



Graham Randle -

Pilkington

BEHAVIOURAL SAFETY USER CONFERENCE 2005

Chair

The final presentation from this section is Graham Randall. Graham joined Pilkington in 1996. Currently Health, Safety and Environment Manager for their building products business in Europe, and he led the introduction of the behavioural safety into Pilkington in 1998 and since then has championed the introduction and development of a behavioural safety programme into the other UK sites and 13 countries in continental Europe.

Graham Randall

Thanks Tim and good afternoon everybody.

As you know Pilkington make furniture!!! (Musical Introduction was "Heart of Glass")

That is me that is my role. What I would like to do is to present to you in the next 12 minutes behavioural safety in Pilkington since we started in 1998.

Very briefly, the structure of Pilkington and understanding what building products Europe needs and the different cultures, there is still 25,000 of us left split across 40 graphical regions and we are split into two business lines according to the markets that they service.

Within building products there is two different tribes, there are about 4,000 people over 14 operation sites that actually make the glass and also some coating products, just mention Pilkington Active if you add sunlight and rain it actually self cleans, so not only have we been looking at the behaviour of people we have looked at the behaviour of our products as well.

There is just over 4,000 in the branches across 86 sites so they are really SME's within a large organisation. They receive the glass from manufacturing, toughen it, laminate it, cut it to size etc.

SME problems, in 1997 there was 220 sites now we are down to 86 and all the challenges that that brings.

I will just mention automotive, one in 4 cars will be fitted with Pilkington glass, is your trivia information for the day.

So March 1998, we started off with two pilots and as the Doncaster Works Manager said if you can make it work in Yorkshire you can make it work anywhere and that is what we tried to do. Our initial intervention had four main elements – we used the HSC climate survey which was very powerful for us at the time, it gave us a good reality check, several parts of the organisation thought they were better than they actually were.

The managers went for a one day workshop off site, the morning was spent making them feel uncomfortable, at their current level of performance which was quite an interesting way for a safety guy to spend his time, I can recommend it. The afternoon was spent being more constructive and really trying to persuade them the importance of their own behaviour that we won't change the work teams behaviour until we change those guys.

That was followed by a similar one day event off site for the work teams and whilst I think we persuaded managers that most of the injuries were down to them we slowly wanted to get the work teams involved and persuade them that they had got a role to play in preventing their own injury. The only thing that kept it going – it has been mentioned already – job observation or the Susa process as it is known – we trained all the managers and supervisors and as many volunteers as we could get and that was the engine that kept us going.

Just to touch on the culture at the time, this was the culture of one site in the UK in 1998. I am sure most of you are aware of the HAS climate survey – this I use as what is more important glass or people, clearly the managers thought it was people, everybody else thought it was glass and that was a good reality check for the managers.

We actually found and we have done this on possibly 60/70 sites now the greater the gap between the perception of managers and supervisors, the higher the accident rate. This information gave us some very powerful initial information, a good reality check and all these perceptions were grudgingly true, there is a lack of commitment from managers, verbal commitment yes but not visible commitment.

A lot of turning a blind eye to unsafe behaviour, supervisors thought they were doing a great job but actually other people had a different view, they were actually the weakest link, it was not their fault, they were good technically but had not been given the inter-personal skills.

There was actually poor safety communication which was actually indicative of poor communication overall not just safety.

So there was enough success at Doncaster but the other three manufacturing sites took the behavioural safety programme forward over the next 9/12 months.

The starting point was at the LTAR (lost time accident rate) had actually reached a plateau and as we got more observers trained up the Susa contact rate a site of 200 people 200 observations in a year has a contact rate of one. You actually need a contact rate of three or four to make a difference. But over a period of 12/18 months the rate came down by 50% so it gave us a good start.

Initially the focus was on numbers, just getting people out there to have conversations, it made us address the underlying cultural problems, it made us talk to people, it gave us a framework not to ignore unsafe behaviour, yes much more visible commitment. It also raised the profile of the supervisors.

But you cannot just chase numbers without focussing on the quality, refresher training for the observers, trying to regularly get the observers together to share successes and failures, just to motivate them to continue. But the real challenge was to move the conversation away from just PPE - that was a problem in the early days. We used to get people talking about the behaviours that led to most of the injuries - that was a challenge for us.

We have a few problems with key safe behaviours and I think critical behaviours, as Mark mentioned earlier. We got confused between critical safe behaviours or key safe behaviours and actual safe behaviours, but by using a car as an example that seemed to help the coin to drop. So in work shops we asked people what is in place to prevent people being injured whilst driving and they came up with long lists about the design of the car, maintenance of the car and behaviours. But I used to ask them – well I am not very bright, I am English, I am from head office and I cannot focus on more than 2 or 3 things at any one time, what are the 2 or 3 things you want me to focus on? Most people go for speed, distance and perhaps mobile phones. Because it was driving most people appeared to relate to that.

The actual issues don't really matter it is really all about focussing on a critical number, if there are too many safe behaviours people cannot cope.

That visual material was also important; it is a big step going from hazards and conditions to behaviour, particularly when it is your own behaviour.

So if you remember the small branches, these have got 40/50 people, if we looked at the accident experience, pictures could actually prevent about two thirds of their lost time accidents a year that is about 80 accidents. Surprisingly people who are handling glass without gloves and cuffs and also moving loads around without it being secure. The glass obviously falls and people try and catch it, so just by identifying the right behaviours we started to make real inroads in the lost time accident rate.

We used key safe behaviours either as part of the job observation test and other issues as well, so when accidents occurred not wanting to blame the individual, in addition to the engineering improvements what behaviours could have helped to prevent that accident or injury, so key safe behaviours started appearing with accident investigation reports and recommended actions.

For a work area or a small branch in total what is the small number of key safe behaviours you want people to adopt? This is an excellent way in getting people involved in what those key

safe behaviours are. We started to define the safe behaviours we actually wanted to see.

Where instructions and procedures exist if you are actually watching somebody do that task what are the 2 or 3 critical behaviours key safe behaviours you want people to see?

The last fatality we had in Europe in 1997 a guy was squashed by 2 ton of glass, excellent investigation an 11 page report. One picture would have prevented that person's life, it is all about danger zones and where people stand at critical times. We know that picture has actually saved a number of lives across Pilkingtons since then, much better than the original report.

In addition to help the communication of key safe behaviours a number of in house videos were made. Unlike Helen we did not use our own people, we used actors but we actually used the words that we got from our employees from interviews carried out. The short videos describe real accidents that have occurred in the workplace and also the key safe behaviours that people could use to actually prevent those injuries. The other issue was it was given to supervisors to help the tool box talks to get them to talk to their teams in a more proactive way rather than reading from a script as Helen described earlier, very powerful.

Over the months, over the years we have also improved Susa feedback as I think Mark alluded to earlier it begins as just a numbers game, but you cannot really sustain that if it is just numbers. We improved the feedback so it gave information about the top five behaviours being observed that month and how many were safe and how many were not safe to actually help the teams to understand where their problems were. Also based on accident experience and accidents from elsewhere which key safe behaviours to focus on for the coming months.

We found that improving the feedback was very, very powerful.

Moving on a couple of years but keeping with the key safe behaviour theme we found a gap with our manual handling key safe behaviours. In the early days it only said 'follow the rules' which isn't really a key safe behaviour but we met Pristine Condition at this conference four years ago Tim? Dave Snowdon excellent organisation highly recommended, manual handling historically is the most boring training ever invented. Pristine Condition turned it around and it is the greatest course most employees have ever received. We identified four key safe behaviours for manual handling – and we then turned those into pictures and there are two of them. There is visual material on site to support the training given.

It is not just behavioural safety though. We have mentioned safety at Pilkington at a number of levels, lost time accident rate, incident rate, at a lower level the employees' survey, but at the third level we measure our ability to manage safety and prevent accidents. Difficult to explain quickly but it is very simplified by SRS, at the early levels teams from all levels in an organisation managers, supervisors and shop floor go through a series of questions to identify strengths and weaknesses and use this matrix to plot how well they are doing. As we go through the levels additional elements are added and at level four of our structure you will see at the bottom behavioural safety appears - but it is not as a stand alone element, behavioural safety appears in a number of the other elements either with a requirement to increase employee involvement, in PPE team leaders leading by example, keep safe behaviours in rules and procedures, so we try to integrate the need for behaviour in those ten basic elements of safety management.

Just to give you a feel, level 4 site which is a basic standard within Pilkington require a certain level of behavioural safety involvement - so a site to the level 4 have carried out a employee survey. They have fed the results back to understand what they really mean and they have set targets so that they will be repeated in 2 – 3 years time.

We have carried out some basic training at all levels in the organisation and we have got a job observational feedback programme going; not just training but you have to show that you are actually feeding back information on the quantity and the quality of the observations. Safe behaviours identified and also targets set in the formal appraisal system for managers and supervisors. It is a way of just checking that behavioural safety programme is actually working.

Employee involvement absolutely critical but we came up with this idea of – how do you measure a level of safety involvement? And you might want to try this in your organisation, the challenge of set buildings products Europe was over a twelve month period and involved everybody in at least one proactive safety initiative, there are some possible headings on the left hand side. Again not new headings, headings we are familiar with but can we increase the level of employee involvement. Just being trained, just receiving a toolbox talk that doesn't count, it has to be more proactive. What you might want to do at the end of this month end of quarter one, what percentage of employees have been proactively involved on your site? You come up with a figure, not an exact science, just is it a quarter is it a half? What we found in the early

days is at quarter one it doesn't get much better, we are intending to involve the same people in the different initiatives - the challenge is actually to spread that amongst more people.

I would like Mark and Tim to help me with a level of trust meter. I am not sure if we can measure that but it would be quite handy, trust is very important to safety involvement.

Again pushing proactive safety involvement groups of people try to make safety fun with various initiatives, in terms of recognition we have donated a lot of money to lots of charities of the employees' choice based on safety improvements and performance they have made.

Tim mentioned Ian Whittingham earlier on - you are probably aware of Ken Woodward, we have used Ken in our organisation at all levels, particularly at a shop floor level to persuade employees to get involved in improving health and safety. Ken can say the same thing as the managers but the level of motivation is much higher.

In the early days we thought we were going to get everybody trained to do observations and feedback but that was proving quite difficult in the lower organisation. Getting people involved was a challenge.

We asked people to ask "what if?" not "if only" so what if someone starts the machine rather than if only I had isolated the machine. This was taken up very well by engineering people and production people doing one off tasks, so there is a simple check card which we have simplified from one we have pinched from a local company and again whether the guy who was working that high comes up with those same headings not really concerned about - it is all about getting the person to stop and think before they start the task rather than after they have been injured.

In terms of the small sites we try to improve but more slowly, it is primarily the same programme but carried out at a much slower pace. We have used the same employee survey, focussed primarily on managers and supervisors we believe we need that foundation to begin with. The steering group chooses a choice of tools and we try to persuade them that before you go to the employees you need to have credibility that managers and supervisors have changed their behaviours sufficiently to actually make a difference and there is a champions' guide produced to actually help that guidance.

We have posted a number of abuser groups internally to try and share learning interestingly involving a number of consultants, it got bigger, now we tend to bench more with individual companies, actually we have been involved with Selafield on a couple of occasions.

We have made progress in most of Europe although confronted on safe behaviour in Italy is likely to cause a strike much more rule based in Eastern Europe. But we must be doing something right it appears to have worked.

In the UK the number of LTAs in that time significantly reduced the level of incident reporting significantly increased. Susa observations - a huge number but they have evolved in what they do as we have gone forward.

Across Europe we started behavioural safety a bit later significant progress - still a long way to go but we must be doing something right.

Chair

As with Helen and in order to be consistent I am going to have to say no questions - that was Graham's full 20 minutes.