**15 Commonly Encountered University EH&S Program Problems and Solutions**

(based on personal experience of 25 university safety program peer reviews and >500 attendees of the EH&S Academy)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Problem | Solution |
| 1 | EH&S programs not conducting operations as a service provider | Establish service expectation as an explicit condition of continued employment, Perform periodic client satisfaction surveys |
| 2 | EH&S program staff not truly understanding how universities operate, the mission of universities, the underlying cause of faculty frustrations, etc | Provide training on how universities operate, Establish service expectation as condition of continued employment, Perform periodic client satisfaction surveys  |
| 3 | EH&S program reluctance to accept the key denominator that drives services and resources (sq ft) | Educate staff on statistical basis for relationship to sq ft. Establish expectation for measures to be captured in units related to sq ft |
| 4 | Membership of institutional safety committees predominantly non-faculty, thus losing shared governance leverage when developing, implementing policies and addressing problems  | Establish committee membership criteria to specifically include faculty representationObtain members via requests from Deans, President |
| 5 | Absence of a systematic routine safety surveillance program, and the provision of feedback and trend data to leaders and safety committees | Establish expectation for baseline assessment of all workspaces within a defined time period, even if only superficial on the first round |
| 6 | Absence of a codified escalated enforcement policy for use when safety non-compliance is found. Should be driven by safety committees with predominant faculty membership | Adopt codified policy with faulty inputWork with faculty to avoid using itIf used, rely on faculty to enforce |
| 7 | EH&S programs that immediately lament they are understaffed, but cannot demonstrate optimal use of current staff, and what is not getting done | Collect and concisely display work accomplished and benchmark data |
| 8 | Absence of valid EH&S program benchmark data to justify staffing and resource allocations | Require collection of activity, performance dataShare with safety committees, leadership |
| 9 | EH&S programs that dwell on the exception to the rule rather than larger trends – resulting in paralysis by analysis and nothing getting done | Train on “50 questions”Set expectation for knowledge of answers |
| 10 | EH&S lacking a interdisciplinary approach to safety (trained in the 50 questions) rather, they reside in silos, resulting in multiple interruptions to research | Train on “50 questions”Set expectation for knowledge of answersHave all staff involved in conducting routine surveillance |
| 11 | Failure to arrive at the baseline consensus on simple things that any safety person could check in a lab workplace –this would serve as the start of a routine surveillance program (first round of surveys) | Train on “50 questions”Set expectation for knowledge of answersHave all staff involved in conducting routine surveillance |
| 12 | EH&S programs that cannot readily display data on activities and outcomes | Set expectation to capture and display data |
| 13 | EH&S programs that do not synthesize information, rather they just push information or rules out to university community and expect compliance | Don’t allow this to happen. Synthesize the information for them and help them accomplish what needs to be done |
| 14 | EH&S programs with little or no knowledge of workers compensation or property insurance processes, costs | Provide training on the linkages between EH&S and risk management & insurance |
| 15 | EH&S program directors lacking experience in certain aspects of safety: e.g. biosafety or hazardous waste | Screen hires or send for training with specific expectations on learning |