
Meeting: UNIVERSITY HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Tuesday 16th September 2014
12.15pm

Venue: 3 West North 3.7

Present:

Mark Humphriss	Chair
Ian Cheetham	Director of Human Resources
Greg Dargue	Deputy Director of Estates
Cathy Day	Head of University Health, Safety & Environment Service
Brian Schofield	Head of Security Services
Julian Sulley	Faculty of Engineering & Design
Lorna Woudberg	Facilities Manager, Accommodation and Hospitality
Jo Carter	UNITE Representative
Ben Jessup	Students' Union Sport Officer
Graham Mott	Technical and Experimental Representative
Steve Nicholson	UNISON Representative
Mareike Posner	Education and Research Representative
Sarah Richardson	Management, Specialist and Administration

Apologies:

Malcolm Holley	Faculty of Science
Paul Brooks	UNISON Representative
Michael Carley	UCU Representative
Marie Morley	UCU Representative
Ron Stewart	Facilities Manager, Sports Development & Recreation
Rodney Vowler	Operations and Facilities Support Representative

In attendance:

Sue Stove	Secretary
Sophie Hamer	Assistant Facilities Manager, Sports Development & Recreation

ACTION

653 INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The apologies were noted.

The Chair welcomed the Facilities Manager, Accommodation and Hospitality and the Students' Union Sport Officer to the Committee. He also introduced the Assistant Facilities Manager, Sports Development & Recreation who attended on behalf of the Facilities Manager.

654 MEMBERSHIP

The updated Committee membership for 2014/15 and the Terms of Reference were noted.

655 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 June 2014 were approved as a correct record of the proceedings and signed by the Chair.

656 MATTER ARISING:

Minute 637 – Annual Specialist Reports

The Head of UHS&E reported that the matter of the autoclaves had been followed up. She also advised the Committee that the Scientific Safety Manager had now taken up his post and in doing so replaced the Specialist Advisers.

Minute 640 – Key Performance Indicators – Frequency of Inspections

The Head of UHS&E noted that there had been a query as to whether the frequency of inspections should be every twelve or eighteen months. She confirmed that they should be every twelve months.

The Chair would contact departments soon regarding the introduction of KPIs.

Chair

Minute 642 – Fire Risk Assessment Programme 2014-15: Open Air Events

The Head of UHS&E reported that UHSE had met with both Estates and Security. A way forward had been agreed with Security already using the UHSE template, but further conversations were required at a higher level to clarify how overall permission for such events should be managed and by whom.

Minute 645 – UHSE Update

The Head of UHS&E reported that Heads of Department had been reminded in August about the need for staff to complete the online fire safety training and UHSE was still chasing those individuals who had not yet done it.

Minute 646 – Smoking Cessation

The Head of UHS&E informed the Committee that the Health and Safety Adviser was in the process of identifying two individuals to be trained.

Minute 650 – Health Surveillance Toolkit: Fire Alarms

The Head of UHS&E confirmed that changes had been made to the health surveillance questionnaires, so that they were now marked 'confidential' and stated on the form that they should be returned to UHSE direct.

The Deputy Director of Estates advised that the fire alarm in 1 West would be upgraded as part of the refurbishment of the building. The alarms in 2 East and 4 East would be upgraded as refurbishments were undertaken.

Minute 651 – Any Other Business

Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)

The Head of UHS&E reported that this would be reviewed by the Scientific Safety Manager.

Immunisation

The Deputy Director of Estates reported that he had had discussions with the UNITE Representative and the Head of UHS&E and now needed to finalise the matter within the Estates Department.

Electrical Infrastructure Work on Campus

The Deputy Director of Estates confirmed that during power outages automatic doors would not open automatically and would go on to a manual system. This would need to be incorporated into PEEPS. The Head of UHS&E added that her team would be doing some work to promote and encourage the use of PEEPS.

657 GANTT CHART UPDATE

The Head of UHS&E highlighted the items which were 'under threat':

- routine checks on showers to prevent legionella – the Deputy Director of Estates confirmed this had been done.
- fire safety management - there were still very few PEEPs in place in relation to the number of staff who would require one. UHSE would therefore be running a campaign on PEEP awareness, which should bring this back 'on target'.
- asbestos management - an audit had been undertaken in January 2014 and the Health and Safety Adviser was monitoring progress against the subsequent action plan. There would then be a further audit. Also, work was continuing on the re-writing of the Asbestos Plan with Estates. This item was now 'on target'.

The Committee noted the update.

658 INCIDENTS UPDATE

The Head of UHS&E pointed out that there had been one RIDDOR reportable incident since the last meeting of the Committee. A visitor to the University had been hospitalised after he had slipped and fallen in a shower. The incident had been investigated. No fault with the shower was identified or any particular reason for the slip.

There had been one non-RIDDOR incident caused when a ceramic tile fell off the Quads, but no-one was injured. UHSE subsequently requested spot checks and inspections of all other tiles which had been installed in the same manner. It was now awaiting confirmation that the installation of these tiles was satisfactory.

There was also an accident involving a visitor to the University who sustained an injury whilst crossing the pole vault area. At the time the cover to the pole vault pit had not been in place. This had now been addressed.

The Committee noted the update.

659 AUDIT AND FIRE RISK ASSESSMENTS

Fire Risk Assessment Update

The Head of UHS&E reported that the Fire Safety Adviser was undertaking approximately three risk assessment per month as part of a three year programme of assessments. The Fire Risk Assessment Programme was currently on track with no slippage.

In addition, a fire risk assessment of the HIVE project at Wroughton Airfield had been undertaken.

The focus was now on assessing the Quads and ensuring they were up to University fire safety standards to enable them to be signed over by the end of this week as students were due to occupy them on the 20th September.

Audit Update

The Head of UHS&E reported that Campus Retail and Commercial Operations had recently been re-audited and was found to be much improved.

She also pointed out that the total result for the high-level audit of the Department of Pharmacy and Pharmacology was 83%, but this was not shown on the chart on page 3 of Paper 05.

The Committee noted the report.

660 SCIENTIFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE, MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Head of UHS&E introduced the proposed membership and Terms of Reference for the Scientific Safety Committee. She added that the Dean of Science had agreed to chair it.

The Committee approved the proposed membership and Terms of Reference.

661 HAZARDOUS WASTE - FUNDAMENTAL REVIEW, MAY 2014

The Head of UHS&E introduced Paper 7. The Fundamental Review had been undertaken to assess the University's compliance with legislation and policies. A number of issues were identified where changes were required to ensure compliance. Some of these within the control of UHSE had either already been addressed or were being addressed. More significant issues relating to the collection of waste have already resulted in discussions between the Head of UHS&E and the Deputy Director of Estates to identify relevant changes. In the interim the service off campus had been temporarily suspended.

Head of UHS&E

In response to a question from the Technical and Experimental Representative, she explained that the Hazardous Waste Manager was now working under tight time restrictions which may mean slightly longer waiting times for the removal of waste. The Scientific Safety Manager had been assigned the task of reviewing the

processes used for hazardous waste collection to ensure a more cohesive approach for both normal and hazardous waste based on risk. The Scientific Safety Manager would also be working with the Hazardous Waste Manager to review the service standards for the removal of hazardous waste to ensure they were realistic given the time constraints. The Deputy Director of Estates added that there were now dedicated waste operatives who would be liaising with the Hazardous Waste Manager to ensure waste was removed and transported in accordance with safe systems of work. There was also a new vehicle on order which would be used for transporting both hazardous and general waste, but in order to avoid contamination the different types of waste would not be transported at the same time. The van would be appropriately signed and compartmentalised to comply with the findings of the Fundamental Review.

The Head of Security Services commented that CCTV had been installed at the waste compound, but it was not yet working. This was an issue for Computing Services to deal with. The Head of UHS&E pointed out that there was no CCTV at the hazardous waste compound which posed a much higher risk and this would need to be considered when the Scientific Safety Manager reviewed the processes and service standards.

The Technical and Experimental Representative noted that according to point 1.1.3 on page 2 the Faculty of Engineering and Design did not seem to have been consulted as part of the Fundamental Review. The Head of UHS&E responded that she had liaised with the Department of Chemical Engineering and agreed that this had not been made clear.

The Committee noted the report.

662 MANAGED GAS SERVICE - FUNDAMENTAL REVIEW AND BUSINESS CASE, SEPTEMBER 2014

The Head of UHS&E informed the Committee that the review was prompted after the matter had been raised by Procurement.

She explained that currently each department had its own way of using, storing and transporting gases and gas cylinders, which posed a significant health and safety risk as well as opportunities for significant cost savings. She summarised the three options recommended (see below) and pointed out they would need to be reviewed by Finance.

Option 1 – Support the BOC proposal in principle and ask them to provide an updated estimate of cost which can be presented to the University in the form of a business proposal.

Option 2 – Support the in-house proposal in principle and ask the working group to prepare a report to the University for further consideration.

Option 3 – Do nothing. Leave the existing system in place’.

The Head of UHS&E reminded the Committee that the BOC ‘On-site Customer Management Proposal’ was confidential and not for circulation.

The Chair emphasised that the role of the Committee was to be satisfied that the management of gases was appropriate from a health and safety point of view, not from the point of view of allocation of resources.

The Management, Specialist and Administration representative raised a number of questions. The Head of UHS&E explained that the majority of the costs were associated with the rental of the cylinders not the purchasing of the gases. So a significant cost saving could be made on rentals, by returning the cylinders instead of keeping them.

She confirmed that if the cylinders were kept in a central store it would potentially be more efficient, but there would be a risk associated with manual handling when moving the cylinders to departments as required. This risk had been identified and possible solutions investigated.

The Head of UHS&E explained that if the service was managed centrally by the University, it would be responsible for ensuring that adequate training, management and auditing were undertaken. However, if the University employed BOC, then it would be BOC which would be responsible for this and thus the risk would be mitigated.

The UNISON Representative asked if it would be cheaper to buy cylinders and containers than to rent them. The Technical and Experimental Representative did not think it was possible to buy them any more and even so they would still need to be checked and maintained. It was also noted that they were very expensive to dispose of.

The Technical and Experimental Representative felt that BOC was profiting from the lack of clarity / efficiency with the University's processes and requirements. So there was a need to clarify the ordering process and how it was co-ordinated. He also pointed out that any potential cost savings would need to be clear to the end user. If the cost per cylinder was going to be greater than it currently was, then it would not be appropriate to change the system used. It was noted that the BOC proposal would provide a reduction in transport and cylinder rental costs.

The Head of UHS&E explained that the hazard mapping system provided a floor plan and indication of where cylinders were kept. Also regular inspections and audits would be a requirement of the University regardless of who provided the managed gas service in future. The University did not currently undertake relevant audits, so there was no cost associated with this shown in Appendix B which also meant it was currently non-compliant.

The Chair noted that if the service was brought in-house it would potentially save the University approximately £30,000, so this would seem to be a strong argument for doing so. The Head of UHS&E pointed out that the counter argument to this would be the off-set of risks. The Technical and Experimental Representative noted that an in-house service would need to be robust and able to deal with staff being on sickness absence and annual leave. The Head of UHS&E agreed that this potentially could be an issue, but it had been considered. The in-house proposal suggested having two people on site to manage the service, whereas the BOC proposal only allowed for one person. She added that if the service was managed in-house there would also be a need to train technicians, so that they could provide cover if necessary and prevent a single point of failure in the system.

The Head of UHS&E was not aware of any health and safety concerns with the service delivered by BOC. However, the way in which the University currently operated did pose health and safety risks which needed to be addressed. This could be done by using the BOC managed gas service or providing training and changing University practices.

The UNISON Representative asked if University staff would be at risk if the contract was granted to BOC. The Head of UHS&E confirmed that this would not be the

case.

The Faculty of Engineering and Design representative pointed out that previously there had been suggestion of the working group visiting other institutions. He suggested that if this had not already taken place it could be done as part of preparing the business plan for Option B.

The Management, Specialist and Administration representative asked if Agresso would need to be modified in line with any changes to the ordering process. The Head of UHS&E advised that this may be necessary or new, separate software might be required.

In summary, the Chair acknowledged that it was not possible to totally eliminate risks, but there were cultural issues about how gas safety was viewed and managed. From a health and safety point of view it was not an option to do nothing. If there was an option which also offered cost savings, then it would seem sensible to make a change. The decision would therefore be between Option 1 (BOC) and Option 2 (in-house). Option 2 was potentially cheaper, but there were areas of risk to be addressed (such as potential single points of failure). However, BOC should only be asked to provide an updated cost estimate in the form of a business proposal if they were considered to be a serious contender.

The Head of UHS&E did not have a strong view as to who should provide the service, but she did have a strong view that changes needed to be made and that doing nothing (Option 3) was not an option.

The Technical and Experimental Representative suggested that it might be useful to visit other Universities to see how their gas services were provided and what the pros and cons were. The Chair asked that members of the working group did this and then produced a proposal for an in-house option, which drew attention to any potential downsides such as staff absence, manual handling and the need for any additional equipment or vehicles.

Head of UHS&E

The Committee noted the report and requested that a revised proposal was submitted to its next meeting on 16 December 2014.

Head of UHS&E

663 POLICIES

Paper 9 – Working with Biological Materials Policy

The Head of UHS&E explained that the most recently circulated version of Paper 9 included comments from the Faculty of Science representative.

The Chair requested that the bullet point on page 5 about relevant licences (e.g. from DEFRA or the Home Office) was amended to make it clear that it applied to animal pathogens and not animal scientific procedures. The Head of UHS&E would amend this point accordingly.

Head of UHS&E

He also asked that the last bullet point on page 5 regarding ‘ethics groups’ was made more specific. The Head of UHS&E would liaise with the Chair and amend this point accordingly.

Head of UHS&E

The policy was agreed, subject to the amendments requested.

Paper 10 – Noise and Vibration Policy

The Head of UHS&E advised this policy concerned work related noise and vibration and was particularly relevant to the Faculty of Engineering and Design.

The Head of Security Services confirmed that there were no issues from the point of view of Security Services. A copy had been sent to the staff representative for consultation.

The UNISON Representative asked for clarification regarding how the policy would apply to staff who worked in the Students' Union night club. The Head of UHS&E pointed out that most of these staff were not employed by the University so it would not apply. However, health surveillance in respect of noise was currently being developed which would be targeted at bar staff.

The policy was agreed.

Paper 11 – Health and Safety Documentation Policy

The Head of UHS&E advised that Paper 11 laid out the way in which UHSE would manage its Health and Safety documentation, data and statistics.

There still appeared to be some confusion as to when incidents should be investigated by Departments. The Head of UHS&E said that she would provide examples to departments to illustrate when incidents would be investigated by UHSE and when they would not.

The policy was agreed.

664 UHSE UPDATE

The Head of UHS&E summarised the items covered in Paper 13.

Health & Wellbeing Fair

The BaNES Wellbeing Festival was held at the Green Park Station on the 18th July. The University Health & Wellbeing Adviser attended and her report, with photographs, was attached at Appendix A. She felt that this was something the University could replicate and now planned to arrange for a similar wellbeing event to be held on campus in conjunction with the Students' Union.

Fire Assembly Points

Appendix C – Fire Assembly Points (Flat Map) would be updated to include a key. The map would then be uploaded onto the University website, where there would also be some communication about fire assembly points. The map would be sent out with the next Health and Safety newsletter for distribution by departments.

Head of UHS&E

The Technical and Experimental Representative requested that Appendix C was circulated in time for the forthcoming departmental safety inductions. The Head of UHS&E advised that the revised version would be available by the end of this week / early next week and she would send it direct to the Technical and Experimental Representative and the Faculty of Engineering and Design representative.

Head of UHS&E

The UNISON Representative noted that some assembly points seemed to be

missing from the map. The Head of UHS&E explained that this was likely to be because they would no longer be used. She added that the University had adopted a system whereby people could evacuate to another area or building. However if they did that then they would not be alerted to the all-clear. Fire Wardens had been trained to wait at the assembly point so that they could relay the all clear as necessary.

The UNITE Representative mentioned that people did not necessarily know where fire call points were situated or what they looked like (they were usually by exits and in corridors).

The Chair requested that information about fire alarms, assembly points and evacuation processes was clarified and communicated promptly so that everyone would know what to do in the event of a fire drill or real fire. The Head of UHS&E pointed out that the Evacuation Plan was on the website but that it had been updated and would be uploaded after the meeting. She also pointed out that the Fire Safety Awareness Training made it clear what the fire call points looked like. However if this still wasn't clear then she would ask the Fire Safety Adviser to provide clarification.

Head of UHS&E

Health Surveillance

The programme for 2014/15 had already commenced.

The Committee noted the update.

665 WORKSTATION SELF HELP AND SELF ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT

The Head of UHS&E reported that a new toolkit had been developed for workstation awareness on the wiki. Part of this toolkit was a new workstation self-assessment for use by staff where there was not an in-department workstation assessor and for those who were working off campus. The toolkit also provided guidance on using laptops and tablets.

She added that UHSE had been working with Procurement to ensure that only suitable chairs and desks were made available through the purchasing system.

The Committee noted the update.

666 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Occupational Health Needs Assessment

The Head of UHS&E informed the Committee that the University provided an in-house occupational health service. Additional medical services were provided by the Royal United Hospital. The aim of the Occupational Health Needs Assessment undertaken in June 2014 (Paper 14) was to determine whether the arrangements which were in place were suitable for the needs of the University.

A question was asked by the Management, Specialist and Administration representative about who decided the sickness categories. The Director of Human Resources explained that the University's sickness absence categories were mapped to the categories used by the national employers' association Health and Safety Committee and adopted by the HSE. This was based on international

practice and had been done in order to gather data and take part in national benchmarking.

The Committee noted the report.

Royal United Occupational Health Performance Table

The Head of UHS&E pointed out that the medical occupational health service provided by the Royal United Hospital (RUOH) dealt with complex medical cases and the provision of counselling through the Employee Assistance Programme. Paper 15 Appendix B showed performance levels for 2013/14. The University's in-house occupational health service had triaged an increased number of cases, resulting in fewer being dealt with by the Royal United Hospital and thus the services of the RUOH had been used to deliver wellbeing events and additional counselling sessions.

The Committee noted the update.

667 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Future Agenda Items

The Head of UHS&E asked Committee members to let her know if they had any particular items that they wished to be covered at a future meeting.

All

668 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 16 December 2014.

The meeting concluded at 2.00pm

Chair: