



Occupational Health & Safety - Leading Indicators Assessment Sheet

This rating sheet provides a quick method for assessing a quarry site or company against a series of useful indicators of good health and safety practice that should relate to future performance. It has been developed through trials within the quarrying industry. While an individual may gain benefit from working through it, it is best used as a survey across a team of, for example, manager(s), supervisors, safety representatives or other interested members of the workforce and health and safety professionals who know the site or company. This requires someone to collate the information in order to provide report or presentation data who is trusted by the respondents. The appropriate level of anonymity and identification of returns for practical survey management must be considered in advance

Unlike some surveys that benefit from a quick response, respondents should think carefully before giving a rating. It is easy to assume that things are better than they really are. Any informed external viewpoint is useful. The rating sheet has not been designed for widespread workforce use but the completion by a few, well informed members of the workforce who take an interest in management and safety issues is strongly recommended as this can reveal very useful perceptions that may either require action or careful explanation. From experience, there may be questions, such as on senior management's visible involvement in promoting H&S, where members of the workforce see less activity than the managers feel they undertake, and others, such as workforce understanding of their H&S responsibilities, where the workforce believe they understand but managers feel they could do more in challenging unsafe behaviour. Clearly, any such survey requires an open response and a consequent action plan in the spirit of seeking genuine improvement. Any entries in 'reasons for assessment' should be collated against questions and considered.

It is suggested that reporting of the outcomes shows average ratings for each question, together with the spread (highest and lowest) in order to bring out any exceptional viewpoint. This is where, for example, a divergence of views between safety reps and managers may be seen. Small companies may not have a large population of respondents, but larger companies may show separate groups, such as managers, supervisors, health and safety professionals, non-managers so as to reveal different perceptions.

For example, the following is a fictional output to question 1.1.1 at an imaginary small, one site company (typical of many) where the Managing Director is also the site manager. He has taken part along with two supervisors and three interested members of the workforce.

How evident is the active involvement of senior management in promoting H&S?

Average rating 6.5

Highest rating 8

Lowest rating 5

The fact that the average is low on the range in comparison with the highest rating shows that it was not only the person or people that rated this at five that feel that more could be done by the manager and hence should prompt him to discuss this and to consider what more he might do to show support. Other questions might reveal the need for specific improvement activities or areas where effective safeguards have been put into place but need better explanation.

This survey should reveal a wide range of areas to consider that go beyond the typical site inspection or audit. Several heads invariably come up with a better review than one. *However, it must be borne in mind that a small number of important procedural or training areas may simply not be fully appreciated by anybody working in a few companies, such as the lack of a fully effective locking-off procedure or the absence of any geotechnical training, and hence such a weakness may not emerge in an internal review such as this.*

Survey Details

Company:.....

Site or Office name / 'Whole-company' report:

Site address (if single site):

Site contact telephone:

Date: Identification (if required):

Please give a rating of the company or site (as agreed) on the scales 1 – 10 (ten is good) for as many questions as you can, taking your perception and considering the following points:

Do these elements exist?

How effective are the processes supporting them?

Are they well established, comprehensive and likely to continue to be effective?

Please use the 'Reasons for assessment' spaces to express your opinions as extensively as you wish.

1.1 Management – Senior

1.1.1 How evident is the active involvement of senior management in promoting H&S?

Rarely involved – leave it to others

Personal interest frequently demonstrated

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.1.2 How effectively has senior management (the directors or the owners) considered the H&S policy?

Simply some words signed off to make it legal

Policy well-debated at Board level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.1.3 Are there clear, high-level H&S objective(s), including health, from which a programme of improvement work can flow?

No visible high-level H&S objectives

Coherent objective(s) set at senior level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.1.4 How effective is the communication of H&S information and messages through the company (all directions)?

Haphazard communication – not much is heard

Information is clearly communicated in all directions as needed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.1.5 Is there a perception in the company that resources are readily allocated to ensure good H&S?

It seems difficult to obtain money to improve H&S

Resources are always provided as needed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.2 Management – Line

1.2.1 Do managers have stretching H&S improvement objectives?

No visible line management H&S objectives

Coherent H&S objectives set and reviewed for progress

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.2.2 Are managers achieving progress in H&S?

Little evidence of improvement

Clear evidence of improvement due to management activity

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.2.3 Are H&S objectives effectively integrated with operational, financial, environmental, quality objectives?

No real integration – actions appear randomly

A well-integrated process, e.g. at objective setting & review meetings

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.2.4 How effective are managers and supervisors at running meetings, adapting management approach, presenting information?

Variable skills –some reluctance to hold meetings

Well trained in management techniques

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.3 Workforce Employees

1.3.1 How 'involved' do you think workforce employees feel in managing their own and others' H&S?

Little serious thought – management's responsibility

Strong sense of personal responsibility and involvement

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.3.2 Are workforce employees involved in writing work procedures?

All done by managers or specialists

Company policy involves the workforce

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.3.3 Are workforce employees involved in investigating incidents for root causes and improvement to controls?

No systematic use of work employees

Company policy involves the workforce

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

1.3.4 Do employees understand their H&S responsibilities (e.g. reporting hazards, correcting others' unsafe behaviour)?

Variable understanding of what H&S means while at work

Explain and undertake their H&S responsibilities well

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

2 H&S management and related processes

2.1 Is there evidence of continuous improvement in H&S across the company, including root cause incident analysis?

Little underlying improvement work – matters handled reactively

Proactive improvement readily identifiable

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

2.2 Is there a systematic approach to H&S?

Not systematic – matters dealt with as they arise

A coherent management system that controls H&S

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

2.3 Is the safety management system regularly reviewed in a 'bottom-up' manner, so that all managers and interested employees can contribute to system improvement?

Not effectively reviewed

Regular (e.g. annual), effective procedure for flagging up improvement needs

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

2.4 Is hazard identification, risk assessment (RA) and control effective and regularly reviewed, with involvement of the people who do the work?

Only a minimum level of RA carried out to meet legal need

*Comprehensive, regularly reviewed risk assessment,
involving the people who do the work*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

2.5 Is there a comprehensive and effective audit programme?

Minimal audit

Effective audit programme with clear standards to check against

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

2.6 Is corrective action (CA) carried out quickly, putting effective and permanent solutions into place?

Backlog of CA / temporary fixes in place

Easily verified records of a quick and effective CA regime

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

2.7 Are training needs analysed systematically, e.g. for each job?

Training not planned – haphazard

Training needs analysis or Job profile procedure in place

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

2.8 Is training delivered in a timely and effective manner

Training poorly organised

Training plans and delivery timely and effective – well-trained workforce

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

3 Safe and Healthy Person

3.1 Are employees fully aware of the risks involved in their work?

Some difficulty detailing risks

High awareness of risks and safe procedure

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

3.2 Is there a comprehensive health surveillance (HS) programme (medical checking) in place for employees?

No coherent health surveillance programme

Regular in-depth HS programme in place for all employees

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

3.3 Are work procedures / systems of work understood and followed?

Difficulty explaining safe procedure – possible non-compliance

Procedures well understood and followed

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

3.4 Is there a good sense of teamwork?

People cynical about teamwork

Supportive effort within and between teams (e.g. shifts)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

3.5 Is H&S regularly discussed?

Little mention – no real culture of discussions

Regular discussion, e.g. team meetings, toolbox talks

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

3.6 Do people believe that their supervisor or manager listens to H&S issues raised and acts where appropriate?

Not worth raising issues – management often do not act

Management listen and do their best to respond

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

3.7 Are H&S action plans in place at an individual or team level?

No use of local workforce plans

Workforce members discuss and plan safety improvement

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

3.8 Is personal protective equipment (PPE) used properly and effectively?

Variable use of PPE even where justified

PPE use understood and respected by all

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4 Safe and healthy place

4.1 Are all legal requirements understood and systematically met (Quarry regs, MOHSW regs, etc.)

Some non-compliance known

Confident that all legal requirements are met

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.2 Do specified risk controls (from risk assessment records) appear to be fully in place?

Evidence of some lack of risk control (e.g. panels not replaced, locks left open)

Controls always in place as specified

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.3 Do dust control measures appear comprehensive (e.g. bowring, dust collectors, spray systems, enclosure)?

Room for improvement in dust control

State of the art dust control measures in place and functional

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.4 Is dust measurement and monitoring effective and commensurate with risk (mg / m³ within risk level for chemical content)?

Some lack of confidence in monitoring

Regular personal monitoring – within workplace exposure limit

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.5 Do noise control measures appear comprehensive (e.g. muffling, sound insulation panels, maintenance schedules)

Room for improvement in noise control

State of the art noise control measures in place and functional

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.6 Is noise measurement and monitoring effective (dB/A thresholds, up to date noise maps and signs, personal monitoring)?

Some lack of confidence in monitoring

Regular measurement – confident within limit or good PPE

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.7 Has vibration been effectively measured and controlled for all jobs where musculoskeletal disorders are possible?

Some lack of confidence in vibration level understanding

Comprehensive measurement and control

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.8 Is mobile plant checked daily, in good condition, well maintained and meeting QNJAC standards of H&S provision?

Does not always fully meet standards

Daily checks and matches QNJAC standards

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.9 Is all fixed plant checked daily, safe and well maintained?

Variable standard

Daily checks, safe and well maintained

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.10 Is the site design as safe as is reasonably possible (e.g. roadway layout and maintenance, turning areas, visibility, processing plant)

Some difficulties inherent in the designs

Designed to meet stringent H&S criteria

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.11 Are geotechnical requirements fully met and all areas checked by competent people prior to work?

Insufficient geotechnical assessment

Comprehensive checking, formal assessment and control

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.12 Are work procedures clear and usable, including those relating to contractors or other visitors?

(including locking-off, permit to work, emergency procedures as well as systems of work)

Procedures not all user-friendly

Clear, usable procedures in use across all work processes

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.13 Are vehicle movements well controlled to minimise risk?

Inherent problems in minimising vehicle risk

Good vehicle rules – drivers always comply

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.14 Is the use of signs effective in contributing to good H&S?

Inadequate H&S signs or vehicle instructions

Eye-catching signs giving clear and effective H&S messages

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.15 Is all personal protective equipment (PPE) that might be required available in sufficient quantities, well fitting and in good condition?

Some problems with PPE condition or availability

All PPE available in good condition to meet any need

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

4.16 Where hazardous substances are present, are there effective handling procedures, training, etc., to ensure safety and health?

Some reason to doubt fail-safe controls

As far as can reasonably be judged, fail-safe systems in place

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Reasons for assessment:

SITE INFORMATION

(If site-only review)

Product(s):

Management structure:

Number and type of employees:

Major machinery in use:

Extraction method(s):

Transportation: