17

**Evaluation of P-101 Course
"Orientation to Occupational
Safety Compliance in DOE"
Taught in Amarillo, Texas
May 7 - May 17, 1991**

R. W. Vinther

July 1991

**Prepared for the
U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830**

**Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Operated for the U.S. Department of Energy
by Battelle Memorial Institute**

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor Battelle Memorial Institute, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or Battelle Memorial Institute. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST LABORATORY
operated by
BATTELLE MEMORIAL INSTITUTE
for the
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830

Printed in the United States of America

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the
Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831;
prices available from (615) 576-8401. FT5 626-8401.

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service,
U.S. Department of Commerce, 5205 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161.

EVALUATION OF P-101 COURSE
"ORIENTATION TO OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY COMPLIANCE
IN DOE" TAUGHT IN AMARILLO, TEXAS
MAY 7, 1991 - May 17, 1991

R. W. Vinther

July 1991

Prepared for
the U.S. Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830

Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Richland, Washington 99352

SUMMARY

This report summarizes trainee evaluations for the DOE Safety Training Institute's course, "Orientation to Occupational Safety Compliance in DOE", which was conducted May 7, 1991 - May 17, 1991 at Amarillo, Texas.

The first part of the report summarizes the quantitative course evaluations that trainees provided upon completion of the course and provides a transcript of the trainees' written comments in Appendix A. The second part summarizes results from the final examination designed to measure the knowledge gained from the course. The third part of the report summarizes course modifications and recommendations for improvement.

Numeric course ratings were generally positive and show that the course material and instruction was very effective. Written comments supported the positive numeric ratings. The course content and knowledge gained by the trainees exceeded most of the students' expectations of the course.

Examination results on the final examination indicate that appropriate knowledge was gained by students attending the course.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	iii
1.0 SUMMARY OF TRAINEE COURSE EVALUATIONS	1.1
1.1 NUMERIC RATINGS	1.1
1.2 WRITTEN COMMENTS	1.4
1.3 EXAMINATION RESULTS	1.5
2.0 SUMMARY OF COURSE	2.1
2.1 NUMERIC RATINGS	2.1
2.1 WRITTEN COMMENTS	2.1
2.3 EXAMINATIONS	2.2
3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS/PROPOSED COURSE MODIFICATIONS	3.1
APPENDIX A - COURSE EVALUATION FORM	A.1
APPENDIX B - COURSE EVALUATION FORM	B.1

1.0 SUMMARY OF TRAINEE COURSE EVALUATIONS

This course was conducted in Amarillo, Texas. Three instructors, including a PNL course administrator, presented the course to thirty-three (33) students.

1.1 NUMERIC RATINGS

Thirty-three (33) trainees completed a course evaluation form upon finishing the course. The first rating area of the form covered five (5) items dealing with course content; the second rating area covered three (3) items dealing with testing materials; and the third rating area covered thirty-one (31) items specifically associated with course topic areas.

For the first and second rating areas, respondents were instructed to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement using a five-point scale with 1 (low) and anchored to "strongly disagree" and 5 (high) anchored to "strongly agree". The ratings are as follows:

COURSE CONTENT RATINGS

1. Developed specific skills and competencies in occupational safety compliance that I can use on the job.

Average Class Rating - 4.16

2. Gained a greater understanding of 29 CFR 1910, Occupational Safety and Health Standards.

Average Class Rating - 4.50

3. Gained factual knowledge about Federal safety and health program requirements.

Average Class Rating - 4.22

4. Would recommend this course to others.

Average Class Rating - 4.53

5. Compliance knowledge gained from this course will make work environments safer.

Average Class Rating - 4.19

The average class rating for the course content area was 4.32. This high rating reinforces the applicability of the course content to the trainees' interests and work environments.

TESTING MATERIALS

1. The final test was a good measure of the knowledge gained in this course.

Average Class Rating - 3.72

2. The final test thoroughly covered materials and instruction presented in the course.

Average Class Rating - 3.69

3. The final test should become a permanent part of this course.

Average Class Rating - 3.34

The average class rating for the testing material was 3.58. Trainees felt that the testing material was applicable and a good measure of what was presented. Some felt that the final test could be improved.

The third rating area asked the respondents to rate the value of each of the 31 topic areas using a five-point scale with 1 (Unsatisfactory), 2 (Satisfactory), 3 (Good), 4 (Very Good), or 5 (Excellent). The following are the average class ratings that dealt with topic content as well as with the value of the instructor:

TOPIC AREA RATINGS

	<u>Topic Area</u>	<u>Content</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
1.	Introduction to DOE Safety and Health Program	3.81	4.22
2.	Introduction to DSHA standards	4.10	4.48
3.	Hazardous Materials -- flammable and combustible materials	4.06	4.22
4.	Materials Handling and Storage	3.93	4.29
5.	Means of egress	4.00	4.26

TOPIC AREA RATINGS (contd)

	<u>Topic Area</u>	<u>Content</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
6.	Fire Protection	3.87	4.11
7.	Compressed gas/air equipment	3.94	4.26
8.	Welding, cutting and brazing	4.13	4.37
9.	Electrical Safety	4.10	4.35
10.	Machine guarding	4.23	4.57
11.	Lock out Tag out (LOTO)	4.00	4.36
12.	Hand and portable tools	4.13	4.39
13.	Construction safety	4.00	4.22
14.	Walking-Working Surfaces	4.26	4.38
15.	Powered platforms	3.90	4.19
16.	Toxic and hazardous substances	3.87	4.07
17.	Carcinogen policy and model standards	3.80	3.93
18.	Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS)	3.84	3.96
19.	Laboratory Safety	3.93	4.14
20.	Personal protective equipment	4.00	4.17
21.	Medical and first aid	3.81	4.07
22.	Occupational health and environmental control	3.97	4.00
23.	Confined space entry	4.13	4.26
24.	General and environmental controls	4.00	4.07
25.	DOE accident/injury/illness reporting system	3.90	4.14
26.	Accident investigation procedures	4.06	4.21
27.	Inspection responsibilities and procedures	4.07	4.27
28.	Introduction to communications and human relations	4.03	4.25
29.	Safety inspection field exercise	4.52	4.50

TOPIC AREA RATINGS (contd)

<u>Topic Area</u>	<u>Content</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
30. Presentation workshop, Part I	4.30	4.39
31. Presentation workshop, Part II	4.38	4.45

The overall average class rating for specific topic content was 4.03. The overall average class rating for the instructors in general was 4.24.

1.2 WRITTEN COMMENTS

After providing numeric course evaluations, participants provided written comments about the course. Written comments were transcribed and are presented in their entirety in Appendix A and are summarized below.

Expectations

The general feeling held by most trainees was that the course met and/or exceeded their expectations. Most felt that it was an excellent review of OSHA regulations and that trainees were given a very good basic understanding of compliance issues.

Most Helpful Topics

Learning how to use the code book was deemed as one of the most helpful parts of this course. In general, trainees were pleased with all parts of the course.

Least Helpful Topics

Topics listed by some of the trainees indicated that Laboratory Safety and Construction were the least useful. This was very subjective in that some trainees are simply not interested in some areas as much as others.

Suggestions For Improvement

Use of more up-to-date films was mentioned as a potential improvement. Some students stated that the slides were hard to read. Preparation of equipment and facility making sure that all equipment is in place well before class starts was mentioned as an area that could be improved. Trainees felt that

there should have been more classroom space with bigger tables and more room for the individuals. More interaction between students and instructor was encouraged for future courses.

Other Types of Training Courses

Courses mentioned of potential interest included Electrical Safety, construction, compressed gases, hoisting and rigging, ergonomics, OSHA refresher course annually.

Other Comments

A general comment was that the course was conducted in an interesting, professional, and beneficial manner.

1.3 EXAMINATION RESULTS

On the last day of the course, a forty (40) question final examination was administered to thirty-three (33) trainees. There were thirty-three (33) multiple choice questions and seven (7) questions that required the trainees to list the appropriate answers.

The scores ranged from 75% to 97.5% with the average score being 87.3%.

2.0 SUMMARY OF COURSE

2.1 NUMERIC RATINGS

Numeric course ratings provided by trainees were positive and show that the course material and instruction was very effective.

The average class ratings for individual questions associated with the applicability of course content ranged from 4.16 to 4.53. The overall average class rating for the course content area was 4.32. This high rating reinforces the applicability of the course content to the trainees' interests and work environments.

The average class ratings for individual statements concerning the effectiveness of the testing materials ranged from 3.34 to 3.72. The overall average class rating for the testing material was 3.58. In general, trainees felt that the examinations were applicable and an adequate measure of what was presented in the class, although ratings were lower than in previous classes.

Specific topic areas were rated as to the value of content as well as the value of instructor ability. Average class ratings for specific topic area content ranged from 3.80 (Carcinogen policy and model standards) to 4.52 (Field Exercise). The overall average class rating for topic content was 4.03.

The average class ratings for instructor ability ranged from 3.93 (Carcinogen policy and model standards) to 4.57 (Machine Guarding). The overall average class rating for the instructors was 4.24.

2.2 WRITTEN COMMENTS

Course materials, presentations, and knowledge gained by the trainees exceeded most of the students' expectations of the course. Trainees felt that the class was interesting, applicable to their needs and was well worth the time and effort. Most would highly recommend this course to others who needed OSHA compliance familiarity. Written comments supported the positive numeric ratings.

2.3 EXAMINATIONS

Examination results showed that most of the class acquired an adequate knowledge of the material presented in the course. Trainees indicated that maintaining similar tests in the future would be a fair measure of the effectiveness of the training course. Student evaluations in this course did rate the applicability of the final examination lower than in previous P-101 courses.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS/PROPOSED COURSE MODIFICATIONS

Trainees and instructors all viewed the course as being successful. The emphasis on use of OSHA standards was deemed very valuable by students as well as an application of those standards to real life situations. One of the most mentioned complaints by the students was the crowded condition of the classroom. More effort should go in to having the site provide adequate training facilities that will enhance the learning environment and assure that the training room is properly set up well before class begins.

Mention was also made about the slides being too hard to read and that more up-to-date films should be used. Lighting in the classroom is often a problem with the slide shows and this should be considered when arranging for the training facility.

All numeric average class ratings were 3 (Good) or higher. The average class ratings that were under 4 (very good) indicate that improvements could be made in those topic areas which are listed below:

- Introduction to DOE S&H Program
- Materials Handling & Storage
- Fire Protection
- Gas/Air Equipment
- Power Platforms
- Toxic Substances
- Carcinogen Policy and Model Standards
- MSDSs
- Medical/First Aid
- Occupational Health and Environment control
- DOE Injury reporting

Trainee evaluations and verbal feedback indicate that additional courses should be considered for development by the Safety Training Institute in the following areas:

- Electrical Safety
- Construction
- OSHA refresher course (annually)
- Compressed gases
- Hoisting and rigging

APPENDIX A

COURSE EVALUATION FORM

"ORIENTATION TO OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY COMPLIANCE IN DOE"

MAY 7, 1991 - MAY 17, 1991--AMARILLO, TEXAS

EVALUATION COMMENTS

APPENDIX A

COURSE EVALUATION FORM

"ORIENTATION TO OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY COMPLIANCE IN DOE"

MAY 7, 1991 - MAY 17, 1991--AMARILLO, TEXAS

EVALUATION COMMENTS

Please briefly describe how your expectations of this course were or were not met.

Were met quite well.

A lot of material in a short time. Very well presented.

Examples and interpretation of standard's applicability met my expectations. The slides could be debatable.

Learned about how to use CFR and how to find answers.

This course was more interesting and informative than I expected.

I expected a little deeper delving into some of the topics and a little more advance preparation by the instructors.

It was a good review of OSHA.

The courses were taught in an interesting manner.

Have become more aware of the safety environment in the workplace in relationship to the OSHA regs.

Exposure to CFRs and their use.

Helped me to safeguard areas of lab.

I have learned a lot for which I am grateful. I did not know ahead that I was scheduled for this class.

I expected the course to be a dry dull nine days which this was not the case. It was a very productive nine days.

All my questions were addressed and much knowledge was obtained from the course. Very good school for broad cross section of students present. Material presented in very simple, easy to understand format. Excellent instructors.

General knowledge presentation was satisfactory.

I believe the class gave a very good basic understanding of OSHA.

The course was much more informative than I expected.

Will be able to find data easier than before.

Basic expectations met because I feel I understand the OSHA, DOE regs. better than before. One problem left over is the fact I really didn't get clear-cut answers to some pertinent questions.

Expectations were met extremely well . . . GOOD JOB!

I gained a good overview of the OSHA regulations and how they apply to my job duties.

Excellent course.

Learned how the 29 CFR is set up and what it covers.

This was one of the best courses I've attended. I didn't know what to expect when I was told I was to go to it.

This gave me a better understanding of OSHA.

Built background in OSHA interpretation and application.

Overall material presented was very good. Instructors knowledgeable and provided good examples, explanations, based on their personal experience.

Too much material in a short time.

I expected and did receive a working knowledge of OSHA CFR 29 regulations and how to use the regulation books.

The most helpful topics covered or activities presented in this course were:

How to mark and use the CFR 29 regulation books.

USAGE -- How to find locations in textbooks (CFR).

All of it.

Pictures of observed violations. Pictures and illustrations of equipment, guards, operating procedures.

29 CFR 1910.

Techniques of using the Code book.

Understanding how to use the Federal Register.

L.O.T.O. and the field exercise.

All.

HAZCOM and lab standards.

Most, if not all, were helpful.

Machine guarding, welding and related items. The handouts will be excellent reference material, may define grey areas not specifically addressed in regs. Field inspection was excellent hands-on training.

All the extra handouts.

How to use the 29 CFR.

All topics were interesting and most were covered quite well.

The use of the OSHA manuals.

Those that pertain and relate to my main job function -- construction management. Also gained knowledge about various other areas.

Hand and portable powered tools, walking - working surfaces. Hazardous materials - flammable and combustible materials, machine guarding.

Means of egress, toxic and hazardous substances, personal protective equipment.

Searching CFR, MSDS, machine guarding, hearing.

PPE's, forklift safety, toxic and hazardous substances.

LOTO, means and egress and walking - working surfaces.

Machine and electrical.

Subpart N and construction safety.

Fire protection, toxic and hazardous substances.

Most of them.

The rules and regulations concerning OSHA and its main objective. I like the site inspections.

Means of egress, office safety, toxic and hazardous substances, electrical safety.

Most of the topics covered were helpful.

DOE accident/injury/illness reporting system and Hazard Communications.

How to read 29 CFR 1910.

Electrical safety.

The least helpful things discussed or done were:

N/A.

Laboratory safety.

The question is subjective. Every subject should be given about the same emphasis.

All things were helpful for me.

For me it was education.

None.

The introduction to OSHA.

Construction.

Lab safety.

Construction is not an area I cover. Interesting questions from class, but it's sometimes hard to get direct answers.

Construction.

Laboratory safety, construction safety, and DOE accident/injury/illness reporting systems.

PPE and health requirements - I don't use these items much in construction. In near future this will change.

The amount of personal opinion presented.

How to use the OSHA standards.

All will help in some way.

None were not helpful.

Medical and first aid, construction safety, lab safety.

As a safety engineer, all topics were helpful.

Walk through presentations seemed a little long.

It was all helpful.

All were helpful.

All things were helpful.

More emphasis should be given to:

Subjects were adequate as presented.

Don't know.

N/A.

Using the Code book.

1910.1000 Hazardous materials.

The liability of a safety professional.

"Communications" and "How to recognize hazards," and "Toxic and Hazardous Substances;" Accident - illness reporting.

In class book work.

Class time for looking up the deficient areas in the 29 CFR 1910.

Students having more inspections to perform (actual inspections).

Most recent safety area audit findings.

Answering the questions of the participants, all questions relating to the course.

More specific application of CFR's to the actual work areas.

LOTO.

Construction.

All subject matter was discussed properly. No emphasis should be placed on one particular topic.

MSDS.

Medical and first aid.

Since I recently started this job, not sure what should be emphasized more or less than others.

The question is subjective. Every subject should be given about the same emphasis.

Accident investigation.

Electrical.

Less emphasis should be given to:

N/A.

Construction safety.

The question is subjective. Every subject should be given about the same emphasis.

Since I recently started this job, not sure what should be emphasized more less than others.

None.

Record keeping.

Construction safety.

Construction safety.

N/A.

All areas presented were needed and information exchange in informal talks was good.

Most subjects were given about the right amount of emphasis.

Well organized -- split up as good as seems possible.

Human relations.

Office safety as the hazards "should" be less compared to high risk areas such as crafts and/or production personnel. Lab safety.

Jungian Personality Analysis.

Understanding the ear.

N/A.

What I had hoped would be covered but wasn't mentioned was:

N/A.

OSHA's viewpoint on chains and why so many different standards exist (i.e., OSHA, ANSI, DOE, Mason Hanger, plant safety standards, maintenance inst, IOPs, etc.).

None.

Nothing.

Most items were covered well enough.

Training certifications -- where do Mason and Hanger trainers go to get certified and where are existing courses available. Can non-certified trainers certify others by just presenting a course and issuing a test for knowledge?

N/A.

N/A.

Fall protection.

Everything I deal with was covered.

None.

Not sure since I only recently began this job.

Since my exposure to OSHA regs was not present, all the topics were informative.

More info on fire prevention.

N/A.

What specific suggestions do you have for improving future sessions. What the presenters might do?

Add more comedy.

More-up-to-date films.

The slides could be better. Carl presented his subjects much more interestingly since he didn't depend on the slides at all. Slides were hard to read.

I enjoyed relating the standards to real life situations. I don't know if more of these discussions could be included.

Show up the day before to make sure all equipment and facilities are in place BEFORE class starts. Prepare better.

None.

The instructors did a great job in making the material interesting. This doesn't improve future sessions but it will be interesting.

N/A.

N/A.

More video and hands-on demonstrations to keep interest alive. The eight hour sessions for 9 days is too much to absorb and created problems doing regular job duties.

Course will improve as it matures.

All instructors did quite well.

Presenters did good. The room could be bigger for that many participants.

List the OSHA reference on the boxes or slides. Some are and some are not.

Have bigger classroom with bigger tables and more individual space.
Presenters do not have to read what slides or material says but evaluate what it says, or what it means in layman's terms.

Use more slides and video presentations showing real life situations that are OSHA violations.

Give each class member an objective to do on their out of class time.

Code book drill.

I thought presenters did a good job of varying presentation. Good contact with participants.

What the participants might do?

Complete the given objective instead of having a final exam or take a comprehensive exam.

Maybe do a before and after mock inspection (one before the class starts and one at the end of class).

Let the student explain certain interpretations of certain standards so that everyone leaves the class with some form of consistency.

Work as a team.

Good class participation.

More specific inspections as compared to a general type.

More active in some areas of material covered and areas of plant that have problems. Print them out.

Less talking while instructor is making presentation.

N/A.

Participants got involved with the material and they should in order to retain interest.

None.

Have a little background of OSHA.

Talk a little more.

Possibly more interaction assignments within classroom. Sometimes listening for more than three hours at a time (even though there are breaks) is cumbersome. In house activities make participants more involved. Learning capacity is raised. (Such as 5/15/91).

More shop tours.

Other materials to supplement or substitute for the provided handouts?

N/A.

All provided material was excellent.

None.

Well organized.

Remember book so that instead of two sets of 1-10, it flows from 10 to 11 to 12 . . . Also, consistency in the books; some had the objectives on viewgraphs and some did not.

None.

N/A.

I felt there were ample handouts and inserts in the book.

Handout current which was good.

Handouts are satisfactory.

The films were good -- more up-to-date might be better.

Handouts were very helpful.

Possible Department of Labor leaflets or more ANSI standards if pertinent.

Not anything.

Good assortment provided. Appropriate to topics.

Handouts were adequate.

Daily schedule/timing of activities, worktime?

Daily worktime was well used.

Good.

Good mix of activities. Breaks appropriately spaced.

Good.

I think the schedule of time was well planned.

Worked out very well -- no changes.

Breaks are a must and were appreciated. Should have had more class study time to do violation worksheet.

Planned good.

OK.

It was OK.

Schedule appeared about right, frequent breaks are required due to the class personnel.

Could not have been better scheduled.

Very good timing -- very close to schedule.

OK.

N/A.

N/A.

OK.

Everything was timed and arranged very well.

I liked the schedule.

Schedule is fine.

Excellent.

N/A.

Facilities/training room arrangements?

N/A.

Hold classes away from plant site.

Room was too small for size of group.

Training room was a bit uncomfortable. A larger room with better ventilation is preferred, las few days did improve.

Larger room and better temperature controls.

The room was too small and not well ventilated.

Tight and uncomfortable -- better if done off plant site. This was the biggest detriment to the class.

Too hot and room too small.

More comfortable chairs.

Cramped.

Too small, too crowded, too little air circulation.

Too small but OK.

Need more space -- more cool air.

Improvement needs to be made with larger room, better ventilation, and more work room on tables.

Adequate -- more room for work table needed -- 12-1 classroom small for number attendees.

Not within control of the instructors.

Have more space -- larger room.

Bigger room -- more tables for material.

Not enough room for getting in or out. Also not enough table space.

Need bigger room, more individual space. Get an uncluttered presenters area. Have useful overhead projector that doesn't malfunction.

As good as possible under the circumstances.

Room was small and crowded. Good donuts though.

Larger room, larger tables, possible four TVs, softer chairs.

Too small but not the fault of the instructors.

Crowded.

Crowded.

Would be nice to have more work space. Ventilation poor at times.

Room was too small and the air conditioning was poor.

Poor -- not enough room for the number in class.

Room was small. Needed more work table surface area to work on.

What other types of safety training courses would you like to see available?

MSDS's.

N/E.

I would like to see Hazardous Materials be covered more thoroughly and LOTO expanded. Also electrical safety, compressed gases, construction, and hoisting and rigging.

More OSHA, some CSP refresher training, more system safety analysis, management technique for liability protection.

Electrical safety.

(Same class, only shortened). Training classes should involve more crafts people, as they are the ones which these standards are basically aimed at. Crafts can provide information that most management is not aware of (i.e., hazards involved in certain operations). Get the people's input that actually do the work.

Most are available off-site.

How these inspections will be implemented into our programs at the plant and what to expect for responses.

Specific to certain areas. (Welding - walking working surfaces, etc.).

More detailed coverage in specific OSHA areas I'm involved with. Also more construction safety and equipment inspection training.

Ergonomics.

Hoisting and rigging.

N/A.

1960.

Construction training, electrical courses, trenching and shoring.

First aid.

OSHA refresher course annually.

N/A.

N/A.

Accident investigation procedures.

N/A.

Any further comments?

I would like to see this course return to Pantex so many others can receive this valuable instruction in OSHA compliance.

The instructors were experts and dedicated.

Generally, course was structured thoughtfully, though more work in class would be helpful and improve the students' attention span.

Carl, Deana, and John were very good instructors.

Instructors were qualified but would have been more effective if they were more familiar with both the plant site and the visual aid equipment.

None.

Good instructors. Good interaction between instructors and students.

Donuts, coffee, cokes were a nice touch.

I consider this an excellent class which would be wonderful if all Pantexans had the opportunity to participate in one of the classes.

It was very interesting, informative, and not dull, dry or boring.

Basically a good course and time utilization very good.

The class was worth the time spent.

Too fast to fully understand all the contents. Overall very good.

The final test should be the student having to write up his findings in the field inspection just as a compliance officer would. All three instructors did a good job under the conditions. Mr. Heise's ability to communicate his professionalism is to be commended. *(We were "flat footed" lied to about final test! DEANA!)*

Class was conducted in an interesting, professional, and beneficial manner.

Course timeline could have been condensed to 7 from 9 days with little loss. Days 7, 8, 9 could be condensed to 1-1/2 days -- Jungian personality analysis was nice but really didn't help my safety knowledge.

Very good class.

N/C.

Too much home study.

There was a lot of information presented during the training course. Hopefully all of it was absorbed in the short time span.

APPENDIX B

COURSE EVALUATION FORM

APPENDIX B

COURSE EVALUATION FORM

Orientation to Occupational Safety Compliance in DOE

Date _____

Name _____

Title _____

Please list your major job duties. _____

What do you expect to gain from this course? _____

Briefly describe your safety training within the last three years? _____

Please evaluate various features of the course you have just completed. Your comments will be kept confidential. The information you provide here will be combined with that from other trainees and summarized for the sponsor, the U.S. Department of Energy. Results from this evaluation will be used to improve this course.

Course Content

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Overall, as a result of this course I believe that I:					
developed specific skills and competencies in occupational safety compliance that I can use on the job. ...5	4	3	2	1	
gained a greater understanding of 29 CFR 1910, Occupational Safety and Health Standards.5	4	3	2	1	
gained factual knowledge about Federal safety and health program requirements5	4	3	2	1	
would recommend this course to others.5	4	3	2	1	
compliance knowledge gained from this course will make work environments safer.5	4	3	2	1	

Testing Materials

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The final test was a good measure of the knowledge gained in the course.5	4	3	2	1	
The final test (and pre-test) thoroughly covered materials and instruction presented in the course.5	4	3	2	1	
The final test (and pre-test) should become a permanent part of this course.5	4	3	2	1	

Topic Areas

Please evaluate each topic area using the 5-point scale below.

5 Excellent 4 Very Good 3 Good 2 Satisfactory 1 Unsatisfactory

	Content					Instructor				
Introduction to DOE safety and health program	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Introduction to OSHA standards	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Hazardous materials—flammable and combustible materials	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Materials handling and storage	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Means of egress	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Fire protection	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Compressed gas/air equipment	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Welding, cutting and brazing	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Electrical safety	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Machine guarding	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Lock out Tag out (LOTO)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Hand and portable powered tools	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Construction safety	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Walking - Working surfaces	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Powered platforms	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Toxic and hazardous substances	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Carcinogen policy and model standards	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
material safety data sheets (MSDS)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Laboratory safety	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Personal protective equipment	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Medical and first aid	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Occupational health and environmental control	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Confined space entry	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
General and environmental controls	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
DOE accident/injury/illness reporting system	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Accident investigation procedures	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Inspection responsibilities and procedures	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Introduction to communications and human relations	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Safety inspection field exercise	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Presentation workshop, Part I	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
Presentation workshop, Part II	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Trainee Comments

Please briefly describe how your expectations of this course were or were not met. _____

The most helpful topics covered or activities presented in this course were: _____

The least helpful things discussed or done were: _____

More emphasis should be given to: _____

Less emphasis should be given to: _____

What I had hoped would be covered but wasn't mentioned was: _____

What specific suggestions do you have for improving future sessions.

What the presenters might do? _____

What the participants might do? _____

Other materials to supplement or substitute for the provided handouts? _____

Daily schedule/timing of activities, worktime? _____

Facilities/training room arrangements? _____

What other types of safety training courses would you like to see available? _____

Any further comments? _____

DISTRIBUTION

No. of
Copies

No. of
Copies

OFFSITE

12 DOE/Office of Scientific and
Technical Information

R. J. Bowser
Office of Safety and Quality
Programs
U.S. Department of Energy
19901 Germantown Rd.
Germantown, MD 20874

C. S. O'Dell
Division of Worker & Facility
Safety
U.S. Department of Energy
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874

J. W. Teske
Division of Worker & Facility
Safety
U.S. Department of Energy
19901 Germantown Rd.
Germantown, MD 20874

V. A. Runnion
Hazcon
4636 E. Marginal Way S.
Suite 215
Seattle, WA 98134

C. H. Heise
1146 Saddle Ridge
Portage, WI 53901

ONSITE

DOE Field Office, Richland

P. W. Kruger

11 Pacific Northwest Laboratory

J. L. Anderson
H. N. Bowers
D. L. Colley
M. J. Farabaugh
R. W. Vinther
Publishing Coordination
Technical Report Files (5)