point of reference for all organisations who were involved in the scheme. Regular H&S training sessions are going to be held by PRP and GMB, providing training in H&S, risk assessments, creating H&S policies amongst other things. These training sessions will continue to provide the resources that the SMEs need and will enable staff to continue expanding their knowledge base.

**8.20.3 Lessons learnt**

A number of lessons were learnt, these include:

- A carefully conceived action plan is critical;
- Holding firm to deadlines, targets and schedules is important, otherwise things can easily get out of control;
• An experienced project administrator really can make a big difference, particularly towards the end of the quarters;

• Hold regular meetings with the WSA, to get a feel of how they are progressing, whether there are any things that they would like to see changed, as well as to get a better understanding of what it is like being out on the front line.

8.21 RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL (RHO)

8.21.1 Summary

Inputs

• One individual fulfilled the joint role of WSA and Lead Partner;

• Interlink provided good contacts to the voluntary sector to enable straightforward recruitment of beneficiary organisation;

• Joint risk assessments to help workers to be better engaged and feel they have a contribution to make.

Outcomes

• Encouraging managing directors to take more direct responsibility for H&S and provide support, for example H&S training, for their H&S manager;

• Workers attending H&S training discussing manual handling and advising other colleagues to adopt lifting techniques.

Lessons Learnt

• The WSA/Lead Partner recognised earlier that they were thinly stretched but it took time to put in place the additional administrative support that they needed;

• More urgency at the start of the project to get the project moving and established stronger commitments from beneficiary organisations;

• There is a need to set a minimum H&S requirement for those who are responsible for H&S.

8.21.2 Project details

Project background

Type of sector: Voluntary

Workplace: 50 organisations in the Rhondda Cynon Taf region using Interlink CVC members list.

Location: Rhondda Cynon Taf region which is a semi rural area close to Cardiff.
**Partners:** Interlink CVC

**WSA:** One – with joint responsibility as Lead Partner. NEBOSH Diploma, IOSH RSP, CIEH trainer, Pacific institute Facilitator.

**Project aim**

The aim of the project was to: raise the profile of H&S, provide a package of H&S training; develop a positive H&S culture and to set up links with other organisations to maintain the continued delivery of the project after its completion. This was to be achieved through certificated training and empowerment to ensure that staff at all levels have the necessary competence and confidence to be an active role in developing and implementing H&S procedures and practices.

**Partnership**

**Background**

The partnership with Interlink CVC was established for the purposes of delivering the WSA scheme; however, they have worked in partnership with other sections of the local authority. This means that even though the partnership is new, knowledge of the activities and key relations are already established.

**Partnership characteristics**

The Lead Partner met with their key contact at Interlink on a regular basis and the Lead Partner noted that the trust and communication was excellent between them. The popularity of the WSA scheme increased at Interlink and it was viewed as a useful platform to develop networks helping them in the future to deliver other initiatives. There were no problems or difficulties encountered in the partnership and the Lead Partner was enthusiastic about the support provided by Interlink in promoting the scheme to its members.

**Other partner contributions**

The partner made following contributions:

- Providing lists of branch members and company names;
- Proactively visiting organisations to help sell the WSA scheme;
- Encouraged members to be involved by chasing those that might not be engaging and encouraging other to sign up;
- Providing feedback back to RHO from the participating organisations on the success of the scheme.

**Project outcomes**

**Partnership development**

The Lead Partner commented that there has been no expansion of the partnership instead there has been a focus on consolidating the existing relationship. This was likely to be due to two
reasons, firstly because the partnership was newly established and secondly because the key individual acting as both WSA and Lead Partner had a very full role and there was probably less time for them to network or establishing new partnership links.

There have been no significant contributions levered in from other areas although a number of internal contributions were made, in kind in terms of the use of office facilities, admin support, and existing training materials.

**WSA development**

The WSA is an experienced H&S practitioner with additional training and facilitation skills. During the scheme the WSA was due to attend the ROSPA manual handling passport scheme to help benchmark M/H knowledge and deliver appropriate training. Unfortunately the WSA became sick after Christmas and to our knowledge, did not attend this scheme. The illness of the this key individual also meant no end of year Lead Partner or WSA interview was completed and so it is difficult to gauge whether the WSA increased their knowledge and expertise or even whether they had the desire to continue in their role.

Their unique position as both Lead Partner and WSA did, however mean that this key individual from the outset had a very good understanding of the scheme and how it should be delivered. This is supported to a limited extent from conversations with them, observations of their approach at an organisation and from feedback from beneficiary organisations.

**Demand for services & expansion of the scheme**

The verification interviews conducted with the beneficiary organisations at RHO at the conclusion of the scheme suggested there was a strong demand for the continuation for the scheme. Many were disappointed that the visits had be cut short because the WSA had fallen unwell. It is not certain whether this demand would lead to a self funding mechanism but indicates the scheme was well received. There was also a plan to continue to use the regular interlink forums to ensure H&S message remained a priority with cross over advice on other existing H&S initiatives such as 'Pathfinder' which assists SMEs on a regional level.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

The key input was to empower the H&S manager, educate the managing director or key duty holder and encourage participation from the workers. Getting participation from the workers was achieved by demonstrating ‘quick wins’ the tangible benefits of the scheme and H&S. It was necessary at the outset to identify issues by talking to workers; the H&S manager and using observation skills to identify possible solutions.

It was also seen as being very important not to be negative and accentuate the positives that people are doing, otherwise it just appears like criticism of the business and of the person responsible for H&S which can be damaging. It is therefore important to give examples of own H&S problems and empathise with the difficult position of the H&S manager as the go-between.

It is also important to make H&S relevant by tackling the primary concerns whether this is M/H, stress or being physically assaulted.
Training is another useful tool not only to build up H&S knowledge but also to provide opportunity to talk to the workers and discuss any concerns. It was important that any training be carried out in work time to demonstrate the worth of WSA input and commitment from management to tackle H&S.

Finally training was conducted in joint sessions with management and workers. These sessions helped to increase worker involvement because by answering questions openly and honestly in this forum workers can see that the WSA is not just there for the benefit of management. Need to ensure a balanced response to workplace intervention to address worker concerns, for example for poor lighting do not need to spend £7,000 on re-wiring but instead get battery lights or seek other way to address the issue. “It is about being cost effective and balanced in the approach representing both workers and management”.

A key input that was felt to work well was joint risk assessments, where one of two workers were involved with the H&S manager and WSA. This helps workers to be better engaged and feel they have a contribution to make.

**Workplace outputs**

There have been a number of reported outputs that were reported by the WSA made prior to Christmas, these include:

- Improving H&S manager’s confidence to come forward and discuss what they need with the managing director or duty holder;
- Getting support for the H&S manager by getting workers to engage and become more involved in H&S;
- Encouraging the managing director to take more direct responsibility for H&S and provide support, for example H&S training, for their H&S manager;
- Providing assistance on re-writing H&S policies;
- Providing training on M/H and risk assessment;
- Signposting sources of information on H&S;

The Lead Partner/WSA felt strongly that H&S training was an excellent method for improving worker involvement. It provided a means to consult with the workforce and gave them the opportunity to discuss H&S which could lead to a change of attitudes. He provided an example of this when after M/H training he observed two workers discussing the training with each other and good lifting techniques and later reminding each other of the techniques and discussing with other employees who did not attend.

**Desirable WSA competencies & approach**

The Lead Partner/WSA reported prior to Christmas that the role of the WSA was a mentoring approach to enable the organisations and key individuals within that organisation to take ownership of the scheme and to improve worker involvement and H&S.
The role of the WSA is to bring about engagement across the whole business from management to workers. The WSA must look to use levers to bring the managing director into the equation and break down the barriers that may be preventing them from tackling H&S, such as the cost of letting staff away from the shop floor. To do this the WSA must have an understanding of the business and identify what needs to be said or done, for example giving the business case to the MD and the consequences of an accident on the funding regime.

The WSA/Lead Partner also felt it was necessary to be able to deliver training. It was also important to have a formal qualification and know H&S as it is necessary to win confidence of others by demonstrating that you have the right credentials. Without these credentials the Lead Partner/WSA thought it would be difficult to successfully engage with workers or management.

**The barriers to the scheme**

One significant barrier to the delivery of the scheme was the dependence on one individual acting as both WSA and Lead Partner. The pressure of this demanding role was exacerbated by the ambitious target of 50 beneficiary organisations and an internal issue concerning the conditions of their employment. These factors are likely to have made the working position of the WSA/Lead Partner extremely difficult. This reliance on one individual also meant that when they became ill after Christmas the delivery of the scheme effectively ceased.

Overall recruitment was made relatively straight-forward by the input from the partner organisation, and there were no other significant barriers to the delivery of the scheme.

**The benefits the scheme can bring**

Overall the Lead Partner/WSA felt the scheme was a good approach to improve H&S. It provided a different way of tackling H&S based on proactive mentoring, and advice giving rather than fines or punishment.

**8.21.3 Lessons learnt**

The WSA/Lead Partner recognised earlier that they were thinly stretched but it took time to put in place the additional administrative support that they needed. They also felt that they should have established stronger commitments from firms through a harder sell on the scheme, for example, by saying places were limited and getting agreement as to their interest and level of participation - "if they are committed then they can have my time". This would have also provided a better focus on organisations who want to be engaged rather than spending time chasing those who were not.

In hindsight the Lead Partner/WSA felt it would have been better to have had a lower target and instead spent more time with each one. The WSA/Lead Partner also felt that they were too flexible about arranging visit times and should have pinned beneficiary organisations down more firmly to a fixed dates. He felt that giving more choice on visit times meant that the time between visits slipped and organisations lost momentum.

One suggestion made by the WSA/Lead Partner to improve H&S was to impose a minimum H&S competence for those who are responsible for H&S. So for example before an individual
could run a business they would need to get some H&S certification. For example: such as a driving licence which offers a minimum level of competence to drive on the roads.

8.22 SHEFFIELD OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH ADVISORY SERVICE (SOHAS) – ROUND 2

8.22.1 Summary

Inputs

- Strong existing partnership with good link and networks available.

Outcomes

- Willingness to learn;
- De-mystified approach to H&S;
- A willingness to expand knowledge to other areas of H&S not covered, such as stress.

Lessons learnt

- Small organisations share a real concern about H&S;
- De-mystifying the issues enhances worker involvements and removes barriers;
- Apply finances to the right areas.

8.22.2 Project details

Project background

Type of sector: Voluntary

Workplace: 140

Location: Sheffield, Doncaster

Partners: Voluntary Action Sheffield, Voluntary Action Rotherham, Voluntary Action Barnsley, Doncaster CVS, Healthy Workplace Advisory Service, Workplace Health Advice Management Service

WSA: 3 Worker Safety Advisors. Two part time and one full time:

Full time WSA: Certificate in occupational health and safety, TUC Certificate in Employment Law.

Project aim

The aim of the project is to increase workplace activities and knowledge in the Voluntary sector, building on the first year programme and continue the successful approach of ensuring participation at all levels within organisations and to extend the work into South Yorkshire.

Partnership

Background

The partners have been working together, on and off for a number of years. The organisations are very similar to one another and have considerable expertise in their fields, dealing within the voluntary and charity sector.

Partnership characteristics

The partnership is very close and strong. All organisations are aware of their individual strengths and know exactly what it is that they can bring to the project. Each has the required expertise to deal with their specific areas and tasks and the local knowledge that is essential to the project.

Contributions

The partner made following contributions:

- Provided a list of organisations to recruit in the specific areas the project concentrated on;
- Helped advertise and promote the benefits of the WSA Challenge Fund to local organisations;
- Offered assistance and support to the WSA’s, providing them with materials, resources and office space;
- Gathered feedback on the scheme to help facilitate improvements.

Project Outcomes

Partnership development

The Lead Partner and project partners have reported that the partnership has run well all year round. Good relations have been maintained throughout and the lines of communication have been strong and consistent. There is a real sense of team unity and each partner has invariably learnt something from the other. Monthly meetings were held and all partners were in regular communication with one another. A significant number of organisations were recruited based on the strength of the partnership and the networks available.

WSA development

Two additional WSAs were brought onto the scheme this year, whilst retaining the WSA from the round 1 project. All three WSAs had practical experience of H&S in the workplace and in other settings, such as the NHS, the voluntary and charity sector and in SMEs. All three were
put through an extensive IOSH training course prior to the scheme, to build up their competencies and capabilities.

**Demand for services & expansion of the scheme**

The Lead Partner and WSAs reported that demand for the services provided by the WSA scheme was high. This is also a reflection on the strength of the partnership. The good work that was done by all partners has meant that there has been a huge response from organisations wishing to participate in the scheme, which continued throughout the course of the project. There were lots of referrals from organisations wishing to participate and actively wanting to be involved.

There was a huge amount of demand from the Doncaster & Rochdale areas, whilst demand in the Sheffield area had dried up, due to the concentration of organisations that had been involved in round 1 of the project.

SOHAS have been examining ways to continue providing a WSA type scheme in the future, focusing on training and educating staff. The top two topics for training appear to be Risk Assessments and Stress Training. The scheme will be funded by employers as it has proved difficult to get funding from the Learning Skills Council. An initial price has been drawn up of £80-90 per person for the Voluntary Sector and double for those not in the Voluntary sector.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

The Lead Partner and WSAs have reported that it was easy getting workplace activities off the ground. This was due to the nature of the sector being very good at working together, forming partnerships and wanting to improve every aspect of the organisation.

WSAs would:

- Explore an organisations H&S structure;
- Explore and discuss H&S issues and concerns;
- Provide detailed information about the scheme as well as pertinent H&S information;
- Carry out risk assessments;
- Help establish H&S committees;
- Provide manual handling training;
- Provide basic H&S training.

In addition, SOHAS also created a portfolio for each organisation containing additional support information, breaking down the issues into ‘bite size’ pieces, so as not to overwhelm the workers and to help sustain the project’s aims.

The WSAs also placed a lot of importance on de-mystifying H&S, through explaining the tasks and procedures simply and putting it into a context, those with little or no H&S experience can understand.
Workplace outputs

The WSAs reported a real willingness to learn and a real enthusiasm to get involved in the project. This was reported from the majority of workplaces. Employers and employees have been asking a lot of questions in the focus groups and have often requested additional information. Feedback from these focus groups has been positive. WSAs have built up good relations with a number of organisations and the reputation of the partners and the scheme has increased.

Organisations are now performing regular risk assessments and H&S committee meetings are far more frequent than they ever had been before. Worker and manager relations have improved. In addition, a number of organisations inquired about stress levels and stress management, which is now being considered in a number of organisations.

Desirable WSA competencies & approach

The Lead Partner believes a good WSA must have:

- Relevant training and a practical experience in H&S;
- Strong communication skills;
- Experienced in the sector they will be working in, greater than 3 years;
- Ability to deliver materials, training and be able to easily and concisely communicate the issues. No matter how many qualifications they have, if they cannot deliver the material in a concise and understandable format, then they are likely to fail.

The barriers to the scheme

The Lead Partner has reported no real barriers to the scheme this year.

Occasionally, managers would drop out of the scheme due to the employees organising a WSA visit. When management discovered these visits were going to take place, they would call up and decline to participate. However, this only happened occasionally.

The Lead Partner reports that the general feedback received from the organisations was very positive.

The benefits the scheme can bring

The Lead Partner feels that the scheme has brought a much sought after service to the charity and voluntary sector. Raising H&S issues to a number of workers, who normally would not have had the time to learn what they have learnt, has provided the workforce with the ability to affect change within their workplaces. The scheme has also raised awareness of H&S and worker involvement to the surrounding areas and demand is growing in areas such as Doncaster and Rotherham.

8.22.3 Lessons learnt

The Lead Partner reported that people in small organisations have a real concern about H&S. The Lead Partner also noted that the most effective approach to take is to de-mystify the whole
process for the employers and the employees, in order for organisations to stand a greater chance of putting H&S structures in place that will be sustainable. Increased worker involvement is therefore a by-product of this. If you explain the issues, carefully and coherently, then workers are more likely to pass that information onto their fellow employees, thus raising the profile of H&S and sharing the issues. This will in turn lead to greater communication in the workplace. This process is also applicable to management.

Additionally, there should be a concentration of applying finances to the right areas of the project and these finances need to be monitored properly. All partners and members involved in the Round 2 work were made aware of the project’s aims and needs, in addition to the funding dynamics of the project.

8.23 SCOTTISH TRADE UNION CONGRESS (STUC)

8.23.1 Summary

**Inputs**
- On-line health and safety training course.

**Outcomes**
- Changes to health and safety policies to increase the chances of sustainability;
- Relationship with partners has improved over the WSA scheme;
- Workers presented at seminars to share good practice in health and safety and worker involvement.

**Lessons learnt**
- STUC felt as though they had carried out the project to the best of their abilities and had done a good job;
- If they had received funding for year three they already had the companies who had had to be turned down this year ready and willing to participate;
- The Lead Partner from STUC noted that part of their success was that there was such a need for a worker safety advisor in the voluntary sector and although STUC had made a start, there was a lot more work still left to do.

8.23.2 Project details

**Project background**

**Type of sector:** Voluntary sector organisations

**Workplace:** 25

**Location:** Scotland
**Partners:** Scottish Council of Voluntary Organisations (SCVO), Employers in Voluntary Housing (EVH) and TUC Regional Education Service.

**WSA:** One WSA - No details of previous H&S qualifications provided. H&S background through TUC involvement and being a branch secretary of ASLEF. The WSA is currently undertaking an HNC course, to improve knowledge of the voluntary sector, and an IOSH qualification in H&S.

**Project aim**

The aim of the STUC’s project was to raise awareness of H&S and initiate and improve H&S dialogue in a number of voluntary sector organisations, building upon existing principles of partnership as promoted by the STUC.

**Partnership**

**Background**

The Lead Partner noted that they have worked together previously on other projects with their partners, however, relations had been slightly strained in the past. The WSA project provided an excellent opportunity to improve their relationship. As the project progressed relations improved dramatically.

**Partnership characteristics**

The partnership worked well and there were no problems reported. Relations with the partners improved over the course of the WSA scheme and both the Lead Partner and WSA were in regular contact with them through formal meetings and more informal telephone conversations. STUC met with SCVO on average every six weeks for their partnership forum at which they would discuss the WSA project. The WSA would report back to SCVO any issue that he came across relating to voluntary organisations.

**Contributions**

STUC have had the following contributions from their partners:

- Strategic advice;
- Guides on best H&S practice;
- The TUC Provided STUC with an on-line training course for employers and employees that recruited organisations could use;
- The TUC also provided STUC with an informal evaluation of their project.

**Project Outcomes**

**Partnership development**

In terms of partnership development there has been no expansion, instead there has been a focus on developing the existing partnership. The Lead Partner noted that the relations with their partners had grown significantly in strength during the WSA project and felt that both sides
were able to benefit from the partnership. No additional resources have come from outside the existing partnership. However, had STUC been rewarded funding for round 3 SCVO would have provided them with offices so that the WSA challenge fund could be spread further around Scotland.

**WSA development**

During the scheme the WSA has attended an EVH seminar and a care commission conference had gained a great deal of knowledge regarding the voluntary sector.

The Lead Partner felt strongly that one WSA is barely scratching the surface in terms of all the work still left to do and therefore had not made much of an impact in terms of how their WSA project has increased the pool of competent WSAs in the UK. The Lead Partner felt that one WSA wouldn’t really make that much difference.

The WSA felt that the WSA work last year has helped improve his communication and presentation skills.

**Demand for services & expansion of the scheme**

The Lead Partner noted that they were massively over subscribed for the WSA scheme and had to turn many businesses down because they had only budgeted to accommodate 25 organisations. There is demand for this work to continue, however, there is no funding available to do this. The Lead Partner noted that this was evidence that there is a real need for this type of work within the voluntary sector. The Lead Partner also noted that they had barely scratched the surface in terms of what needs doing in the voluntary sector. Therefore, although STUC did not win round 3 funding for the WSA scheme, they are hoping to continue to employ the WSA and to offer continued support to those businesses that need it. However, this support is limited due to no further funding from the WSA scheme.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

The WSA spent a lot of time actually talking and engaging with the employees themselves. Whilst walking around the various organisations he would talk to employees and ask them to complete the evaluation questionnaires. The WSA also gave several presentations to the workers to explain the importance of their role in H&S. The WSA tried to set up H&S committee meetings in all of the businesses. Presenting to the workers was one method the WSA used to encourage workers to volunteer to attend these meetings.

The types of activities that the WSA has been involved in include:

- Setting up H&S committee meetings;
- Facilitating discussions between workers and employers at H&S committee meetings;
- Giving presentations to workers and employers about the WSA scheme and the importance of workers being involved in H&S;
- Helping organisations to up-date their H&S policies;
- Getting workers involved in risk assessments:
• By handing out hazard identification sheets for them to complete;
• And by getting managers and workers to work together to come up with solutions to the hazards identified.

- Getting managers and workers to attend seminars (organised by the STUC) in which both employers and workers were encouraged to speak out about how workers have been involved in H&S;

- WSA shadowed night workers from community organisations who carry out street work in areas of Glasgow as part of developing risk assessment procedures, improving worker involvement and increasing awareness of hazards.

**Workplace outputs**

There have been a number of reported outputs following WSA intervention these include, for example:

- Managers and workers attending H&S committing meetings;
- Workers from deaf and deaf/blind organisation able to participate in H&S committee meeting by having signers present at the meeting;
- Workers being involved in risk assessments both by identifying hazards then working together with managers to find solutions to those hazards;
- H&S representatives nominated;
- Workers and managers taking on –line TUC H&S training courses;
- Workers showing more awareness of H&S by raising issues either through the H&S representative or through managers. As workers knowledge in H&S increased it is thought so has their confidence to ask questions and to raise issues;
- Workers have been giving presentations at the seminars organised by STUC to share good practice of H&S and worker involvement.

One of the successes identified by the Lead Partner has been the on-line learning courses attended by several of the organisations. The course covers basic health and safety law, risk assessment management of health and safety, workplace inspections, communication, problem solving and sources of information. The Lead Partner felt that this course will equip the different stakeholders with the ability to have input into the risk assessment process and participate in the proposed safety committee.

Another success story has come from one organisation that deals with providing support and accommodation for the deaf and deaf-blind. They have formed a health and safety committee meeting that is fully inclusive of its users, staff and management. The need of the users and their participation in the committee has been assured by the provision of signers at their meetings.
Desirable WSA competencies & approach

The Lead Partner felt that it was important for a WSA to be very “hands on”. They felt that a WSA needs to be able to enter an organisation and very quickly be able to analyse the situation and decide what support that they need and put the relevant procedures in place in which to do this. Another key skill that was identified by the LP was the ability to engage with managers and workers alike.

The key partner (Scottish Council of Voluntary Organisations) organisation was also interviewed as part of the end of year analysis. They reported that the key competencies of a good WSA are the ability to be able to communicate the importance of H&S; the ability to make regular contact with the organisation; being open and providing support and information on various aspects of H&S.

The barriers to the scheme

Generally there were very few barriers that STUC encountered as part of this scheme. They were over subscribed to the scheme right from the start, and therefore had no problem with recruitment. The WSA worked hard at engaging with businesses and therefore was able to engage with managers and workers and act as a facilitator in getting workers and managers to communicate about H&S.

The only slight problem that was noted by the LP was the administration. It was noted that there was quite a high demand of evaluation forms from both GSB and PNE. If STUC had won third year funding they noted that they would have employed someone to manage the forms.

Another barrier that was highlighted by the key partner was that one WSA was not enough for the scheme and that two would have been more effective. They felt as though one WSA wasn’t always able to respond to everything that the organisations needed.

The benefits the scheme can bring

The Lead Partner felt there was an obvious need for this kind of service as demonstrated by how the scheme had been enthusiastically embraced by the participating workplaces and how the scheme was over subscribed from the start.

8.23.3 Lessons learnt

The Lead Partner noted that due to the small number of organisations they were dealing with (25), they had to be realistic in that they were not able to make much of a difference. There are hundred’s of voluntary organisations out there and they were only targeting a very small proportion of them. The Lead Partner also commented that it was important to get the HSE involved.

As noted earlier the Lead Partner they found that there was quite a demand in terms of the evaluation forms needed from GSB and PNE. Therefore if they had received third year funding they would have someone other than the Lead Partner to co-ordinate the evaluation material.
8.24 UNION OF CONSTRUCTION ALLIED TRADES & TECHNICIANS (UCATT) – ROUND 2

8.24.1 Summary

**Key Inputs**
- A high level consolidation of the existing partnership despite a change of Lead Partner mid way through the scheme;
- New WSA recruited and new area of the country engaged (West Midlands);
- WSA focus on worker engagement through health and safety training and toolbox talks.

**Key Outcomes**
- Continued WSA development and training for workers to help them acquire their Construction Skills Certificate Scheme CSCS;
- H&S improvements in one organisation had a positive impact on their sub contractors;
- Strengthening of union trade association partnership and planned delivery of the scheme nationally post WSA scheme funding.

**Key Lessons learnt**
- The recognition of the major benefit of the partnership approach and the closer co-operation of union/worker with employer/trade association;
- The importance of supporting the WSA and planning the logistics (time spent on travel, paperwork etc) of the scheme;
- Likely that organisation would benefit from some ongoing support to H&S on the agenda.

8.24.2 Project details

**Project background**

- **Type of sector:** Construction
- **Workplace:** 90 Small construction firms (less than 25 employees) in the West and East Midlands using NFB members list.
- **Location:** The Midlands region of England. The East Midlands region was targeted last year, this year the West Midlands was identified as a new area for workplace recruitment.
- **Partners:** National Federation of Builders (NFB) / Construction Confederation (CC)
- **WSA:** Two
• NEBOSH General Certificate, 8 year H&S experience. Previous experience as a safety representative and trainer on construction equipment.

• TUC H&S qualifications (stage 3) and union representative (stage 2).

Project aim

The project aim was to use the Safe Working Activity Plan (SWAP) to identify improvements areas and develop an action plan to tackle H&S. The main methods to improve employee awareness and worker involvement are ‘tool box’ talks and H&S training which can help construction workers qualify for the Construction Skills Certificate Scheme (CSCS) card

Partnership

Background

The partnership of UCATT, NFB and CC is recent fairly new, although the same tripartite system was also used in round 1 of the WSA scheme. The emphasis for the first two years of the scheme has therefore been on consolidation and building the existing relations rather than on project expansion.

Partnership characteristics

The current Lead Partner describes the relationship with both NFB and CC as being good. They have worked more closely with NFB in terms of project delivery where as CC have been involved in more of an advisory role. It was observed that at the start of round 2, however, communication between NFB, who took over the responsibility of Lead Partner, and the WSA was less than desired. This was recognised as a resource issue because the individual acting as Lead Partner was prevented from fulfilling their role due to other commitments. At the end of quarter two Lead Partner responsibilities reverted back to UCATT who had a better support network and were more familiar with leading on this type of project. This led to an improvement in communication and support for the WSAs. It should be recognised, however, that the change of management is likely to have caused a period of unsettlement for the WSAs.

Other partner contributions

The partners have made the following contributions:

• Strategic advice;

• Providing lists of branch members and company names;

• Publicity for the WSA scheme.

---

29 The Construction Skills Certification Scheme (CSCS) is the industry standard to prove occupational competency and health & safety awareness.
**Project Outcomes**

**Partnership development**

The Lead Partner commented that there has been no expansion of the partnership instead there has been a focus on consolidating the existing relationship which has developed well over round 1 and 2 of the project. The aim is to take this strong base and to expand the scheme and look at how to make it sustainable after round 3. Any expansion of the partnership, for example, working with other trade associations would need to be carefully considered.

The NFB have been enthusiastic in their promotion of the scheme through their own publications which shows that they see the scheme and the collaboration with UCATT as a success story. Both NFB and UCATT have benefited by the mutual association of working together and it has helped to demonstrate to businesses the benefits of a partnership approach. No additional funding has been levered in from outside of the original partnership.

**WSA development**

Both WSAs have approximately 2/3 years prior experience in H&S as either safety representatives or working in a safety office. Both WSAs had a construction background.

The first WSA had worked on the project during the previous year and had been trained and received certification in the NEBOSH Diploma. Both WSAs received a number of additional training during round 2 to help them deliver the project, for example:

- IOSH managing safely training course (2 day free course);
- CITB safety awareness course (1 day);
- CITB site safety managers course - £500.

WSA two had received additional support regarding the:

- Construction skills certificate scheme (CSCS);
- Construction design regulations;
- HSE regulations.

The second WSA also recently passed the NEBOSH H&S General Certificate – although it has been understood that this has been self funded.

Evidence of additional training and the belief of the Lead Partner and WSAs suggest that the partnership has increased the competencies of both WSAs. The second WSA also felt that their communication skills and confidence had increased during the scheme. The first WSA felt that they were now more confident at approaching management. Both WSAs expressed that they had enjoyed their work and would want to continue in their current role.
**Demand for services & expansion of the scheme**

The UCATT partnership secured round 3 funding but is now working in a new geographic area. The change of location was because they felt they had exhausted employer demand in the region where they had originally been operating. In should be noted, however, that WSA two reported strong demand remained in the West Midlands where UCATT had operated just in round 2 and not in round 1.

UCATT currently deliver a similar scheme to the Roving Safety Representative\(^{30}\). Taking the lessons from both this scheme and the WSA scheme UCATT will look to develop a business plan to deliver a similar participatory approach on a national basis. They will identify ways to make this sustainable, for example by considering alternative funding methods.

During the early part of round 2 in an article NFB reported that one organisation scheme had been helped to improve their overall safety culture and working practice because they better understood H&S. They also reported that these improvements also had a positive impact on the H&S of their sub contractors.

**WSA activities & workplace inputs**

One of the key activities of the scheme and the WSAs work is to gain access to workers, to discuss H&S issues, to improve their awareness and try to get them adhering to safe working practice. One WSA reported that training also provided an opportunity to meet and consult with workers and frankly discuss H&S. Issues were then reported back to the employer. This led to a number of changes, for example the provision of better PPE, was prompted as a result of this worker feedback and demonstrated the advantages of consultation.

Getting initial buy-in to the scheme was seen as very important and overcoming initial scepticism to the scheme. This was successfully achieved by explaining the benefits of the scheme and through offering and delivering training on H&S. This is of benefit to both the employer and workers, for example: enabling workers to get their CSCS cards (http://www.cscs.uk.com). This card puts the employer in a stronger position when they are bidding for contracts, and workers are finding that it is becoming more of requirement in terms of their employment.

Initial visits are carried out with the employer to discuss the nature of the scheme and overcome any concerns over the service the WSAs provide.

Evidence suggests that concern over the scheme being used as a vehicle for union recruitment still exist, however, knowledge of the scheme (and what it can offer) has slowly permeated into the industry and these fears seem to less that in round 1. The WSAs provided the employer with a list of possible training options some of which they provide free some of which is offered by outside agents but at reduced rates, for example axle grinding.

\(^{30}\) ‘roving’ safety representatives provide representation to workplaces that lack their own and would be responsible for several employers in a given area or sector
As well as regular training methods toolbox talks are used as a method for discussing a pertinent issue with the workers with the aim of raising worker awareness and improving safe working practice.

Training and toolbox talks are delivered formally through presentations using Power-point and projectors.

Workers are also engaged in risk assessment and hazard identification sessions.

The WSAs also look to set up safety structures, for example, helping to appoint health & safety representatives - not necessarily unionised and where appropriate committees.

**Workplace outputs**

There have been a number of reported outputs following WSA intervention these include, for example:

- Representative appointed;
- H&S committees set up;
- Delivering on H&S training;
- CSCS certification;
- Better provision of safety equipment for workers;
- Assisting employers source specialist training;
- Changing both employer and worker attitudes to H&S.

**Desirable WSA competencies & approach**

The Lead Partner stated that the WSA should understand the partnership approach and that it is used to promote worker involvement. This WSA also requires good negotiation and representation skills and the ability to assess an organisation's current H&S position.

The Lead Partner felt that with more than one WSA it was not necessary to have both at NEBOSH level 3 but some qualification or equivalent to stage 2 would be necessary to gain credibility with employers.

The Lead Partner also felt it was important to have experience and motivation to make employers and workers carry out the work and therefore be careful not to act as a H&S consultant. What makes the WSA distinct from other approaches is to establish sustainable dialogue, therefore it’s about having the necessary competencies to be able to do this.

One WSA noted that for a successful approach it was important to be confident and have belief in the scheme. The second WSA stated that they felt a minimum level of H&S experience, a basic H&S qualification, plus negotiation and communication skills were essential qualities of a WSA. He felt it was not important to have an advanced H&S qualification or facilitation skills and only desirable to have sector specific skills and training skills.
**The barriers to the scheme**

The Lead Partner stated that one barrier to the scheme was the short term funding which made it difficult to recruit prior to the awards being made. This meant it had been difficult to get WSAs in place for the start of the scheme and had contributed to a slower than desired start to the project in round 2 although they had been lucky to find a suitable person who had the right experience and attributes.

Probably another barrier to the scheme as stated earlier were the issues regarding the Lead Partner role and support of the WSAs. Both WSAs commented that they would have liked more support and contact from those managing the scheme. They also spent a lot of their time recruiting employers through cold calling and mail shots which may have impacted on the time spent with beneficiary organisations. Both WSAs suggested that this may have happened because they were not provided with good leads from the NFB members list.

The recruitment drive was more successful than in round 1 possibly due to more referrals due to the success of the scheme spreading by word of mouth. Even so a number of employers remained wary that the scheme was used as a vehicle for union recruit. This is reflected in employer responses during the verification interviews and comments made by one of the WSAs. The other WSA stated that it would take time to break down these pre-conceptions and that they should recognise what strides had been made in the last two years partly as a result of the WSA scheme.

**The benefits the scheme can bring**

One WSA and the Lead Partner stated that a major benefit of the scheme had been the partnership approach and the closer co-operation of union/worker with employer/trade association. Overall both WSAs and Lead Partner were enthusiastic in their belief of the benefits of the scheme. This is partly illustrated by their success in securing three consecutive years of funding and the demand of beneficiary organisations to engage as demonstrated by their success in opening up a new sector in the West Midlands.

The Lead Partner also stated, however, that even though the scheme has been hugely beneficial, they were concerned about leaving the employers without future contact and suggested there may be scope for occasional pop in visits, for example attending H&S committee meeting, or calls to keep H&S on the agenda, otherwise there was a risk of a return to the normal.

**8.24.3 Lessons learnt**

In terms of the management of the scheme, one WSA stated that it was important to look at the Logistics of delivering the scheme, for example, planning travelling time. This is very important particularly when the scheme is being delivered in a large geographical area.

One WSA stated that they would have liked more guidance. They felt they were left to their own devices too much and would have liked feedback or some recognition of the work they were doing. This was echoed by the Lead Partner who stated that in hindsight they focused too much on delivery without recognising the need for better management of the WSAs. Their aim in the next round was to recognise this and provide better administrative support for the WSAs.
so they don’t need to worry about the paperwork and so on and therefore can get on with delivering the scheme. For round 3 they would schedule in more time for administration and spend time at the end of each month to go through paperwork.

The Lead Partner also noted that they need to improve planning by generating a schedule with milestones, which could be flexible depending on outcomes. They also stated that cost effectiveness of the scheme could be improved by recruiting on a bigger scale although there may be a pay off in reducing the time with each organisation. In terms of delivering the scheme one WSA felt it was important to take more of a ‘softly softly’ approach to win over those beneficiary organisations less willing to participate. This may have been down to the need to meet the recruitment targets. Instead of offering training too soon to get buy-in they would change their approach and spend more time breaking down initial scepticism and selling the idea of the scheme. In the long run this would improve access to workers and improve worker involvement in H&S.
9 APPENDIX D VERIFICATION INTERVIEWS - WORKER AND EMPLOYER

9.1 ROUND 1

9.1.1 Key findings

The key findings are that:

• 25% of the 88 workplaces contacted (all cited by WSAs) were unfamiliar with the WSA scheme and claimed no knowledge or awareness of it;

• 18% of the 88 workplaces contacted (cited by WSA) said they could not provide meaningful feedback on the WSA scheme because they had either one visit only or that the visits were incomplete.

In all cases the interviewer outlined the WSA project to prompt recall, checked the contact details and who was being spoken with.

Of the 57% who were able to recollect the visits and had completed their project, the feedback was broadly positive. Of the 8 projects for which full interviews could be completed, 5 had more positive feedback (namely SOHAS, British Glass, CRT, CVL and Health@Work Liverpool) whilst three had less positive feedback, two due to the conduct of the WSA visits (Enworks and Kirklees) and one due to language barriers (Park Royal).

Responses to rated questions from 31 employers and 20 workers indicated that:

• The WSA visits were considered to be beneficial and to have improved both H&S and worker involvement;

• The WSA were considered helpful, gave good advice etc, spending most of their time working with managers alone or with workers and managers together but rarely with workers alone;

• The level of involvement was between some and a lot;

• Only a minority had a H&S committee, relying instead mostly on individual consultation and some on employee representatives;

• They are likely to continue with worker involvement after the end of the WSA scheme without further WSA involvement.

In general, most interviewees talked about improvements to H&S systems and practices that had occurred as a result of the WSA involvement. There was also a general feeling that H&S awareness had increased in most companies. Many talked about increased employee responsibility but it is not clear if this means that formal responsibilities were placed on employees or they were actively engaged in working with managers to identify issues and resolve them.
A significant proportion of the interviewees did discuss instances where they felt worker involvement had been increased. This was generally due to workers increased understanding of why H&S was important and how they could influence it, whilst managers were also now open to the idea of employee input and collaborative working i.e. the WSA empowered workers to take a more active role in H&S processes and also made managers more open to using workers as a resource to be used in H&S.

It is not clear from the interviews how much of an impact the WSA had on managers’ openness. However, given that a common change was the placing of H&S as an agenda item in team meetings, this would suggest that managers were also changing how they approached the topic with workers i.e. that they were opening formal channels in addition to the informal ones that may or may not have previously existed.

9.1.2 Summary of response rates

GSB made telephone contact with a sample of workplaces cited in WSA project returns in order to provide a double check on the employers and workers view of the WSA visits and the outcome of these visits. The telephone interviews used a semi-structured questionnaire to allow employers and workers freedom to provide open-ended feedback, as well as posing some specific questions that respondents provide a rating form of response.

88 employers and workers were engaged by telephone across the WSA projects, from which 51 respondents were able to provide feedback on the WSA. It was not possible to contact workplaces in three of the projects due to lack of contact details.

Table 50 provides a summary of the contacts made, including:

- Total number of calls made to the workplaces for each WSA project;
- Interviews completed for employees and employers;
- The number of workplaces where no one could be found who was familiar with the WSA scheme;
- The number of workplaces who had contact with a WSA or started the project but did not complete it, for any reason.

The figure in brackets is the percentage of total number of responding organisations for that project.
Table 50: Summary of contacts with employers and workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING COMPANIES</th>
<th>CALLS MADE</th>
<th>CONTACTS MADE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS COMPLETED</th>
<th>UNFAMILIAR WITH WSA</th>
<th>WSA PROJECT NOT COMPLETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enworks</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17 (77%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>9 (41%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Glass</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 (86%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCATT</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health@Work Liverpool</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Royal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthworks Newham</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td>3 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHAS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 (88%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50 (57%)</td>
<td>22 (25%)</td>
<td>16 (18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In those cases where workplaces denied knowledge of the WSA scheme we:

- Checked that we were speaking to the person who is responsible for health and safety or who would have been responsible for this project;
- Explained in some detail about the WSA project and its aims, who their lead project was and what it would have involved.
- Re-checked the phone numbers through directory enquiries.

In these cases these organisations maintain that they have not been involved. The reasons cited by these respondents are given in Table 51. In six cases it was uncertain whether the correct workplace had been reached.
**Table 51: Details of statements from workplaces unfamiliar with WSA scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have had normal H &amp; S input from the lead organisation over the last year but unaware that any particular project has gone on. Have never heard of WSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved in WSA scheme, the only recent project they have participated in is the ‘passport to NHS’ scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar with WSA project at all. Have employed H &amp; S consultant over last 2 months as had no systems in place previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never heard of WSA project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in normal H &amp; S checks as stipulated by head office but is not aware of any additional project or scheme – nothing has changed from the normal input over the last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never heard of WSA project, have had no change in their H &amp; S input over past year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has never heard of WSA, is only person in the company, has no H &amp; S input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager has only been in post since Feb 2005, she is not aware of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All H &amp; S comes through head office, not familiar with WSA at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All H &amp; S comes through head office, not familiar with WSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New management in Jan this year, have not seen any WSA’s since then, new manager does not know about scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of any WSA project, does not think they have been involved. All H &amp; S comes through Penninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of WSA project, never heard of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have attended external H &amp; S courses through the partner but not familiar with the WSA scheme in any form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar with WSA scheme at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager has recently changed, new manager not familiar with scheme at all, although keen to improve H &amp; S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager has never heard of WSA, has had no involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have lots of H &amp; S input in different areas but none through Healthworks London and not familiar with WSA at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never heard of WSA or partner, have not had any external H &amp; S input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have never heard of WSA – have had no H &amp; S input over last year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While efforts were made to sample across all projects and also to weight the sampling relative to the projects scale, this was not possible due to the difficulty in getting responses from some people within the sampling period (April 2005). This may have led to a degree of self-selection, which could potentially bias the results in either direction. However, the interviewer found that trying to get agreement for interviewees to participate in this survey, companies for Kirklees and Healthworks London were the most problematic. Both of these projects had relatively high proportions of companies who were unfamiliar with the project, or who have started but not completed it.

Complete interviews were possible from organisations involved in eight of the projects, who were a mix of employers and workers. As far as possible both an employer and a worker was interviewed at each organisation. Typically an employer would be interviewed and then asked for someone in their organisation that the interviewer could carry out a corroborating interview. This meant that interviewees were effectively selected by the employer as someone who would be appropriate to speak to. This is likely to mean that we spoke to workers who had had involvement with the WSA. This therefore may not make them typical of other workers in their organisation but does make them more likely to have an overview of what the WSA did during visits to the organisation. A breakdown of the complete interviews carried out by project is provided in Table 52.

**Table 52: Number of interviews from respondents who could recall WSA scheme and where WSA visits were completed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>No. of organisations</th>
<th>No. of Employers</th>
<th>No. of workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enworks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health@Work Liverpool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthworks Newham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Royal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHAS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCATT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The vast majority of companies were micro, 13, or small, 14. There were four medium companies and one interviewee from a company of an unreported size.

### 9.1.3 Numeric responses

Some numeric responses were collected during the interviews. While this cannot be analysed statistically due to the small numbers of interviewees (20 workers and 31 employers), comments can be made on the apparent trends in the data. The results are shown in Table 53 to Table 61.

The results indicate that:

- Workers and employers agree the visits were beneficial and the WSA gave good advice on H&S and worker involvement, and both H&S and worker involvement got better;
- They did not want a different WSA nor did the scheme cause problems;
- They are likely to continue with worker involvement after the end of the WSA scheme without further WSA involvement;
- WSA usually work with managers alone or with managers and workers together, but rarely with workers alone;
- WSA tend to spend a bit more time on H&S than on how to involve workers.

However, they also indicate that workers have between some and a lot of involvement in H&S, not as much as possible. Also, most workplaces in the sample do not have a health and safety committee, instead consulting workers individually or via a representative. Only two (6%) workplaces reported trade union representation.

#### Table 53: Employer and worker evaluation of WSA visits (1 = Yes, benefited very much, 2 = Yes, benefited a little)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Employer Mode</th>
<th>Worker Mode</th>
<th>Employer average</th>
<th>Worker average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that workers in your organisation benefited from the WSA visits?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that your organisation as a whole benefited from the WSA visits?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 54:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. It has very much benefited our business (or will shortly)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. The benefits have probably been more than the costs to our business</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. The benefits to our business have been about the same as the costs of being involved / we are unsure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. The costs have probably been more than the benefits to our business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. The costs of being involved have been very much more than the benefits.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 55: Perception of the WSA (5 = strongly agree, 4= agree, 3 = no opinion, 2= disagree and 1 = strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Employer Mode</th>
<th>Worker Mode</th>
<th>Employer average</th>
<th>Worker average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our WSA was able to give good advice on H&amp;S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our WSA was able to give good advice on improving worker involvement in H&amp;S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would prefer a different person as our WSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation is likely to continue with improved worker involvement without further WSA involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WSA scheme caused increased unwelcome problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 56: Level of worker involvement in H&S (1 = None, 2 = a little, 3 = some, 4 = a lot, 5 = as much as possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Employer Mode</th>
<th>Worker Mode</th>
<th>Employer average</th>
<th>Worker average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much involvement do workers have in your workplace?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 57**: Who did the WSA work with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was most of the WSA’s time spent at your workplace …</th>
<th>Working with managers alone</th>
<th>Working with workers alone</th>
<th>Working with managers and workers together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 58**: WSAs focus on H&S vs. worker involvement (1 = much more on H&S, 5 = much more on worker involvement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you say the WSA focused more on H&amp;S or on worker involvement</th>
<th>Much more on H&amp;S</th>
<th>A little more on H&amp;S</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more on worker involvement</th>
<th>Much more on worker involvement</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 59**: How helpful was the WSA (1 = very helpful, 5 = unhelpful)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall how helpful (or unhelpful) would you say your WSA was</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Unhelpful</th>
<th>Very unhelpful</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question regarding the regularity of committee meeting was not applicable in most workplaces as few had a committee.

Table 60: Form of worker involvement – number of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Your employer (or senior manager) discusses possible health &amp; safety changes with workers individually</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. At least one worker has been identified as the representative for workers’ health and safety concerns</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Some workers in your organisation are represented by a trade union appointed health and safety rep.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Your organisation has a committee or working group that involves workers and a manager(s) in H&amp;S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Your health and safety committee or working group meets more often than once a year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 61: Improvement in H&S and worker involvement (1 = A lot worse, 3 = No change, 5 = a lot better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent have the following improved / got worse since the start of the Worker Safety Advisor visits?</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Health &amp; safety standards (e.g. more / better gloves, guards, help to return to work, better communication for lone workers, better policies etc.)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worker involvement in health and safety, (e.g. regular meetings, H&amp;S problem solving,, audits, risk assessments)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.4 General qualitative findings

Size of company and need for H&S committee

Many interviewees commented that it was not appropriate to have a separate H&S committee when they were in very small organisations. Some also commented that it was better not to as issues could be dealt with faster using agenda items in team meetings, or through informal channels within their organisation.

Impact of WSA characteristics

In general, interviewees were positive or very positive about their WSA rating them as competent in giving H&S and worker involvement advice. Some gave more personal descriptions as to why they found the WSA helpful and effective. These tended to relate to the personal characteristics of the WSA and their ability to communicate effectively with those he or she were dealing with.
**WSA personal characteristics**

“Approachable”, “not intimidating”, “encouraging”, “reassuring”, “dynamic and open to suggestions” were some of the words used to describe WSA who interviewees felt positively about.

The few that were rated poorly were described as “boring”, “couldn’t put knowledge across”, “didn’t motivate or inspire”, “communications difficult due to language/accent issues”

**Effective communication**

People were very positive about WSAs who they felt explained things in a way that was meaningful in their own organisational context – “good at explaining”, “gave relevant examples”, “down to earth and practical”.

**Impact of organisational context on influence of WSA**

Some employer interviewees commented that their organisation was looking to understand/improve their H&S and that the WSA intervention therefore became more powerful as it was working directly in line with the organisation’s (management) aims.

There were also interviewees who commented on the additional power that a “third party” brings to organisational change. One described how the WSA, as an outside expert, had got money from the organisation’s directors to enable changes. Two others said that workers listened more to the WSA than they would to a manager, and therefore were more responsive to learning about H&S requirements and taking them more seriously as a result.

**Language barriers**

A number of organisations said that levels of English were not good in all their workers and that this impacted on the degree of involvement the WSA had with them. In two cases (possibly the same WSA), this was addressed by the WSA arranging for training and H&S information to be provided in languages that could be well understood by the workforce. This approach was felt to be very effective in raising worker awareness.

**Agreed objectives between employer and WSA**

Four employer interviewees reported that objectives had not been agreed between them and the WSA. Two of these were Enworks WSAs. It is not clear if this was a common issue for Enworks WSAs. The two companies where this occurred with Enworks’ WSAs were not positive about the impact and benefit of the WSA in their organisation. Of the other two, one was very pleased with the outcome of the WSA’s actions, the other felt that there had not been large benefits.

This could indicate that it is important to agree objectives between a WSA and the company he or she is working with, to ensure all parties are clear as to the objectives and expected outcomes of the work.
**Perceived activity during intervention**

WSAs were generally described as being “much more focused” on H&S than worker involvement by employer interviews, and as being “focused about the same” on H&S and worker involvement by worker interviewees.

This suggests that there are different understandings as to the aims of the WSA when they are working in organisations. This may reflect either how the WSAs communicate their aims to different groups in the organisation, or that they deal differently with the two groups in terms of the focus of their activities with them. The second appears more likely given that several interviewees described the WSA as starting on improving H&S in their organisation, and worker awareness of H&S before starting to work on increasing worker involvement.

It is also possible that managers are more focused on improving H&S systems and practices, and see working involvement as a part of that, whereas workers tend to see worker involvement as a separate activity.

**9.1.5 Qualitative findings by project**

**British Glass**

Six interviews were carried out, covering a worker and employer from three different companies. All were positive about the WSA intervention and the WSA’s they had had, saying it had significantly benefited both employees and the organisation in general. All felt that improved worker involvement would continue following the intervention. All employers reported feeling more comfortable with their improved H&S understanding and systems.

All also described the process used by the WSA as one of improving understanding of H&S, and changing attitudes towards it in order to get workers to understand why they should get involved with influencing it, as well as seeking to improve the existing H&S processes, and ensure that worker involvement was improved.

The three companies interviewed varied widely in size. The smallest, with 1 full-time and two part-time workers described vividly the changes in worker perceptions about H&S and their personal responsibility and role in being involved in it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Employer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Worker</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Look at jobs in a different light”</td>
<td>“Eye opener….. much more aware now of our surroundings, the risks and hazards”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Workers didn’t previously know that they needed to be as involved”</td>
<td>“[WSA] told us H&amp;S requirements to enable us to take on responsibilities. …. Feel have more clout now… have been involved/given responsibility”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The owner also described the change in attitude of the workers being, in part, because they now understood that the requirements were being issued by the HSE/government rather than “the management”, and were, as a result, taken more seriously.

The mid-sized company reported the change in worker involvement which the employer and the employee reported as coming from the WSA working with managers and safety representatives. The change in worker involvement was felt to have come both from increasing workers awareness and willingness and ability to participate, but also from raising managers awareness of the role and usefulness of worker involvement.

The employer in the largest company was unusual in reporting he felt that the benefits did not outweigh the costs for the organisation. However, he said that he hoped this would change in the long run. This company was also where the worker interviewee was least positive about changes to worker involvement as a result of the WSA actions. While the employer saw the risk assessments, carried out by the WSA, as improving worker involvement in H&S, this was not the perception of the worker, who cited these as a H&S improvement and felt there had been no change in the level of worker involvement in H&S.

- Generally very positive about changes to worker involvement;
- Changes through improving understanding of H&S then getting increased engagement with issues from managers and workers;
- So WSA work to improve existing systems as part of increasing worker engagement.

**CRT**

Three employer and two worker interviews were carried out. All were generally positive about the impact the WSA had on worker involvement, health and safety performance, and the organisation in general.

One employer reported that she felt the scheme was not cost effective for the organisation, due to the amount of time that was required for relatively small benefits gained. However, the worker interviewee commented that a Board member had formally been given H&S responsibility and that employees were now much more aware of their own responsibilities for H&S and how to communicate concerns. She felt that this had lead to a great increase in the level of worker involvement in the organisation.

One employer interviewee reported that the WSA only worked with the manager. While this resulted in H&S improvements, and putting H&S as an agenda item for staff meetings, he felt that the focus had been on H&S rather than worker involvement and that there would not be an ongoing improvement in worker involvement following the WSA’s involvement.

In the third organisation, the WSA started working with the manager, and then spent time working with the management committee and all employees. In this organisation it was felt by the employer that the intervention led to great increases in the profile of H&S, particularly for the management committee when they learnt that they had ultimate responsibility for H&S even as volunteers. Both employer and worker interviewees felt the WSA gave good advice and was very helpful in giving his information in the organisation’s context, to ensure people could use it effectively. The employer reported that he expected improved employee consultation to
continue following this intervention. The worker interviewee reported that the WSA did not appear to explicitly discuss worker involvement, but acted to enable the workers to communicate more effectively – in part by ensuring it was an agenda item at staff meetings. She reported only slight benefits to H&S performance and worker involvement following the intervention.

- Significantly different views in one organisation between employer and worker. Employer much less positive about scheme in terms of cost/benefits. Worker very positive reporting significant increases in worker involvement through increased knowledge and confidence, appointment of Board member for H&S which raised profile;

- Another organisation, significant impact reported from a manager in making management team aware that they had ultimate responsibility for H&S even though volunteers.

**CVL**

Two employer interviews were carried out. Both were positive about the impact the WSA had had in their organisations, feeling that the benefits outweighed the costs to the organisation, the scheme did not cause increased problems, and that workers and the organisation as a whole had benefited. Both reported that they felt improved worker involvement was likely to continue without further WSA involvement.

It is not known if the WSA was the same person across the two companies. Both companies reported that they felt the WSA was able to provide them with good H&S and worker involvement advice. The WSA was seen as responsive to each organisation’s needs e.g. developing tailored training, fitting around managers’ schedules.

The reported impacts related to education of workers and managers and improved understanding of training needs, improved risk assessments through training and form redesign. In one organisation, the WSA led to the creation of a health and safety committee.

The WSA was felt to cover both H&S and worker involvement. One company commented that over the three visits they received, the advisor moved from focusing on H&S to purely dealing with worker involvement in the last visit. This could be seen as giving the workforce and managers competence to then engage effectively. The two respondents reported different balances of time allocation of the WSA of working with managers alone vs. workers alone vs. managers and workers together.

- Both interviewees were very positive overall about the scheme – “a breath of fresh air”, and expect improved worker involvement to continue;

- WSA covered H&S and worker involvement;

- H&S committee introduced in one organisation.

**Enworks**

Enworks have many more WSAs than any of the other projects. They are often people that have already been dealing with organisations on H&S. This appears to have lead to some confusion
as to the WSAs roles for interviewees, meaning they cannot differentiate WSA work from other H&S work that individual is doing in the organisation. Even when prompted in the interviews to consider work done by the WSA over the last year, some interviewees seem unaware of any altered approach/ focus to the individual’s work. A benefit of using people as WSAs who are already involved in H&S in organisations is that they already have working relationships and a degree of trust, making communication and influence easier.

Interviews were carried out with six companies with both employer and worker interviewees, four companies with employer interviewees, and one company with an worker interviewee. This is a total of 11 companies.

Of the four employer only interviews, responses were either mildly positive or neutral, saying there was no benefit to worker involvement. Of the two mildly positive interviewees, both felt that awareness of H&S had been improved; one talked about this being the case for employees the other as employers that had increased their awareness. Both felt that safety systems and standards had been improved and that employee compliance with the safety requirements had increased. One reported that the WSA had been strongly focused on improving worker involvement and that this had been achieved.

Two employer interviewees, with no corroboration from worker interviews, were neutral/negative about the WSA intervention. Both these interviewees said that objectives had not been agreed with the WSA, unlike most of the other organisations in this survey. One of the companies was very small, with three employees, and had only had one visit to date and was unsure if that was the end of the input. He felt that the WSA had increased the employer’s awareness of their H&S requirements and prompted changes to address safety failings identified by the WSA. However he felt that the WSA had not addressed worker involvement in any way, and referred to it in proposed changes. The WSA had only dealt with the interviewee as the workers did not speak good English. The other negative employer interviewee caveated his comments with the fact that the company was suffering from poor morale due to a redundancy programme and that this could have affected the impact and freedom of action for the WSA. However, the interviewee felt strongly that the WSA had not focused sufficient attention or time to dealing with the workers, and seeking to build up the communications and trust between management and shop floor workers which was one of the interviewee’s key expectations of the work. While the interviewee reported that the WSA was too focused on H&S rather than worker involvement, he also reported that workers feedback on H&S issues, which had been gathered via the WSA sending out a form to all employees, had influenced management priorities on dealing with H&S issues and that this had appeared to have a positive impact on morale, as workers could see that they were being listened to and their concerns dealt with. However, the interviewee did not view this as an example of worker involvement as he was wanting to get workers to do risk assessments as their “involvement”. The interviewee also commented that he would like to change the WSA as he felt a WSA with more experience could be more effective.

A worker interviewee for a manufacturing firm, with no employer corroboration interview, was very positive about the impact the WSA had had on the company as a whole and for the workers. He said that the WSA had lead to increased employee awareness and involvement in H&S through improved channels for communication and feedback, training and regular discussions of H&S at meetings. There had also been changes made to signage and risk assessments following the WSA’s involvement.
Interviews with organisations with both employer and worker interviewees were fairly consistent. Four of the six were very positive about the impact of the WSA intervention, the other two describing it as slightly beneficial for both the organisation and for workers. Of these four, two employer interviewees described it as very cost effective.

In three out of six of these organisations there was disagreement between the two people from each organisation as to whether or not there was an employee representative for H&S. This was not as common over the other projects reviewed.

All interviewees felt that H&S had been improved following the work of the WSA, both the systems and procedures and people’s understanding and awareness of H&S issues. Many talked about increased worker responsibility. However, some of the interviewees’ descriptions of what had changed suggested that while employees’ responsibilities may have been increased following changes made on the recommendation of the WSAs, these increased responsibilities may not be indicative of increased worker involvement per se but of an increase in the required compliance to H&S procedures e.g. completing risk assessments. Some interviewees, both employer and workers, did describe explicit examples of increased worker involvement, or the opportunity for it – such as setting up a H&S committee and formally placing H&S on team meeting agendas.

In one organisation, changes that were perceived to have occurred as a result of the WSA’s intervention were quite different. The employer felt that general awareness and risk assessment had increased and that he, as the owner, was now more comfortable that he did have good H&S systems in place. The employee agreed that awareness of H&S had been improved – “opened everyone’s eyes to H&S issues” but said that it had led the employer to recognise their responsibilities and to provide PPE for workers. Both employer and employee reported that communications on H&S had been improved. This was an organisation where the employee thought that there was an employee representative and the owner said that there was not.

The WSAs were generally seen to have worked with managers and workers individually and also both together in a group. The message that was given to workers is that they should get involved with H&S and take responsibility for it.

- Using people as WSAs who already have links with organisations as H&S advisors may have benefits – if clear scope of work;
- Less positive comments from employer interviewees who said objectives not agreed with WSA;
- Apparently larger proportion of interviewees disagreed on employee consultation arrangements in their organisations than in other projects – shows lack of communication/shared understanding?
- WSAs resulted in improvements to H&S practices and systems – but not all related to worker involvement.

**Health@Work Liverpool**

There is only one WSA in the Health@Work Liverpool scheme.
Interviews were carried out with managers and workers in two organisations. All interviewees were very positive about the impact the WSA had had in their organisation and all felt that it would have a lasting positive effect on the level of employee consultation in the future.

One of the organisations only had a manager and one full-time day employee, with 6-7 part-time evening workers. Here the impact was felt to be very strong as the WSA has given both the manager and the employees the ability to understand the issues they needed to deal with and the knowledge of how to access information and resources to enable them to do that, as well as ensuring that all employees had a good understanding of how they could actively participate in H&S management in the organisation and an appreciation of why it was worth doing. The focus appears to have been on enabling the full-time employee to ensure that the part-time employees were actively involved. A number of practical changes to the workplace, such as signage and cleaning, were also mentioned as examples of improvements to the H&S of the workplace that had also occurred.

In the second organisation, a notable feature was the very different responses given by the manager and employee about the employee consultation arrangements. The employee reported that none of the formal mechanisms for worker consultation were used by the company. The manager reported they were all used, except for Union appointed H&S representatives. In this company the manager reported that the company was starting to review its H&S practices with the aim of improving them, and that the WSA had been very helpful in making that productive. In particular in getting the release of money from Directors to support the changes was made easier as the recommendations were coming from an external third party. Both the employer and the employee described employee attitude changes and behavioural changes that had happened as a result of the WSA’s actions. This is both in terms of the safety behaviours that are now being used which were not previously, and different levels of employee involvement – “Staff are encouraged to raise issues... and are taking on more responsibility and action when needed”.

- Very strong on employee attitude and competence changes, enabling them to be more effectively involved in the workplace H&S;
- Seen as very positive business benefit by both organisations;
- Difference in reported consultation arrangements in one company - lack of knowledge? Misreporting?

**Kirklees**

Six interviews were carried out covering four organisations. Two interviews were with employers only and four which had an employer and worker from two organisations.

The two employer only interviews suggested that their WSAs had focused on working with the manager of the organisation only, and had been focused on H&S improvements rather than promoting worker involvement. Both reported no change in worker involvement following the intervention. The reported changes related to improvements to the H&S systems, but at a management level; one reported the documentation of the existing informal H&S systems, the other reported improved risk assessments that were being done by the manager. There were no reported efforts to involve workers in the development of either of these changes.
In the other two organisations there were some significant differences in the comments made by employer and worker in terms of the perceived impact of the WSA interventions. In both organisations the managers interviewed saw the WSA’s main impact as being one of helping them, as managers improve their previously poor H&S systems and procedures by formalising them. Neither organisation had strong formal systems in place before. One rated the changes as of minor benefit to employees and organisation, the other as of significant benefit to both employees and organisation in terms of the H&S standards and changes. Both felt that they already had good employee involvement as they were both very small organisations and dealt with H&S through individual consultations. One of the managers queried the competency of the WSA they dealt with; feeling that they had an “industrial” focus which was not appropriate for their organisation which had more “people” issues – having a manager and two part-time workers who were based at home.

Both the employees interviewed in these two organisations felt that worker engagement had increased following the WSA intervention. Both said that they had had no contact with the WSA. One reported that a safety representative had been appointed (however it would appear this position existed “informally” before from her other comments) and that employees now formally discussed H&S as part of their weekly meeting. The other reported that she felt there was an increased awareness of H&S issues as a result of the WSA.

- Generally less positive overall than many other projects about WSA benefits for workers and organisation as a whole;
- Appear to have more of a focus on improving H&S systems than directly encouraging worker involvement;
- Tend to work with managers only to achieve changes.

**Park Royal**

Five interviews were carried out with people from three organisations. There is one WSA working on the Park Royal project.

There were comments made that the WSA was not good at communicating effectively with the companies – one cited him as being difficult to understand due to language/accent, another described communication as difficult and that he, as an individual, put the information across in a boring, uninteresting manner. Some interviewees also said that they would prefer to have another person their WSA, which was very unusual. This is very different to most of the other interviewees who have been very positive about their WSAs. There was also a degree of doubt in two employer interviewees as to whether the individual had appropriate H&S skills and knowledge; the smallest company feeling that the WSA made inappropriate suggestions for a company of their size and resources.

In the two larger manufacturing companies (employees of 200+ and 80+) language differences were seen as significant barriers to communicating with workers about H&S effectively. The WSA addressed this in both companies – arranging literature to be translated and training courses to be provided in several languages. This was felt to help significantly in raising employees’ awareness of H&S.
In both companies the WSA was seen to focus on working with employees, and not just with managers. However it is not clear from the responses how far managers felt that the improved consultation was due to receiving feedback from the WSA on reported employee issues, or due to changes in actual levels of consultation. One company reported that it had appointed a H&S representative as a result and are intending to start a H&S committee, but also commented that it was possible that these worker involvement actions could “fall by the wayside” in practice.

Like interviewees in several other projects one organisation, which is relatively new and felt it was lacking H&S knowledge and systems, described the main benefits of the WSA intervention as being to “open the managers eyes” to H&S issues and what they needed to do to manage it effectively as a company.

The smallest company, with 12 employees, felt there had been slight benefits for workers and the organisation overall. The WSA had been very helpful in helping managers focus on what needed doing and getting it done on H&S. However, the focus appeared to have been on H&S improvements rather than worker involvement, but it did include improved arrangements for employee feedback and a safety representative was appointed. However the employer interviewee commented that the company had not allowed employees to participate in the risk assessment training as had been anticipated by the WSA. This could have been a way to give the employees sufficient knowledge that they could take on responsibility and increase their involvement. Both interviewees reported improved employee awareness of H&S, but the worker attributed this to increased availability of information visible to workers.

- WSA rated much less positively than on other projects but still interventions seen as beneficial to companies and generally to workers. But large part of positive rating due to improvements to H&S rather than worker involvement;
- Not clear if smallest company restricted WSA degree of impact on worker involvement by managers not allowing employee training;
- Employee representative appointed;
- Value of providing translated material and training for workers who do not have English as a first language, to raise their awareness of H&S issues.

SOHAS

Seven interviews were carried out with four organisations. All felt that the benefits outweighed the costs and that the intervention had been very positive for both the workers and the organisation as a whole.

Two of the organisations interviewed were linked to each other and shared a building with another two organisations. The WSA worked with H&S representatives from each of the four organisations and the overall manager and building caretaker, to develop a plan to be rolled out through all the organisations. The plan was a “bottom-up” approach, with the aim of ensuring all workers were aware of their responsibilities and therefore get their involvement. Interviewees reported that there had been 2-3 meetings with the WSA, which is at the low end across the projects. Both reported improvements in H&S procedures and documentation, increased awareness in their organisations. One employer interviewee talked about the benefits in changing managers’ attitudes to H&S by informing them of their obligations. This had led to
an increased commitment to H&S issues and systems in his organisation. The expectation was that the bottom-up approach would also lead to increased worker commitment and involvement through an improved understanding of their responsibilities. In the second organisation, both the employer and worker interviewee said a key change was that H&S was now put ‘firmly’ on the agenda at team meetings, enabling workers to have more involvement through increased opportunities for discussion. The worker also said that individuals had been allocated specific areas of responsibility.

The employer interviewee, from a small voluntary organisation, stressed that while worker involvement had improved through the WSA’s activities, this could also be linked to other H&S changes that were happening at the same time. In this organisation the workers involvement appeared to be in the form of the WSA calling a meeting of all members of the organisation and facilitating a discussion between manager and workers. H&S policies and procedures had also been changed over this period, making them more formalised. A key to the value of the WSA for this company was their experience and knowledge of other small, similar organisations which meant that the advice was appropriate. The issue of administrative load in a small organisation was raised, as revising and therefore retyping the H&S policies and procedures had been a significant issue for this organisation.

The fourth organisation again reported improvements in H&S practices and policies and also overall employee awareness, which would “set the ball rolling” on H&S issues in the future. Behavioural changes were also reported – employees rotating responsibility for fire equipment checks. While the WSA had facilitated one meeting with all members of the organisation, the worker interviewee commented that it would be helpful to have more all member meetings to continue progress. It was not clear if this was planned.

- H&S practices and procedures, and worker involvement all felt to be improved following WSA intervention;

Knowledge/experience of type of organisation seen as very helpful in WSA – enabling practical advice to be given.

9.1.6 Conclusions

Cost-effectiveness of the Challenge Fund in building WSA capacity

Companies generally felt the benefits were greater than the costs for them. None felt that the costs outweighed the benefits.

To what extent does the work of the WSAs lead to a change in the employers’ and workers’ attitudes towards worker involvement?

Majority are pleased that employee awareness in higher and therefore improved H&S practices. Some cases seem to be clear increases in involvement and opportunities for involvement (agenda item at meetings etc.). Not always clear where changes – especially relating to increased understanding of responsibilities – is management feeling employees are now doing what they should be doing, or whether managers are actively involving workers in decision making etc.
**To what extent does the work of the WSA lead to increased health and safety knowledge and competence amongst workers and employers?**

Generally interviewees say that WSA has improved/greatly improved their knowledge and competence – including improvements to systems and practices. There was a sense of greater confidence in some managers that they understand what they need to do. WSA input was particularly welcome where managers/businesses not clear on requirements and looking to improve/put something in place.

**To what extent does the work of the WSAs lead to a self-sustaining increase in (arrangements for) worker involvement in health and safety?**

Most interviewees responded positively to question as to whether further worker involvement would continue after WSA intervention. However, often not clear in the interviews as to what actions had been taken, so not known how significant an impact on WI the WSA had had (mainly because questions didn’t get measure of change over intervention).

Where changes such as “H&S now firmly an item on team meeting agenda” were cited, one could assume that this would give opportunities for self-sustaining increases. This was the most common formal process change for WI that was cited.

However, where consultation exercises were facilitated by the WSA either as group meetings or via one-to-ones with workers and then findings fed back to manager, it is harder to see how this will necessarily carry on without further input.

A number of interviewees describe how the confidence and knowledge of workforce has increased, also their understanding of why they should be involved in H&S. Hopefully this, along with managers that are also more confident in their H&S management, should enable on-going dialogue about H&S at a level which is productive for both sides. This then could be directly attributed to the WSA interventions, albeit they appeared initially to focus on increasing H&S knowledge and standards in the organisation in their work.

**To what extent does the work of the WSAs lead to improvements in health and safety arrangements in workplaces, either directly or via worker involvement prompted by the WSA?**

This seems to be one of the main outcomes of this work. All or almost all of the respondents cited improvements to H&S – changes to procedures, signage, increased awareness and understanding, changes in worker and managers behaviours and risk assessments etc.

There is a question as to how far in some of these organisations changes needed to be made / a H&S system needed to be put in place before a WSA could start to involve workers in improvements with managers.

**To what extent does prior employer attitude and expectation of the project affect the outcome?**

Employer interviewees often commented on how helpful the WSA was because they were concerned about their H&S/ knew they didn’t know about it. This appeared to make it easier for the WSA to get managers attention/ org resources.
Also a couple of comments about how WSA being a 3rd party/external person meant they had more impact in getting resources and getting workers to listen to their messages on H&S.

**Do the types of activities the WSAs engage in affect effectiveness?**

In the few instances where comments were negative about a WSA their technical competence was queried. There were also negative comments when it was felt that a WSA did not have relevant experience to the type of company/activity they were dealing with. Would suggest that technical competence and relevant background/ability to translate to different organisational settings is important in being credible and making suggestions that organisation will act on.

In a sizeable proportion of the case studies managers commented that the H&S systems needed changing before anything else could be done. Difficult to “prove” either way as to whether worker knowledge has to be increased in order to get willingness to engage / be involved. However, it probably assists as it gives all a common framework and “language” in which to discuss issues – degree of “neutrality”/factual basis if is lack of trust between managers and workers. – also issues of the confidence of individuals getting involved.

Do the projects achieve their project specific objectives?

Overall, the majority of interviewees were happy with their experience and felt it was positive in some way. Very few commented on whether it had met the agreed objectives at the start of the intervention.

**What are the causes of any problems or difficulties during the WSA projects?**

Communication problems between WSA and managers/workers – either due to language/accent, or poor at communicating knowledge in a way that is meaningful to the organisation/people WSA is dealing with.

WSA becomes the “voice” of the workers - in a few cases the WSA appeared to talk to workers then tell management what the issues were. It is not clear whether consultation would happen again without the WSA doing it.

**9.2  ROUND 2**

**9.2.1   Key findings**

The key findings are that:

- 31% of 118 workplaces contacted were unfamiliar with the WSA scheme and claimed no knowledge or awareness of it.

- 7% of the 146 workplaces contacted (cited by WSA) said they could not provide meaningful feedback on the WSA scheme because they either had one visit only or were still awaiting their first visit;

---

31 Please note. This figure does not include UCATT in the calculation of organisations unfamiliar with the scheme because the interviewer used a contact list provided by NFB than included members who were not involved in the WSA scheme.
• 3% of the 146 workplaces contacted were aware of the scheme and had been contacted by a WSA but decided not to partake in the scheme.

A total of eight (5%) of the 146 workplaces contacted were not willing to be interviewed.

In all cases the interviewer outlined the WSA project to prompt recall, checked the contact details and who was being spoken with.

Of the 47% who were able to recollect the visits and could provide a full interview, the feedback was broadly positive. Of the 11 projects for which full interviews could be completed, only 1 had less positive feedback due to a belief that involvement in the project was dependent upon union membership.

Responses to rated questions from 40 employers and 28 workers indicated that:

• The WSA visits were considered to be beneficial and to have improved both H&S and worker involvement;

• The WSAs were considered helpful, gave good advice etc, spending most of their time working with managers alone or with workers and managers together but rarely with workers alone;

• H&S standards and worker involvement have improved a lot since the start of the WSA visits;

• Almost half had a H&S committee which meets more often than once a year;

• They are likely to continue with worker involvement after the end of the WSA scheme without further WSA involvement.

In general, most interviewees talked about improvements to H&S systems and practices that had occurred as a result of the WSA involvement and most cited examples of changes that have been made. There was also a general feeling that H&S awareness had increased in most companies and the scheme had prompted people to think more about H&S. Many talked about increased employee responsibility but it is not always clear if this meant that formal responsibilities were placed on employees or whether they are actively engaged in working with managers to identify issues and resolve them.

A significant proportion of the interviewees did discuss instances where they felt worker involvement had been increased. This was generally due to workers increased understanding of why H&S was important and how they could influence it, while managers were also now open to the idea of employee input and collaborative working i.e. the WSA empowered workers to take a more active role in H&S processes and also made managers more open to using workers as a resource to be used in H&S.

It is not clear from the interviews how much of an impact the WSA had on managers’ openness. However, given that a common change was either setting up a H&S committee or the placing of H&S as an agenda item in team meetings, this would suggest that managers were also changing how they approached the topic with workers i.e. that they were opening formal channels in addition to the informal ones that may or may not have previously existed.
9.2.2 Summary of response rates

GSB made telephone contact with a sample of workplaces cited in WSA project returns in order to provide a double check on the employers and workers view of the WSA visits and the outcome of these visits. The telephone interviews used a semi-structured questionnaire to allow employers and workers more freedom to comment on the WSA scheme.

146 employers and workers were contacted from which 68 respondents were able to provide feedback on the WSA scheme.

Table 62 provides a summary of the contacts made, including:

- Total number of calls made to the workplaces for each WSA project;
- Interviews completed for employees and employers;
- The number of workplaces where no one could be found who was familiar with the WSA scheme;
- The number of workplaces who were aware of the scheme but who had received either one visit or were still awaiting their first visit;
- The number of workplaces who were aware of the scheme and had been contacted but were either still awaiting visits or were not partaking;
- The number of workplaces who were aware of the scheme but not willing to be interviewed.
### Table 62: Summary of contacts with employers and workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>BID</th>
<th>CALLS MADE</th>
<th>CONTACTS MADE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS COMPLETED</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS NOT COMPLETED</th>
<th>UNFAMILIAR WITH WSA SCHEME</th>
<th>AWARE OF SCHEME BUT NOT COMPLETED (E.G., ONLY 1 VISIT)</th>
<th>AWARE OF SCHEME BUT HAD NO VISITS</th>
<th>AWARE OF SCHEME BUT NOT PARTAKING</th>
<th>NOT WILLING TO BE INTERVIEWED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundworks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health@Work Liverpool</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohas</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCATT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>801</strong></td>
<td><strong>302</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>68 (47%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>36 (32%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 (5%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 (2%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 (3%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 (5%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Please note. This figure does not include UCATT in the calculation of organisations unfamiliar with the scheme because the interviewer used a contact list provided by NFB than included members who were not involved in the WSA scheme.
In those cases where workplaces stated no knowledge of the WSA scheme GSB:

- Checked that we were speaking to the person who is responsible for health and safety or who would have been responsible for this project;
- Explained in some detail about the WSA project and its aims, who their lead project and WSA were and what the scheme would have involved.
- Re-checked the phone numbers through directory enquiries.

In these cases these organisations maintain that they have not been involved. Some of the reasons cited by these respondents are given in Table 63

**Table 643: Details of statements from workplaces unfamiliar with WSA scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Never heard of WSA scheme. Only heard of ‘better health at work’ scheme”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Management has recently changed. New manager knew nothing about the scheme”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Never heard of WSA Challenge Fund or any H&amp;S initiative or Lambeth College”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Never heard of WSA scheme”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Not heard of scheme or been approached. Not involved”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Not had any WSA visits, not aware of scheme”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Not linked with partner, never heard of WSA”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“New manager in October 2005, never heard of project. Could have received some information in the post but not sure, never been contacted directly by anyone”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Never heard of WSA Challenge Fund or the scheme”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Not heard of ‘Challenge Fund’ or aware of pilot project. They receive regular mail shots from NFB but not heard of scheme or been approached about getting involved”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete interviews were possible from a sample of employers and workers in each of the 11 projects. While efforts were made to weight the sampling relative to the projects scale, this was not possible due to the difficulty in getting responses from some companies. The interviewer found that trying to get agreement for interviewees to participate in this survey; companies for Lambeth College and UCATT were the most difficult. It should be noted, however, that the contact list for UCATT also included organisations who although members of NFB were not engaged on the scheme. Both of these projects had a very high proportion of companies who were unfamiliar with the project. Out of the 34 contacts made for Lambeth College, 26 (76%) were unfamiliar with the scheme, whilst for UCATT out of the 28 contacts made, 19 (67%) were unfamiliar with the scheme. In addition both Kirklees and FMB also had a relatively high
proportion of companies unfamiliar with the scheme; 25% of contacts made in Kirklees and 29% of FMB contacts were unfamiliar with the project.

Efforts were made to interview both an employer and a worker from the same company. However the interviewer found that in most companies it was not possible to attain interviews for both. It was often the case that the only person available for an interview was the person who was most familiar with the scheme, whether this was the employer or a worker responsible for H&S.

There were however a small number of companies where it was possible to interview both an employer and worker. Typically the employer was interviewed first and then asked for someone in the company who could carry out a corroborating interview. This meant that interviewees were effectively selected by the employer as someone appropriate to speak to. This is likely to mean that we spoke to workers who had had involvement with the WSA. This therefore may not make them typical of other workers in the organisation but does make them more likely to have an overview of what the WSA did during visits to the organisation. A breakdown of the complete interviews carried out by project is provided in Table 65

**Table 665:** Number of interviews from respondents who could recall WSA scheme and where WSA visits were completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>No. of organisations</th>
<th>No. of organisations</th>
<th>No. of organisations</th>
<th>No. of organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundworks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health@Work Liverpool</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCATT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2.3 Numeric responses

Some numeric responses were collected during the interviews. While this cannot be analysed statistically due to the small numbers of interviewees (40 employers and 28 workers), comments can be made on the apparent trends in the data. The results are shown in Table 66 to Table 74.

The results indicate that:

- Workers and employers agree the visits were very beneficial and the WSA gave good advice on H&S and worker involvement;
- They did not want a different WSA nor did the scheme cause problems;
- They are likely to continue with worker involvement after the end of the WSA scheme without further WSA involvement;
- WSA usually work with managers alone or with managers and workers together, but rarely with workers alone;
- WSA tend to spend a little more time on H&S than on how to involve workers;
- Almost half the workplaces have a H&S committee which meets more often than once a year;
- Workers have a lot of involvement in H&S, and H&S standards and worker involvement has got a lot better since the start of the WSA visits in most workplaces.

Also, in the majority of workplaces, workers are consulted individually on H&S and in almost all workplaces there is an H&S representative. Only 7 workplaces reported trade union representation.

Table 676: Employer and worker evaluation of WSA visits (1 = Yes, benefited very much, 2 = Yes, benefited a little)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Employer Mode</th>
<th>Worker Mode</th>
<th>Employer average</th>
<th>Worker average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that workers in your organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefited from the WSA visits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that your organisation as a whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefited from the WSA visits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 687:** Employer view of benefits of being involved in the scheme – number of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>It has <strong>very much</strong> benefited our business (or will shortly)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>The benefits have probably been more than the costs to our business</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>The benefits to our business have been about the same as the costs of being involved / we are unsure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>The costs have probably been more than the benefits to our business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>The costs of being involved have been <strong>very much</strong> more than the benefits.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 698:** Perception of the WSA (5 = strongly agree, 4= agree, 3 = no opinion, 2= disagree and 1 = strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Employer Mode</th>
<th>Worker Mode</th>
<th>Employer average</th>
<th>Worker average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our WSA was able to give good advice on H&amp;S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our WSA was able to give good advice on improving worker involvement in H&amp;S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would prefer a different person as our WSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation is likely to continue with improved worker involvement without further WSA involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WSA scheme caused increased unwelcome problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 69: Level of worker involvement in H&S (1 = None, 2 = a little, 3 = some, 4 = a lot, 5 = as much as possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Employer Mode</th>
<th>Worker Mode</th>
<th>Employer average</th>
<th>Worker average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much involvement do workers have in your workplace?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 700: Who did WSA work mostly with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was most of the WSA’s time at your workplace spent …</th>
<th>Working with managers alone</th>
<th>Working with workers alone</th>
<th>Working with managers and workers together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 71: WSAs focus on H&S vs. worker involvement (1 = much more on H&S, 5 = much more on worker involvement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you say the WSA focused more on H&amp;S or on worker involvement</th>
<th>Much more on H&amp;S</th>
<th>A little more on H&amp;S</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more on worker involvement</th>
<th>Much more on worker involvement</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 722:** How helpful was the WSA (1= very helpful, 5 = unhelpful)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall how helpful (or unhelpful) would you say your WSA was</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Unhelpful</th>
<th>Very unhelpful</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 733:** Form of worker involvement – number of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of worker involvement</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Your employer (or senior manager) discusses possible health &amp; safety changes with workers individually</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. At least one worker has been identified as the representative for workers’ health and safety concerns</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Some workers in your organisation are represented by a trade union appointed health and safety rep.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Your organisation has a committee or working group that involves workers and a manager(s) in H&amp;S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Your health and safety committee or working group meets more often than once a year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 744:** Improvement in H&S and worker involvement (1 = A lot worse, 3 = No change, 5 = a lot better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent have the following improved / got worse since the start of the Worker Safety Advisor visits?</th>
<th>Employer Mode</th>
<th>Worker Mode</th>
<th>Employer Average</th>
<th>Worker Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Health &amp; safety standards (e.g. more / better gloves, guards, help to return to work, better communication for lone workers, better policies etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Worker involvement in health and safety, (e.g. regular meetings, H&amp;S problem solving, audits, risk assessments)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2.4 General qualitative findings

Most commonly cited benefits of WSA

The most commonly cited improvement in H&S procedures was implementation of risk assessments. Some interviewees who cited improvements regarding risk assessments commented that ‘risk assessments were more regular and more formalised now’ and that they had ‘upgraded their current procedures’. The most commonly cited improvement in worker involvement was that awareness had been raised amongst employees and better channels of communication opened. H&S is now a standard item on the agenda at regular staff meetings for the majority of those interviewed, whilst almost half had in addition, set-up H&S committees.

Size of company and need for H&S committee

Many interviewees commented that it was not appropriate to have a separate H&S committee when they were in very small organisations. It was more common for these organisations to discuss H&S at regular team meetings or in some cases it was found that H&S is only discussed ‘as and when’ needed.

Size of the company and impact of WSA scheme

Interviewees from a few larger organisations, namely housing associations commented that they generally had good H&S systems in place prior to the WSA and that the scheme may better serve those organisations who are new or who do not have well established H&S systems in place.

Impact of WSA characteristics

In general, interviewees were positive or very positive about their WSA rating them as competent in giving H&S and worker involvement advice. Some gave more personal descriptions as to why they found the WSA helpful and effective. These tended to relate to the personal approach taken by the WSA and their ability to communicate effectively with those whom they were dealing with.

WSA personal approach

“Approachable”, “non-pressurising”, “hands-on”, “down to earth”, “practical focus” and “tailor-made” were some of the words used to describe WSA approaches which interviewees felt positive about. Interviewees were also very positive about WSAs who made themselves easy to contact and who were prompt at responding to queries.

Effective communication

People were very positive about WSAs who they felt were able to communicate effectively – “good at building rapport”, “good facilitator”, “information well presented”.

The few who were rated communication poorly described the problems as the WSA being “a bit insensitive”, “boring” and “communications were difficult due to their accent”.
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**Language barriers**

The level of English spoken and/or understood by the workforce seemed to be an issue for the Lambeth College organisations as the majority of these are Chinese Restaurants. In the initial approach of the interview it was difficult to communicate the reason for the phone call. From those restaurants where there was no awareness of the scheme or no visit from a WSA, several of the staff spoken to seemed uneasy when ‘health and safety’ was mentioned as they assumed we were ‘checking up on them’.

**Overcoming the barriers**

From the 3 employers that were interviewed from Chinese restaurants 2 asserted that the WSA spent time instructing them regarding health and safety and thereafter communicated this knowledge to their workforce in order to overcome the language barrier.

**9.2.5 Qualitative Findings by project**

**BPI**

There were two employer and two worker interviews conducted across 3 organisations.

Both an employer and worker interview was conducted in one organisation and both agreed that they very much benefited from the scheme and found the WSA very helpful. In particular they spoke about increased awareness of H&S in the workplace and how a H&S committee has been set-up. The worker interviewed is a committee member who has found that since the commencement of committee meetings their approach to H&S is more formalised and people now know who to report different H&S concerns to.

An employer and worker interview was carried out in two other companies. Both also report that they very much benefited from the WSA visits and found the WSA very helpful. One company found the scheme helpful in terms of helping to clarify that there current H&S policies and strategies were correct. However they reported no change in the amount of worker involvement, reasons being that the company is small and employees work shifts so it’s not feasible to have H&S meetings. The other company spoke of both improved H&S controls and also worker involvement and praised the WSA for the training provided. The interviewee also commented that they found the WSA scheme better than the company they paid to do H&S training.
Four employer and two workers were interviewed from five organisations.

Four out of the six interviewees said that the workers only benefited a little from the WSA visits but four out of the six also stated that they thought the organisation as a whole very much benefited from the visits.

The WSA visits have had a positive impact on the organisations interviewed with only one employer saying that the impact was minimal; this being due to them already having health and safety measures in place. Another employer said that because they often win Council contracts their health and safety standards are already kept high. One employer said that the increased health and safety training contributes to a more professional appearance for the company which can increase business.

Half of those interviewed said that the WSA focussed the same amount of time on worker involvement as on health and safety. Two of the remaining three said that much more time was focussed on health and safety. But all thought that the balance between health and safety training and worker involvement was good.

Most rated the WSA as ‘quite helpful’, with one employer commenting that his down to earth approach was good. Only one worker reported that they would prefer a different person as their WSA.

Only one employer said that they had a health and safety committee or working group set up, the common approach amongst those interviewed is that health and safety issues are discussed “as and when needed”.

It was reported that health and safety control measures have specifically improved in two of the organisations. Interviewees reported that better clothing and equipment is now used.

The workers stated that they’re more aware of health and safety issues and their own responsibilities regarding health and safety. Employers also stated that the awareness amongst the workforce regarding health and safety had increased.

Groundworks

Three employer and four worker interviews were completed from six organisations. Only one organisation gave both an employer and employee interview.

Five organisations stated that both the workers and the organisation very much benefited from the WSA visits with only one stating that they had benefited a little. The interviewees from the same organisation agreed that the external input on health and safety training that the WSA brought had more of an impact on the staff and volunteers than what is done ‘in-house’.

One of the interviewees commented that external help from the WSA with regards to the recent change in catering legislation was very helpful. Another said that the WSA brought external support in helping to complete legal documentation and the owner of a small, family run business said that they’ve been, “brought up to speed with health and safety” because of the
external input. One worker commented that staff have received external health and safety training since the WSA visits which wouldn’t have happened without the scheme.

Only one interviewee stated that the WSA focussed a little more on worker involvement than on health and safety, stating that this was appropriate as their health and safety standards were already high. In two other organisations the WSA focussed much more time on health and safety, whilst in the other three organisations it was reported that an equal amount of time was spent on both worker involvement and health and safety. In each case the balance seemed correct according to those interviewed.

All stated that the WSA was either ‘quite helpful’ or ‘very helpful’. One manager said that the WSA gave details of relevant courses and information which saved the interviewee from having to seek the information himself. Other comments regarding the WSA - “liked her attitude”, “very impressed with her”, “good ideas given”.

Two organisations have a committee or working group that involves workers and a manager. Other organisations stated that health and safety is mentioned regularly in staff meetings or and when needed on site. One organisation has now set up a risk assessment group which meets monthly.

Some improvements since the WSA visits include, having a health and safety notice board set up and put in a more prominent place than the other notice boards, manual handling training has been done, aisles are now cleared for when deliveries arrive, stock put away on racking to keep area clear, and a rota for cleaning the site for all staff has been set up.

Comments on improvements since the start of the visits include, “H&S policy - up to date with H&S info”, “Staff understand benefits of better H&S practices -working environment safer for all” and “Staff point out H&S issues now to manager instead of the other way around”.

Other comments regarding the scheme include, “’Better Business Guide’ could be included - broaden the scheme. Could have levels of achievement. Make WSA grade / certification for businesses so the public and businesses are aware if WSA award is given to orgs. (Like food standards certificates etc)”, “Scheme needs to be expanded to include hygiene info / instruction.”

**Health@Work Liverpool**

Four employer and two worker interviews were conducted across six organisations.

All six interviewees reported that both their workers and organisation very much benefited from the WSA visits and all employers reported that it has very much benefited their business. All interviewees mentioned how partaking in the scheme has increased awareness of H&S among staff. Other cited benefits of the scheme included “updated and better formulated policies”, “better able to identify hazards”, “increased staff involvement”.

All interviewees agreed that there WSA was very helpful and was able to give good H&S and worker involvement advice. All agreed that there were improvements in H&S standards and worker involvement also. The types of improvements regarding H&S standards were specific to the type of organisation being interviewed. Some examples included, “spillages now wiped up straightaway”, “if raining outside, wet floor sign put up”, “scissors put away after use”, “signs
displayed for workers to wear their ear defenders”. Another interviewee cited how workers now have improved the way they lift and stand since they took part in a manual handling course.

All interviewees reported there were improvements in worker involvement also. None of the interviewing organisations had set-up a H&S committee as a result of the scheme but all reported that they now discussed H&S at team meetings, and that this was sufficient given that almost all organisations employed less than 6 members of staff.

**Kirklees**

Five employer and three worker interviews were conducted in seven organisations.

All were generally positive about the scheme and all employers reported that the scheme has very much benefited their business. Interviewees who were very positive about the scheme reported that the scheme “helped people think about H&S in a different way”, it “had helped raise awareness among staff” and “there was much more involvement in H&S issues from staff”. For one organisation, the interviewer spoke how the scheme had come at an excellent time for them. They were a new organisation, and didn’t have any H&S policies in place before the WSA visits. As a result of the scheme the interviewer reported that they had now “set-up procedures and put H&S systems in place, learnt how to conduct risk assessments and there was increased worker awareness and involvement in H&S issues”.

Five of the eight organisations reported that there was much more focus on H&S than worker involvement. All five reported that this was the case because it was the company’s objective to focus more on H&S. As such four of these companies reported no improvements in worker involvement.

All eight interviewees reported that there were improvements in Health and Safety standards since the start of the WSA scheme. Some reported improvements included, “more formalised and structured method of conducting risk assessments”, “fire alarm and sprinkler system tested weekly”, “safety checklists drawn up”.

Three of the seven organisations interviewed, reported that there were improvements in worker involvement since the start of the WSA scheme. One organisation has set-up a H&S committee since the start of the WSA scheme where each committee member has a specific area of responsibility and all have attended relevant training courses. In the other two organisations interviewees reported that H&S is now an item on the agenda at team meetings. In the other four organisations, which reported no change in worker involvement all interviewees reported that H&S is discussed ‘as and when’ required.

**Lambeth College**

Three employers and one worker were interviewed from four different restaurants.

All of the employers stated that the workforce and organisation benefited a little from the WSA visits. The worker interviewee believes their workplace very much benefited from the visits stating that the training has been a good reminder of hygiene for staff as well as increasing their knowledge on health and safety. Their cleaning schedule has been improved and staff are responsible for their role on the rota.
The impact on the organisations has been a general improvement in health and safety standards. Employers comment that, “H&S issues improved regarding food and fire exits”, “Workplace hygienically kept tidier. Staff are washing hands more”, “Learnt more on H&S, already had good knowledge but now it’s improved”.

The WSA spent most time working with managers and owners who then communicated to their workforce. This was mainly due to a low level of understanding and speaking of English amongst the workforce.

Two of the interviewees stated that the WSA focussed the same amount of time on health and safety and worker involvement, one employer said that more time was spent on worker involvement and in the other restaurant much more time was spent on health and safety. Three of those interviewed said that the WSA was quite helpful and the other interviewee said that the WSA was very helpful - “Training was clearly explained. WSA was ‘quite professional’.” Two of those interviewed said that health and safety issues are raised in staff meetings, the other two interviewees said that the owner raises issues as and when needed.

Worker involvement in health and safety has improved due to the WSA’s visits, “Staff now know to separate meat & veg in fidge / freezer”, “Staff do risk assessments”, “Better attitude regarding H&S amongst workforce. Checklist now in force for certain practices”.

The manager interviewed commented that, “Staff accept H&S instruction easier because of friendly approach by WSA. It’s different to the Health Inspector’s visit where they just tell you what is wrong without instruction”. He also believes that the scheme is too limiting as only one member of staff was allowed to attend training at Lambeth College when more members were interested.

Park Royal

Three employer and four workers were interviewed from five organisations.

All workers stated that the workforce and the organisation benefited very much from the WSA visits. However an employer from an organisation which also interviewed a worker, stated that both the workforce and organisation benefited only a little from the visits.

The workforce is generally more aware of health and safety issues. The impact the visits have made on interviewees organisations has been positive, “the workplace is tidier than before”, “we’re more careful around the workshop”.

Amongst the organisations interviewed, the WSA either focussed about the same amount of time on health and safety and worker involvement or more time on health and safety. Five out of the seven people interviewed thought that this balance of time spent between training on health and safety and worker involvement was OK, it was what was needed.

All of the workers and employers interviewed said that the WSA project had a positive impact on their organisation. “Workforce now thinks more responsibly”, “More attention given to health and safety now in organisation than before visits”, “Better understanding of health and safety throughout organisation”.
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Two out of the three employers interviewed commented that the WSA did not communicate to the workforce particularly well. One employer said that the WSA’s approach seemed a little insensitive, pointing out positive and negative issues to individuals within the workforce at their own workstation. This was taken to be a bit ‘too personal’. The other employer commented that the WSA’s accent made it harder for the workforce to understand all that was said.

One of the companies interviewed stated that they have an informal health and safety working group set up; any issues are spoken to the manager who then discusses them with the employer. Some of the other benefits from the visits mentioned were:

- Better H&S signs,
- Staff now wear, hats, hi-visibility gear and ear defenders
- Reduction in tripping hazards

**Rhondda**

Four worker and four employer interviews were carried out in seven organisations. Overall the feedback was broadly positive and most cited that both workers and the organisation benefited as a result of the scheme. One employer interviewed, however, reported that there was no benefit or cost as they were still waiting to receive training. The organisation has received 2 visits from the WSA where proposals regarding training have been made but as yet they had not received any. The interviewee was particularly frustrated as numerous calls have been made to ascertain when training may begin but as yet they have received no update on the situation. The interviewee commented that the first two visits had alerted them to the importance of H&S and prompted them to think about H&S issues but they are disappointed they have received no training.

One employer interviewee reported that they have received 4 visits from their WSA but that a 3 hour training session with workers had been cancelled on two occasions. The interviewee reported that they have benefited a little from the visits but believes they will benefit a lot more after they receive training. However the interviewee spoke positively about the scheme in general, asserting that it has helped raise awareness and they now plan to target specific areas, for example ensuring staff receive free eye tests. The interviewee also reported that the WSA has helped them put together a better policy for lone workers by providing advice and knowledge on how to improve this policy. In general, the interviewee found that things which often get overlooked were brought to their attention.

In one organisation both an employer and worker interview was carried out. Both agreed that their organisation very much benefited from the scheme and that awareness of H&S had increased immensely as well as awareness of their own personal well-being. Both also reported that the scheme has helped identify the types of risk assessments that need to be carried out in their particular organisation and the type of risks and hazards to watch out for. Both interviewees were also positive about the WSA commenting that he was a “very good facilitator” and was “excellent at giving relevant examples”. When asked if there was any improvement in H&S standards there was disagreement in responses given, the worker said there was no change but the employer reported that there was much improvement, and cited how they now conduct regular fire drills and how they have a new upgraded H&S document.
However when asked about improvements in worker involvement both agreed this was a lot better, reporting that staff were a lot more involved in conducting risk assessments.

Interviews were conducted in four other organisations and feedback on the scheme was very positive. All agreed that both workers and the organisation benefited very much from the scheme. Some reported comments made by interviewees regarding benefits include:

“It gave employees the initiative to think about H&S – something previously lacking”

• “Interest in the field of H&S has increased immensely. Policies are more in line with legislation through rewriting and revising”

• “It improved employee motivation, awareness and ownership of H&S as all employees got involved in the scheme”

• “Increased awareness. Staff now have the skills to enforce H&S issues/concerns which they didn’t have previously”

In three of the four organisations most of the WSAs time was spent with both managers and workers together and all were very positive about the WSA and agreed that the WSA was able to give good H&S and worker involvement advice. All four interviewees reported that there were improvements in H&S control measures and worker involvement. Overall feedback was very positive but one interviewee commented that they were still to receive training. They were aware that the WSA has been ill but thought there should have been a back-up in place and they should have been informed earlier of the WSA’s absence.

**SOHAS**

Six employer and two worker interviews were carried out from eight organisations.

Seven of the eight interviewees reported that the WSA spent an equal amount of time on both H&S and worker involvement and all found that this balance was good.

All were generally very positive about the scheme and its impact on worker involvement, health and safety standards and the organisation in general. All six employer interviews reported that the scheme had very much benefited their business and all interviewees cited the WSA as being very helpful. Almost all interviewees spoke how the scheme ‘gave focus and raised awareness of H&S issues’ and most mentioned how people now have a ‘better understanding of their roles and responsibilities regarding H&S’.

All interviewees reported that there were improvements in H&S standards and in worker involvement, for example:

- “New H&S policy used as induction training for new workers”;
- “H&S is item on agenda at team meetings”;
- “All staff now have a H&S file”;
- “H&S committee set up since project”;
- “Updated policy for lone workers”;
• “new staff member appointed to explain to workers on the shop floor the company’s H&S policies/procedures”;
• ‘buddy system’ put in place to improve personal safety of workers”;
• “More formalised risk assessment policies and workers more involved in risk assessments than previously”.

**STUC**

Six interviews were carried out covering five organisations.

Of the six interviews three were conducted in housing associations. The general finding in these organisations was that they already had in place quite good health and safety systems so the WSA scheme did not have any major impact. Only one of the three organisations reported that H&S standards had improved and only one reported that worker involvement had improved. Both these improvements were only cited as being a little better.

In one workplace both an employer and worker interview was carried out and both agreed that they had very much benefited from the scheme with H&S standards and worker involvement a lot better than before. They both spoke about how the organisation now had a new formalised way of conducting risk assessments and how the WSA had helped them to set up a H&S committee and assisted them in drafting a new smoking policy. The employer in particular spoke very highly of the significance of the H&S committee saying “it had helped raise awareness...lead to more worker involvement and therefore ownership and responsibility”. Overall the employer believes that since the formation of the H&S committee that things are done in a more thorough way than in the past. Both employer and worker also spoke very highly of the WSA saying that he didn’t create dependency but was more of an advisory support encouraging them to use their initiative which prompted them to think for themselves.

In the fifth organisation the employer reported that the organisation benefited a little from the scheme but reported no significant changes because the organisation must abide by the Care Commission which has in place its own H&S policies. The employer reported that the greatest benefit for them was that the WSA helped them set-up a H&S committee, which has lead to a more formalised and official approach to dealing with H&S.

**UCATT**

Three employers and one worker were interviewed from three organisations.

Of the respondents one employer felt that UCATT involvement was a concern and was suspicious and viewed the scheme as a way to recruit workers to union members. Other comments, however, saw the benefits of the scheme, for example: “a good scheme, it encourages small organisations to improve their H&S awareness, when approaching new customers it is always beneficial for business to be able to say that we have a worker representative because customers ask.”

Another respondent commented “Now that we have an H&S worker rep the workforce feel that they can approach him more with H&S issues than with the management”. A different employer said that there is an increase in health and safety awareness among the workforce because of the WSA visits.
A third employer suggested that the association with NFB because it “added credibility to the scheme.”

9.2.6 Conclusions

Cost-effectiveness of the Challenge Fund in building WSA capacity

Companies generally felt the benefits were greater than the costs for them. Only two companies felt that the costs outweighed the benefits of being involved.

To what extent does the work of the WSAs lead to a change in the employers’ and workers’ attitudes towards worker involvement?

The majority of interviewees report that there has been an increase in employee awareness due to the scheme and this has lead to improved H&S practices. In some cases there appears to be clear increases in involvement and opportunities for involvement (e.g. agenda item at meetings, H&S committee’s set-up etc.).

To what extent does the work of the WSA lead to increased health and safety knowledge and competence amongst workers and employers?

Generally interviewees say that the WSA scheme has improved/greatly improved their knowledge of health and safety as well as their competence in making improvements to systems and practices. There is a sense of greater confidence amongst some employers / workers that they understand what they need to do in order to sustain a safe and healthy workplace. The WSA input was particularly welcome where a manager/business was not clear on requirements or was looking to improve/put something in place (e.g. policies and procedures).

To what extent does the work of the WSAs lead to a self-sustaining increase in (arrangements for) worker involvement in health and safety?

Most interviewees responded positively to the question as to whether further worker involvement would continue after WSA intervention.

In situations where new changes such as “H&S now an item on team meeting agenda”, “new H&S committee set up” or “new H&S rep appointed” were cited, one could assume that this would give opportunities for self-sustaining increases. These were the most common formal process changes for worker involvement that were cited amongst interviewees. Comments made relating to these new formal changes suggest that overall employees now knew whom to report H&S concerns to as well as having more opportunities in which to make contributions relating to H&S.

To what extent does the work of the WSAs lead to improvements in health and safety arrangements in workplaces, either directly or via worker involvement prompted by the WSA?

The majority of workplaces cited improvements to H&S. The most commonly reported were changes and improvements to policies and procedures, more regular and formalised risk assessments, H&S practices more inline with current legislation, better signage.
The improvements in risk assessment practice often appeared to be as a direct result of increased worker involvement. Many workplaces reported that risk assessments were now done more regularly and formally and with more input and involvement from workers.

**To what extent does prior employer attitude and expectation of the project affect the outcome?**

Employer interviewees often commented on how helpful the WSA was because they were concerned about H&S/ knew they did not know a lot about it. This appeared to make it easier for the WSA to get managers attention/ organisational resources and commitment. Interviewees in new enterprises were found to be particularly welcoming and enthusiastic about the scheme as many did not have established H&S systems and would not have had the know-how without the WSA.

**Do the types of activities the WSAs engage in impact effectiveness?**

The majority of interviewees spoke highly of their WSA and found the approach they used worked effectively. All interviewees indicated that the balance between H&S and worker involvement was good and most employers asserted that they arranged with the WSA how much time they wanted to devote to both areas at the initial stages. Some organisations already had good H&S knowledge so their agreed objectives with the WSA was to focus more on worker involvement activities as it would not have been effective to spend time on H&S.

Interviewees were particularly impressed with WSA’s when they knew the business area of the organisation or knew where the business was coming from and could therefore give relevant examples.

**Do the projects achieve their project specific objectives?**

Overall, the majority of interviewees were happy with their experience and felt it was positive in some way. Almost all employers reported that they had agreed objectives at the start of the project but very few commented on whether it had met the agreed objectives at the start of the intervention.

**What are the causes of any problems or difficulties during the WSA projects?**

One new issue to emerge from the interviews was for one project there was no replacement or backup available when the WSA became ill. Some interviewees were disappointed and frustrated that no alternative arrangements were made and the scheme came to a standstill.

Another issue to emerge was that some interviewees from another project group were uncertain about union involvement and had the impression that felt that engagement on the scheme was dependent on workers joining the union.
Health and Safety Commission (HSC) Strategy for Workplace Health and Safety in Great Britain in 2010 and beyond has, as one of its strategic aims, a workforce fully involved in the management of health and safety. The aim of the Fund is to encourage partnerships for creating the right conditions for workers to get involved and be consulted on health and safety. Findings from the interviews with workers and employers from the verification interviews and the end of year interviews with advisors and Lead Partners provide support for improvements in worker involvement and health and safety. These findings reinforce the validity of the quantitative findings and strongly suggest that positive changes occurred following WSA intervention. The funding cost per workplace is about £1000 each. It is recommended that a follow up survey is completed of the workplaces to explore whether the reported increases in worker involvement (and reported reductions in absence and injury) have been sustained after completion of the WSA visits.

This report and the work it describes were funded by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). Its contents, including any opinions and/or conclusions expressed, are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect HSE policy.