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Executive Summary

Background to the Research
The purpose of the evaluation is to test the contribution to employers made by the Scottish Centre for Healthy Working Lives (SCHWL) through two key areas of its activity. The first is its services to support employers, which includes the package of measures available through the Healthy Working Lives (HWL) website, HWL Adviceline, one-to-one workplace visits and customised support, workshops and training sessions and the second the HWL Award Programme. More specifically it seeks to assess SCHWL's impact on employer policies, practices and behaviours and employer performance.

As part of the evaluation, the research team were given access to the management information system that is used to monitor progress for the SCHWL. This was provided in the form of:

- access to the live database to get a feel for the data and to view the 'standard reports' that SCHWL staff can generate to monitor progress and help to develop and support its approach
- a snapshot of data extracted in November 2010 to enable the research team to look behind the standard reports and where possible to manipulate the data further. This snapshot included all data inputted up to the extraction date.

This paper will be updated in January 2012, using figures to November 2011 to see if there are any notable changes.

Employer Engagement
The raw data contains information relating to 12,941 individual employers. This figure relates to employers' 'main registration sites' and strips out any duplicates created by organisations having multiple sites. However in seeking to analyse this raw data, the amount of missing data presents a significant challenge to its analysis. For example:

- 58% of organisations are missing information on the number of employees that they employ
- a further 18% are recorded as having zero employees, but on looking at the type of organisations concerned, the vast majority appear to be miscoded and the data should be viewed as missing
- 15% of organisations do not have Health Board data recorded
- 11% of the organisations do not record their main activity.
Despite these issues with the data, it is the best source of information available and can still give an indication of the characteristics and scope of employers with which the SCHWL is engaged.

With regard to the geographic distribution of employers:

- the largest number of employers in the database were in the Greater Glasgow and Clyde and Lothian Health Board areas
- there were also significant numbers of employers across Lanarkshire, Grampian and Tayside
- the island Health Boards had the smallest number of employers
- 15% of employers had no Health Board area data recorded. Many of these may be organisations from outside Scotland that have contacted the Adviceline.

With regard to the size of engaged employers, as described above there was a great deal of missing data. Based on the 25% of organisations where reliable size data has been recorded:

- 16% of organisations have fewer than 10 employees (known as ‘micro-businesses)
- 63% have 10-249 employees (combined with micro-businesses, these constitute SMEs)
- 22% have more than 250 employees (i.e. are large businesses).

Again, there are a number of issues with the classification of organisations on the database by their main industrial sectors. Based on the data that is available:

- the SCHWL engages with organisations across the full range of industrial activity, although they have much stronger links with some sectors than others
- at 11% the most frequently recorded area of activity is human health and social work, followed by voluntary organisations and charities (9%)
- 8% of organisations are coded ‘other service’ activities, which has a much tighter definition in the Standard Industrial Classification system than it would appear has been used in the database suggesting that there is a need for recoding of these employers
- some sectors, including wholesale and retail, construction and professional scientific and technical are underrepresented.

The database provides some information about the support that is provided to employers both through its services to support employers and those delivered through the HWL Award Programme.

There were 3,698 occupational health and safety visits conducted from the set up of the SCHWL to the end of September 2010. The time period as a whole saw an
increasing trend from a low of just over 250 visits between October 2006 and March 2007 to more than 500 between April and September 2010. In addition, since 2006 the number of ‘first visits’ and ‘follow-up visits’ to organisations have increased year on year. Award support visits made a very small contribution overall to the total.

There were 9,674 queries logged with the Adviceline in the period April 2006 to September 2010. The number of calls to the HWL Adviceline has been fairly steady in the region of 1,000 per six month period, with a more marked increase towards the end of 2010, where calls peaked at just over 1,300. The greatest number of queries came from Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Lothian and Lanarkshire Health Board Areas. An evaluation of the Adviceline is being undertaken by the Institute for Employment Studies and this may provide some additional insights.

Data on employers’ participation in training and events has been recorded since February 2009. It was not possible to assess whether all individuals that have participated in training were captured in this data. Looking at those attending training and workshops, from February 2009 to September 2010 1,874 places were filled at training courses or workshops provided through the SCHWL.

- Training and workshops have been delivered across all of the range of different aspects of the HWL agenda.
- The most well attended courses have been those around mental health.
- There is a Central Belt bias in the delivery of training and workshops, with 23% of all the training and workshops delivered in Forth Valley, with Lothian and Greater Glasgow and Clyde each with 14%. Lanarkshire and Tayside received 12% and 10% respectively.
- Health Boards in more remote and rural areas, including the Highlands and Islands, received few or no training opportunities.

SCHWL also collect data on the number of employers registered for the HWL Award Programme. The HWL Award Programme began on 1 April 2007 (as the SHAW Award Programme had remained in place for the first operating year of the SCHWL). From April 2007 to September 2010 there were a total of 1,354 registrations, comprising of 704 new registrations and 660 registrations from the SHAW programme.

- Transitional registrations from the SHAW programme made up the bulk of registrations for the first year.
- The largest number of transitional registrations came from the Grampian area, where the SHAW Award had a significant support base.
- The number of new registrations has remained fairly steady at around 100 per six-monthly period after peaking in the period October 2008 to March 2009.
Focusing on employers that have received awards since set up of the SCHWL shows that there have been 973 awards to 704 different employers. Although the majority of these have been through the HWL Award Programme, for the first year of operations the SHAW Award Programme was still in place. An analysis of the Awards made shows:

- a ramping up of the HWL Award programme from 2007 onwards in terms of the number of Awards presented
- increasing numbers of organisations achieving the Bronze Award year on year
- a decrease in the numbers of organisations achieving Silver and Gold Awards from a peak in 2009
- very small but increasing numbers of organisations being awarded the Commendation for Mental Health and Wellbeing.

How does the SCHWL monitoring system measure up?
For a management information system to be effective for monitoring purposes it needs to:

- have a clarity of purpose around who will collect the data and how it will be used
- capture a range of indicators which are directly related to the core objectives and service areas of the organisations that it serves
- define these indicators in clear terms so that there can be confidence that they have been completed accurately and consistently
- include a range of indicators that measure aspects of performance that lie within the control of the organisation
- provide a baseline, from which progress can be easily measured
- comprise of data that are actually used on an ongoing basis.

The SCHWL database falls short on a number of these. Whilst recognising that there are some strengths (e.g. the wealth of data that it holds about its existing clients and its potential to generate relevant and timely reports) and that a significant amount of work has been undertaken on the SCHWL database in the last couple of years to improve its functionality, the quality of information that it captures and its accessibility to its users (particularly the HWL advisers) questions still remain as to its fitness for purpose in terms of delivering meaningful monitoring data.

Implications for SCHWL from the analysis
The analysis of SCHWL’s monitoring database has identified a number of issues that SCHWL should address to help it deliver on its aims and objectives.
A review of database content would be beneficial to ensure that the system is not holding significant amounts of data that are surplus to requirements as these potentially create confusion. There needs to be action taken around a number of specific variables including the recoding of the main areas of industrial activity in line with standard SIC codes, checking the employee data held against each organisation and verifying the status of organisations as SMEs. Improvements made to the database mean it is likely that these issues have been addressed for more recent records.

There is a vast amount of missing data in the system, which makes it very difficult to get a clear picture of what is going on and to have confidence in the reports that are generated. This needs to be addressed, both in terms of backfilling and checking the accuracy of data that exists in the database, and in ensuring that the data that is inputted into the system is comprehensive and accurate.

The standard reports represent a very useful tool in terms of keeping abreast of progress in relation to the type and volume of support provided by the SCHWL, but it is important that the SCHWL reviews each of these in terms of their value in monitoring progress against its aims and objectives.

While the database captures information about the type and volume of services and support that it provides to employers, there is currently no focus on the impact that it is making on the employers that it works with. Attempting to introduce aspects of this into the SCHWL MIS would provide an extremely valuable source of information.
1 Introduction

As part of the evaluation of the Scottish Centre for Healthy Working Lives (SCHWL), a key vehicle in helping to create the conditions to deliver a virtuous circle between health and work in Scotland, the research team have been given access to the management information system that is used to monitor progress for the SCHWL. This was provided in the form of:

- access to the database to get a feel for the data and to view the 'standard reports' that are generated for the SCHWL to monitor progress and help to develop and support its approach
- a snapshot of data extracted in November 2010 to enable the research team to look behind the standard reports and where possible to manipulate the data further. This snapshot included all data inputted up to the extraction date.

This paper will be updated in January 2012, using figures to November 2011 to see if there are any notable changes.
2 Aims and objectives

2.1 Rationale for analysing the SCHWL monitoring data
For a management information system (MIS) to be of value it needs to be able to provide appropriate and timely information for its organisation. The rationale for analysing the monitoring data was to see what information it can give that could potentially inform and support the activities undertaken by the SCHWL through its services to support employers and through the HWL Award Programme that will ultimately lead to the goals articulated for the SCHWL in the Theory of Change (ToC), namely:

- impacting positively on employer behaviour and practices
- impacting positively on employer performance.

Whilst it is recognised that the SCHWL is involved in a wide range of different activities, the focus of this research is the work that it undertakes with employers, and there are a number of key areas in which its MIS needs to be able to provide information. These include:

- employer engagement - which employers is the SCHWL working with and is this changing over time?
- services and support - how is the SCHWL supporting employers through its programmes and is this changing over time?

One further area where many MIS systems collate data is around the impact they are having and, in this case, this would relate to the impact on employers (e.g. is there any evidence that the services to support employers and the HWL Award Programme are impacting on employers?). However, the SCHWL database was not designed to capture impact information.

Whilst this research does not have a remit to evaluate the MIS per se, as it is a potential source of evidence to inform and support the direction and activities of the SCHWL, there is a need for the SCHWL to be confident:

- that the system is ‘fit for purpose’
- in the quality of the data
- in the completeness of the data
- in the processes that exist to support data entry, analysis and reporting.

The aim of this short briefing paper is to seek to address these key questions and assess the extent to which the SCHWL can have confidence that its management information system can deliver what it needs to be able to demonstrate in a clear and systematic way where it is adding value to its clients.
3 Method and scope

3.1 Background to the system
The database was built up primarily from data drawn from pre-existing systems, including a historical database that had been developed for the SHaW Award programme, a new system for the Advisors working with the HWL Award Programme and a system used by Health and Safety Advisors. There was an obvious case for having a single system that was capable of reflecting the range of services that are delivered through the SCHWL. To this end, staff resource was put behind the development and delivery of a single repository to capture all of the information. An independent data management company (IPort) was commissioned to integrate the data and functionality of the existing system and develop a new system. The process included an internal scoping exercise and consultations with users, leading to a new system was developed. This system was launched in November 2009 and the database team have worked to backfill some of the historical data.

The current system now provides direct access to the advisors for them to input and update information about who they are working with and how. Through a log-in system it restricts their access only to the elements that are of relevance to them e.g. Award advisors would not be able to see the outcome of confidential information that is requested through the Adviceline.

While SCHWL staff have access to the data, IPort host the database and implement any developments required. The database has been built using Microsoft SQL Server, a specialist relational database.

3.2 Data used for analysis
There are two sources of data contributing to the analysis presented in this report, although the data sitting behind them is all drawn from the SCHWL’s monitoring database.

- Firstly, the research team has had access to the live database. IPort facilitate access to the database for the SCHWL staff (in ‘real time’) who can access a range of standard reports which provide information on some of the key aspects of performance e.g. number of Award registrations, number of SMEs, number of Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) visits broken down by a range of other variables such as Health Board area and employer size. There are also options to allow some time series analysis through the production of bespoke reports for some variables. This function has been used to generate time series data for analysis from the set up of the SCHWL at six-monthly intervals to the
end of September 2010. However, as will become apparent later in the report, not all of these reports are useable.

- The research team was provided with a ‘dump’ of the raw data from the SCHWL database, up to mid November 2010. To enable a snapshot of the data to be analysed the data was exported first by IPort into Microsoft Access Pro 2007 and then analysed by the research team using SPSS, an industry standard statistics package for social scientists.

In terms of deciding which of these to use, the following two factors were important.

- Whilst these two data sources are ultimately derived from the same source, the standard and bespoke reports available from the live database are aggregate only and for this analysis, it has not been possible for the research team to see the individual employer data that sits behind them or to check their validity. This has meant that the reports had to be taken ‘at face value’ with no opportunity to review the completeness or quality of the data. This in itself has potentially important implications which will be discussed in greater detail later in the Briefing Paper. More recent changes to SCHWL reporting should allow for future analysis to ‘drill down’ into the data contained in these reports.
- The raw data ‘dump’ does not include any time-series data but it is possible to extract data on a time series basis through the standard and bespoke reports from the live database. This has important implications for the analysis – as it has meant that it has not been possible to identify from the data ‘dump’ those employers that are currently engaged or to undertake any analysis of the change in employer characteristics over time. Where a time-series analysis was required, the live database was used – with data extracted for 6 monthly intervals (e.g. April – September and October – March of each available year).

There is a vast amount of historical data stored within the MIS, so for purposes of this analysis, the focus is only on data that relates to after the SCHWL was set up on 1 April 2006. Any deviation from this is flagged up at the appropriate section in the report.

In addition to the data analysed for this report, the SCHWL also collates a range of other data including:

- participant data for the Mentally Healthy Workplace Training, Alcohol and Drugs Training and Work Positive activities
- details of employers registered as ‘champions’ for Health Risks at Work.
3.3 Scope of the database
The scope of the database was established in terms of the type, completeness and accuracy of data that it holds.

3.3.1 Type of data held in the database
The database is organised into a number of linked tables that are set up to provide data on a wide range of information relating to:

- contact details for the organisations
- key characteristics of organisations such as size, type of organisation e.g. public, private, third sector, industrial sector and registration date
- the type of supports that they have received including OHS visits
- the Award Programme, including progress, visits etc.
- occupational health and safety visits
- Adviceline usage
- the volume and type of enquiry category made to the SCHWL
- pilot projects that employers have engaged in e.g. Mental Health pilot project
- a range of other information about employers including grants received, workplace initiatives undertaken, resources provided and training undertaken.

In some cases, these are legacy reports that the SCHWL no longer use. In particular, the number of employers/employees being reached and the performance data are now captured through the key performance indicator (KPI) report. Data on training and events is available through either the KPI report or the training ‘tab’ on the database.

It is important to note that although it is a key service in the package of support that is available to employers, website usage is captured and analysed by the SCHWL team directly and is not part of the database (and as such is not part of the analysis undertaken in this report). One factor here is that web usage is anonymous (beyond an IP address) – encouraging use by those who would perhaps be reluctant to use other services.

The series of standard reports draw down information from the live database in ‘real time’. This helps to keep SCHWL and its staff informed of progress in specific areas across both the Award Programme and the range of services to support employers and should help them to target specific organisations and or areas of activity as required.

For the Award Programme these standard reports include:
- a key performance indicator report covering registrations, awards, visits and withdrawals with breakdowns available by Health Board area, SME versus non-SME and Award level
- reports focusing on award employer registrations including new registrations, transitional registrations, registrations by area, by SME versus non SME etc.
- details of awards by Health Board and sector
- details of organisations currently working to the next level of award
- details of organisations holding the SHAW award
- a report of monthly visits
- records of applications submitted by employers for HWL Grants and in relation to National Smile Month.

For services to support employers these standard reports include:

- the number of companies being worked with
- the number of employees being reached
- a range of reports to capture performance data including staff turnover rates, sickness absence rates
- information about Adviceline usage broken down by a range of different variables including size, Health Board area, category of call, how employers heard about the services etc.
- information about events and training
- information about enquires to the SCHWL broken down by a range of different variables including size, Health Board area, category of call, how employers heard about the services etc.
- information about visits made to employers by advisors
- information about engagement in the mental health pilot project.

Whilst the reports have been set up to be fairly comprehensive in nature (and there is scope for the development of bespoke reports based on any of the data contained within the database), there are a number of problems in using them to try and answer the questions posed by this report.

- The individual records which sit behind the aggregate data cannot be viewed so there is no way of verifying the comprehensiveness or accuracy of what is being produced, although the KPI report that has been introduced aims to address this issue.
- Some of the web links are broken (e.g. those to do with events and training), preventing access to data. SCHWL has indicated that some of these reports have never been used. Obsolete reports need to be removed from the system.
- Some of the reports are empty, because although the framework exists data has never been collected (e.g. staff turnover rates, sickness absence rates and the number of policies developed). All of these could represent key impact indicators for the SCHWL should it decide to incorporate
impact measures in the future. Alternatively, if impact measures are not to be included in the SCHWL’s monitoring efforts, the reports should be removed to avoid confusion.

3.3.2 Completeness of data
As outlined above, whilst the range of data that is covered by the database is fairly comprehensive, on investigating the data in more detail by looking at the raw data provided to the research team, it is immediately apparent that there is a large amount of missing data for some variables. This has potentially important implications for the findings that can be drawn from the data. This will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sections. One issue to note at this juncture is that the raw dataset does not contain time-series data, and therefore it has not been possible to assess whether or not the completeness of data has improved over time.

3.3.3 Accuracy and clarity of the data
Examination of the raw data suggests that there should at least be some caution applied in taking the standard reports at face value. Although there is no opportunity within this research to examine each individual employer record, even a cursory look at the data suggests that there are some issues around the coding of data (and subsequent quality control) that merit some further attention from the SCHWL. This is particularly the case around the following.

- The definition of an SME – whilst there is no single definition of an SME (with some encompassing turnover, balance sheet details and employee numbers), for the purposes of this research it is assumed that the working definition – in line with the definition provided by the Enterprise Directorate of the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (2010)\(^1\) – is that of a company with fewer than 250 employees. However there are clearly a number of third sector organisations coded in this way. To ensure clarity, it is useful if third sector organisations are separated out from those in the private sector.

- The main area of activity of the organisation – which is not coded using standard industrial classifications (SIC). Instead it uses a mix of what appears to be some SIC codes, some descriptions of activity e.g. ‘enterprise organisations’ or ‘other services’ (which has a very precise meaning when using SIC codes but appears to have been used in instances where it has been difficult to classify organisational activity) and organisational status e.g. voluntary/charity, which does not indicate the area of activity at all.

\(^1\) BIS (2010), Small and Medium-Sized Enterprise (SME) Statistics for the UK and Regions, 2009: Methodology Note
Less a case of accuracy, but more one of clarity there are also potential issues in the standard reports around categorisations of:

- employer size – where it is not clear if the reports are based on the total employee numbers or those at the site at which the SCHWL is providing services
- employer engagement – where it is not clear if the reports relate to the overall engagement of an employer or each individual engagement e.g. with a department, branch plant, etc. This is because employer engagements are recorded to reflect the way in which the organisation has elected to work with SCHWL – so some are for a specific site, whilst other are for an organisation as a whole. Whilst this clearly has benefits in an operational sense, it complicates the analysis of the data.

In seeking to monitor an organisation’s progress it is critically important that it is clear what is being reported. For example in making claims around the number of employees reached by a service the SCHWL needs to be sure that employer size information is both accurate and complete.
4 Results

This section presents the results from the analysis of the database. Whilst there are a lot of data (or certainly the potential to collect a lot of data) across a wide range of areas recorded in the system, this analysis focuses only on those that are directly relevant to this evaluation – i.e. aspects of the services to support employers and the HWL Award Programme that are working to influence the policies, practices and behaviours of employers and their performance. Only the data that has been provided can be analysed – and as outlined in the previous section, there are a number of problems and issues relating to the available data.

Some of the analysis uses the standard tables accessed through the service user interface and some is drawn from the raw data provided to the research team, with the sources being made clear in the text. It is beyond the scope of this analysis to check individual records and therefore it is not possible to comment on whether the details for each organisation were correct or whether all records have been included. The analysis was organised around a number of key questions that the SCHWL needs to be able to answer to be able provide an evidence base around their progress and the extent to which they are delivering on their aims and objectives. These relate to:

- employer engagement - which employers is the SCHWL working with and is this changing over time?
- services and support - how is the SCHWL supporting employers through its programmes and is this changing over time?
- impact on employers - is there any evidence that the services to support employers and the HWL Award Programme are impacting on employers?

The implications of these results will be discussed in more detail in section 5.

4.1 Employer engagement

4.1.1 Which employers is the SCHWL working with?

The raw data contains information relating to 12,941 individual employers held in the database. This figure relates to the ‘main registration site’ of the organisation and strips out any duplicates created by the organisation having multiple sites. These organisations could (and should) be viewed as in scope potential clients, irrespective of whether they are currently actively working with the SCHWL (or indeed whether SCHWL has worked with them at any point since establishment). If this is not the case and they are purely historical records, then they should be removed from the database.
However in seeking to analyse this raw data, the amount of missing data presents a significant challenge to its analysis. The following are some, but by no means all, of the relevant examples.

- 58% of organisations are missing information on the number of employees that they employ. A further 18% are recorded as having zero employees, but on looking at the type of organisations concerned, excepting some of the voluntary organisations and potentially a handful of sole traders, the vast majority appear to be miscoded and the data should be viewed as missing. It is also unclear as to whether employer size for the main registration site relates to the size of employing unit with which the SCHWL is engaged or the total number of employees employed by the organisation.
- 15% of organisations do not have Health Board data recorded. In some cases, these may be non-Scottish organisations that have contacted the Adviceline.
- 11% of the organisations do not record their main activity.

In addition, the data 'dump' lacks information on when organisations engaged in specific services (and where data is available it is not comprehensive). This means that it is not possible to identify whether the organisations included in the data 'dump' are current (i.e. have been actively engaged in using SCHWL services in, say, the last 12 months) or indeed whether or not SCHWL has engaged with them at any point since its establishment.

Although there are some issues with the data, it is the best source of information available and can still give an indication of the characteristics and scope of employers with which the SCHWL is engaged. The data has been analysed by:

- geographic spread
- size of employer
- whether or not an employer is an SME
- main area of industrial activity.

It is important to know the geographic distribution of employers by area as this can potentially have implications for the appropriate targeting and resourcing of services. Table 4.1 shows that:

- the largest number of employers in the database are in the Greater Glasgow and Clyde and Lothian Health Board areas
- there are also significant numbers of employers across Lanarkshire, Grampian and Tayside
- the island Health Boards have the smallest number of employers
- 15% of employers have no Health Board area data recorded. As outlined earlier, many of these may be organisations from outside Scotland that have contacted the Adviceline.
In broad terms, this reflects distribution of employing units across the Health Board areas.

Table 4.1: Main registration address of organisations on database by Health Board Area (number and % of all organisations with data recorded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employers registered with SCHWL</th>
<th>Number of employers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% of Scottish employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Glasgow and Clyde</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lothian</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth Valley</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayrshire and Arran</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12941</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Raw data from complete database; % of Scottish employers from Annual Business Inquiry (Nomis)

It is important for the SCHWL to know about the type of employer that they are working with in terms of size and main area of activity. As highlighted previously there are issues around both missing data and the recording of a zero against a significant number of organisations. Therefore all organisations recorded with ‘0’ employees have been considered as missing values and the analysis below focuses on the 25% of organisations where size data has been recorded (n=3,107). Analysing this subset shows that:

- 16% of organisations have fewer than 10 employees (known as ‘micro-businesses)
- 63% have 10-249 employees (combined with micro-businesses, these constitute SMEs)
- 22% have more than 250 employees (i.e. are large businesses).
Within the database as a whole, 8% of organisations are coded as SMEs.

- 14% are charities or voluntary organisations.
- There are also small, but potentially significant numbers of organisations across education, health care, housing associations and other aspects of local government that are coded as SMEs and should be verified. These are most likely the result of coding errors or a lack of clarity around how an organisation should be classified, but nonetheless this should be investigated by the SCHWL. SCHWL have undertaken a recoding exercise and introduced a 'rule' into the database that should ensure that no public sector organisation or any employer with 250 or more employees is classed as a SME. A further review of monitoring data is scheduled as part of the evaluation for early 2012 and at this stage it should be possible to identify whether these changes have led to improvements in the data recorded.

This suggests that the number of SMEs that the SCHWL using HWL Award Programme and Workplace Services is likely to be smaller than the figures used to generate the standard reports in the database, although clearly this would need to be looked at in more detail.

There is information in the database that relates to the industrial sector of the organisation, however as indicated in section 3.3.3 there are a number of problems with this:

- 1 in 10 organisations have no information about their main area of activity
- the database does not use standard industrial classification codes (SIC codes) which makes it difficult to undertake meaningful analysis (although this is being addressed by a mapping exercise being undertaken by SCHWL)
- there is a code listed for voluntary organisations or charities, which is not an area of activity, but rather a description of a type of organisation. This means that the actual industrial activity of the business is not recorded.

Putting these issues to one side, Table 4.2 uses the available data to show the distribution of the industrial sectors of organisations on the database. This has been created by translating the non-standard codes within the database to industry standard SIC codes. However, it should be noted that each individual record has not been reviewed individually to check that its initial code is correct. The amended data shows that:

- the SCHWL engages with organisations across the full range of industrial activity, although they have much stronger links with some sectors than others
- at 11% the most frequently recorded area of activity is human health and social work
this is followed by voluntary organisations and charities, which represent 9% of clients - in reality their activities could be across a wide range of different areas

8% of organisations are coded 'other service' activities, which has a much tighter definition in the SIC system than it would appear has been used in the database, suggesting that there is a need for recoding of these employers

accommodation and food services, manufacturing, administrative and support services, public administration, defence and social security, education and wholesale and retail each account for between 6% and 8% of organisations

all other industrial areas of activity register 5% or less

some sectors, including wholesale and retail, construction and professional scientific and technical are underrepresented.

Table 4.2: Characteristics of organisations by SIC code (% all organisations responding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type</th>
<th>% of employers registered with SCHWL</th>
<th>% of Scottish employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human health and social work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary/charity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration, defence and social security</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional scientific and technical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, sewerage and waste management</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households as employers</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Raw data from complete database; % of Scottish employers from Annual Business Inquiry (Nomis)

Notes: Voluntary/charity is not a SIC code, but has been included as it is coded against a significant number of organisations
4.1.2 Are the characteristics of employers that the SCHWL is working with changing over time?

The SCHWL needs to be able to answer the question about how its client base is changing over time. There is no standard IPort report that provides information about employer characteristics and given the very limited amount of information provided as raw data that contains date information (and the volume of missing data) it is not possible to analyse changes in characteristics over time.

As outlined elsewhere in this report, it would be helpful to develop clearer indicators showing the date of first intervention and whether or not clients are ‘current’. As well as ‘date of first engagement’ and ‘date of most recent engagement’ (which would be used for segmenting the database), other characteristics that it would be useful to include in this report include:

- number of employees/employer size
- type of employer (e.g. public, private or third sector)
- sector (using SIC)
- services used.

Some of these indicators are already available but are not currently pulled together into a single report to assess how the characteristics are changing over time.

4.2 Services and support

It is important that the SCHWL has a clear idea of its service delivery mix. The database provides some information about the support that is provided to employers both through its services to support employers and those delivered through the HWL Award Programme.

4.2.1 How is the SCHWL supporting clients through its services to support employers– and is this changing over time?

Not all of the aspects of the SCHWL’s services to support employers are recorded on the database, however there is information that relates to OHS visits, the Adviceline and training. Data relating to website usage is not stored in the database.

The standard reports within the database show that there were 3,698 OHS visits conducted from the set up of the SCHWL to the end of September 2010. The data ‘dump’ provides data up to November 2010 but in order to compare 6-monthly periods, the period to September 2010 has been chosen for this analysis. As shown in Figure 4.1, the time period as a whole has seen an increasing trend from a low of just over 250 visits between October 2006 and March 2007 to more than 500 between April and September 2010.
The breakdown of the types of visit is presented in Figure 4.2, which shows that:

- in the period April to September 2010, the overall number of visits has returned to almost its highest level (recorded in the period October 2008 to March 2009)
- since 2006 the number of ‘first visits’ and ‘follow-up visits’ to organisations have increased year on year
- the significantly different numbers of ‘award assessment visits’ across the various six-monthly periods, ranging from a high of 206 in October 2006 to March 2007 to only 14 between April and September 2010, reflects a change in SCHWL recording procedures
- award support visits make a very small contribution overall to the total, although they increased to their highest level in the period April to September 2010.
The data from queries to the Adviceline has been generated using the standard reports and shows that there were 9,674 queries logged with the Adviceline in the period 1 April 2006 to end of September 2010. Queries can be made by telephone or email and cover a range of issues across health and safety, occupational health, etc. Figure 4.3 looks at the number of queries in the same period at six-monthly intervals. This shows that the number of calls to the HWL Adviceline has been fairly steady in the region of 1,000 per six month period, with a more marked increase towards the end of 2010, where calls peaked at just over 1,300. One useful exercise that SCHWL could pursue would be to map its marketing efforts against these peaks to see if there is a relationship.
Figure 4.3: Number of queries made to the Adviceline 1 April 2006 to 30 September 2010

Source: Standard database reports generated for April 2006 to 30 September 2010

Figure 4.4 shows the percentage of queries that come from each of the Health Board areas in the period from the set up of the SCHWL in April 2006 to the end of September 2010. This shows that:

- at 17% of the total, the greatest number of queries comes from the Greater Glasgow and Clyde Health Board area
- this is followed by Lothian at 16% and Lanarkshire at 14%
- all of the other Health Board areas record less than 6% of the queries
- ‘national’ employers make up only 2% of the Adviceline queries.

There is also a significant amount of missing data, where Health Board information has not been recorded for 17% of the queries. As outlined elsewhere, one factor here is that the Adviceline receives some queries from employers based outwith Scotland.
Fig. 4.4: Adviceline queries from set up of SCHWL April 2006 to end September 2010 (% of total by Health Board area)

Source: Standard database reports generated for April 2006 to 30 September 2010

No further analysis of Adviceline data is possible (for example, to identify the types of employer, size of employer, etc.) using the data that has been provided. However, there is an evaluation of the Adviceline being undertaken by the Institute for Employment Studies and this may provide some additional insights.

Although there are standard reports set up within the IPort database interface to provide information on attendance at events and training, at the time of the analysis being undertaken the links were broken. In going back to look at the raw data this shows that training and events data has been recorded on the database since February 2009. Again, it is not possible to assess whether all individuals that have participated in training are captured in this data – only to analyse what has been provided. The data includes both those attending training and workshops and those attending awards ceremonies. Looking at just those attending training and workshops, from February 2009 to September 2010 (20 months), 1,874 places have been filled at training courses or workshops provided through SCHWL.

- Training and workshops have been delivered across all of the range of different aspects of the HWL agenda including health promotion, health and safety, occupational health and vocational rehabilitation.
• The most well attended courses have been those around mental health, taking three of the top four places and representing 28% of the training places.

In addition to those shown in the table, other courses that have been run include a mental health and wellbeing networking event, assessor training course, a health promotion development day, alcohol and drugs training, fire safety awareness, smoking cessation courses, support for emotional wellbeing, awareness of health risks at work, men’s health, improving attendance and managing sickness absence and workshops for SMEs.

There is however a marked difference in attendance at training events by Health Board area as presented in Figure 4.5. This shows that:

• there is very much a Central Belt bias in the delivery of training and workshops, with 23% of all the training and workshops delivered in Forth Valley, with Lothian and Greater Glasgow and Clyde each with 14%
• Lanarkshire and Tayside received 12% and 10% respectively
• Health Boards in more remote and rural areas, including the Highlands and Islands received very little or no training opportunities.

Fig. 4.5: Training and workshops February 2009 to end September 2010 by Health Board area (% all training)

Source: Raw data from ‘Training’ table February 2009 to end September 2010
Overall, the figures suggest that there has been a significant increase in the amount of training offered from 2009 to 2010, with 30% of the training and workshops taking place in 2009 and 70% in 2010. However, feedback from the SCHWL team suggests that this reflects both an increase in training being undertaken and also better data capture (with a facility to record training introduced in January 2010).

Table 4.3 shows the training courses and workshops run by the SCHWL that were attended by at least 20 attendees. Over and above these courses were a number of other less well attended courses that addressed a wide range of issues across health promotion, health and safety and occupational health issues.
### Table 4.3: Training courses and workshops attended by at least 20 individuals February 2009 to end September 2010 (number of attendees and % of all training offered by SCHWL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National - Mentally Healthy Workplace Training (2 day course)</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National – Alcohol and Drug Training for Managers</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Healthy Workplace Training - NHS Managers</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health in the Workplace</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Risk Assessment</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Session</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Eating</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME Workshop</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Performance</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National - Policy Workshop Day</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Handling</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSHH</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National - Managing Stress in the Workplace</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Kickstart</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Training</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musculoskeletal Disorder (MSD) Training</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Networking Event</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health &amp; Stress Training (.5 day Course)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace and the Environment Training</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and the Environment Network Event</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthier Eating and Weight Management</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney H&amp;S Awareness</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Kickstart Workshop</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensible Risk Assessment</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Walk Leader Training</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backcare</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Forum</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Standard database reports generated for April 2006 to 30 September 2010

4.2.2 How is the SCHWL supporting clients through its Award Programme – and is this changing over time?

The HWL Award Programme began on 1 April 2007 (as the SHAW Award Programme had remained in place for the first operating year of the SCHWL). Running a standard report for the timeframe 1 April 2007 to September 2010 shows that there were a total of 1,354 registrations, comprising of 704 new registrations and 660 registrations from the SHAW programme. If these
registrations are broken down by type of organisation this shows that there were 454 organisations registered as SMEs and 910 non SMEs, a ratio of roughly 1:2.

Figure 4.6 shows these new and transitional registrations broken down by Health Board. This shows that:

- in broad terms the level of registrations reflects the size of the employer base in the various Health Board areas, with the largest number of new registrations in the Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Grampian and Tayside and Lothian areas
- rural and more remote areas have seen significantly fewer new registrations
- the largest number of transitional registrations came from the Grampian area, where the SHAW Award had a significant support base.

**Fig. 4.6: Number of new and transitional registrations for the HWL Award Programme from its start up in April 2007 to end September 2010**

In looking at changes over time, Figure 4.7 shows that:

- transitional registrations from the SHAW programme made up the bulk of registrations for the first year
the number of new registrations has remained fairly steady at around 100 per six-monthly period after peaking in the period October 2008 to March 2009.

There has not been a significant increase over time in the number of new employers registering with the HWL Award Programme.

**Fig. 4.7: Number of new and transitional registrations for the HWL Award Programme from its start up in April 2007 to end September 2010 by six-monthly periods**

Source: Standard database reports generated for April 2007 to 30 September 2010

**4.3 How successful is the SCHWL at supporting clients?**

In relation to the monitoring data, success can be viewed as looking at the reach of the services in terms of the number of companies and employers and any evidence of impact on their activities and performance.

**4.3.1 Services to support employers**

Whilst it has not been possible for this analysis to break down the data over time, the standard report within the IPort database should allow the SCHWL to look at its ‘reach’ in terms of the number of companies and employees on its database. The OHS report does not relate to a specific timeframe, but covers all of the information held on the database (to the end of February 2011) and shows that:
• 11,551 employers are listed
• in total, these organisations employ 618,813 individuals.

However given some of the issues raised previously about the size of employer it is not possible to comment on the extent to which this figure reflects the reality of the situation. As outlined elsewhere in this report, developing indicators that would allow analysis of employers that have been engaged since SCHWL has established and/or the analysis of those that are currently engaged in the HWL Award Programme and/or Workplace Services would be a useful development going forward.

Whilst there are standard reports set up in the IPort database to capture information from employers on their sickness absence rates, staff turnover rates and the number of polices being developed, the database does not and has never collated data against these indicators. As data is not collected on impacts, it is not possible to undertake any analysis here on the impact of SCHWL services to support employers on its clients. Given the need for the SCHWL to be able to record and evidence the impacts that it has on the employers with which it engages, and the fact that this is becoming increasingly necessary in the current climate of cuts in public sector spending, this is an important omission and will be discussed further in section 5.

4.3.2 HWL Award Programme
As with the services to support employers the reach of the Award can be estimated by looking at the number of organisations registered as participants and the number of employees they report having. In the period since the Award Programme was set up in April 2007 to the end of September 2010, the standard report looking at award registrations claims that the SCHWL has worked with 1,364 organisations, that employ 724,056 employees (although there is no suggestion that SCHWL has worked with all employees).

As there are no indicators that look at employer experience or the impact that being engaged in the Award Programme has on individual organisations, the only proxy for how successful the SCHWL is at working with employers is the number and type of Awards that it has given out since its set up. An analysis of the raw data, focusing only on employers that have received awards since set up of the SCHWL, shows that there have been 973 awards made since 1 April 2006 to 704 different employers (for example, with some receiving the HWL Bronze Award followed by the Silver or following up their SHAW Gold Award with the HWL Gold Award). The majority of these have been through the HWL Award Programme, however for the first year of operations the SHAW Award Programme was still in place, therefore Table 4.4 also includes the awards made through this route.
There has been a ramping up of the HWL Award programme from 2007 onwards in terms of the number of Award presented.

Increasing numbers of organisations have achieved the Bronze Award year on year.

There has been a decrease in the numbers of organisations achieving Silver and Gold Awards from a peak in 2009. There are likely to be two factors here – as Awards must be renewed, many of those awarded SHAW Award in its last full year had to transition across to HWL Awards in 2009 and, secondly, that 2010 data does not account for a full year.

Very few but increasing numbers of organisations have been awarded the Commendation for Mental Health and Wellbeing.

### Table 4.4: Number of awards made since set up of SCHWL 1 April 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006¹</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010²</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HWL Award</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHAW Award</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

¹ Data from 1 April 2006
² Data to mid November 2010.

Source: Data from raw data ‘Awards’ Table

To get a sense of who is being reached, over and above the numbers of employers receiving awards, it is also important to look at the type of organisations that are receiving awards. Of the 974 awards made to organisations, only 16% were made to organisations recorded as SMEs. The figures reported by the live database are slightly higher at 25%. These figures are low in the context of the ratio of SMEs to non-SMEs registered on the HWL Award programme. SCHWL had indicated that it would be useful to know whether SMEs experience any particular barriers in completing the Awards – whilst the monitoring data does not allow this analysis to be undertaken, the e-survey, telephone survey and case studies will hopefully provide some insights here.

However, as outlined previously, when looking at the cases recorded as SMEs in the database, it is clear that many of these do not reflect the accepted definition of an SME. The actual number of awards to SMEs is therefore likely to be lower than the 16% recorded.
In terms of employer size more generally, irrespective of sector:

- only 3% of organisations have fewer than 10 employees
- 54% of organisations have 10-249 employees
- 42% of organisations have more than 250 employees.

However, this also needs to be considered in the context of the point made in section 3.3.3 that it is not entirely clear whether the number of employees figure relates to the employer as a whole, the branch, or department etc. receiving support. Looking at the data at six-monthly intervals suggests that there is no clear pattern emerging over time.
5 Discussion

This Briefing Paper looks at the MIS of the SCHWL with the purpose of analysing the information that it holds to potentially inform and support the activities undertaken by the SCHWL through its services to support employers and through the HWL Award Programme, which in turn ultimately lead to the goals articulated for the SCHWL in the ToC (Theory of Change), namely:

- impacting positively on employer behaviour and practices
- impacting positively on employer performance.

The discussion is organised around:

- the key findings from the analysis that could help to inform the SCHWL about its progress in terms of engaging and working with employers through its services to support employers and the HWL Award Programme
- the key characteristics that are required in a good MIS system and the extent to which the SCHWL system measures up
- the key implications that the SCHWL needs to consider in the light of the analysis of its existing system against this ideal, specifically around the quality and completeness of the data, the processes that exist to support data entry and the MIS’ overall fitness for purpose.

5.1 Key findings from the analysis

5.1.1 Employer engagement

The database provides a wealth of information about existing clients (and those that they have worked with more actively in the past). Whilst the analysis is somewhat hampered by missing data or data that may be inaccurate in some cases, it nonetheless demonstrates the following issues.

- The SCHWL has engaged with almost 13,000 employers across all of the Health Board areas in Scotland.
- Taken at face value the monitoring data suggests that fewer than 1 in 12 employers are SMEs. Notwithstanding the question mark over the definition of SME used by the SCHWL, this still reinforces the findings of the e-survey and telephone survey that suggests a still greater focus needs to be placed on engaging with this community. As SMEs are the key target group for the SCHWL it is critically important that engagement with them is accurately monitored.
- The data shows that the SCHWL has successfully engaged with organisations across the full range of industrial activity, although there is much greater engagement with some sectors than others. For example
there is still heavy engagement with employers that focus on human health and social work, public administration, social security and education. Whilst these organisations require support around the HWL agenda, many sit within the public sector and the SCHWL needs to continue its push to engage with private sector organisations across a wider range of industrial activity.

- Given that there is only size data available for 25% of the organisations recorded on the database it is not possible to undertake detailed, meaningful analysis around employer size.

Whilst it may be the case that there have been changes in relation to the characteristics of employers that the SCHWL has engaged with over time, the amount of missing data around dates and broad characteristics makes it difficult to undertake any meaningful analysis to test this.

5.1.2 Services to support employers

The SCHWL needs to be very aware of its service delivery mix. With regard to its services to support employers the MIS provides some data that can help to monitor progress around OHS visits, the Adviceline and training and events.

- The period from the set up of SCHWL through to the end of September 2010 has seen an increasing trend in the number of OHS visits undertaken by advisors. In looking at this in more detail, there has been significant variation by type of visit, with first visits and follow-up visits increasing year on year, whilst visits relating to the Award have fallen over time (although this reflects a change in recording processes).
- The number of enquiries to the Adviceline has not seen much change over the timeframe and has remained fairly steady at around 1,000 per six month period, with the users of the Adviceline predominantly within the Central Belt. Whilst to some extent it would be expected that the greatest number of enquiries would be taken from Health Board areas with the largest employer bases, nonetheless there would appear to be scope both to increase the usage of the Adviceline over time and to extend its reach. One area where SCHWL could add value to this analysis would be to review whether there is a relationship between the peaks in enquiries and the SCHWL’s marketing efforts.
- A wide range of training has been delivered across all aspects of the HWL agenda, although there has been a bias towards some specific areas e.g. mental health training and particular geographic areas, most notably the Central Belt (an issue raised in the telephone survey). Training data has only been recorded in the MIS since 2009, and shows a significant rise in the amount and variety of courses on offer in 2010 from the 2009 figures. This reflects an improvement in the processes used to record this data.
Data relating to the usage of the website is not stored in the database and was therefore outside the scope of this analysis.

However, the database was never intended to measure impact and therefore has no measures to record the client experience, client satisfaction or harder impact measures that would indicate changes in employer performance considered elsewhere in the evaluation. However, as Appendix 1 shows, this is an area where SCHWL are currently developing the MIS.

5.1.3 Healthy Working Lives Award Programme

With regard to the HWL Award Programme, the MIS provides some data that can help to monitor its reach.

- In broad terms the registrations for the HWL Programme reflect the size of the employer case in the various Health Board areas with the most registrations in Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Grampian, Tayside and Lothian and significantly fewer in rural and more remote areas. Whilst Health Board sizes vary and the profile of HWL registrations reflects this, this should not detract from the need to engage with more companies across all of these areas.
- Over time there has been no significant increase in the numbers of employers registering on the programme in each 6 monthly period from its start up. This suggests that there is scope for raising the visibility of the Award Programme amongst the employer community.

The MIS would ideally act as a tool to measure the progress of the HWL Award Programme in terms of the number of employers that it engages with, the number of employees that can be reached through these organisations and their success in achieving the various levels of the Award. The best proxy for success can be viewed in terms of the number of Awards made to employers.

- Since 2007, there has been a year on year increase in the numbers of organisations receiving Bronze Awards and the Commendation for Mental Health and Wellbeing.
- However, in the same time period there has been no significant increase in the numbers achieving Silver and Gold Awards. Whilst analysis of the monitoring data cannot speculate on the reasons for this, the SCHWL needs to consider the reasons that sit behind this in more detail.
- The relatively small numbers of SMEs achieving the Award (relative to the numbers registering for the Award) suggests that there is a need for additional tailored support to help these organisations to achieve the Award.
5.2 The characteristics of a good management information system

Monitoring is a system of continued observation, measurement and evaluation and is critically important as it enables an organisation to assess whether or not they are making a difference. More specifically, it should provide the scope to:

- track progress against targets
- identify opportunities for improvement
- provide the basis on which to allocate resources
- ultimately make an organisation accountable to its stakeholders.

For a management information system to be effective for monitoring purposes it needs to:

- have a clarity of purpose around who will collect the data and how it will be used
- capture a range of indicators which are directly related to the core objectives and service areas of the organisations that it serves
- define these indicators in clear terms so that there can be confidence that they have been completed accurately and consistently
- include a range of indicators that measure aspects of performance that lie within the control of the organisation
- provide a baseline, from which progress can be easily measured
- comprise of data that are actually used on an ongoing basis.

5.3 How does the SCHWL system measure up?

Monitoring systems tend to be backward looking, and the SCHWL is no exception. Much of the data held in the system relates to the period prior to the set up of the SCHWL in 2006, which only serves to 'muddy the waters' in terms of trying to establish a baseline and measure progress.

In looking at the specific characteristics of a good MIS articulated in section 5.2, the SCHWL database falls short on a number of these. Whilst recognising that there are some strengths (e.g. the wealth of data that it holds about its existing clients and its potential to generate relevant and timely reports) and that a significant amount of work has been undertaken on the SCHWL database in the last couple of years to improve its functionality (outlined in Appendix 1), the quality of information that it captures and its accessibility to its users (particularly the HWL advisers), questions still remain as to its fitness for purpose in terms of delivering meaningful monitoring data. The implications for the SCHWL from this exercise are articulated in the next section.
5.4 Implications for the SCHWL from the analysis

5.4.1 Need for a review of database content
As a framework the database is fairly comprehensive and should provide the basis for all of the information that SCHWL staff need to be able to monitor progress and target their efforts appropriately. However in looking at the raw data there appears to be a lot of variables within the system that are not used, or whose purpose is not immediately clear. A review of database content would be beneficial to ensure that the system is not holding significant amounts of data that are surplus to requirements as these potentially create confusion.

There needs to be action taken around a number of specific variables including the recoding of the main areas of industrial activity in line with standard SIC codes, checking the employee data held against each organisation and verifying the status of organisations as SMEs. A review of database content would be likely to identify a number of other aspects to consider. It is highly likely that the improvements that have been made to the database (see Appendix 1) mean that these issues have been addressed for more recent records.

5.4.2 Identifying and filling in missing data
There is a vast amount of missing data in the system, which makes it very difficult to get a clear picture of what is going on and to have confidence in the reports that are generated. This needs to be addressed in a systematic way and there are at least two important issues to consider.

- The first relates to backfilling and checking the accuracy of data that exists in the database, particularly for all of the variables that are used to monitor progress including SME status, main area of activity, employer size and geographic location.
- The second relates to ensuring that the data that is input into the system, particularly given the open access nature of the system with its multiple users, is comprehensive and accurate. Part of the solution is around (further) training and support to ensure that individuals using the system are consistent in their approach, but it also requires the SCHWL team to put in place a system to ensure that the data is checked and verified. It would appear that there are inconsistencies in the way in which advisors are using the system (an issue which was raised in focus groups with advisors in 2010) and without line management of all of the advisors it is a difficult task to keep control of the quality and amount of data collected.

To address the second of these two points, the following is required.

- As the data is stored and manipulated by a third party organisation, it is essential that the SCHWL team has a comprehensive understanding and control of all aspects of database management.
Data is inputted by advisers and it is important that training (including ‘refreshers’) on the database and data entry is provided to these key staff. This is particularly important as these individuals are drawn from different professional and organisational backgrounds and will have different levels of previous experience and knowledge. This should help to ensure that data is entered correctly, however, it is also important that any problems arising from it are identified and promptly addressed. This requires somebody within the SCHWL to be tasked with this role.

Given the number of employer records that sit within the database and the difficulties of back filling historical data, this would require careful management and significant staff time and resource to ensure ongoing monitoring and review.

5.4.3 Need for a review of the standard reports
The standard reports represent a very useful tool in terms of keeping abreast of progress in relation to the type and volume of support provided by the SCHWL, but it is important that the SCHWL reviews each of these in terms of their value in monitoring progress against its aims and objectives.

Given that the reports do not allow for a review of the data that sits behind them, any issues around the completeness, accuracy and quality of data may be hidden. This needs to be investigated further and then reviewed on a regular basis.

On a practical note, the links are broken for some of the existing reports and there are a number of empty reports within the system. This needs to be addressed.

5.4.4 Need for a focus on the impact of SCHWL on employers
Notwithstanding any concerns about the completeness and accuracy of the data, the database captures information about the type and volume of services and support that it provides to employers, yet there is currently no focus on the impact that it is making on the employers that it works with.

Whilst this is not uncommon in MIS, in the current economic and funding environment the ability to generate evidence of impact and added value is increasingly important. Attempting to introduce aspects of this into the SCHWL MIS would provide an extremely valuable source of information. The reports within the database suggest that some thought has been given to using the system in this way as there are reports set up to capture information around sickness absence, staff turnover etc. but to date there does not appear to be any data sitting behind them. Populating these reports (and considering what else could be added into the system) would represent a significant step forward in using the MIS to help to demonstrate the impact of the SCHWL over time.
In deciding on the indicators to include in the MIS to demonstrate impact and added value, the key issues are as follows.

- Improving the quality of the data gathered. In addition to the issues identified above in relation to the completeness, accuracy and clarity of the data, it is important that data on the characteristics of the employers using the different services and the patterns of usage is available. For example, it would be useful to know the proportion of Adviceline queries that come from employers who have not contacted the Adviceline before. Whilst not directly a measure of impact, understanding the characteristics of employers and their pattern of usage will underpin any interpretation of the impact figures.
- In terms of measuring the impacts, it is important that there should be a range of indicators covering the impacts on policies, behaviours and performance.
- However, gathering and inputting this data will have resource implications and therefore the number of indicators should be limited to those the SCHWL believes it will make use of and has the capacity to analyse on a regular basis.
- The indicators must be clearly defined and advisers must receive guidance and, possibly training, on completing this aspect of the database. This will help ensure accuracy and completeness of the data collected.
- Where possible, the impact indicators should help feed into the Health Works Triangle Outcomes.
6 Conclusion

Whilst the MIS system holding the SCHWL’s monitoring data has some strengths, particularly in relation to the wealth of data that it holds about its existing clients and its potential to generate relevant and timely reports, these are overshadowed by the issues of missing and potentially inaccurate data. This leads to a loss of confidence in conclusions that can be drawn from the data and potentially limits its usefulness in informing progress and as a resource for determining future direction.

Whilst accepting that a significant amount of work and resource has gone into improving the database in the last couple of years, the MIS system needs to be reviewed and further refined to ensure that it contains the right information to enable the SCHLW to measure its progress against its aims and objectives. This would allow the SCHWL to be able to build on areas where it is successful, whether they relate to aspects of employer engagement, service delivery or the Award Programme, and to identify and act on those where it is falling short. The research team, SCHWL staff and others cannot be fully confident in their analysis of this database until the recommendations made in Section 5 have been addressed.

Addressing the issues raised in this Briefing Paper will help the SCHWL to deliver on its aims and objectives (as articulated in the Theory of Change), giving its staff and stakeholders confidence in its MIS and enable them to enhance the package of services and supports that it offers to employers, in turn maximising its impact on the HWL agenda for employees, employers and the economy as a whole.
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## Appendix 1: Healthy Working Lives Database Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre Nov 2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use of 2 separate database systems</strong>&lt;br&gt;Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) advisers used a transactional based database inherited from SHaW to record activity and services to companies. Health Improvement advisers had been using a database inherited from SHAW which was the template used to develop the current HWL database.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Jun-Nov 2009** | **Unification of both databases**<br>HWL database developed to incorporate OHS side of the service; development ran from June-November 2009 going live mid-November 2009. All advisers now using the same database meant that all information/data relating to HWL services was held in one place. Specific stages included:  
  - removal/hiding of redundant fields which decreased the amount of time taken to input data  
  - introduced mandatory fields for the creation of new records  
  - improved searching/querying  
  - developed the facility to review by company or contact name rather than individual enquiries/visits allowing SCHWL to view a summary of engagement with a specific company  
  - improved reporting to reflect actual activity  
  - migration of historical data from old database into HWL database  
  - improved interface and navigation for users  
  - training advisers on new system. |
<p>| <strong>Nov 2009</strong>   | <strong>HWL database user guides</strong>&lt;br&gt;HWL database user guides were pulled together and made available to advisers to ensure consistent use of the system and entry of data/information across all local HWL teams. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dec 2009   | **Occupational Health Adviseline Pilot** <br>HWL database utilised for DWP Occupational Health Adviseline Pilot project. Development work carried out to allow this included:  
  - purchase and application of SSL security certificate for the HWL database site so that any information transferred was secure and encrypted  
  - mapping of HWL database fields to Pilot management information requirements to ensure comparability across all Pilot sites (e.g. ‘organisation types’ in HWL database mapped to Pilot specified SIC codes)  
  - development of management information reports for use by DWP and IES. |
| Jan 2010   | **Facility to record training**  
  Training section of the database developed so that we could begin to formally record training delivered by HWL to companies. This meant that we could, to some extent, evidence how many training courses were being delivered and to how many delegates. |
| Jan 2010-present | **De-duplication/merging of company records**  
  Following the migration of data from one system into another during the unification process we were left with a high number of duplicate company and contact records in the HWL database. This was in part due to the same company/contact existing in both previous databases. Work has been and is still being carried out to identify these and merge the records to ensure we have only one record for one company/contact. |
| Jun 2010   | **Development of KPI report**  
  Comprehensive report developed to show all information relating to the Centre’s key measures over a selected time period. |
| Oct 2010   | **Development of staff directory**  
  Staff directory developed on the HWL database to give advisers the ability to quickly find/source other advisers in other health board areas or with certain areas of expertise. Each HWL adviser has a ‘profile’ within the directory. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td><strong>Events/training calendar</strong>&lt;br&gt;Calendar developed to sit on the database so that all HWL staff could see what training/events/meetings had been scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2011</td>
<td><strong>SME classification fix</strong>&lt;br&gt;Introduced a rule that prevents any public sector or firm with more than 250 employees from being classified as SME on the database. This should give us a bit more confidence in the output rather than a blind assumption that everything is an SME unless otherwise defined. This fix was also back dated to correct company records which had been incorrectly classified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2011</td>
<td><strong>Training/events feeding to website</strong>&lt;br&gt;A feed was built between the HWL database and the HWL website so that when a training session is entered into the database it also populates on the website at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td><strong>Current development work</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Customer feedback questionnaires – these are being built on the database so that we can reach out to customers who have used our services and ask for feedback. Results will be stored on the database for analysis.&lt;br&gt;- Health Risks at Work – a facility is being added to record companies/contacts that are using this HWL resource. This information is currently being captured elsewhere.&lt;br&gt;- Health Profits – a facility is being added to record companies/contacts that are using this HWL resource.&lt;br&gt;- HWL Newsletter - a facility is being added to record companies/contacts that are subscribed to the HWL newsletter. The newsletter can then be distributed to subscribers directly from the database. This information currently sits as a separate Excel spreadsheet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** SCHWL