**Evaluation of M-101 "Managing
Occupational Safety in DOE"
Courses Taught in Richland,
Washington and Los Alamos,
New Mexico**

January-February 1991

R. W. Vinther

April 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. FTS 626-8401.

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service,
U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161.

EVALUATION OF M-101
"MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE"
COURSES TAUGHT IN RICHLAND, WASHINGTON
AND LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO
JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1991

R. W. Vinther

April 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, "Managing Occupational Safety in DOE", which was conducted four times in January 1991. The first course was a Pilot Course conducted January 8 - 9, 1991 at Richland, Washington. A second course was taught in Richland on January 17 - 18, 1991. The last two classes were taught January 29 - 30, 1991 and January 31 - February 1, 1991 in Los Alamos, New Mexico.

Trainee evaluations were generally favorable. They reported that the course was especially helpful in the area of management commitment and employee involvement. Most respondents would recommend this course to others. Trainees offered suggestions for modifying the course; these are summarized and described in the report. All written comments were transcribed and are presented in Appendixes A - D.

No examinations were administered for these four courses.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	iii
1.0 SUMMARY OF TRAINEE COURSE EVALUATIONS	1.1
1.1 JANUARY 8 PILOT ADMINISTRATION, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON	1.1
1.1.1 Numeric Ratings	1.1
1.1.2 Written Comments (Richland -- January 8, 1991) . . .	1.3
1.1.3 Summary	1.4
1.2 JANUARY 17 COURSE ADMINISTRATION, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON . . .	1.5
1.2.1 Numeric Ratings	1.5
1.2.2 Written Comments (Richland - January 17, 1991) . . .	1.7
1.2.3 Summary	1.8
1.3 JANUARY 29 COURSE ADMINISTRATION, LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO . .	1.8
1.3.1 Numeric Ratings	1.8
1.3.2 Written Comments (Los Alamos - January 29, 1991) . .	1.10
1.3.3 Summary	1.11
1.4 JANUARY 31 COURSE ADMINISTRATION, LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO . .	1.12
1.4.1 Numeric Ratings	1.12
1.4.2 Written Comments (Los Alamos - January 31, 1991) . .	1.14
1.4.3 Summary	1.15
2.0 SUMMARY OF COURSE MODIFICATIONS	2.1
APPENDIX A - TRAINEE EVALUATION COMMENTS -- JANUARY 8 - 9, 1991	A.1
APPENDIX B - TRAINEE EVALUATION COMMENTS -- JANUARY 17 - 18, 1991 . .	B.1
APPENDIX C - TRAINEE EVALUATION COMMENTS -- JANUARY 29 - 30, 1991 . .	C.1
APPENDIX D - TRAINEE EVALUATION COMMENTS -- JANUARY 31 - FEBRUARY 1, 1991	D.1
APPENDIX E - TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM	E.1

This report summarizes information on the trainee evaluation forms from the four courses administered during January 1991 shown below:

January 8 - 9, 1991	Richland, Washington
January 17 - 18, 1991	Richland, Washington
January 29 - 30, 1991	Los Alamos, New Mexico
January 30 - February 1, 1991	Los Alamos, New Mexico

1.0 SUMMARY OF TRAINEE COURSE EVALUATIONS

1.1 JANUARY 8 PILOT ADMINISTRATION, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

This pilot course was conducted at Richland. One PNL instructor and a course administrator presented the course to ten Pacific Northwest Laboratory employees.

1.1.1 Numeric Ratings

Ten trainees completed a course evaluation form upon finishing the course. The first twelve items of the rating form were general; eleven of them dealing with attitudes and insights gained from the course with the last question asking how they would recommend the class to others. 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".

GENERAL RATINGS

1. Gained an awareness of the cultural changes presently underway in the Department of Energy regarding safety and health programs.

Average class rating - 4.10

2. Understand how management commitment and Employee Involvement is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.

Average class rating - 4.60

3. Gained an appreciation for why safety training is essential for establishing management expectations for safe work performance.

Average class rating - 3.80

4. Understand how Worksite Analysis is used to identify risks to safety and health.

Average class rating - 3.50

5. Learned that Hazard Prevention and Control is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.

Average class rating - 3.80

6. Understand that safety can and must be managed like other functions.

Average class rating - 4.50

7. Realize that normal line management systems must be used to maintain reasonable accountability for safety performance.

Average class rating - 4.10

8. Understand that the underlying causes of most accidents involve inadequate management systems.

Average class rating - 4.00

9. Realize that safety takes total organizational involvement.

Average class rating - 4.30

10. Understand that each individual makes a difference.

Average class rating - 4.50

11. Was motivated to take a leadership role in managing occupational safety in my organization.

Average class rating - 4.00

12. Would recommend this course to others.

Average class rating - 4.10

SPECIFIC COURSE CONTENT RATINGS

The last numeric ratings allowed the student to evaluate specific course content along four dimensions: value to health and safety, value of course content, value of training aids (videos, slides, notebooks, handouts, etc.), and value of instructor. Respondents were instructed to rate the value of each topic using a five-point scale with 1 (unsatisfactory), 2 (satisfactory), 3 (Good), 4 (Very Good), or 5 (Excellent). The following shows the average value rating from those in class responding to the respective questions:

	<u>Health & Safety</u>	<u>Course Content</u>	<u>Training Aids</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
Course Introduction/ Overview	3.13	3.86	3.57	4.22
Management Commitment/ Employee Involvement	4.44	4.00	3.88	4.11
Safety Training	4.11	3.44	3.38	3.67
Worksite Analysis	4.00	3.22	3.13	3.56
Hazard Prevention and Controls	3.78	3.11	2.88	3.56

1.1.2 Written Comments (Richland -- January 8, 1991)

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

Expectations

As this was a pilot course, many of the respondents did not come to the course with a set expectation of what they might learn. One comment indicated that expectations were exceeded in that the person gained insights from examples that would improve future safety efforts.

Most Helpful Topics

Practical examples of management commitment (such as the information on the NIOSH studies) was found to be helpful. Generally, the topic of

Management Commitment and Employee Involvement were regarded as very important and helpful. The videos and the company safety rating sheets were appreciated by most respondents.

Least Helpful Topics

It was felt that the information on Safety Training was too detailed and overemphasized.

Suggestions for Improvement

The area of Hazard Prevention and Control could have been emphasized more. Additional class discussion would have been beneficial.

Instructors

If it continues to be a two day course, there should be two instructors to keep enthusiasm high in the classroom. A stronger emphasis on the conclusion slides could have been made. The quotes from books on safety management issues was appreciated.

Other Comments

It was stated that the class may be too long -- that it could be shortened up and be just as effective. Respondents said that having a DOE-HQ representative (Charles O'Dell) was an excellent way to show commitment. It was suggested that someone from the DOE field office be present at all local classes.

1.1.3 Summary

The Pilot Course was very successful. Respondents felt that the courses would be more valuable in the future if representation from upper management was more evident so that viewpoints from all working levels could be shared. The class gave very favorable comments on the intent and direction of the course.

1.2 JANUARY 17 COURSE ADMINISTRATION, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

The second course was conducted at Richland. One PNL instructor and a course administrator presented the course to ten Pacific Northwest Laboratory employees.

1.2.1 Numeric Ratings

Seven trainees completed a course evaluation form upon finishing the course. The first twelve items of the rating form were general; eleven of them dealing with attitudes and insights gained from the course with the last question asking how they would recommend the class to others. 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".

GENERAL RATINGS

1. Gained an awareness of the cultural changes presently underway in the Department of Energy regarding safety and health programs.

Average class rating - 3.57

2. Understand how management commitment and Employee Involvement is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.

Average class rating - 4.29

3. Gained an appreciation for why safety training is essential for establishing management expectations for safe work performance.

Average class rating - 3.86

4. Understand how Worksite Analysis is used to identify risks to safety and health.

Average class rating - 4.14

5. Learned that Hazard Prevention and Control is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.

Average class rating - 3.71

6. Understand that safety can and must be managed like other functions.

Average class rating - 4.43

7. Realize that normal line management systems must be used to maintain reasonable accountability for safety performance.

Average class rating - 3.71

8. Understand that the underlying causes of most accidents involve inadequate management systems.

Average class rating - 3.43

9. Realize that safety takes total organizational involvement.

Average class rating - 3.71

10. Understand that each individual makes a difference.

Average class rating - 3.86

11. Was motivated to take a leadership role in managing occupational safety in my organization.

Average class rating - 3.71

12. Would recommend this course to others.

Average class rating - 4.14

SPECIFIC COURSE CONTENT RATINGS

The last numeric ratings allowed the student to evaluate specific course content along four dimensions: value to health and safety, value of course content, value of training aids (videos, slides, notebooks, handouts, etc.), and value of instructor. Respondents were instructed to rate the value of each topic using a five-point scale with 1 (unsatisfactory), 2 (satisfactory), 3 (Good), 4 (Very Good), or 5 (Excellent). The following shows the average value rating from those in class responding to the respective questions:

	<u>Health & Safety</u>	<u>Course Content</u>	<u>Training Aids</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
Course Introduction/ Overview	3.43	3.43	3.43	4.00
Management Commitment/ Employee Involvement	4.33	4.00	3.67	4.17
Safety Training	3.80	3.80	4.00	4.00
Worksite Analysis	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.29
Hazard Prevention and Controls	4.00	3.71	3.71	4.14

1.2.2 Written Comments (Richland - January 17, 1991)

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

Expectations

Only two respondents commented on this topic. Information presented was viewed as excellent. One DOE-RL participant had expected a better representation from RL personnel and that he could have benefited more from discussions from mid- and upper-management personnel. Unfortunately they were not there.

Most Helpful Topics

Sharing of experiences, class discussions and rating exercises were very useful to the students. Stressing management commitment was appreciated by trainees.

Least Helpful Topics

The introduction, overview and Tiger team findings appeared to be over-emphasized and drawn out for the class. The class consisted of individuals with Safety and Health experience.

Suggestions for Improvement

Several of the trainees commented on reducing the time spent on the introduction and overview. Some mentioned limiting the class to 1 - 1 and 1/2

days. It was generally inferred that a class made up of personnel from all levels would be beneficial for a mix of views and experience. Limit breaks to a shorter time period.

Instructors

Attendees were impressed with John Piatt as an instructor and encouraged his continued involvement in the program.

Other Comments

Overall opinion was that the course was very good. Trainees felt that more managers should have been in attendance at the course to get the message to the right people.

1.2.3 Summary

Written comments corroborated the positive numeric ratings. Respondents generally had positive comments about the course and course contents. Overall consensus showed that students felt the material to be very important, but they were disappointed that perhaps managers at a higher level were not at the class to show genuine management commitment and involvement.

1.3 JANUARY 29 COURSE ADMINISTRATION, LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO

The third course was conducted at Los Alamos, New Mexico. One PNL instructor and a course administrator presented the course to twenty-four LANL, Sandia, DOE-AL, and Pinellas Plant employees.

1.3.1 Numeric Ratings

Sixteen trainees completed a course evaluation form upon finishing the course. The first twelve items of the rating form were general; eleven of them dealing with attitudes and insights gained from the course with the last question asking how they would recommend the class to others. 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".

GENERAL RATINGS

1. Gained an awareness of the cultural changes presently underway in the Department of Energy regarding safety and health programs.

Average class rating - 3.94

2. Understand how management commitment and Employee Involvement is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.

Average class rating - 4.25

3. Gained an appreciation for why safety training is essential for establishing management expectations for safe work performance.

Average class rating - 3.56

4. Understand how Worksite Analysis is used to identify risks to safety and health.

Average class rating - 3.63

5. Learned that Hazard Prevention and Control is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.

Average class rating - 3.88

6. Understand that safety can and must be managed like other functions.

Average class rating - 4.25

7. Realize that normal line management systems must be used to maintain reasonable accountability for safety performance.

Average class rating - 4.00

8. Understand that the underlying causes of most accidents involve inadequate management systems.

Average class rating - 4.13

9. Realize that safety takes total organizational involvement.

Average class rating - 4.44

10. Understand that each individual makes a difference.

Average class rating - 4.19

11. Was motivated to take a leadership role in managing occupational safety in my organization.

Average class rating - 3.93

12. Would recommend this course to others.

Average class rating - 3.64

SPECIFIC COURSE CONTENT RATINGS

The last numeric ratings allowed the student to evaluate specific course content along four dimensions: value to health and safety, value of course content, value of training aids (videos, slides, notebooks, handouts, etc.), and value of instructor. Respondents were instructed to rate the value of each topic using a five-point scale with 1 (unsatisfactory), 2 (satisfactory), 3 (Good), 4 (Very Good), or 5 (Excellent). The following shows the average value rating from those in class responding to the respective questions:

	<u>Health & Safety</u>	<u>Course Content</u>	<u>Training Aids</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
Course Introduction/ Overview	3.13	3.33	2.87	3.20
Management Commitment/ Employee Involvement	3.94	3.31	2.73	3.27
Safety Training	3.60	3.40	2.73	3.00
Worksite Analysis	3.53	2.86	2.64	3.07
Hazard Prevention and Controls	3.47	2.86	2.64	3.07

1.3.2 Written Comments (Los Alamos - January 29, 1991)

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

Expectations

Expectations were mixed. Many of the respondents had expected greater focus on the elements of a VPP program.

Most Helpful Topics

The training questionnaire for new employees was considered a valuable tool for assessing training needs. Positive comments were made on most of the presentation topics, especially Management Commitment and Involvement.

Least Helpful Topics

A demonstration on LANL computer equipment was given during the class at the request of Mike Baker from LANL. This appeared to be distracting to the M-101 presentation. Comments were made that there was too much reading of the graphics and that the computer graphics were actually distracting.

Suggestions for Improvement

It was felt that more group discussion and class exercises would be helpful. It was suggested that the class breakup in to smaller groups to discuss key points on safety issues.

Instructors

Respondents felt that instructors read too much off the viewgraphs and that the presentation could have been more polished. Again, incorporation of class involvement and participation was stressed.

Other Comments

It was a common comment that none of this material was new to safety personnel, yet it was felt that all managers should attend the course. Most respondents felt the course material was important. Generally, the attendees had the expectation that they were coming to a detailed course on the specifics of a DOE VPP program. That was not the intention of the course.

1.3.3 Summary

The general consensus showed that attendees had expected a "nuts and bolts" presentation on the DOE VPP program. In that respect, many respondents felt the course did not meet their expectations. It was their opinion, however, that the information presented was important to share and discuss.

This was especially pointed out by those who were not directly involved in ES&H activities at the site. Those individuals felt all managers should attend this type of course.

1.4 JANUARY 31 COURSE ADMINISTRATION, LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO

The fourth course was conducted at Los Alamos, New Mexico. One PNL instructor and a course administrator presented the course to twenty-five LANL employees.

1.4.1 Numeric Ratings

Twenty-two trainees completed a course evaluation form upon finishing the course. The first twelve items of the rating form were general; eleven of them dealing with attitudes and insights gained from the course with the last question asking how they would recommend the class to others. 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".

GENERAL RATINGS

1. Gained an awareness of the cultural changes presently underway in the Department of Energy regarding safety and health programs.

Average class rating - 3.59

2. Understand how management commitment and Employee Involvement is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.

Average class rating - 4.45

3. Gained an appreciation for why safety training is essential for establishing management expectations for safe work performance.

Average class rating - 3.86

4. Understand how Worksite Analysis is used to identify risks to safety and health.

Average class rating - 3.45

5. Learned that Hazard Prevention and Control is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.

Average class rating - 3.91

6. Understand that safety can and must be managed like other functions.

Average class rating - 4.41

7. Realize that normal line management systems must be used to maintain reasonable accountability for safety performance.

Average class rating - 4.24

8. Understand that the underlying causes of most accidents involve inadequate management systems.

Average class rating - 4.29

9. Realize that safety takes total organizational involvement.

Average class rating - 4.67

10. Understand that each individual makes a difference.

Average class rating - 4.48

11. Was motivated to take a leadership role in managing occupational safety in my organization.

Average class rating - 3.65

12. Would recommend this course to others.

Average class rating - 3.95

SPECIFIC COURSE CONTENT RATINGS

The last numeric ratings allowed the student to evaluate specific course content along four dimensions: value to health and safety, value of course content, value of training aids (videos, slides, notebooks, handouts, etc.), and value of instructor. Respondents were instructed to rate the value of each topic using a five-point scale with 1 (unsatisfactory), 2 (satisfactory), 3 (Good), 4 (Very Good), or 5 (Excellent). The following shows the average rating from all those in class responding to the respective questions:

	<u>Health & Safety</u>	<u>Course Content</u>	<u>Training Aids</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
Course Introduction/ Overview	3.53	3.44	3.56	4.00
Management Commitment/ Employee Involvement	4.58	4.06	3.72	4.21
Safety Training	3.84	3.33	3.56	3.95
Worksite Analysis	3.88	3.25	3.00	3.82
Hazard Prevention and Controls	3.94	3.53	3.56	4.25

1.4.2 Written Comments (Los Alamos - January 31, 1991)

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

Expectations

A common comment was that trainees expected more detailed information on the DOE Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) and specifics on how to set up a pilot VPP program.

Most Helpful Topics

Discussions were viewed very favorably. The section on Management Commitment and Involvement was deemed helpful. The realization that many safety management problems are universal was appreciated.

Least Helpful Topics

Review of general ES& H requirements, DOE's basis for cultural change, and previous DOE problems that contractors feel they had no control over.

Suggestions for Improvement

Students wanted more emphasis on details of implementing a DOE VPP program. Smaller group discussions should be encouraged. Some respondents felt that lecture involved too much reading to the class. It was emphasized

that regular class breaks need to be adhered to. The classroom environment, chairs without tables, was not desirable to many respondents.

Instructors

Comments were favorable on instructor's expertise and use of examples and anecdotes. Instructor's facilitation of discussion time was appreciated overall.

Other Comments

Class participation was viewed to be of great value. Some disturbances, such as "pagers" in the room were an unnecessary distraction.

1.4.3 Summary

Several of the respondents appeared to be disappointed that this course was not a "nuts and bolts" course of implementing a Voluntary Protection Program. Many of them had been given the impression that they would be learning a step by step procedure on the DOE VPP program. Signs on the classroom specifically titled the class "VPP Course". All in all, respondents were appreciative of efforts to increase management commitment and involvement in DOE but were apprehensive as to how that was actually being accomplished.

2.0 SUMMARY OF COURSE MODIFICATIONS

Numeric course ratings provided by trainees were generally positive and show that the course was effective. One of the rated items that varied somewhat amongst the four courses was in the area of training aids. The January 29 - 30, 1991 Los Alamos course scored values somewhat lower than the three other classes. A key factor in the low rating for training aids was the lack of proper projection equipment and the less than adequate room lighting control. Students in the other three courses rated the value of training aids much higher. The Los Alamos courses were taught in training rooms that did not have tables to place course materials on. As the course continues to be presented in different locations, adequate equipment and facilities will need to be utilized to enhance the effect of training aids.

From the pilot course at Richland, Washington to the last course in Los Alamos, New Mexico, several course content and style modifications were made. Based on comments from students and the instructors' own class experience, the graphics were modified to trim back on the details of training guidelines and programs and to reemphasize the important points of Management Commitment and Employee involvement.

More quotes from management periodicals and reference books were added to the course. A big improvement was the increased group discussions that were occurring by the time of the last course. A segment on development of action plans to improve sight specific safety issues became an important addition to the course. This occurred by breaking the class into small groups. Mutual safety challenges were discussed and "plans of attack" were formulated to address individual as well as shared safety issues.

Feedback on the importance of class involvement will guide the direction of the course in the future. Several different methods of group discussion and class exercises were incorporated. Thought should be given to modifying the course structure to adhere to a workshop or seminar environment. This would allow and encourage trainee ownership in the development and formulation of safety action plans that could be put to practical use in their respective work locations.

To evaluate future course effectiveness, followup questionnaires could be used to determine how safety management principles have been applied on the job as a result of this course.

APPENDIX A

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM
"MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE"
JANUARY 8 - 9, 1991 -- PILOT COURSE IN RICHLAND, WASHINGTON
EVALUATION COMMENTS

APPENDIX A

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM
"MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE"
JANUARY 8 - 9, 1991 -- PILOT COURSE IN RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

EVALUATION COMMENTS

January 8-9, 1991
TRAINEE COMMENTS

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

The Course identified the problems and attributes of EH&S programs. I think it would be valuable to show or state specific methods for correcting deficiencies in EH&S programs. How do you get employee involvement for example.

I wasn't sure of what to expect; however, in general I thought the course was very good and the instructor did a fine job.

Lots of background/Theory information.

I was very pleased with the course content. Most importantly for the first time, having a clearer understanding of DOE's position on ES&H and the constraints/needs required to meet DOE's initiatives in this area.

Content the 1st day was great, dragged the second day. Mgmt involvement emphasis is there. The message was made clear. But not really tied to DOE. Need to say VPP is DOE's way.

I felt I would receive some good general information which would reinforce our current efforts. My expectations were exceeded in that I have gained many specific examples which can be applied directly to improve our efforts.

The course provided ideas on managing safety as a project rather than an added responsibility. It provided a view of safety beyond the supervisor responsibility.

I had no preconceived expectations, other than providing comments and crew the course and how it would benefit my group.

I didn't have any expectations because I didn't know what the course was about.

Wasn't sure at the beginning of what to expect. I was signed up for the course without any introduction.

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

Admiral Watkin's message in terms of safety.

Successful Company models for ES&H programs.

Key Elements for successful ES&H programs.

Management commitment/Practical examples of mgmt commitment.

NIOSH study slides and data were excellent. Also follow up slides/data regarding what organization can/should do to meet good company's standards.

Rating evaluation chart and discussion re: BNW practices from our viewpoint.

The management commitment and employee involvement section, in particular the discussion generated by rating the company safety program.

The section on mgmt commitment provided excellent info. Every manager should be exposed to this class. The video's info from Dupont and the safety program rating sheet were great.

Interaction discussion with other managers and discussion of individual and company problems and attitudes. Ideas on safety training, worksite analysis, materials available within other organizations. Grading the company exercise.

Main activities of a good ES&H program concept of an integrated activity of overall management system.

Discussions regarding staff involvement and participation. Working together as an organization. It was good to have references of later study.

The least helpful things discussed or done were:

Training program - it's necessary but to such detail isn't.

Safety training and introduction/overview.

To much history - Tiger Team results could be shorter.

Criminal activity/aspects - video of same re: Aberdeen.

The safety training section was to lengthy and could have been more specific based on the S&H model - Slides 181-187, don't think it was necessary to spend much time on the OSHA voluntary training guidelines, etc.

All items are needed to provide complete program and understanding.

Hazard prevention and control could be beefed up.

Details of safety training content.

More emphasis should be given to:

Not enough detail (I'm not sure) on hazard analysis/prevention control.

The most emphasis should be given to management commitment/employee involvement. Actual culture change was discussed very little.

DOE demands for safety program. What are useful trend analysis tools?
Accountability is ultimately the CEO.

Interaction between the trainees, discussion, etc.

Mgmt commitment and that upper and line mgmt really set the tone for a successful safety program.

Top management commitment and involvement - Representative present.

Criteria for goals - objectives, performance indicators/evaluation.

Possibly providing working examples of worksite analysis.

How to set up program for hazard prevention and control.

Positive examples of good practices and situations which have happened here at Battelle. Rewards to staff for safety performance.

Less emphasis should be given to:

Details of VPP, pick the overall summarize in the best methods not results of studies 1-2 & 3.

Training doesn't need to be discussed as much.

Safety training and introduction/overview try to shorten the class by spending less time on these subjects.

The 3 studies of successful programs and the VPP descriptions.

Avoid elements that address implementation of the components of ES&H programs. I think you did this with some of your viewgraph material.

Safety Training section - other than stressing responsibilities.

None.

Tiger teams and Watkin's initiatives as drivers - needs to be there but not as much.

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

More emphasis on safety is away of doing business. We're in the ES&H business.

How you can improve safety by starting at the bottom of the management change - make your supervisor aware.

DOE's insistence that the VPP be instituted.

Specific tools to help manage safety. It sounds like Jeanne Hobbs is working on these training modules.

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

I think course could be compressed to 1 day.
If 2-day course, I would benefit by having 2 presenters for variety as well as to keep the instructors enthusiastic about subject.

Emphasize Conclusion slides.

Try to shorten up class.

Make it more acceptable to managers, not a "nuts and bolts" safety program (to much training detail).

DOE will comply with OSHA but compliance does not mean DOE is satisfied.
Safety goes beyond.

More on the "customer" theme - public - sponsor - employees and effect of safety program - i.e. WHC example in last rating.

I would like to see the management structures (layouts/function that lead to the successful models presented. What are the elements of these structures and do they work. Specific case studies might be good to show the inner workings of the structures.

At least one additional group discussion period.

Add another presenter to provide additional views and relieve speaker. May increase attention span. Add more exercises such as evaluation of company.

What the participants might do?

I don't think this is needed.

Volunteer - what works in their group, How do they show safety program involvement.

Class participation re: Company rating chart was excellent If 1 day course this is enough; however, if a 2 - day I would suggest more class participation in another area.

Use a questionnaire up front on how they feel about the S&H program or use the exercise of 3 corporate values.

Discussion sessions.

Participate in exercised, provide experience in safety both good and bad.

Other materials to supplement or substitute for the provided handouts?

Try personal exercise at the end of each section. Three (any #) of actions I could take to implement/improve this S&H program element in my organization.

Thought handout notebook was good. Helpful if the numbers of the overhead copies were larger so could read and follow instructor better.

Not needed.

Handout of DOE vs. Industry stats.

You should provide the results of the participants company rating on safety and health program management.

Improve quality of video tape, Highlight with good and bad example. Top management representative to address the class on company commitment to the S&H program.

John quoted from several books and I found this to be one of the most interesting aspects of the class. Copies of these materials should be included in the notebook.

Provide answers from an interview with staff members on different questions regarding our ES&H program.

Daily schedule/timing of activities, worktime?

OKAY

I think the course could be conducted in 8 hours.

Generally good.

Good/fine.

Facilities/training room arrangement?

Good luck w/ the overhead!

These were adequate.

OKAY/Good.

It was good to have a limited number of participants to allow easy discussion.

Any further comments?

I think it would be valuable to have a person from DOE present at everyone of these classes. Perhaps you might want to get an ES&H representative from DOE/RL to attend.

Overhead slides were great but a little variety would add greatly.

Pre-class literature should indicate course content; i.e., not expected to be rules/regulations type course.

Print your evaluation on 2 sides. You shouldn't need a whole separate cover sheet. Print in 10 pitch to reduce the # of pages. (waste min opportunities are everywhere, just like S&H).

If the course at a particular time is given to a select level, other level viewpoints need to be provided.

DOE representative (Charlie O'Dell) was excellent show their commitment. Provide participant with previous information on class objectives.

Presentation - Excellent.

Handouts - Excellent.

APPENDIX B

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM
"MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE"
JANUARY 17 - 18, 1991 -- RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

EVALUATION COMMENTS

APPENDIX B

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM "MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE" JANUARY 17 - 18, 1991 -- RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

EVALUATION COMMENTS

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

The information presented was excellent. The only problem is, I can't fully implement the safety program presented.

I was expecting to be the person among several DOE-RL participants, and that I would benefit from discussions involving mid management (directors) and senior management (AM's, DM's, and the MGR). As it turned out I was the senior of two RL people.

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

The exercise and discussion based on the "How do you rate your company," safety and health program management.

Discussions regarding the necessity of mgmt involvement.

Aside from very good presented material, I believe that sharing experiences and individual comments was very useful.

Employee involvement programs, employee safety motivation, accident analysis.

All of the information was helpful and informative.

Need for management commitment by upper management.

The least helpful things discussed or done were:

The Tiger Team findings, etc.

Because I was not really prepared for the course, I felt the introduction and overview were long and irrelevant. I had lots of problems connecting the introduction and overview with the training.

More emphasis should be given to:

If this course is for mid and upper management it should be presented to those levels and put emphasis on the "How do you rate ----?" This exercise could be the beginning of a strong program to change the culture and getting management involved.

Way to get mgmt involved which have proven successful.

The course needs to be introduced by someone from the director level. With more actual "How To".

Less emphasis should be given to:

Everything else in the course. I recommend that the course be cut to 8 hours or less and that at least 5 hours be oriented to the "How do you rate ---?"

The introduction and overview. More time should be spent on the items from "Safety Training" and reduce the amount of time spent on "Basis for Cultural Change".

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

A recipe for "Managing Occupational Safety in DOE" as the course title implies. The only thing I saw along these lines was confirmation of my confusion about responsibility of safety staff and verification that there is no recipe.

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

Reduce time on overview, condense "Basis for Cultural Change", have director level involvement, better control over breaks.

Have the directors of each contractor attend and give a brief introduction.

Limit to one day.

Class made up of all levels of staff.

Get more students. Get PNL mgmt more involved. Perhaps drive attendance through the SDR/ES&H goal setting process.

J.A.P. Does a very good job! Keep him!

Until we get our safety program management organized and are able to have a few more answers to questions I would change the title to "Management Commitment to Safety". I realize that the presenters probably do not have authority to do this.

What the participants might do?

Break up into group of 3 for 10-15 minutes to provide innovative ideas how to implement or discipline what are going to be the long jams.

Show up for every session.

Encourage mgmt attendance.

Interaction was good, anymore might take away from the course content.

Other materials to supplement or substitute for the provided handouts?

Case histories of companies in which cultural change was successfully implemented.

More information about the other successful safety programs like OxyChem.

Handout evaluation form at the beginning of the class.

Handouts on "How do you rate ---?" and Voluntary Protection.

Organizational charts for the groups involved.

Daily schedule/timing of activities, worktime?

Condense course to 8 hours, I got the impression that the instructors were told to make this material fill up 16 hours.

The breaks were out of control.

I think the class should be reduced to a day and a half.

Perhaps too many breaks.

Very good - approve 50 minute sessions.

Facilities/training room arrangements?

Good.

Any further comments?

We really need those people who have the organizational power to effect change.

I was impressed with the course and I'm recommending it to my management. I hope somebody will listen, learn, and implement.

The information presented is excellent and the presentation very good. However, I came away feeling that I still do not know what PNL expects me to do with this information.

I think the class was a good management class, but it failed to put any great amount of emphasis on Occupational Health. The class might be retitled "Managing people in DOE."

The instructor did a good job.

It is a good program - get more mgrs to attend.

APPENDIX C

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM
"MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE"
JANUARY 29 - 30, 1991 -- LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO

EVALUATION COMMENTS

APPENDIX C

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM
"MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE"
JANUARY 29 - 30, 1991 -- LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO

EVALUATION COMMENTS

January 29 - 30
TRAINEE COMMENTS

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

I would have liked to hear more about the details of implementing and managing a VPP.

I was volunteered on short notice for this course and therefore had no expectations.

I don't know how to set up a VPP of LANL.

Was hoping for more practical solutions rather than theoretical.

Overall, met my expectations.

This course was not very motivational.

Expected greater focus on VPP (OSHA) and examples of how it was implemented.

Expected more emphasis on goal setting.

More time on "how to" develop a VPP program for LANL. How should we organize to develop one - what is the model?

Too much selling of importance of safety, I personally did not need this.

Thought it was more an OSHA requirement, turned out to more of a management training course.

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

Management commitment and message that safety is just good management.

Safety Training Handout to New Employees. (Survey of training needed)

Support for Risk Analysis Training.

Worksite Analysis.

Training needs survey.

Videos good idea/broke up long lectures.

VPP explanation.

Importance of involvement of everyone.

I found all topics helpful.

Discussions and working with others in small groups.

Management commitment and employee involvement.

The least helpful things discussed or done were:

MORT.

Basis for cultural change took too much time - We have already bought in the concept - We need to know how to make it work.

Demo on Next.

Why? We already know why we have to change.

Use of computer graphics - **distracting!**

Survey exercise - could have been better done in teams
Too much **reading** viewgraphs.

Worksite Analysis.

1st part of Safety Training.

More emphasis should be given to:

Hazard Analysis, Risk Assessment.

How to implement this (ES&H) with management.

Need more discussion, need more questions about what a good manager is doing.

Group discussion.

Hazard Prevention and Control.

Telling success stories.

Example of positive practice at other sites.

Findings from OSHA assessment of DOE Health and Safety Program (Dec. 90 report).

Less time on theory - more on practice.

Less emphasis should be given to:

Reading the viewgraphs.

Basis for cultural change portion.

Why we need it. -- Didn't need details of Tiger Team and three studies -- Tiger team and study fine.

Introductory matter (although great) could be reduced.

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

OSHA requirements.

How to implement VPP.

VPP - how to do it!

Goal setting and Tiger Team expectations.

Timely responses to employee suggestions and requests.

More examples of ways to involve employees in ES&H in creative ways.

What are the major components of a VPP.

Who is responsible for each component.

What does an OSHA VPP look like/who has one?

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

More audience participation, exercises, presenters seemed to lose concentration when comments made from participants.

I heard comments and agree that the info. could have been presented more dynamically to hold the attention of the audience.

Decrease introduction, give more information about VPPs.

Difficult viewgraphs, better room, more discussion.

Read fewer view graphs.

The visual aids could be improved, too much of the same thing - also more class participation would be helpful.

I really don't like to be read to. John, you were more relaxed the second day and got away from reading every word - that helped me relax and apply your principles to my situation.

Presenters need a course in Basic Instructor Training - Hanford teaches several that are said to be good. Adult learners dislike being read to.

Spend too much time playing with equipment, use standard overhead.

What the participants might do?

Breakup into smaller groups to discuss key points on Occupational Safety or specific problems.

Put less on overheads, and allow more audience interaction.

Other materials to supplement or substitute for the provided handouts?

Draft VPP.

Perhaps a case study.

Handouts to backup statistics.

Daily schedule/timing of activities, worktime?

4 1/2 days would be better.

Lessons right after lunch are always difficult.

For the way the material was presented it could have been a one day course.

Too long, one day max.

Need more variation, too much time spent in lecture portion.

More change of pace needed.

A 1/2 day course would be better.

No break the afternoon of day 2.

Facilities/training room arrangements?

Too cold.

Nice room. I didn't enjoy sitting in rows and taking notes in my lap.

More round table atmosphere.

Room geared to more formal presentation: tended to restrain discussion.

Desks would have been nice.

Any further comments?

Material covered too quickly. All managers should be required to take this course.

Overall, a very good class. I learned a lot and am motivated to try new ideas.

The information covered should not be new to a Safety manager, but is the type of info important to every manager of an organization if ES&H is to be a priority.

APPENDIX D

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM
"MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE"
JANUARY 31 - FEBRUARY 1, 1991 -- LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO
EVALUATION COMMENTS

APPENDIX D

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM "MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE" JANUARY 31 - FEBRUARY 1, 1991 -- LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO

EVALUATION COMMENTS

January 31 - February 1, 1991
TRAINEE COMMENTS

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

I really did not know what to expect. But I can see, after having been through this course, that Los Alamos is on the right track. My resolve to ES&H compliance has been strengthened.

Very informative, expectations met.

I expected more information on the DOE VPP program. What exactly do we need to do?

I thought we were going to learn more steps to ensure how to implement a VPP at LANL.

I expected the course would consist of nuts and bolts of a VPP program. Pleasant surprise that it turned out to be Safety Management 101.

Course strongly verified my efforts and has given me support.

I had expected an intro course on setting up a pilot program.

I enjoyed the course. I expected this to be a course on implementing VPP. Instead this was a course on Safety Management philosophy to the extent I was misinformed concerning the course content.

Good overview of the ES&H problems. For me, it was not new material, but useful for review.

Its a good beginning.

I expected more ideas on how to implement the program.

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

Round table discussions of problems.

Management commitment and employee involvement.

Realization that my perception of the problems are lab wide.

Put our problems in the MORT system.

Audience participation.

Characteristic of good safety programs.

The least helpful things discussed or done were:

DOE basis for cultural change. It needs to occur, but I think that DOE is missing the boat as to how to make such a change.

40 year old material in viewgraphs.

The section on Hazard Prevention and Control.

Long discussion on things that we have no control over: educational system, problems with DOE, etc.

Some audience participation.

Review of general ES&H requirements.

More emphasis should be given to:

How to get on VPP.

Implementation on the VPP program.

Problem solving.

Smaller group discussions.

Worksite Analysis, Hazard Prevention & Control.

What management must do and how.

Total management commitment at SMG/DOE levels.

How to overcome public outcry.

What the ground rules and structure of VPP should be.

Less emphasis should be given to:

The outline, more "How to".

Whining about the sorry state of affairs at Los Alamos.

MORT, etc.

Why we need to improve.

Training/Worksite Anal/Haz Prevention.

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

Implementation on VPP programs.

The need for a funding commitment from DOE.

Organization changes to support DOE Req i.e. QA reporting to a position that provide freedom.

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

I would like to see analyzed one or two specific organizations that got on VPP. Step by step process.

More small class discussions.

For top/mid managers 2-4 hours is max training time. The topics are appropriate but less time should be devoted to it.

More direct emphasis on the elements or VPP and specific outline for implementation.

The first section (cultural change). Don't lecture what can be read. We can read.

What the participants might do?

When course is no longer a pilot, work with form outline to input to Robbie's operation ideas for VPP implementation plan.

Cooperate with your request by leaving the pager outside.

Stay more focused on subject.

Enjoy proactive discussions.

I like participation exercises in class.

Other materials to supplement or substitute for the provided handouts?

Notebook was excellent, plenty of room for notes. Viewgraphs, etc very good.

More 1st hand information from organizations who have successful programs.

I would like to have a compilation of the ACTION PLANNING GUIDE discussions and presentations made by the attenders.

Industry cooperated org charts and procedure of companies like Dupont, etc.

Daily schedule/timing of activities, worktime?

Need to stick to hourly breaks, this was not watched - found myself drifting after 1 1/2 - 2 hours without a break.

Try to compress into 8 hours.

Break for lunch earlier so that we don't have to fight the 12:00 traffic.

Facilities/training room arrangements?

Terrible, poor, uncomfortable chairs.

Any further comments?

Good job on facilitating discussion, good class.

Thanks for your time and help. If possible pls extend to ES&H.

Good move. I hope that this will help Los Alamos move in this direction and develop a VPP.

I don't think in the present form, you will get a buy-in from DOE. Course is too long to maintain their interest. Also need to include more E in the ES&H.

I enjoyed the course, thanks.

Number the pages in the workbook when possible.

John Piatt is an excellent instructor - adequate examples, anecdotes, etc.

Excellent discussion time!

APPENDIX E

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM

Name _____

**TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM
MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE**

INSTRUCTIONS

This form asks you to evaluate various features of the course you have just completed. All of your comments will be kept confidential. The information you provide here will be combined with that from other trainees and summarized in aggregate form for the sponsor, the Department of Energy. Results from this evaluation will be used to improve this course.

Use the scale below to indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements to evaluate this course.

- 5 - Strongly Agree
- 4 - Agree
- 3 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 1 - Strongly Disagree

EVALUATION OF COURSE CONTENT

Overall, as a result of this course I believe that I:

gained an awareness of the cultural changes presently underway in the Department of Energy regarding safety and health programs.	5	4	3	2	1
understand how Management Commitment and Employee Involvement is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.	5	4	3	2	1

EVALUATION OF COURSE CONTENT (CONT)

gained an appreciation for why safety training is essential for establishing management expectations for safe work performance.	5	4	3	2	1
understand how Worksite Analysis is used to identify risks to safety and health.	5	4	3	2	1
learned that Hazard Prevention and Control is an essential element in an effective Safety and Health program.	5	4	3	2	1
understand that safety can and must be managed like other functions.	5	4	3	2	1
realize that normal line management systems must be used to maintain reasonable accountability for safety performance.	5	4	3	2	1
understand that the underlying causes of most accidents involve inadequate management systems.	5	4	3	2	1
realize that safety takes total organizational involvement.	5	4	3	2	1
understand that each individual can make a difference.	5	4	3	2	1
was motivated to take a leadership role in managing occupational safety in my organization.	5	4	3	2	1
would recommend this course to others.	5	4	3	2	1

TRAINEE EVALUATION FORM FOR MANAGING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN DOE

Listed below are the main topic areas of the course; Managing Occupational Safety in DOE. Please consider each topic area separately. For each topic area, consider the value of the content to your job-related health and safety issues, value of the course content, value of the training aids, and the value of the instructors.

To make your rating, use the 5-point scale shown below. Indicate your evaluations by circling the appropriate number in each category.

	5 Excellent	4 Very Good	3 Good	2 Satisfactory	1 Unsatisfactory	
	VALUE TO HEALTH AND SAFETY		VALUE OF COURSE CONTENT		VALUE OF TRAINING AIDS	VALUE OF INSTRUCTOR
Course Introduction and Overview	5	4	3	2	1	
Management Commitment/ Employee Involvement	5	4	3	2	1	
Safety Training	5	4	3	2	1	
Worksite Analysis	5	4	3	2	1	
Hazard Prevention and Controls	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?

Any further comment

DISTRIBUTION

No. of
Copies

No. of
Copies

OFFSITE

ONSITE

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 Rd.
Germantown, MD 20874

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

DOE Richland Operations Office

P. W. Kruger

11 Pacific Northwest Laboratory

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