

CASLE: Creating an Active Safety Leadership Environment
SHIP grant # 2008 XB 00031
Funding Period 7/1/2008 – 11/30/2009

Nicole Forward, SHIP Grant Manager
Nicole_forward@toc.org

TOC Management Services

12-30-09

Author of report: Nicole Forward



Funding and support for this project has been provided by the State of Washington, Department of Labor & Industries, Safety & Health Investment Projects.

TOC Management Services (now Vigilant), is solely responsible for the content of and views expressed in this report and related materials unless they have been formally endorsed by the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries.

PART I

Final Report Narrative

Organization Profile

For awarded organizations, to include partners and collaborators, provide a brief description of each organization. Mission, vision, and purpose of the organizations may be valuable to include.

We are a nonprofit employers association that offers legal services, safety services, health and benefits packages, H.R. services, training and claims oversight for a retrospective rating program to 500+ member companies in Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho and Montana. Over 200 of those companies are within Washington state. Our goal is to make these member companies safer, reduce injuries and fatalities, improve their overall work environment and reduce their costs while improving productivity and morale.

Abstract

Present a short overview of the nature and scope of the project and major findings (less than half a page)

Although the vast majority of our member companies have good safety programs in place, we still observe employees doing unsafe things—and other employees won't say anything about it. When we ask, employers will often say, "they knew better than that". Often we find companies will be in compliance by having a safety program and think that's enough. But that only goes so far—it's the culture at that workplace that truly impacts unsafe behaviors. These behaviors lead to injuries and accidents in the workplace. It is the responsibility of the employer to create a culture that will prevent behavioral safety issues. We worked with 24 companies to develop a strong safety culture in order to reduce or eliminate the unsafe behaviors that lead to injuries and accidents. We planned to reduce workplace injury and accident rates in the companies by conducting a Employee Safety Perception Survey Pre-Survey at the beginning of the project, then delivering three training classes (Active Safety Leadership Parts 1 and 2 as well as Conflict Resolution), requiring participants to create personal and company wide action plans to commit to improvement in their three lowest scoring areas, and finally conducting a Post-Survey to assess any improvements (we also had the survey translated into Spanish to survey non-native English speakers). To also obtain more objective data, injury rate data was derived from L&I claim reports for each company (attached). We hoped for a 20% improvement in each company's safety culture (as reflected in the Employee Safety Perception post-test data) and a 10% injury reduction rate at each company that completed 12 months of activities.

Major findings: in 20 companies (83%), we had positive, measurable results ranging from a substantial 36% improvement to a modest 1% improvement in some companies. Four companies had one or more items where their post-test scores were lower than their pre-test. Of those 4, three only scored lower on one item, while improving 1%-4% on the other two items. Only 1 company scored worse on all three items, as mentioned above. Amongst all 24 companies, frequency of injuries went from 11.3 in the 07/08 fiscal year to 10.2 in 08/09, resulting in a 10% positive difference (our goal was 10%). Additionally, 97% of participants stated that they learned new skills in the training classes this project funded (see sample evaluations we have attached to this report).

Purpose of Project	Describe what the project was intended to accomplish.
<p>Reduce injuries and improve the safety culture at 24 companies within Washington state fund employers. We intended to achieve this by conducting a safety perception survey of all employees, identifying the company's three weakest areas, providing training and tools for improving safety culture, holding supervisors accountable with personal action plans and company-wide action plans, then re-surveying the employees to measure levels of improvement on those three indicators. We held ourselves to a very high standard, with the intentions of seeing a 20% improvement in each company's overall safety culture (as reflected in the Employee Safety Perception post-test data) and a 10% injury reduction rate at each company that completed 12 months of activities.</p>	

Statement of the Results	Provide a clear statement of the results of the project include major findings and outcomes
<p>Enclosed is an Excel spreadsheet with the final results. The first tab is the summary of the overall results with some highlights to note: one of our Safety Professionals went above and beyond the requirements of this grant by surveying not only the employees at each of his assigned companies, but also the supervisors as a separate group. We did not include the supervisor's results in this final report for two reasons: a) the survey was not intended to measure supervisor's perceptions of themselves and b) our project was not written to include this additional component. However, since the data was there, we decided to include it on the spreadsheet, simply for your perusal. The next tab is the injury frequency rates for each company, as reported to L&I. Finally, each of the subsequent tabs are the post-test results for each company, with their three lowest scores (from the pre-test) highlighted in orange. We have removed the company names from all attached documents.</p> <p>Project results: Overall, project results were positive. In 20 out of 24 companies (83%), we had improvement between the pre-test and the post-test results on the Safety Perception Survey on the three items each company focused on improving. After each company's pre-test scores were tallied, the three lowest scores were identified and each company was asked to create a company-wide action plan to address those items, in addition to each supervisor creating personal plans. Then, after three training classes and several follow up visits to each company, we re-surveyed the employees to assess any improvements in the safety culture. One company, a foundry, had an impressive 36% improvement on "my supervisor lets me know if I'm working safely", a 35% improvement on "I receive positive feedback from my supervisor for working safely" and a 32% improvement on "management measures safety performance of supervisors".</p> <p>Another company specializing in wood products saw a 29% improvement on "my supervisor lets me know if I'm working safely," a 25% improvement on "I receive positive feedback from my supervisor for working safely" and a 17% better score on "new employees receive adequate safety training before they start work." This is no surprise given that some of the supervisor's personal action plans stated that they would "work hard on listening...to make this plant as safe as possible," and "talk to employees daily to see if they have a safety issue to address" because of this project.</p> <p>A company that manufactures vitamin supplements also had exciting results, with a 24% improvement on "supervisors actively look for safety hazards," a 17% better score on "my supervisor lets me know if I'm working safely" and a 12% improved score on "management measures safety performance of supervisors". The company-wide action plan that was</p>	

implemented included such activities as "recognition for safe behavior must be soon, often and positive" as well as "inform employees at safety meetings that safety performance is part of supervisor's annual performance evaluations".

Additionally, a company that manufactures recycled products improved 23% on "I receive positive feedback from my supervisor for working safely", 19% on "management measures safety performance of supervisors" and 18% on "when discipline results from safety violations it is done fairly and consistently." To achieve this, supervisors committed to, "utilize the Superintendent and his assistant to consistently enforce discipline" as well as "make dedicated rounds through the mill to look only at safety items...make comments to individuals either positive or constructive as required." As you can see, the personal and company-wide commitments made by those participating in this project resulted in their improved scores.

We had two foundries as part of this project and both had impressive results. The foundry mentioned above had the best scores among all of our participating companies. The second foundry had an improvement of 26% on "management measures overall safety performance" a 24% improvement on "my supervisor lets me know if I'm working safely" and a 19% better score on "supervisors are held accountable for individual safety performance as well as their crew". This particular company was so impressed with the classes they received as part of this project that they booked another 12 classes for supervisors to attend over the next year. A manager who attended the classes self-identified as being one of the main reasons why major issues, including safety issues, existed at their company; stating that "the classes hit us right between the eyes" and therefore he wanted more training on how to be a better leader. He booked the 12 additional classes.

In working with these companies, we were struck by their level of commitment to improving safety at their workplace. As reflected in some of the attached action plans, participants identified areas they could improve upon and personally committed themselves to "eliminating the chances of any short cut or unsafe practice", "more consistently enforcing the safety rules when I see them being violated" and "remove barriers" that keep employees from being safe. Participants in the program learned that safety leadership is the responsibility of all workers, not just those with certain titles or positions. This seemed to be a real eye-opener for some, who stated that after our classes, they would "say something every time (they) see an unsafe act", they planned to "walk the talk" more and they would ask whether or not their workers "had a safe shift before asking about production scheduling." The training classes also discussed how to create a culture where safe acts were praised and encouraged. Commitments to this were reflected in statements such as "I will create a work environment that supports people in working safely...for the right reasons", "I will seek input from others, build leadership and trust with others, and empower others" and our personal favorite, "I will not disparage any safety suggestion brought up by an employee, no matter how lame it might be." These are only some examples of the types of commitments made by participants—others can be seen in the supporting documentation, attached at the end of this report.

Although some companies had improvement scores as high as 36%, others had more modest results. One company specializing in custom cabinets had modest results (1% improvement) on survey question #8 "my supervisor lets me know if I am working safely." In our classes, there were a lot of discussions about this subject; interestingly, we learned that supervisors did not really know how to effectively and consistently communicate with their crew on positive safety behavior, which may explain the lower scores. In fact, 17 of the 24 companies (71%) had this survey item as one of their three lowest scores. Thus,

ideas on how to achieve this were discussed as part of the Active Safety Leadership Part 1 class, but in general, we found that most company cultures supported an approach of only catching someone when they were doing something wrong, rather when they were doing something right. As reflected in some of the actions plans we have attached, you will see that some supervisors made a concerted effort to change their approach with their crew at their respective companies and were rated by their peers as being fairly successful at doing so.

Unexpectedly, we discovered that question #10 on the survey, "I receive positive feedback from my supervisor for working safely" was among the three lowest scores for all but 3 companies (21 total). At some levels, it surprised us that so few companies made this a practice, as we all know that "behavior that gets rewarded, gets repeated." On one hand, with 88% of the participating companies having that item as one of their lowest scores, we could question the validity of the survey question itself (statistically). However, it may be a reflection of how uncommon it is for safe behavior to be rewarded, perhaps even more so in manufacturing environments where there's mounting pressure to reach production numbers. Of the companies that had improvement on this survey item, scores ranged from 2% to 35% improvement, with 8 companies scoring between 2%-10% better, 7 companies scoring between 11% and 20% better, and 3 companies scoring over 20%.

There were two companies whose post-test scores on this item were lower than their pre-test scores. The first company, labeled H-M, was closed for 9 months this year, after a roof collapsed. At the time of the collapse, the company had already been through 2 of the 3 training classes, written and began implementing their action plans. Thus, they were heavily committed to the project and wanted to continue with it, once they were running again. We delivered the third class in November, and re-surveyed their employees again at the end of the month. Unfortunately, they were unable to implement their action plan, before this report. Thus, their post-test scores are lower. However, a surprising result came of this misfortune; several of the supervisors from this company were temporarily placed in other jobs at another nearby plant location, which meant there was a new set of eyes, ears and influence on the way that plant was doing business. Although the two locations were seen as previous competitors, we heard from several people that significant mutual learning took place, a newfound respect for other's jobs emerged and instead of competing, they were now helping each other improve all aspects of their business, including safety. Both companies were part of our project; consequently they had a common language to speak when it came to improving the safety culture.

As mentioned above, there were two companies whose pre-test scores were lower than their post-test scores on item #10. Of the 24 companies in our project, only one scored lower on all three areas from their pre-test to post-test, including question #10. This metal fabrication company had the most unusual post-test results—they only scored higher on one item out of 22 (despite their strong qualitative feedback on the project). When looking closer at the data, we noticed something peculiar: in the pre-test, only 4 people from the swing shift were surveyed. Yet on the post test, 40% of the surveys were given to people on swing shift. Indeed, it appeared as if in all cases, swing shift workers at this company consistently rated their perceptions of safety as significantly lower than those on day shift. We repeatedly hear from those who work these shifts in manufacturing environments about the overall lack of supervision, lack of communication, and general lack of knowing what's going on. This insight led us to think that perhaps this uncovered another need we could address in a future project, specifically a safety and leadership training emphasis for those who work non-regular hours.

One company really struggled with their commitment to this project, which is subsequently

reflected in their scores. The company, which specializes in wood products, terminated the HR/Safety lead (and our contact for this project) after 14 months into the project, which forced us to start over on the buy-in and commitment level from this company. The impact is reflected in their low score of -10% on "management recognizes and rewards good safety performance of the crew as well as the individual supervisors." This was the lowest score on any one item in our entire project. In addition to the above mentioned termination of the HR/Safety contact, there were a couple of other factors that the low score could be attributed to: we discovered at the end of the project that 83 employees were surveyed in the pre-test, but only 36 in the post-test, skewing the post-test results (statistically). Second, despite our insistence, management did not attend the three classes we delivered at their location, only supervisors did, and the overall lack of commitment to safety projects could be reflected in this score.

Our goal was to find a 20% improvement in the overall safety culture at each company. As listed in the tab labeled "overall post test scores" in the attached Excel spreadsheet, we had 2 companies who showed a 20% or greater improvement, 7 companies who showed improvement between 10% and 20% and 14 companies with less than 10% improvement. Perhaps our goal of 20% improvement was too lofty, especially given the span of time, the recession and the change in personnel. When analyzing the data, those that had less than 10% improvement were also the same companies whose initial pre-test scores were very high. Thus, there was little room to grow.

Major findings: in 20 companies (83%), we had positive, measurable results ranging from a notable 36% improvement to a modest 1% improvement in some companies. Four companies had one or more items where their post-test scores were lower than their pre-test. Of those 4, three only scored lower on one item, while improving 1%-4% on the other two items. Only 1 company scored worse on all three items, as mentioned above. Amongst all 24 companies, frequency of injuries went from 11.3 in the 07/08 years to 10.2 in 08/09, resulting in a 10% positive difference (our goal was 10%). Ninety-seven percent of participants stated that they learned new skills in the training classes this project funded (see sample evaluations we have attached to this report).

Evidence of the results	Demonstrate evidence of how well the results met or fulfilled the intended objectives of the project.
<p>As mentioned above, our intended objectives were to see a 10% reduction in workplace injuries and/ or fatalities and a 20% improvement in the overall safety culture at each company. We met the 10% goal, as reflected in the attached document. The data is captured from L&I reports with losses through June 30th of each fiscal year. The frequency is measured by using the number of claims times 200,000 divided by the hours worked for each individual company.</p> <p>However, the second goal may have been too idealistic. Only 2 companies achieved a 20% overall improvement as measured (across all 22 items on the pre/post test), with the other 22 companies ranging between -3% and 19%. Those with the lowest scores suffered major setbacks such as extended closures and reductions in force, but we also had some issues with proper administration of surveys (% of swing shift employees surveyed in the pre-test vs. post-test and overall number of pre-tests administered versus post-tests). Yet, despite the overall numbers being lower than we had anticipated, when you review the three specific items that each company focused on, a significant 83% of participating companies improved their safety culture.</p>	

Project's promotion of prevention	Explain how the results or outcomes of this project promote the prevention of workplace injuries, illnesses, and fatalities?
<p>Focusing on compliance alone does not always create safe working environments. It is only one element. It takes a focus of ongoing reinforcement by management and supervisors of day-to-day good, safe work practices. We conducted a focused approach to change the safety culture at each company from being solely compliance driven to being a positive safety environment where everyone is involved, responsible and held accountable to safe acts. The essential elements were: equipping participants with the tools necessary to create a strong culture, asking them to write personal and company-wide commitments to improving the culture, and holding them accountable by having their supervisors rate them on how well they did. Additionally, having a TOC safety professional regularly check in on their progress and help remove barriers ultimately resulted in the prevention of injuries. The results of our project show that workplace injuries were reduced, by as much as 10% from the previous year.</p> <p>Additionally, having a visible and demonstrated upper management commitment remains essential. Remaining true to our strongly held principles on this, TOC safety professionals are on site with companies daily. They can use the results of this grant program to not only promote stronger safety cultures in all of their 60+ assigned companies, but through this project, they have deepened their understanding of the essential steps it takes to achieve a shift in safety culture. As additional shifts are added, when economic conditions change, TOC may embark on an initiative that would place additional emphasis on managing safety cultures on non-regular shift work employees. We would expect to see continued reductions in workplace injuries, illnesses and fatalities in the forthcoming years.</p>	
Relevant processes	Specify all relevant processes, impact or other evaluation information which would be useful to others seeking to replicate, implement, or build on previous work.
<p>Before starting on this project we made a commitment to seek out a variety of companies with differing demographics and cultures. Some had a visible upper management commitment to safety and others were seriously lacking with opportunities for major improvements. Once the companies were contacted and expressed an interest, critical to this project was a signed commitment letter up front stating what the requirements were, and what would happen if their commitments were not followed through upon. We had to use this commitment letter more than once to get a company to do what it had promised to do (action plans, schedule classes, administer and tally the surveys, etc.). For some companies, this was enough to get them back on track, fulfilling the project requirements. For others, it was the impetus that caused them to pull out of the project (as noted in previous reports, we had three companies drop/ pull out of the project, which were subsequently replaced with three new companies). Fortunately, we have strong relationships with all of our member companies in Washington that it was easy for us to find replacement companies who wanted to participate. For others who may replicate this project, we would suggest a back-up plan is in place, in case one or more companies decide to no longer participate.</p>	

Also critical to the project: a tracking sheet stating exactly what had been done at each company and when, which was sent out monthly to all the TOC safety staff who were involved in the project. For replication or building on this project, it would be important to keep in mind that due to reductions in force across the board, fulfilling the multiple requirements we imposed upon them was difficult because of market conditions. We found that as conditions worsened, so did their ability to comply with the requirements of this grant. Thus, our staff often had to pick up the pieces that were left unfinished by participating companies: tallying survey data, administering the surveys, etc. Again, we are fortunate to have staff whose time is already dedicated to assisting their member companies in whatever ways necessary. Without this capacity, we may have had more difficulty in completing all the components of this project.

Additionally, translating materials into Spanish was a huge help in this project. In an effort to be inclusive of those who are non-native English speakers, it was important to also get their input and feedback on how safety is perceived at their workplace.

Another aspect critical to this grant was access to professional trainers to deliver the courses. When trying to change a company's culture, the training needs to be grounded not only in adult learning theories, but needs to be focused on behavior change, rather than just a knowledge dump. We consistently received high marks on our class evaluations relative to the quality of our trainers. Replicating this project without access to professional trainers could yield significantly different results, because so much of this project hinged on the tools learned in class.

Finally, having safety professionals who have a track record of successfully impacting a company's culture around safety was a significant advantage. Not only does it help with credibility when having difficult discussions with upper management regarding their safety status, but it is crucial when training and empowering frontline leaders to make radical shifts in how they think and behave. Without this bench strength amongst our staff, it may have been infinitely more challenging to accomplish what we set out to do with this project.

Lessons Learned

Provide information on lessons learned through the implementation of your project. Include both positive and negative lessons. This may be helpful to other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.

Lessons outlined should not relate to SHIP grant processes.

Positive lessons learned: having a TOC staff person assigned to each company to track their progress and hold them accountable, having professionally written training materials prior to the start of the grant, having a company-wide action plan as well as individual, personal action plans where people knew they would be held accountable to behavior change, and strong pre-existing relationships with all the participating companies and their major stakeholders were all critical in the success of this project.

Negative lessons learned: the following items were all more difficult than we thought: getting the rated personal plans returned to us, getting some companies to administer and

tally the survey data (even with an Excel spreadsheet that automatically calculated things for them), or anything else administrative. However, scheduling and delivering the classes was fairly easy. Getting upper management buy-in and commitment to the changes we were asking the employees to do was a challenge with a few companies, but not all. This challenge often lowered morale amongst those who were involved in our project and were excited about it; but our TOC staff professionals worked diligently to break down the walls between management and those on the floor to attain a balance between the two groups. Also, in companies where there was turnover, especially in the main contact for this project, there were poorer overall results than those who didn't have the same interruption. We may have given more fore-thought into this and could have done a better job of creating back-ups. Finally, we did not anticipate that some companies would rate so high on the initial pre-test, resulting in very little room to improve for the post-test, thus influencing the overall results.

Note: One of our participating companies just applied for VPP Status, preliminary results indicate Star recognition. We are proud of our efforts to help them get there.

Measures to judge success

If relevant, state what measures or procedures were taken to judge whether/how well the objectives were met and whether the project or some other qualified outside specialist conducted an evaluation.

This question doesn't relate to our project.

Uses

How might the products of your project be used within the target industry at the end of your project?

Is there potential for the products of the project to be used in other industries or with different target audiences?

Our results show that it is, indeed, possible to change the safety culture in a company. It is empowering at all levels to know that change is possible, even when those implementing the change are at the frontline level. Most of the participants in this project were frontline supervisors, who found weaknesses in their safety practices, committed to making improvements, and those changes had a trickle down effect to the other employees within the company. We know this because we surveyed employees, even though they weren't the ones who attended the classes—it was the frontline supervisors and leads who did. Therefore, the employees who were surveyed were the observers and recipients of any change hoped for. Typically, people wait for changes to be dictated from the top. But now all levels of the organization know that they do not need to wait for an order from management in order to make a positive shift in their safety practices and culture—they are empowered to do it themselves. Through this grant, we provided them with the tools and held them accountable, but they were the ones who created real change. Thus, when these results are shared more widely amongst all of our members, we can see others wanting to change their culture, too, and we will be able to give them the tools to do so.

Potential for being used in other industries or audiences: Culture, whether it be safety, ethical or work related, exist in all organizations. Culture is not specific to a given industry or segment. Changing a safety culture saves lives, creates a more positive work environment and morale, while also affecting the bottom line. The “packaging” of the three training classes is applicable throughout all industries as one of many methods to support change in a safety culture. Due to the experience of our staff and the outcomes of this grant project, our safety staff will be better equipped to sell the concept to other companies. It isn’t just about compliance, it is about “walking the talk.”

Product Dissemination

Outline of how the products of the project have been shared or made transferrable.

Since our results were based on post-tests, which were just administered and tallied in the last few weeks, we didn’t have results to publish until this week. However, our results will be published in our January newsletter to all of our members, prospects and other influential contacts, reaching over 500+ people in 5 states in the Northwest. We will also be submitting articles/ announcements of our project results in January 2010 to Workplace HR & Safety Magazine, Industry Week, as well as Occupational Health & Safety Magazine. We have submitted email requests to all the aforementioned publications, asking how to submit articles. Copies of all submissions will be sent to the Department of Labor & Industries. Individual companies who participated in TOC’s grant project will also receive specific feedback in their performance compared to other participants.

Feedback

Provide feedback from relevant professionals, stakeholder groups, participants, and/or independent evaluator on the project.

We did not have an independent evaluator on this project, however, we did collect feedback over the course of this project (July 2008- Nov. 2009), particularly in relation to the training classes that were delivered.

Comments included:

I had new insight into:

- “how to get employees involved in safety”
- “how to keep unsafe behaviors from happening”
- “how to have an effective safety program”
- “how to approach, confront and resolve conflict”
- “safety and leadership and how they interact”

I learned:

- “that there is a lot more to safety than what one thinks”
- “how to better identify and eliminate barriers to lead to safety hazards or accidents”
- “how important supervisor feedback to employees (is, how it) affects safety attitudes”
- “how to build trust”
- “how to diffuse an argument”
- “the importance of keeping all employees actively involved”
- “every injury, no matter how small, need to be reported”

This is what I plan to apply/try after today's session:

"I plan to walk the talk"
"watch how I conduct myself in regard to managing safety"
"listen"
"be more aware of my commitment to safety procedures"
"don't avoid issues"
"take responsibility for any unsafe actions I see in and out of my department"
"be positive in dealing with safety conflicts"
"work safer"
"be more observant of safety issues"
"become more active in the safety program:
"create an environment of more...accountability"
"use the 6 steps to resolve conflict"
"take out barriers and work with employees on improving safety"
"I intend to recognize personnel more often for doing it safe and following procedures"
"I will own up to my part of the problem"
"say something every time I see an unsafe act"

Additional comments:

"I learned a lot from this"
"the class met all my expectations"
"kept our interest by getting interaction from the class"
"the real world examples are very powerful"
"well worth the time"
"the teacher inspired the class"
"went above my expectations"
"very useful and relative information"
"looking forward to more classes"
"I came out of this with more knowledge and a better understanding of how to change things"

PART II

SAFETY AND HEALTH INVESTMENT PROJECTS ***SHIP Final Expenditure Report*** ***Budget Summary***

Project Title:	Creating an Active Safety Leadership Environment (CASLE)		
Project # :	2008 XB 00031	Report Date:	Dec. 30 th , 2009
Contact Person:	Nicole Forward	Contact #:	425-349-4477
Start Date:	July 2008	Project Completion Date:	Nov. 30 th , 2009

1.	Total budget for the project		\$ __ 93,336 __
2.	Total SHIP Grant Award		\$ __ 93,336 __
3.	Total of SHIP Funds Used		\$ __ 93,336 __
4.	Budget Modifications (if applicable)		\$ __ 2,400 __
5.	Total In-kind contributions		\$ __ 82,246 __
6.	Total Expenditures (Lines 3 + 4 + 5)		\$ 175,582

Instructions:

- Complete the Supplemental Schedule (Budget) form first (on the next page).
- The final report must include all expenditures from date of completion of interim report through termination date of grant
- Indicate period covered by report by specifying the inclusive dates
- Report and itemize all expenditures during specified reporting period per the attached supplemental schedules
- Forms must be signed by authorized persons (see last page)
- Forward one copy of the report to (Name), **SHIP Project Manager, PO Box 44612, Olympia, WA 98504-4612.**

SAFETY AND HEALTH INVESTMENT PROJECTS
SHIP Final Expenditure Report
Supplemental Schedules (Budget)

Project Title:	Creating an Active Safety Leadership Environment (CASLE)		
Project # :		Report Date:	Dec. 30, 2009
Contact Person:	Nicole Forward	Contact #:	425-349-4477
Total Award \$:	\$95,736		

ITEMIZED BUDGET -- How were SHIP award funds used to achieve the purpose or your project?

	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
A. PERSONNEL	See below	See below	See below

Explanation for Difference and other relevant information:

	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
B. SUBCONTRACTOR	N/A	N/A	N/A

Explanation for Difference and other relevant information:

	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
C. TRAVEL	See below	See below	See below

Explanation for Difference and other relevant information:

	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
D. SUPPLIES	See below	See below	See below

Explanation for Difference and other relevant information:

	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
E. PUBLICATIONS	See below	See below	See below

Explanation for Difference and other relevant information:

	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	See below	See below	See below

	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
--	----------------------	-----------------	------------

INDIRECT COSTS	See below	See below	See below
	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
TOTAL SHIP BUDGET	See below	See below	See below
	Budgeted for Project	Amount Paid Out	Difference
F. IN-KIND	See below	See below	See below
Explanation for Difference:			

Our project was approved with the following explanation, without division of costs as above: it costs TOC a little over \$300 per hour to deliver a training class which includes travel, publications, supplies and salaries. Thus, for each four hour class it costs \$1200 in both direct and indirect costs.

Classes Delivered:

ASL 1	8/26/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	9/3/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	9/10/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	9/19/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	9/23/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	9/26/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/2/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/9/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/13/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/14/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/15/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/18/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/21/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/21/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/24/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/25/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/28/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	10/30/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	11/3/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	11/5/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	11/8/2008	\$1,200
ASL 1	11/8/2008	\$1,200
ASL 2	11/5/2008	\$1,200
ASL 2	11/11/2008	\$1,200
ASL 2	11/12/2008	\$1,200
ASL 2	12/5/08	\$1200
ASL 1	12/6/08	\$1200

ASL 2	12/8/08	\$1200
ASL 2	12/10/08	\$1200
ASL 2	12/11/08	\$1200
ASL 2	12/12/08	\$1200
ASL 2	12/12/08	\$1200
ASL 2	12/16/08	\$1200
ASL 2	12/17/08	\$1200
ASL 2	12/30/08	\$1200
ASL 2	1/10/09	\$1200
ASL 2	1/14/09	\$1200
ASL 2	1/14/09	\$1200
Con Res	1/14/09	\$1200
ASL 2	1/17/09	\$1200
Con Res	1/22/09	\$1200
ASL 2	1/24/09	\$1200
ASL 1	1/29/09	\$1200
ASL 2	2/3/09	\$1200
ASL 2	2/3/09	\$1200
Con Res	2/3/09	\$1200
ASL 2	2/6/09	\$1200
ASL 2	2/7/09	\$1200
Con Res	2/11/09	\$1200
Con Res	2/24/09	\$1200
ASL 2	2/25/09	\$1200
Con Res	2/25/09	\$1200
ASL 2	2/26/09	\$1200
Con Res	2/27/09	\$1200
Con Res	2/28/09	\$1200
Con Res	3/9/09	\$1200
Con Res	3/10/09	\$1200
ASL 2	3/12/09	\$1200
Con Res	3/12/09	\$1200
Con Res	3/13/09	\$1200
Con Res	3/20/09	\$1200
Con Res	3/28/09	\$1200
Con Res	4/4/09	\$1200
Con Res	4/9/09	\$1200
ASL 2	4/17/09	\$1200
Con Res	4/17/09	\$1200
Con Res	4/28/09	\$1200
Con Res	5/16/09	\$1200
ASL 1	5/16/09	\$1,200
Con Res	5/21/09	\$1200
Con Res	6/15/2009	\$1,200
ASL 2	6/20/2009	\$1,200
Con Res	7/25/2009	\$1,200
Con Res	11/11/2009	\$1,200
Admin. duties	2008-2009	\$5,736

75 classes

Total + admin =95,736

Yellow Highlight= two classes we requested additional funding for

PART III

Attachments:

Provide resources such as written material, training packages, or video/audio tapes, curriculum information, etc produced under the grant.

Also include copies of publications, papers given at conferences, etc.

This information should also be provided on a **CD or DVD** for inclusion in the file.

REMINDER!!: All products produced, whether by the grantee or a subcontractor to the grantee, as a result of a SHIP grant are in the public domain and can not be copyrighted, patented, claimed as trade secrets, or otherwise restricted in any way.