

**Executive Summary**

---

**Special Council meeting to Review FY 2008 Data Analysis Questions**

The meeting was called to review the questions that would be included in the questionnaire for the FY 2008 injury and illness data analysis initiative in light of the requirements placed on the study by the DASHO Council. The Safety and Health Council decided that the data available currently through the SMIS was not reliable and could not be used in this study. The managers and supervisors responsible for SMIS data quality are generally not inputting information correctly, and the bureaus do not have the resources at the field level to provide adequate quality control. After careful review, the Council members changed the focus of the initiative to develop entry questions for the new SMIS and move away from any sort of data analysis.

**DOI Safety & Occupational Health Council  
Special Council Meeting October 27, 2009  
Washington D.C.**

**Meeting Summary**

---

Council Members Present: Maurice Banks (OSM), Steve D'Antoni (NBC), Bob Garbe (OHS), Paul Holley (BIA), Jim Meredith (BOR), Bill Miller (USGS), Steve Gillespie (USGS), Chip Murphy (FWS), Mike May(NPS).

Council Members Absent: Leon Craig (OST), Larry D'Emanuel (SOL), Mike May (NPS), Mary Parkinson (FWS), Jim Robison (OIG), Armando Galindo (OHS), Staci King (MMS), Louis Rowe (BLM), Diane Schmitz (OHS).

**Special Council Meeting to Review and Approve FY 2008 Data Analysis Questionnaire Questions**

Background

The meeting was called to review the questions that would be included in the questionnaire for the FY 2008 injury and illness data analysis initiative. The DASHO Council put four conditions on the initiative at their July 27, 2009 meeting. These conditions included:

- Vetting the questions through the National Park Service's (NPS) social scientist.
- Getting DOI Safety and Health Council approval.
- Getting DASHOP Council approval.
- Engaging the services of the USGS economist in charge of electronic surveys for administration of this survey

The Council Executive Director (ED) provided background on the initiative at the start of the meeting that included:

- The Department of the Interior (Department) received two red dots on their Safety Health and Return to Employment (SHARE) Presidential Scorecard for 2008. This project is designed to study the accident and illness reports to learn why these goals were not met.
- This project has two components: one to analyze the FY 2008 data to learn what happened and why; the second to develop a strategy for improving performance.
- There were 4,550 DOI injury/illness cases accepted by the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) in FY 2008. In order to obtain a valid random sample, a 580 case sample set was determined to represent a statistical confidence level of 95 percent.
- The data collected from the 580 employees in the sample set will be done primarily using an electronic questionnaire tool.
- If the bureau or office opts out of the study, the results will be skewed and the confidence in the findings will be much lower.
- The findings and recommendations of the study will be provided to each bureau or office director or assistant secretary and DASHO.

The ED explained that the questions currently before the Council (Attachment 1) fulfilled the first requirement of the DASHO Council; they included the corrections made by the NPS social scientist. Discussions began with the questions for the employee questionnaire. After discussing question one through four, the Council members

began discussing the rationale for continuing work on this initiative. Several bureaus felt the information would be useful; one supported curtailing the initiative as they are already collecting this information in-house.

It was generally decided that the data available currently through the SMIS was not reliable and could not be used in this or any other study. One of the primary reasons the data in SMIS is unreliable is occupational health and safety professionals are not managing the data. Managers and supervisors, who are responsible for the data quality, are not currently inputting information correctly, and the bureaus do not have the resources at the field level to provide adequate quality control. It was felt that one good way to begin improving the quality of the data was to train supervisors and others to investigate incidents properly, ask appropriate questions and input the data correctly.

One of the Council members strongly advocated dropping this initiative. They felt that a study of only one year's data would not do any good. They would be interested in widening the scope and including 2007 to 2009 data. Others felt that data in this wide a band could be problematic as fading memories on the older cases would make the information suspect. The more recent the data the better it is likely to be. The data set cannot be shorter than a year because of the seasonal variation in incidents.

It is a given that safety professionals are not proofing the SMIS data. The current survey questions closely resemble accident investigation questions which caused confusion about the study's intent. It appeared to some that the questionnaire will be re-investigating the incident instead of learning why the management system failed. Given the current level of knowledge on the incidents in the study group, those experienced with surveys were concerned that an effective questionnaire could not be designed at present. USGS suggested coming out with an interview program for a targeted group of 12 or so individuals, listen to what they have to say and use their information to design another group of questions for the broader audience. Several Council members were positive about asking different questions and banding them differently for different classes of accidents. Some members were also concerned that none of the "how satisfied are you" questions have been asked.

Several members voiced concern that the results of the study would go to senior managers which would cause them work load issues. USGS in particular felt they have a good foundation to their program and are managing their incidents well, so the outcome of this investigation would not be useful to them. Individual voting members, and one ancillary member, began calling for the termination of the questionnaire. The Council members pondered changing the focus of the initiative to develop entry questions for the new SMIS and move away from any sort of data analysis. The Council recognized that the effort that has gone into the question to date is not lost; the work could be folded into the new SMIS procurement.

At this point in the meeting, the ED summarized the three possible options the Council has discussed for the study:

1. Develop a focus group to question, and from the responses develop question for the broader survey.
2. Use the existing survey questions and proceed with the broader group survey.
3. Drop the Study and develop question to be incorporated into the new SMIS.

After the summary the ED called a vote. The vote was unanimous among the members present to terminate the present initiative.

The ED called second vote to determine if the data analysis initiative should be converted into a new initiative whose focus is developing question to be incorporated into the new SMIS. The vote was unanimous in favor of developing a new initiative for FY 2010.

### **New FY 2010 SMIS Question Initiative**

The members of the FY 2010 SMIS Question Initiative Team will include the members of the FY 2008 Data Analysis Initiative plus Jermaine Hunter of the National Park Service. Outline of the Initiative includes:

1. Identify the classes of accidents experienced at DOI.

2. Simulate an accident investigation.
3. Turn the simulation into questions for the new SMIS.
4. Vet the questions through the Safety and Health Council.
5. Provide the questions to NBC for inclusion into the SMIS procurement.

If additional research is need to develop meaningful questions, then:

6. Conduct interviews with a focus group.
7. Turn interview data into questions for the new SMIS.

Next Steps:

- The new Initiative will be brought before the Council for a vote on funding.
- Training will be identified for the new Initiative Team members.

**Next Meeting of the new Initiative Team**

Location:

Date:

**Parking Lot**

- Identify budget for the initiative.

**Action Item Summary**

Task	Responsibility	Deadline
<b>Identify Initiative Costs</b>		
• Develop a summary of costs and expenses for this initiative.	ED	November SHC Meeting
<b>Identify Money</b>		
• Identify the funding source for this initiative.	Bob Garbe	November SHC Meeting
<b>Initiative Team</b>		
• Accident investigation training enrollment.	Armando Galindo	December 31, 2009
• Meet and develop outline points 1 through 4.	Team	April 2010
<b>Vet Questions</b>		
• Review and approve question developed by initiative team,	Safety and Health Council	May 2010

## Meeting Participants

<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
NBC	Steve D'Antoni	Stephen_d'antoni@nbc.gov	202-501-8693
OSM	Maurice Banks	jbanks@osmre.gov	202-208-2608
OHS	Bob Garbe	Robert_garbe@ios.doi.gov	303-236-7112
BIA	Paul Holley	paul.holley@bia.gov	505-563-5365
BOR	Jim Meredith	jmeredith@usbr.gov	303-445-2695
USGS	Bill Miller	wrmiller@usgs.gov	703-322-7552
FWS	Chip Murphy	Chip_murphy@fws.gov	703-254-8484
OHS	Barry Noll	Barry_noll@ios.doi.gov	202-208-5318
USGS	Steve Gillespie	sgillesp@usgs.gov	703-648-5705