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This independent evaluation covers the organisation, operation, effectiveness and impact of the European Week of Safety and Health, which took place from 16 – 22 October 2000. Its sets out to analyse responses to the Week, identify good practice, assess the effectiveness of the Week and the activities generated, and provide information to help develop future Health and Safety Weeks.

It was carried out by analysing all the Feedback forms submitted by participants and by interviewing a representative sample of 163 participants and 38 non-participants during February and March 2001.

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.
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1. **EXTENT TO WHICH THE OBJECTIVES WERE MET**

1.1 **Increasing awareness of the causes of MSD and Back Pain**

Research evidence suggests that more than 7,000 UK organisations were stimulated to actively participate in the European Week for Safety and Health (hereafter called EW2000). This estimate is based on three findings: 21,798 organisations applied for Action Packs; 718 submitted Feedback forms proving they participated; a telephone survey of a random sample of those who had applied for an Action Pack, but had not submitted a Feedback form, showed that a further one third had also participated.

The profile of participating organisations derived from the research is skewed towards organisations employing large numbers of people in the public sector (see Chapter 2). Applying that profile, the 7000 organisations thought to have participated are estimated to employ some 5.86m people. On average, those organisations interviewed believe that some 70% of their employees had been directly affected by the campaign. That equates to 4.1m employees.

Beyond that, the original HSE Newsletter about EW2000 was mailed to 500,000 organisations and media coverage appeared in a wide range of national, regional and specialist media, conveying the message to many more people.

The uptake of Action Packs for EW2000 far exceeded that for the similar campaign in 1999; 70,000 Action Packs were distributed, compared to 8,000 in 1999.

1.2 **Stimulating employees, at grass roots level, to take action**

Some 82% of participating organisations interviewed felt that EW2000 had been either very or moderately successful in getting staff to adopt safer practices. 57% claimed that specific changes in working practices had taken place as a result of participation and, in 43% of cases these were expected to have long lasting effects. (See Chapter 5 for details).

1.3 **Supporting SME activity**

Some 45% of organisations that participated in EW2000 were SMEs employing fewer than 250 people; extrapolating the logic in 1.1 above that suggests that 3,150 SMEs took part. That is clearly a fraction of the 1.4m SMEs in the UK.

It could be argued that the idea of conducting a health and safety campaign over a week of activities is more appropriate to organisations with a large numbers of employees, hoping to interest different groups on different days. It is also logical that it should appeal to organisations with full time H&S professionals with the time and motivation to organise the activities.

On the other hand, many small organisations did participate enthusiastically.

Some sectors and sizes of organisation seem to have been more inclined to participate than others. The tables in Chapter 2 show relative penetration by sector and size of enterprise.
1.4 **Overall effectiveness as judged by participants**

99% of those interviewed stated that participation in EW2000 had been worthwhile overall. 82% felt that the economic benefits had very much justified the cost and a further 15% that it had been moderately justified. 96% thought that the non-financial benefits had either very much or moderately justified participation.

59% of those interviewed stated that they will definitely participate in the next HSE Safety Week and a further 40% are highly likely to.
2. PROFILES OF THE ORGANISATIONS THAT PARTICIPATED

2.1 Summary of numbers of establishments analysed and interviewed

Face-to-face and telephone interviews were done with the benefit of working from the Feedback forms that had been submitted. Non-participants were chosen randomly from the database of those who had requested Action Packs but not submitted a Feedback form (See Appendices A and B for detail).

2.2 Profiles of participating establishments by sector size and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of employees per estab.</th>
<th>No. of estabs. intvd. or analysed</th>
<th>No. of estabs. known to have participated in EW2000</th>
<th>% of total No. known to have participated</th>
<th>Total No. of UK estabs.</th>
<th>% by No. of all UK estabs.</th>
<th>% by total No. employed in UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1094943</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 49</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>245393</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-249</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44852</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-3000</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001+</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>223923</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know /</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Analyses and interviews plus Size Analysis of UK Businesses 2000 by the Office of National Statistics and DOE statistics
Examination of Tables 1 and 2 shows that, compared with UK totals, the profile of establishments that participated in EW2000 was skewed towards larger employers (particularly 1000+ employees) and those in the public sector e.g. local government and the health industry.

Sectors that were substantially under-represented included those employing less than 50 and those in the retail/wholesale and financial sectors.

Some SMEs from all sectors participated, but proportionally more from the manufacturing sectors, from schools and from residential and nursing homes.

Chart 2, overleaf, shows that all of the HSE regions were well represented by organisations known to have participated. Similarly, non-participants seemed to be well represented.

### Table 2: Profile of establishments known to have participated by industry sector and compared with total UK industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>No. of estabs. known to have participated in EW2000</th>
<th>% of total known to have participated</th>
<th>No. of UK enterprises</th>
<th>% of total No. of UK enterprises</th>
<th>% of total No. of people employed in the UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>201506</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and water supply</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5263</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals, metals and chemicals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal goods, engineering, automotive</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>102274</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other manufacturing</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81661</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction industry</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>229838</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communications</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88608</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, finance, insurance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52569</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil/ gas/ coal exploration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice, police</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - primary/ secondary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10583</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - higher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health industry, residential homes</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>142573</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade associations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38243</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/ wholesale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>535693</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>615691</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>718</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,247,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Analyses and interviews, plus Size Analysis of UK Businesses 2000 by the Office of National Statistics and Market Locations databases
2.3 Profile by the position of the named contact given

Chart 3 Positions of contacts across all types of participating establishments

- Director/Proprietor: 59%
- Senior Site Manager: 6%
- H&S Specialist: 6%
- Training/HR Manager: 6%
- Safety Representative: 6%
- Other/Various: 4%
Charts 3 and 4 show that a majority of those who submitted a Feedback form or gave an interview about EW2000 were H&S specialists. Safety Representatives and Training Managers were other important categories. Not surprisingly, in smaller firms the contact was more likely to be a Director or the Proprietor.

2.4 **Profile by whether they had participated before**

Chart 5 shows that two thirds of participants in EW2000 had participated before, but, for one third, it was the first time.
Three quarters of those who chose not to participate in EW2000 (after sending for an Action Pack) had not participated in earlier Weeks but a quarter had done so.

This implies that there is a core of regular participants, a further number of “floating voters” and a substantial number of newcomers.

3. WHY SOME PARTICIPATED AND OTHERS DID NOT

3.1 The level of decision-making on EW2000 participation

All those interviewed were asked who, in their establishment, made the decision to participate in EW2000.

These profiles are very similar to those in 2.3; H&S specialists are most important, followed by directors and site managers.
3.2 Main reasons for participating

A common theme is that the Week is seen as an opportunity to latch onto a major national event to raise in-house awareness of H&S issues (not only back care). Interestingly, some participants used the campaign to gain support from their customers. In interviews, NPD gained a strong impression that H&S professionals use the event not only to build commitment but also to raise their personal prestige within the organisation. Few would admit that participation was motivated by the prospect of attending an Awards event although one said that winning in 1999 was an accolade held very dear!
3.3 Main reasons for not participating

Remembering that only 38 non-participants were interviewed, the main theme to emerge was that people were too busy to organise participation. This was uniformly the case across all sizes of business and is also the theme of the “Other” comments.

Late receipt of Action Packs was cited as a reason by 11% of non-participants.

Excuses for non-participation were interesting! One man could not participate because he was having his leg amputated that week and one woman had to take the week off because her husband had been made redundant.
3.4 **Certificates and Awards as motivators**

Although few would admit that the prospect of receiving a certificate or attending an Award event were the main reasons to participate (Chart 8), they did generally feel they were good ideas.

Certificates are particularly valued because they provide tangible recognition to staff and organisers that their efforts have been recognised. Several respondents would have liked extra certificates to give out to particular participants. Others asked whether, in future, certificates could be personalised by the insertion of the name of the participating establishment and the name of the organiser.

Rivalry to win awards is fierce. Minor criticisms of regional Award events was that attendees wanted more prior information about the format and who will be present; also about why some go forward for national awards and not others.

The question of who is invited to the National Awards event is clearly sensitive! Much of its value would seem to be as a launching pad for the following year’s event and as a source of inspiration when subsequently covered in the media and in the HSE Newsletter.

3.5 **Why few Feedback forms were returned**

There is a mystery concerning the number of Feedback forms received from EW2000 (718) versus the number received from HSE’s similar campaign in 1999 (2,000). This is compounded by the fact that, in 2000, 21,798 establishments requested 70,000 Action Packs, whereas in 1999, fewer establishments requested only 8,000 Action Packs.
In both years the Feedback form was printed on the back of a poster to a similar format.

Evidence from the research is limited to the reasons for non-submission given by the 14 participating establishments interviewed who did not submit Feedback forms.

5 said they had been too busy to do so (mostly small employers)
3 claimed they had not seen the Feedback form or could not find it
2 had not received their Action Packs in time to be used
2 could not offer an explanation

Theories for the low rate of return (probably only 10% of participants) advanced by Project Group members include:

a) The back pain posters were so useful that they were used more than the posters issued in earlier years and left up longer, meaning that the feedback forms were not available.

b) Late (or non) arrival of the Action Packs meant that they were never opened or used; hence the feedback form was not discovered

c) The pace of business life has so increased that people have little time for non-essentials. The larger number of participants may have included proportionally more SMEs than in the past; these people are notoriously hard-pressed. Project Group members find, in their own organisations, that it is getting increasingly difficult to get feedback.

NPD recommends that, in future, feedback should be made easier and more rewarding. A separate Feedback form should be included in the Action Pack with the alternative of providing feedback on line. The content should be simple questions with space for answers. If submitted on line, responses could be automatically analysed.

Customising of Certificates (or allowing participants to download and customise) would provide added incentive for feedback.

3.6 **Rating and usefulness of material supplied for EW2000**

In terms of appeal and usefulness to them in organising EW2000, those interviewed were asked to rate the printed material supplied by HSE:

![Chart 11 Appeal and usefulness of printed material supplied for EW2000](chart.png)
Comments associated with the above ratings were as follows:

17  a well-presented pack
11  useful and helpful
10  didn’t receive any
9   could improve/be better
9   arrived too late to be useful
5   posters were good; would have liked more
3   ideas (bullet points) were good

Significantly, about 12% of those interviewed had either not received the Action Pack or it had arrived too late to be useful.

Other comments included: would have liked free video, as last year; internet information and logos were useful; not easy to find what we needed.

Admittedly, few had received the postcards and the contents of Action Packs had varied.
4. EFFECTIVENESS OF MARKETING OF THE WEEK

4.1 How those interviewed first heard about the Week

Direct mailing and distribution of 500,000 copies of the colourful, 14 page special EW2000 newsletter were clearly the most effective means of communicating the EW2000 concept. However, editorial and advertising in the specialist H&S magazines was also very important, reflecting the high proportion of relevant decision makers who are H&S Specialists (See 3.1). Word of mouth, from colleagues was also important.
4.2 **Observations on HSE’s marketing strategy**

4.2.1 **A successful campaign creating an upsurge of interest**

HSE’s campaign to market EW2000 was clearly comprehensive and heavyweight, using all elements of the marketing mix. Its success can be judged in relation to how well it achieved EW2000’s objectives (See Chapter 1) and how much it improved on results for the similar week in 1999.

Some 21,798 establishments called to request 70,000 Action Packs compared with fewer establishments requesting 8,000 Action Packs in 1999.

Based on research evidence, NPD believes the dramatic upsurge in interest in 2000 was due to the following factors:

- The synergistic benefits of coordinating the resources, efforts and public persona of 12 powerful organisations into a Project Group; the multiplier effect resulting from the early involvement of this consortium and use of its various distribution networks greatly increased market penetration.

- MSD and Back Pain was a strong theme, touching not only on problems in most places of employment, but also in homes and amongst families, thus increasing impact. Amalgamation of EW2000 with the well-established Back Care Week gave an added impetus. This is a well-established event with national and local media support, as well as that of the nursing and occupational health professionals.

- Leadership from the European Agency and subsequently from Peter Rimmer of HSE, gave a clear direction and timescale to the project, meaning that planning started early and all could put their weight behind a common cause.

4.2.2 **Use of direct mail and third party distribution**

The strategy of getting the smallest number of contacts to distribute the largest quantities of newsletters proved valid for the reasons quoted in 4.2.1 above, as well as because it was more cost effective than HSE handling total distribution. However, these other organisations had their own agendas and timescales, so some delay occurred in getting newsletters to the target audience e.g. to British Safety Council members in August.

HSE’s own distribution to previous entrants is vitally important, given the finding in 2.4 that 68% of EW2000 participants had participated in earlier Weeks. However, for the future, use of the SRJ Industries database of those who applied for Action Packs (21,987 establishments) would reach more participants than the database of those who submitted Feedback forms (718). This would be worthwhile even though the SRJ database is patchy, with key data missing from about 10% of records e.g. company name, town, surname.

Distribution of the newsletter through Site Safe News also appears to have proved useful and, in future, HSE might consider similar inclusion with others of its publications, particularly those aimed at Manufacturing and Health industries (See 2.2 Table 2).
Finally, on distribution, the TUC has a database of 200,000 safety representatives. For EW2000, it was only able to send the newsletter to 40,000 of these (20%), but, in future, perhaps wider use of this database can be negotiated.

Timing must be a key to recruiting first-time participants who need to be inspired, gain internal agreement, plan their activities and amass their materials well in advance of October. Choice of a clear theme with popular appeal is the other key element. Distribution of the newsletter in June would seem to be the ideal timing.

4.2.3 Editorial coverage

HSE’s PR campaign for EW2000 was impressive, in terms of its duration and spread across all types of media. In particular, the gaining of extensive regional coverage, including TV and radio, was very well done.

The combination of high profile sports stars and HSE Commission members to attend launch events, providing photo opportunities and giving interviews, was cleverly exploited.

Again, joint sponsorship with project partners, such as Back Care, substantially increased media interest.

A rough comparison of the coverage gained in 1999 and 2000, based on the cuttings supplied to NPD, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Comparison of editorial coverage 1999 - 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,849 column centimetres of editorial coverage (5% national)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 local TV and radio spots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Advertising

Again, coverage was wide and the skeleton illustrations were eye-catching.

The specialist H&S journals must have fulfilled a vital role in getting through to the H&S professionals (62% of decision makers in relation to EW2000 – see Chart 6).

Judged by the response analysis from the GHGB IV campaign that NPD has seen, advertisements in the trade press proved more cost-effective than use of national media. Possibly because of the back care theme, the Nursing Times and the Occupational Journal did particularly well.

The special supplement in the Financial Times will undoubtedly have helped penetrate the corporate world and satisfy project partners and sponsors; however, it is an expensive medium (£50K) and H&S specialists in big companies had probably already been reached more cost-effectively through their own specialist press.
4.2.5 Other promotional activities

Word-of-mouth referral from colleagues inside and outside the organisation was the way in which 6% of participants first heard of EW2000. This networking needs to be encouraged (see ideas under 4.3 below).

The series of seminars, events and road shows organised by HSE and its partners seem to have been useful to potential participants. The British Safety Council Members Road Shows were said to be particularly successful.

4.2.6 The Action Packs

The late arrival or non-arrival of Action Packs was a major source of complaint amongst those interviewed; at least 12% mentioned it. Delays of between 2 and 6 weeks from the time of requesting were common.

NPD understands that this was, essentially, a problem of success. Demand was overwhelming compared with expectations – 70,000 requested compared with 10,000 ordered. HSE had the added problem of not being in control of supplies and having to rely on the European Agency, which was presumably similarly over-whelmed.

For the future, having the ability to produce the Action Pack locally will give greater flexibility. Equally, it would be beneficial to put as much of the contents as is practical on the HSE web site for download and printing by the participants themselves.

Posters are particularly important to participants and would be more difficult to download and print from the web site. Participants want more of them and, preferably different versions so that they can ring the changes on their notice boards.

4.3 Other ideas for improving marketing effectiveness

4.3.1 A referral scheme

HSE has the potential to make greater use of a huge untapped asset – the core of loyal and enthusiastic past participants in Safety Weeks – especially those who have won an award. They are well placed to act as ambassadors for HSE, bringing in new participants from their own circle of contacts e.g. suppliers, customers and like-organisations. They could be a valuable and cost-effective source of referrals if they were asked to perform this role and given some nominal incentive to do so.

It may be enough to offer recognition of such efforts by creating the role of HSE “Ambassador”, possibly with some grading system, depending on the number of referrals who took up the scheme e.g. 2 star - 5 star or Premier League, 1st division etc! Another way would be to publish names and/or photos on the HSE web site. This would give these people kudos in their own organisations and generate productive rivalry between them.

Another form of incentive could be to offer those who bring successful referrals a tangible benefit e.g. a free video, a special discount on HSE publications for a limited time, or a place at the Awards dinner.
4.3.2 **Special offers**

Again, it might incentivise some, if HSE was able to offer a special discount or a two-for-one promotion on particular publications or videos to those who participate and send in a valid Feedback form.

4.3.3 **Inclusion of an Action Checklist in the Action Pack**

It seems that two thirds of those who sent for Action Packs did not actually go on to organise any participating activities in EW2000 (See 1.1). A higher level of conversion would be more effective than finding new prospects. A follow-up letter or phone call would be beneficial.

Chart 9 shows that 4% of non-participants admitted that they were not sure of the procedure to adopt; there may have been many more whom, in a busy work situation shelved the project because it required too much thinking through.

HSE has to make it as easy as possible for recipients of the Action Pack to go ahead. One suggestion would be to feature a simple Action Checklist, keyed to the material supplied, encouraging the recipients to proceed by simply following the instructions.

The inclusion of a blank diary in the pack for the 1999 Week had been popular with several participants. However, this may be off-putting to SMEs who may only be able to afford a day of activity during the Week.

4.3.4 **Greater TV and radio coverage**

When asked how HSE could have improved the effectiveness of promotion of EW2000, 29% of those interviewed simply said “advertise it more widely” and many suggested TV.

Before dismissing this as totally naïve, it might be worth considering whether some part of HSE’s substantial advertising budget for such generic campaigns could be effectively diverted to short bursts of regional TV and radio exposure, perhaps in May and then again in September.

Clearly, every opportunity to get news coverage of the Week on TV should be explored, including staging demonstrations (of H&S techniques!) and featuring local personalities and interesting case histories.

Better still would be to re-kindle the idea of a TV docu-soap featuring the activities of HSE and thus raising its profile positively. NPD has contacts that could be helpful in this context.
5. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE WEEK FOR THOSE WHO PARTICIPATED

5.1 The range of activities carried out

Other activities carried out included a range of special training courses and presentations, the creation of special customised materials and the organising of several types of competition.
5.2 Activities thought to produce the best results and why

Chart 14 Which activities gave the best results

Chart 16 Why participants found particular activities to be effective
Another cross analysis showed that practical demonstrations and free training sessions were the most effective means of raising awareness of MSD and back pain issues.

### Table 4: Effectiveness of demonstrations and exercise sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of staff affected</th>
<th>Arranged Demonstrations</th>
<th>Arranged exercise sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% or less</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 75%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 100%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Activities that were considered to be novel

##### 5.3.1 Novel ways for spreading the message about EW2000, internally and externally (81 mentions)

- Put a flashing EW2000 button on all e-mail for a period;
- Quote of the day on e-mail;
- Made a company calendar from 12 posters, designed by employees, and sent it to clients, employees and their families;
- Quiz slogans to be used as poster campaign;
- added EW2000 message to every fax sheet;
- Every supplier had to send a representative to a manual handling talk (on construction site);
- launched a 38pp A5 Supervisors H&S Handbook;
- put posters in all the lifts;
- Used multi-media as part of our exhibition – projected a PowerPoint presentation on a 6’ X 6’ screen;
- Put a 10 pin bowling illustration on front cover of brochure;
- designed a cartoon logo – man with a cap;
- Got story into local newspaper;
- made special book markers;
- produced a leaflet on office ergonomics with a furniture supplier – distributed to all his clients;
- Organised a conference with city and county councils;
- Put a computerised map of Europe on a special poster which encouraged participation;
- News Sheet distributed daily to all employees during the week;
- Published a daily newsletter and used e-mail on topics for work and home

##### 5.3.2 Gave free advice and treatment to employees (62 mentions)

- Visited 14 sites to advise;
- Set up a Back Care School for all staff;
- organised a Tai Chi display; talk on driving ergonomics for company car drivers and driving on rough terrain;
- Got ballet dancers from Birmingham to demonstrate lifting techniques;
- Traffic Police ran road risk awareness sessions;

##### 5.3.3 Gave special prizes and certificates to competition winners (57 mentions)

- Special offers & discounts;
- Our quiz and poster impressed our customer (Zeneca);
- Supplied a free plant to everyone who got involved in workstation appraisal;
- Approached Virgin about problems of flying and back problems (they were positive);
- Staged a key-workers Away-Day;
- Handed out sweets

##### 5.3.4 Organised novel competitions (20 mentions)

- Staged a mock accident at our YTS Training School;
- Staged “The Dolls House Challenge” to get people to spot risks and redesign;
- Dressed up as Captain Critical of the Critical Crew for young children (10 –11);
- Competition
to find the safest department; Hands-On exhibits induce instant inter-action; Ran a week-long quiz based on “Who Wants to be a Millionaire”;

5.3.5 Facilitated free or subsidised exercise sessions (16 mentions)

Produced audio exercise tape; A week of water based sports; A week of land based sports; Stretching with Anne over breakfast;

5.3.6 Other novel ideas (62 mentions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set up free one-day learning courses for local businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held a fete to promote our involvement in Health &amp; Safety week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterers provided special menu / weight reducing diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created body maps of individuals’ problems and collated them into two charts to show most common problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual handling course set up for the whole company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a number of pieces of office furniture on trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees helped to stop smoking by co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formed a Sixth Form H&amp;S Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread over 3 months rather than one week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire “Are you sitting comfortably?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got staff to do risk assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Step Back Plan (getting staff to do risk assessments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced new dependency risk assessment form during EW2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored cause of injury and time lost in an Emergency Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showed the Laurel and Hardy film “The Music Box” (moving piano down stairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran a Home and Leisure session to get across safety in the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staged a Chip Pan Fire with Fire Brigade in attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour Coded all storage bins with weight restrictions for lifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran a seminar on Stress Management and affect on the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put a full body skeleton on display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuaded Vauxhall to make us half a car (!) to demonstrate safety aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave discounts on courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran a safety day for children; they dressed up as fire fighters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did fire escape plans for homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted House of Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a demonstration, lifted a 20 lb turkey out of the oven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressed up as a skeleton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 **Success in raising awareness and promoting safe practices**

Some 59% of participants felt that EW2000 had been very successful in raising awareness and 42% in getting staff to adopt safer practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Positive response from all staff; from all who attended; learnt a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Other positive comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Varied feedback e.g. led to action, identified bad practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negative: waste of time; interruption to working day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>No feedback received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large majority of feedback from staff has been positive.
5.5 Changes in working practices that resulted from EW2000

57% of participants interviewed claimed that specific changes in working practices had taken place in their establishments as a result of participation in EW2000.

Table 6 Examples of specific changes in working practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Equipment purchased; lifting aids; new office chairs; equipment checked or repaired; colour-coded bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New, revised, updated manual handling programme/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recommendations now being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improved workplace; tidier/safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Better ergonomics e.g. seating positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>General improvement overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Various other changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65% of those who said that specific changes had resulted, believed that those changes would not have happened if they had not participated in EW2000.

Chart 19 How permanent the resulting changes are expected to be

- 10% Weeks
- 43% Months
- 47% Years
5.6 Perceived financial and non-financial benefits of participation

Nearly two thirds of participants questioned maintained that the extra cost of participation over and above their normal H&S activities had been under £300. About half of the establishments employing more than 500 people had spent more, but typically under £1,000.

82% of the participants interviewed felt that the economic gains had very much justified their (admittedly small) investment

71% felt that non-financial benefits had very much justified participation
Comments on non-financial benefits are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of mentions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Encourages better teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Paying attention to people does boost morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We got more people involved/interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Staff appreciate that management is trying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management were impressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customers were impressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Puts people’s minds at rest that they are handling correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 How worthwhile overall and percentage of employees affected

99% of the 326 participating enterprises interviewed or mentioning it on a Feedback form, stated that, overall, participation had been worthwhile.

In terms of the percentage of staff felt to have been affected by EW2000, the weighted average of estimates put involvement at 70.3%
5.8 Likelihood of uptake of future Weeks

59% of all those interviewed say they definitely will participate in future HSE Weeks; a further 40% are highly likely to and only 1% unlikely. Even amongst the non-participants interviewed, 92% are likely to participate next time.

![Chart 21 Likelihood of participation in future Weeks](image)

6. OTHER IDEAS FOR IMPROVING EFFECTIVENESS IN FUTURE

6.1 Opinions on the use of a single theme

![Chart 25 Proportion who favour a single theme versus H&S in general](image)

A majority favour promotion of a single theme because it gives a clear focus for activities and appears more pro-active and positive. However, some are going to be frustrated if the theme does not particularly apply to them (this was where back pain had a universal appeal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8 Popular ideas for future themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of mentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other ideas for themes, mostly reflecting sectoral interests included:

A repeat of the MSD and back pain theme (5); noise and ear protection (4); Personal Protective Equipment (3); fire prevention (3); focus on construction (2); handling dangerous chemicals (3); infection prevention; EEC marking of machinery; behaviour training; machinery operation; working alone; road safety/water safety; IT workstations; relevance to children, teenagers, young students (3); work-related hygiene; management involvement; nutrition, diet, fitness; skin care; H&S legal responsibilities; following an H&S strategy; asbestos; call centre safety; management of H&S in SMEs; trips and slips; hazards in the workplace; electricity; H&S in catering; substance handling; needle stick injuries; occupational health; the role of safety reps.; risk assessment; truck safety; mobile phones; Good Neighbour idea; safe working in cemeteries!

6.2 **Opportunities for cross-border initiatives**

When asked whether they saw any opportunities for creating cross border initiatives as part of future Weeks, 30% of participants replied positively. Support came evenly across the size range of companies.

A majority of those who were specific visualised linking their efforts, either with sister companies or suppliers or similar companies in other European countries. Some saw advantages in sharing good practices.

A list of companies supporting this idea can be made available by NPD Associates.

6.3 **Other ideas**

Not surprisingly, the circumstances, there were 48 requests (24% of those interviewed) for Action Packs to be made available earlier and in larger quantities.

34 people suggested that HSE should give more publicity to the Week and advertise it to a wider spread of companies.

12 (6%) asked for more face-to-face contact from HSE staff, both in encouraging participation and in participating in the activities.

Timing was criticised by 13 people; not enough time to prepare; unfortunate clash with half-term week etc.

8 people would have liked more information on what other organisations had done and 8 needed clearer instructions on what to do.

12 felt that the Feedback form should be separate from the poster.

Get more small companies on the database; put all Chambers of Commerce on the database; bigger TV campaign; coordinate with sponsors, including equipment manufacturers; send more information directly to office workers (about use of workstations); improved information about regional events

26 establishments said they were very pleased with HSE’s efforts.
7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Organisation of future Weeks

HSE should repeat its successful experience of organising and leading a Project Group of complementary organisations to harness combined resources and skills behind a coordinated plan.

Focusing on a single theme is preferable, but one that allows for adaptation to the needs of a wide range of sectors and interests.

7.2 Promotion of future Weeks

In terms of recruiting participants, the core of previous participants is vital. Mailing of the Newsletter should encompass all those who applied for Action Packs in earlier years as well as all those who submitted Feedback forms.

HSE should consider how this loyal core of enthusiasts can be encouraged to generate referrals e.g. the creation of HSE Ambassadors (See 4.3.1).

Equally, some extra effort to “convert” those who applied for Action packs to be active participants would be worthwhile e.g. follow up letters or calls and inclusion of an Action List to make it easy to get started.

In terms of trawling for first-time participants, HSE needs to make sure that distribution of Newsletters by project partners is early (June) and on target. The TUC database of safety representatives sounds particularly useful.

Distribution with other HSE publications, such as Site Safe News, is also cost-effective and might be extended to manufacturing and health industry audiences.

Accepting the importance of H&S specialists in organising participation, editorial and advertising in their specialist press and at exhibitions and seminars is vital.

For wider promotion, excellent PR is needed and HSE might look again at whether even greater exposure on TV and radio can be negotiated cost-effectively (See 4.3.4).

7.3 Operation of future Weeks

Local production of Action Packs will give HSE greater flexibility in reacting to future demand, ensuring faster response times. Posters are particularly important and HSE should try to make more available – variety and quantity.

In parallel, HSE should make available as much of the contents as practical on-line, via its web site, so that participants can down load what they want and customise it, if appropriate. This would particularly help with provision of more ready-made material e.g. on competitions, quizzes, ideas for demonstrations, promotional material etc. Even sector specific material could be provided together with inspirational ideas used successfully by previous participants. Novel ideas for spreading the message internally and externally should be promulgated (See 5.3.1).
Inclusion of a simple Action Check-List would help any busy waiverers to become committed (See 4.3.3).

Separate Feedback forms should be provided and the facility to feedback on-line to HSE. A means should be found for participants to have Participation Certificates customised with their own names and to be able to be duplicated for internal distribution as a means of recognition for effort.

Care needs to be consistently applied to invitations and prior briefings for regional award ceremonies as well as for the national event.

A third of those interviewed saw potential for European cross-border initiatives in the future. HSE needs to decide what it can do to encourage and facilitate this support e.g. provide a contact service.

7.4 Overall direction

The formula for organising, promoting and operating EW2000 was largely successful and should be repeated. Industry appreciates such initiatives and many offer enthusiastic support.
APPENDIX A

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY USED

After an Initial Briefing, by Peter Rimmer and Janet Connah of HSE, NPD Associates was given access to:

- Terms of reference for EW2000
- Copies of all relevant promotional material
- Media coverage received
- An interim report to the European Agency
- A report on the Health and Safety Week in 1999
- All the Feed Back forms from 1999

The evaluation consisted of:

- A desk-top analysis of the 718 Feed Back forms received from participants
- In depth interviews with a representative sample of 150 participants
- In depth interviews with a further 14 organisations who had participated but not sent in a Feed Back form and 38 organisations who had requested the Action Pack but had not subsequently participated.
- Short discussions with some other members of the Project Team

The sample interviewed was representative of the kinds of organisations who had participated by sector, size and region and did not distinguish between those who were selected for regional judging and for awards and those who were rejected. The source of names for non-participants and those who did not return Feed Back forms was the database of 21,798 organisations who had sent for Action Packs.

A common questionnaire was used for all the above aspects of the evaluation, with participants and non-participants answering some common questions but not all. This was constructed after an initial analysis of Feed Back forms and was modified in the light of HSE comments. See Appendix C which is the questionnaire used.

Some 50 of the in-depth interviews were conducted face-to-face, typically lasting an hour to an hour and a half. The remaining 151 interviews were carried out by telephone, at times convenient to the respondents, and typically lasted for 10 – 15 minutes. The desk-top analysis included a review of all the supporting materials submitted by participants with their Feed Back forms.

Data from all sources was input to QPSMR market research software for subsequent analysis. This report was compiled to summarise the findings, which were presented to HSE on 12 April 2001.
APPENDIX B

LIST OF CHARTS AND TABLES

Chart No.
1. Number of establishment from whom the data was drawn and how sourced
2. Numbers of participating establishments by HSE region
3. Position of contacts across all types of participating establishments
4. Variation in the positions of EW2000 contacts by No. of employees
5. Extent of repeat participation
6. Position of decision makers across participants and non-participants
7. Variation in the level of those who made decisions about EW2000
8. Main reasons for participating
9. Main reasons not to participate
10. Whether it is a good idea to recognise those who participate
11. Appeal and usefulness of printed material supplied
12. Which printed items were found to be most useful and least useful
13. How those interviewed first heard about EW2000
14. The extent to which participants organised particular activities
15. The activities which gave the best results
16. Why participants found particular activities to be effective
17. Degree of success in raising awareness of MSD and back pain problems
18. Degree of success in getting staff to adopt safer practices
19. How permanent the resulting changes in working practices are likely to be
20. Estimated extra cost of participation above normal
21. Extent to which participation was seen as economically viable
22. Extent to which non-financial benefits justified participation
23. Percentage of total staff affected by EW200 by size of establishment
24. Likelihood of participation in future Weeks
25. Proportion who favour a single theme versus H&S in general

Table No.
1. Profile of establishments known to have participated by No. employed and compared with total UK industry
2. Profile of establishments known to have participated by industry sector and compared with total UK industry
3. Comparison of editorial coverage 1999 – 2000
4. Percentage of staff affected by demonstrations and exercise sessions
5. Summary of feedback from staff
6. Examples of specific changes in working practices
7. Comments on non-financial benefits from participants
8. Popular ideas for future themes
EVALUATION OF
THE EUROPEAN WEEK OF SAFETY AND HEALTH 2000

Would you please answer a few questions and give your views, in confidence, about the European Week for Safety and Health (16 – 22 October 2000)? NPD Associates is an independent market research company, commissioned by the HSE to undertake an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the week (EW2000). Your organisation has been picked at random as part of a representative sample of those who showed interest/participated in the week.

Q1. Company/organisation

Q2. Which region?

| Region | | |
|--------|------------------|
| North West: Cheshire, Cumbria, Manchester, Lancs and Merseyside | (1) |
| Yorkshire and North East: Durham, Tyne and Wear, Yorks, Lincs, Hull, Sheffield | (2) |
| Midlands: West and Leics, Oxon, Northants, Warwicks, Derbyshire, Lincs and Notts. | (3) |
| Home Counties: Beds, Berks, Bucks, Cambs, Dorset, Essex, Hamps, Herts, Norfolk, Suffolk and Wilts. | (4) |
| London and South East: Kent, Surrey, Sussex, London | (5) |
| Wales and West: Wales, Devon, Cornwall, Somerset, Bristol, Glouc, Hereford, Worc, Shropshire, Staffs | (6) |
| Scotland | (8) |

Q3. Which industry/sector?

| Industry/sector | | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing | (1) |
| Energy and water supply | (2) |
| Minerals, metals, mineral products and chemicals | (3) |
| Metal goods, engineering, automotive | (4) |
| Other manufacturing: food, drink, textiles, leather, wood, paper, rubber, plastics, other | (5) |
| Construction industry | (6) |
| Transport and communications | (7) |
| Banking, finance, insurance | (8) |
| Oil/gas/coal exploration | (9) |
| National government | (10) |
| Local government | (11) |
| Justice, police | (12) |
| Fire service | (13) |
| Defence | (14) |
| Education - primary/secondary | (15) |
| Education - higher | (16) |
| Health industry, residential homes | (17) |
| Unions | (18) |
| Trade associations | (19) |
| Retail/wholesale | (20) |
| Other | (21) |

Q4. Number of employees (relevant to EW2000)

| Number of Employees | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| 0 – 9 | (1) |
| 10 – 49 | (2) |
| 50 – 249 | (3) |
| 250 – 500 | (4) |
| 501 – 1,000 | (5) |
| 1,001 – 3,000 | (6) |
| 3,001 + | (7) |

Q5. Contact name

Q6. Contact position

| Position | | |
|----------|------------------|
| Director/proprietor | (1) |
| Senior Site Manager | (2) |
| H & S Specialist (Mgr. Officer etc.) | (3) |
| Training/HR Officer/Manager | (4) |
| Safety Rep. (shopfloor/union) | (5) |

Q7. How did you first hear about EW2000?

| Received the special Newsletter | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| Saw an editorial | (1) |
| - in a national newspaper e.g. FT | (2) |
| - in a regional newspaper | (3) |
| - in a specialist H&S magazine | (4) |
| Saw an advertisement | (5) |
| - in a national newspaper | (6) |
| - in a regional newspaper | (7) |
| - in a specialist H&S magazine | (8) |
| Heard on radio or TV | (9) |
| Saw on HSE or other web site | (10) |
| At an exhibition or event | (11) |
| Told about it by: | (12) |
| - a work colleague | (13) |
| - the union | (14) |
| - an intermediary e.g. Back Care | (15) |
| Other | (16) |

Q8. Has your organisation participated in a Safety Week before?

Yes | (01) No | (02)
Q9. Did your company/organisation participate in EW 2000?  
   Yes □ (01) No □ (02)  

Q9A. If No, what were the main reasons why you decided not to participate?  
   (be as frank as you wish)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>□ (1)</th>
<th>□ (2)</th>
<th>□ (3)</th>
<th>□ (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time/resource to organise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt it would not add value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not see the concept as &quot;exciting&quot; enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please amplify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9B. If No, in what way could HSE have done more to encourage you to participate?  
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................

Q9C. If Yes to Q9, what were the main factors which motivated you to participate?  
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................

Q10. Did you send in a feedback form to HSE to say how EW 2000 went for you?  
   Yes □ (01) No □ (02)  

Q10A. If you did not, please tell us why not:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>□ (1)</th>
<th>□ (2)</th>
<th>□ (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn't see/couldn't find form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. In your organisation, who makes the decision to participate?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>□ (1)</th>
<th>□ (2)</th>
<th>□ (3)</th>
<th>□ (4)</th>
<th>□ (5)</th>
<th>□ (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director/proprietor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Site Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &amp; S Specialist (Mgr.Officer etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/HR Officer/Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Rep. (shopfloor/union)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12. In preparation for the week, did you:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Yes □</th>
<th>No □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send for the HSE Action Pack?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order other HSE publications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order any HSE videos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access either the HSE or the European agency web site to find out more?</td>
<td>Yes □</td>
<td>No □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13. In terms of their appeal and usefulness to you in organising EW 2000, how would you rate the printed material supplied by HSE?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>□ (1)</th>
<th>□ (2)</th>
<th>□ (3)</th>
<th>□ (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13A. Comments  
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................
   .............................................................................

Q14. Which items proved to be most useful and which least useful?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Most useful</th>
<th>Least useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 page Newsletter</td>
<td>□ (1)</td>
<td>□ (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Pack as a whole</td>
<td>□ (2)</td>
<td>□ (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The posters</td>
<td>□ (3)</td>
<td>□ (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peel-off stickers</td>
<td>□ (4)</td>
<td>□ (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A5 leaflet</td>
<td>□ (5)</td>
<td>□ (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Turn Your Back A4 booklet</td>
<td>□ (6)</td>
<td>□ (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A4 Fact Sheets</td>
<td>□ (7)</td>
<td>□ (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Health is Good Business</td>
<td>□ (8)</td>
<td>□ (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighten the Load booklet</td>
<td>□ (9)</td>
<td>□ (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcards</td>
<td>□ (10)</td>
<td>□ (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q15. In terms of effectiveness, which do you favour?

| Focusing the week on a single theme (like musculoskeletal disorders and back pain) | (1) |
| Or health and safety in general | (2) |

Q16. Is there any theme you would like to see promoted in future years?

Q17. EW2000 was a Europe wide campaign. Do you see any opportunities for your organisation in creating cross-border initiatives as part of future European Weeks?

Yes (01) No (02)

Q18. Examples please

Q19. What activities did you carry out during EW2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used materials provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Put up posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used stickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounted a display or exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created/used special materials of our own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets, booklets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged special internal training/presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In manual handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showed relevant videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged talks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged exercise sessions, back massages, physio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed-back evaluation forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other e.g. children's colouring competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. …………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20. Did you do anything that you consider to have been particularly novel or innovative?

Yes (01) No (02)

Q20A. If so please describe:

Q21. What percentage of your total staff would you say were affected by EW2000? (i.e. caused to think more about health and safety issues)

| 25% or less | (1) |
| about 50% | (2) |
| about 75% | (3) |
| approaching 100% | (4) |

Q22. In relation to musculoskeletal disorders and back injuries, how successful would you say your EW2000 activities were?

| Very (1) |
| Moderately (2) |
| Slightly (3) |
| Not at all (4) |

Q22A in raising the level of awareness of the dangers?

Q22B in getting staff to adopt safer practices

Q23. What feedback, if any, did you receive from staff on the benefits of EW2000?

Q24. Are you aware of any specific changes in working practices that have taken place as a result of participation in EW2000?

Yes (01) No (02)

Q24A. Please quote examples:

Q25. In fairness, do you think these changes would have happened even if you had not participated in EW2000?

Yes (01) No (02)
Q26. How permanent do you expect the effects of EW2000 to be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Months</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years – lasting effect</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27. Which activity during the week gave you the best results and why?

Activity ........................................

Reason why ......................................

Q28. What do you estimate to have been the extra cost of participation in the week, above your normal H&S activities?

£..................................................

Q29. To what extent do you feel that, in your case, the economic benefits justified the costs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q30. To what extent did the non-financial benefits justify participation? e.g. morale improvement, greater teamwork etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q30A Comments ........................................................................................................

Q31. Would you say that, overall, your participation was worthwhile?

Yes □ (01) No □ (02)

Q32. What is the likelihood that your organisation will participate in the next Safety Week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely will</th>
<th>(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly likely</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q33. Is it a good idea to recognise those who participate by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awarding a certificate to all who send in feedback</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holding regional awards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staging a national award event and dinner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q34. Do you have any other ideas for how HSE could improve the effectiveness of its organisation and promotion of EW2000?

...................................................................................................................

Thank you for your cooperation.
HSE BOOKS

MAIL ORDER
HSE priced and free publications are available from:
HSE Books
PO Box 1999
Sudbury
Suffolk CO10 2WA
Tel: 01787 881165
Fax: 01787 313995
Website: www.hsebooks.co.uk

RETAIL
HSE priced publications are available from booksellers

HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION
HSE InfoLine
Tel: 08701 545500
Fax: 02920 859260
e-mail: hseinformationservices@natbrit.com
or write to:
HSE Information Services
Caerphilly Business Park
Caerphilly CF83 3GG

HSE website: www.hse.gov.uk
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