2022-2023 NSC Safety Barometer Results
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NSC Employee Perception Surveys provide comprehensive, sensitive leading indicator metrics to assess your safety culture, identify strengths and opportunities, and gaps in your safety management system that can assist in prioritizing continuous improvement efforts. The NSC Safety Barometer is a validated safety survey, asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement with 50 standardized general safety statements (Q01-Q50) assessing safety management system health and safety culture. These statements describe activities or conditions related to the administrative, operational, technical, and cultural elements of the safety management system, representing six fundamental safety performance categories or areas of safety excellence: Management Commitment (7 items), Supervisor Engagement (9 items), Employee Involvement (10 items), Safety Support Climate (10 items), Organizational Climate (5 items). Descriptions of the six performance categories and their respective standard items are below.

### Management Commitment

Management Commitment items describe ways in which top & middle management demonstrate their leadership and commitment to safety in the form of words, actions, organizational strategy, and personal engagement.

Q01: It is common for employees to take part in identifying and eliminating workplace hazards.
Q02: There is frequent contact and communication between employees and management.
Q03: Safety takes a back seat to productivity.
Q04: Management shows that it cares about employee safety.
Q05: My supervisor maintains a high standard of job safety performance.
Q06: Detailed safety inspections of work areas, including government-owned vehicles, are made at regular, frequent intervals.
Q07: It is common for employees to take part in identifying and eliminating worksite hazards.
Q08: Safety meetings are held less often than they should be.
Q09: Good teamwork exists among departments (OUs, Divisions, Groups, etc.).
Q10: Management shows that it cares about employee safety.
Q11: I can protect myself and coworkers through my actions while on the job.
Q12: Good teamwork exists among departments (OUs, Divisions, Groups, etc.).
Q13: Designated employees are well trained in emergency practices, including for example, hazard review emergency response procedures and building evacuations.
Q14: Management has published a written policy that expresses their attitude about employee safety.
Q15: Management does no more than the law requires to keep employees safe.
Q16: Employee morale is poor.
Q17: Management demonstrates their leadership and commitment to safety in the form of words, actions, organizational strategy, and personal engagement.
Q18: I understand the safety and health regulations relating to my job.
Q19: Hazard reviews (or JHAs) are revised and re-reviewed when process changes or new hazards are introduced.
Q20: The same basic precautions are used by employees who deal with hazardous materials.
Q21: Management has provided adequate staff to manage and support its safety program.
Q22: The safety office has high status in this organization.
Q23: The hazard reviews (or JHAs) process reduces risk associated with my work.
Q24: My supervisor understands the job safety problems I face.
Q25: Management's views on the importance of safety are seldom stressed in employee communications.
Q26: The safety office has high status in this organization.
Q27: I believe management is sincere in its efforts to ensure employee safety.
Q28: The training or guidance provided through my supervisor (or principal investigator, or senior practitioner/mentor) helps me do my job safely.
Q29: I can protect myself and coworkers through my actions while on the job.
Q30: The work of committees like the ESC (Executive Safety Council), SAC (Safety Advisory Committees), and OUS safety councils improve safety conditions.
Q31: Management sets a positive safety example through their words and actions.
Q32: Detailed safety inspections of work areas, including government-owned vehicles, are made at regular, frequent intervals.
Q33: The system of preventive maintenance for facilities, work areas (including vehicles), equipment, tools, and machinery operates poorly.
Q34: Management regularly participates in safety program activities.
Q35: The safety coordinator (OU safety program coordinator, division safety representative, etc.) is readily available to provide advice and assistance.
Q36: Employees rarely take part in the development of safety requirements for their jobs (e.g., safe operating procedures and training reviews).
Q37: Job performance standards for production-related output are higher than safety performance standards.
Q38: The safety coordinator (OU safety program coordinator, division safety representative, etc.) has high status in this organization.
Q39: Medical resources are sufficient for treating the injuries that occur.
Q40: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q41: The safety coordinator (OU safety program coordinator, division safety representative, etc.) has high status in this organization.
Q42: The training or guidance provided through my supervisor (or principal investigator, or senior practitioner/mentor) helps me do my job safely.
Q43: Employees are afraid to report safety problems to their supervisors.
Q44: The system of preventive maintenance for facilities, work areas (including vehicles), equipment, tools, and machinery operates poorly.
Q45: Management insists that supervisors think about safety when doing their jobs.
Q46: Many employees don’t use the personal protective equipment necessary to do their jobs safely.
Q47: Job stress is a significant problem for me and my coworkers.
Q48: Management insists that supervisors think about safety when doing their jobs.
Q49: Management annually sets safety goals for which all employees are held accountable.
Q50: Employees rarely take part in the development of safety requirements for their jobs (e.g., safe operating procedures and training reviews).

### Supervisor Engagement

Supervisor Engagement items consider primary roles through which supervisors communicate their support for safety: leader, manager, controller, trainer, organizational representative, and advocate for employees.

Q51: All hazardous activities I perform have an associated hazard review.
Q52: Hazard reviews (or JHAs) are used in emergencies.
Q53: Designated employees are well trained in emergency practices, including for example, hazard review emergency response procedures and building evacuations.
Q54: The training or guidance provided through my supervisor (or principal investigator, or senior practitioner/mentor) helps me do my job safely.
Q55: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q56: Incidents that happen at NIST and lessons learned are discussed in my work area.
Q57: Supervisors encourage the reporting of unsafe/unhealthful conditions.
Q58: Incidents that happen at NIST and lessons learned are discussed in my work area.
Q59: My supervisor maintains a high standard of job safety performance.
Q60: Incidents that happen at NIST and lessons learned are discussed in my work area.
Q61: My supervisor’s behavior often goes against safe job procedures.
Q62: If you experienced a near miss while working, how likely would it be for you to report it?

### Employee Involvement

Employee Involvement items specify selected actions and reactions that are critical to making a safety program work. Emphasis is given to personal engagement, responsibility, and compliance.

Q63: I am committed to continuously improving the safety management practices in my area.
Q64: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q65: I am committed to continuously improving the safety management practices in my area.
Q66: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q67: I am committed to continuously improving the safety management practices in my area.
Q68: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q69: I am committed to continuously improving the safety management practices in my area.
Q70: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.

### Safety Support Climate

Safety Support Climate items ask employees across an organization for general beliefs, impressions, and observations about management’s commitment and underlying values with regard to safety.

Q71: Employee morale is poor.
Q72: Management’s views on the importance of safety are seldom stressed in employee communications.
Q73: Management demonstrates their leadership and commitment to safety in the form of words, actions, organizational strategy, and personal engagement.
Q74: Management’s views on the importance of safety are seldom stressed in employee communications.
Q75: Management demonstrates their leadership and commitment to safety in the form of words, actions, organizational strategy, and personal engagement.
Q76: Management’s views on the importance of safety are seldom stressed in employee communications.
Q77: Management demonstrates their leadership and commitment to safety in the form of words, actions, organizational strategy, and personal engagement.
Q78: Management’s views on the importance of safety are seldom stressed in employee communications.
Q79: Management demonstrates their leadership and commitment to safety in the form of words, actions, organizational strategy, and personal engagement.
Q80: Management’s views on the importance of safety are seldom stressed in employee communications.

### Organizational Climate

Organizational Climate items probe general conditions that interact with the safety program to affect its ultimate success, such as teamwork, morale, and employee turnover.

Q81: There is frequent contact and communication between employees and management.
Q82: Good teamwork exists among departments (OUs, Divisions, Groups, etc.).
Q83: Employee morale is poor.
Q84: Designated employees are well trained in emergency practices, including for example, hazard review emergency response procedures and building evacuations.
Q85: Near miss incidents are thoroughly investigated.
Q86: Detailed safety inspections of work areas, including government-owned vehicles, are made at regular, frequent intervals.
Q87: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q88: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q89: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q90: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q91: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q92: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q93: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q94: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q95: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q96: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.

### Customized Items

Safety program items that are of special concern to your organization.

Q97: All hazardous activities I perform have an associated hazard review.
Q98: Hazard reviews (or JHAs) are used in emergencies.
Q99: Detailed safety inspections of work areas, including government-owned vehicles, are made at regular, frequent intervals.
Q100: Safety meetings are held less often than they should be.
Q101: Designated employees are well trained in emergency practices, including for example, hazard review emergency response procedures and building evacuations.
Q102: The training or guidance provided through my supervisor (or principal investigator, or senior practitioner/mentor) helps me do my job safely.
Q103: I receive enough job-specific safety training to perform my work activities safely.
Q104: Incidents that happen at NIST and lessons learned are discussed in my work area.
Q105: Management’s views on the importance of safety are seldom stressed in employee communications.
Q106: Management demonstrates their leadership and commitment to safety in the form of words, actions, organizational strategy, and personal engagement.
Q107: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q108: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q109: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q110: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q111: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q112: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q113: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q114: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q115: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.
Q116: I believe that safety and health should be a primary concern of management.

Understanding Your Results: NSC Safety Barometer

This page provides you with foundational information about the NSC Safety Barometer items and six safety performance categories.
Section 3

Understanding Your Results: Benchmarking

This page provides you with key information about benchmarking, how we calculate average scores, interpreting percentile scores, why benchmarking is important, and the NSC Database.

Average Response Scores

To ensure the quality of survey responses, two-thirds of the NSC Safety Barometer statements are positively phrased while other statements are negatively phrased. Respondent agreement with a positive statement or disagreement with a negative statement has a positive safety implication for the safety culture. Disagreement with a positive statement or agreement with a negative description has a negative implication. For each statement, average response scores were calculated by assigning the following values to responses:

+2 = strongly positive response (strongly agreeing with positively phrased item/strongly disagreeing with negatively phrased item);
+1 = positive response (agreeing with positively phrased item/disagreeing with negatively phrased item);
0 = neutral response;
-1 = negative response (disagreeing with positively phrased item/agreeing with negatively phrased item);
-2 = strongly negative response (strongly disagreeing with positively phrased item/strongly agreeing with negatively phrased item).

For the six areas of safety excellence, average response scores were calculated by assigning the following values to responses:

+2 = strongly positive response (strongly agreeing with positively phrased item/strongly disagreeing with negatively phrased item);
+1 = positive response (agreeing with positively phrased item/disagreeing with negatively phrased item);
0 = neutral response;
-1 = negative response (disagreeing with positively phrased item/agreeing with negatively phrased item);
-2 = strongly negative response (strongly disagreeing with positively phrased item/strongly agreeing with negatively phrased item).

Benchmarking

Average response scores are compared with the NSC Database for each of the 50 NSC Safety Barometer items and each of the six safety performance categories. A percentile score expresses the percentage of NSC Database businesses with a lower average response score than your business. Possible percentile scores range from 0 to 100, with 0 representing the lowest score in the NSC Database and 100 representing the highest. For example, a percentile score of 100 indicates that all of the businesses in the NSC Database received a lower average response score than your business, a percentile score of 50 indicates that half of the businesses were lower than your business, and a percentile score of 0 indicates that all of the businesses in the NSC Database received a higher average response score than your business.

Value of Benchmarking

The true value of benchmarking in employee survey analysis is it neutralizes inaccuracy in the survey results, allowing organizations to compare scored items and take action. Inherent in all survey work, every survey item has its own natural performance. Some items tend to be answered more positively or negatively than other items. This has to do with the wording of the item, topic being addressed, or both. Benchmarking is a unit of analysis that will allow you to easily identify high and low scores across items and prioritize areas for action planning. The following is an example comparing two NSC Safety Barometer survey items.

Two survey items:

Q01) It is common for employees to take part in identifying and eliminating worksite hazards

Q47) Job stress is a significant problem for me and my coworkers

NSC Database average score of 1.137 and a standard deviation of .27

NSC Database average score of -.208 and a standard deviation of .36

If survey results were provided with only average response scores (on a scale of -2 to +2) and your organization produced the same average response score for both of these items, this result can be interpreted that these items are performing rather equally. However, applying our NSC Benchmark can clarify on the true status of this safety component in your safety culture, as derived from employee perceptions. In this example, benchmarking actually reveals that despite garnering the same average score, Q47 would produce a percentile score of 99 and would be identified as a strength, whereas Q01 would be performing below average, producing a percentile score of 7. Ultimately, benchmarking enables your organization to correctly interpret and take action based on more accurate survey results. See image below for visual on benchmarking in action.

Standard Survey Results

Benchmarked Survey Results

Value of Benchmarking

Percentiles are scaled from 0 to 100

A percentile score above 50, the NSC Database average, indicates above average performance, whereas a score below 50 indicates below average performance when compared to NSC Database organizations. Scores between 20 and 80 are considered average, while scores of 80 or above are described as high. Scores of 90 or above indicate very high performance, as derived from employee perceptions.

NSC Database

The NSC Database includes millions of employee responses from businesses across various industries and countries. The businesses in the NSC Database do not represent a national average. NSC Database businesses tend to be high performing, safety culture focused organizations with emerging and mature safety systems.

Average response scores were compared with the same 1,400 businesses in the NSC Database as at the time of the 2020 survey for each of the 50 NSC Safety Barometer items and each of the six safety performance categories. This allows direct comparison to previous survey results, when available. Given the components assessed with the NSC Safety Barometer are key for all businesses in building and maintaining a positive safety culture, we compare you to the entire NSC Database to ensure the most accurate and precise results. Although specific risk may vary by industry, the six areas of excellence and their respective components are applicable to all organizations.
Your Survey
These results build on employee survey responses to the NSC Safety Barometer survey. The NSC Safety Barometer elicits employee responses to 50 statements regarding foundational safety elements. These components are grouped into six performance categories of safety excellence: Management Commitment (7 items), Supervisor Engagement (9 items), Employee Involvement (9 items), Safety Support Activities (10 items), Safety Support Climate (10 items), and Organizational Climate (5 items).

Your NSC Safety Barometer survey was conducted in December 2022 to February 2023.
Survey administered via anonymous online link.
38% of respondents provided improvement feedback in the comments section.

Overall Response Rate
2022: 49.7%

Responses by Federal Employee Status
Yes 92.12% (2,081)
No 7.88% (178)

Responses by Primary Work Location
Gaithersburg 80% (1,669)
Boulder 15% (314)
Other 5% (105)

NSC Database Benchmark
1,530 Businesses
To generate comparative percentile scores, 2022 average response scores were compared with 1,530 businesses in the NSC Database.

Overall Percentile Score
64.3

Management Commitment Percentile Score
58.1

Supervisor Engagement Percentile Score
86.8

Employee Involvement Percentile Score
51.6

Safety Support Activities Percentile Score
53.3

Safety Support Climate Percentile Score
58.4

Organizational Climate Percentile Score
72.6

Top Strengths
Q28 Supervisors acting on employee safety suggestions (SE)
Q12 Supervisors behaving in accord with safe job procedures (SE)
Q43 Supervisors reducing employees fear of reporting safety problems (SE)
Q50 Employees taking part in the development of safety requirements (EI)
Q07 Management stressing the importance of safety in communications (MC)
Q24 Supervisors understanding employees job safety problems (SE)
Q32 Supervisors integrating safety into work routine (SE)
Q05 Supervisors maintaining a high safety performance standard (SE)
Q17 Belief that management does more than law requires (SSC)
Q47 Significance of job stress for employees (OC)

Focus Areas
Q20 Employees using basic precautions for hazardous materials (EI)
Q49 Management setting annual safety goals (MC)
Q30 Effectiveness of safety committee (like ESC, SAC, and OU) in improving safety conditions (SSA)
Q33 Quality of preventive maintenance system operation (SSA)
Q45 Perception that good environmental conditions are kept (SSC)
Q21 Management providing adequate safety staff (MC)
Q14 Management publishing a policy on the value of employee safety (MC)
Q23 Safety standards relative to production/work output standards (SSA)
Q39 Perception that medical resources are sufficient (SSC)
Q25 Employees following procedures to isolate hazardous energy sources (EI)
Overall & Safety Performance Category
This page contains overall percentile score and safety performance category percentile scores.

Your NSC Safety Barometer Survey
These results build on 2,259 employee survey responses to the NSC Safety Barometer survey, a response rate of approximately 50%. In addition, 38% of respondents also provided open-ended feedback in the comments section.

Your current NSC Safety Barometer survey was conducted from December 2022 - February 2023. Employees participated in your 2022-2023 NSC Safety Barometer through an anonymous online link.

Benchmarked percentile scores for Employee Status groups are also available across this dashboard, as well as Industry-Specific results. Use the Employee Status filter at the top of each applicable page to view results by a specific reporting group. Use the Benchmark Group filter to adjust the benchmark group. In order for results to display properly, please ensure only one variable is selected from each filter at a time. Please note, narrative text will not update and will always reflect analysis of 1-NIST overall results at the full 'All industries' benchmark.

You can also view percentile score comparisons on the Percentile Scores pages of this dashboard.

Overall
For a broad measurement of the survey results, a relative overall score (includes all the responses across all 50 items) is included to provide an overall snapshot of your safety management system health and culture.

The overall percentile score in 2022 is a moderately high score of 64.3, indicating that you scored higher than 64.3% of the NSC Database businesses, overall.

Safety Performance Category
All 50 NSC Safety Barometer items are associated with one of the six safety performance categories: Management Commitment (7 items), Supervisor Engagement (9 items), Employee Involvement (10 items), Safety Support Activities (10 items), Safety Support Climate (10 items), and Organizational Climate (5 items). Performance category percentile scores are generated by comparing performance category average response scores (calculated from employee responses to the corresponding NSC Safety Barometer items) to the NSC Database.

Percentile scores by performance area highlight broad strengths and opportunities. If a specific performance category is underperforming compared with other performance categories, specific components from the lowest-performing performance category should be considered for action planning. Typically, high performing safety cultures will see consistency among performance category scores.

In 2022, all of the six performance category percentile scores were above the NSC Database average of 50. Supervisor Engagement received the highest percentile in 2022 with a score of 86.8. Employee Involvement received the lowest performance category score of 51.6 in 2022.

Additionally, average response scores (scale -2 to +2) by performance category are displayed below along with another table that provides the average response score (scale -2 to +2) for the 0, 50th, and 100th percentile for all the businesses in the NSC Database. This gives you an idea of the distribution of the scores for each performance category and how your average response score compares.

Average Scores of Performance Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Management Commitment</th>
<th>Supervisor Engagement</th>
<th>Employee Involvement</th>
<th>Safety Support Activities</th>
<th>Safety Support Climate</th>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Scores of NSC Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Management Commitment</th>
<th>Supervisor Engagement</th>
<th>Employee Involvement</th>
<th>Safety Support Activities</th>
<th>Safety Support Climate</th>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>-0.596</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.511</td>
<td>-0.674</td>
<td>-0.860</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>1.647</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>1.606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2022 Performance Review

To set the highest-performing components in context, we calculated the following ratios:

- **Strongly Positive**: Components scoring in the first quartile (top 25% percentile range, Q1).
- **Positive**: Components scoring in the second quartile (50th to 75th percentile range, Q2).
- **Neutral**: Components scoring in the third quartile (75th to 90th percentile range, Q3).
- **Negative**: Components scoring in the fourth quartile (below the 25th percentile range, Q4).

The performance of components is calculated using the following scores:

- **100.0**: Strongly positive
- **80.0**: Positive
- **60.0**: Neutral
- **40.0**: Negative
- **30.0**: Strongly negative
- **10.0**: Very negative

### Performance Summary

- **Q1 (Strongly Positive)**: Components scoring in the first quartile must meet or exceed the 76th percentile.
- **Q2 (Positive)**: Components scoring in the second quartile must meet or exceed the 50th percentile.
- **Q3 (Neutral)**: Components scoring in the third quartile must meet or exceed the 25th percentile.
- **Q4 (Negative)**: Components scoring in the fourth quartile must be below the 25th percentile.

### Performance Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile Range</th>
<th>Strongly Positive (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 49</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 74</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 99</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 100</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Insights

- **Q1 Components**: Components scoring in the first quartile must meet or exceed the 76th percentile. Although components with lower scores are worthy of improvement, those scoring below the 25th percentile (Q4) are not remediable. Components with scores ranging from 79.3.0 to 94.8.

### 2023 Lever Review

The primary focus in interpreting your survey results should be placed on the percentage of positive responses. A higher percentage of positive responses are not necessarily the best lever to improve.

### Component Clustering

Three or more components from the same performance category were clustered. To view safety component results by performance category, 11 components from the Supervisor Engagement category; and 4 components from the Safety Management category.

### 2023 Summary

- **Positive responses** are encouraged for components that achieved percentile scores at or above the 76th percentile, indicating strong performance.
- **Negative** responses are mixed for components that earned percentiles from the 25th to the 49th percentile, indicating varied performance.
- **Neutral** responses are neutral, indicating components that achieved percentile scores from the 50th to the 75th percentile.
- **Negative** responses are concerning for components that achieved percentile scores below the 25th percentile, indicating potential areas for improvement.

- **Q1 Components**: Components scoring in the first quartile must meet or exceed the 76th percentile. Although components with lower scores are worthy of improvement, those scoring below the 25th percentile (Q4) are not remediable. Components with scores ranging from 79.3.0 to 94.8.

- **Q2 Components**: Components scoring in the second quartile must meet or exceed the 50th percentile. Although components with lower scores are worthy of improvement, those scoring below the 25th percentile (Q4) are not remediable. Components with scores ranging from 50.1% to 63.8.

- **Q3 Components**: Components scoring in the third quartile must meet or exceed the 25th percentile. Although components with lower scores are worthy of improvement, those scoring below the 25th percentile (Q4) are not remediable. Components with scores ranging from 24.2% to 37.7.

- **Q4 Components**: Components scoring in the fourth quartile must be below the 25th percentile. Components with scores below the 25th percentile can be remediable. Components with scores ranging from 0.1% to 8.9.

- **Q5 Components**: Components scoring in the top 5 quartiles must meet or exceed the 76th percentile. Components with scores above the 75th percentile can be remediable. Components with scores ranging from 94.8% to 100.0.

### Average Response Factors and Response Distribution of Safety Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Clustering</th>
<th>Average Response Factor</th>
<th>Percentile Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Components</td>
<td>Strongly Positive (%)</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Components</td>
<td>Strongly Positive (%)</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Components</td>
<td>Strongly Positive (%)</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Components</td>
<td>Strongly Positive (%)</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note on Safety Performance

- **Quality of response** is critical for ensuring that the feedback is meaningful and actionable.
- **Response rate** is important to ensure that the results are representative of the population.

---

**Section 6**

---

### Average Response Factors and Response Distribution of Safety Components

- **Strongly Positive**: Components scoring in the first quartile (top 25% percentile range, Q1).
- **Positive**: Components scoring in the second quartile (50th to 75th percentile range, Q2).
- **Neutral**: Components scoring in the third quartile (75th to 90th percentile range, Q3).
- **Negative**: Components scoring in the fourth quartile (below the 25th percentile range, Q4).

### Performance Summary

- **Q1 (Strongly Positive)**: Components scoring in the first quartile must meet or exceed the 76th percentile.
- **Q2 (Positive)**: Components scoring in the second quartile must meet or exceed the 50th percentile.
- **Q3 (Neutral)**: Components scoring in the third quartile must meet or exceed the 25th percentile.
- **Q4 (Negative)**: Components scoring in the fourth quartile must be below the 25th percentile.

### Performance Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile Range</th>
<th>Strongly Positive (%)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Negative (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 49</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 74</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 99</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 100</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Insights

- **Q1 Components**: Components scoring in the first quartile must meet or exceed the 76th percentile. Although components with lower scores are worthy of improvement, those scoring below the 25th percentile (Q4) are not remediable. Components with scores ranging from 79.3.0 to 94.8.

### Component Clustering

Three or more components from the same performance category were clustered. To view safety component results by performance category, 11 components from the Supervisor Engagement category; and 4 components from the Safety Management category.

### 2023 Summary

- **Positive responses** are encouraged for components that achieved percentile scores at or above the 76th percentile, indicating strong performance.
- **Negative** responses are mixed for components that earned percentiles from the 25th to the 49th percentile, indicating varied performance.
- **Neutral** responses are neutral, indicating components that achieved percentile scores from the 50th to the 75th percentile.
- **Negative** responses are concerning for components that achieved percentile scores below the 25th percentile, indicating potential areas for improvement.

- **Q1 Components**: Components scoring in the first quartile must meet or exceed the 76th percentile. Although components with lower scores are worthy of improvement, those scoring below the 25th percentile (Q4) are not remediable. Components with scores ranging from 79.3.0 to 94.8.

- **Q2 Components**: Components scoring in the second quartile must meet or exceed the 50th percentile. Although components with lower scores are worthy of improvement, those scoring below the 25th percentile (Q4) are not remediable. Components with scores ranging from 50.1% to 63.8.

- **Q3 Components**: Components scoring in the third quartile must meet or exceed the 25th percentile. Although components with lower scores are worthy of improvement, those scoring below the 25th percentile (Q4) are not remediable. Components with scores ranging from 24.2% to 37.7.

- **Q4 Components**: Components scoring in the fourth quartile must be below the 25th percentile. Components with scores below the 25th percentile can be remediable. Components with scores ranging from 0.1% to 8.9.

### Average Response Factors and Response Distribution of Safety Components

- **Strongly Positive**: Components scoring in the first quartile (top 25% percentile range, Q1).
- **Positive**: Components scoring in the second quartile (50th to 75th percentile range, Q2).
- **Neutral**: Components scoring in the third quartile (75th to 90th percentile range, Q3).
- **Negative**: Components scoring in the fourth quartile (below the 25th percentile range, Q4).

### Note on Safety Performance

- **Quality of response** is critical for ensuring that the feedback is meaningful and actionable.
- **Response rate** is important to ensure that the results are representative of the population.
This page displays another view of the NSC Safety Barometer component percentile scores, average response scores, and percent distributions for only Management Commitment components.

Percentile Scores of Management Commitment Components

- Q07 Management stressing the importance of safety in communications: 82.3%
- Q14 Management publishing a policy on the value of employee safety: 35.9%
- Q21 Management providing adequate safety staff: 35.7%
- Q31 Management setting a positive safety example: 72.2%
- Q34 Management participating in safety activities on a regular basis: 64.5%
- Q40 Management including safety in job promotion reviews: 70.6%
- Q49 Management setting annual safety goals: 21.4%

Average Response Scores of Management Commitment Components

- Q07 Management stressing the importance of safety in communications: 0.8893
- Q14 Management publishing a policy on the value of employee safety: 0.7963
- Q21 Management providing adequate safety staff: 0.5450
- Q31 Management setting a positive safety example: 0.9342
- Q34 Management participating in safety activities on a regular basis: 0.7302
- Q40 Management including safety in job promotion reviews: 0.6330
- Q49 Management setting annual safety goals: 0.4168

Response Distributions of Management Commitment Components

- Q07 Management stressing the importance of safety in communications:
  - Strongly Negative: 2%
  - Negative: 9%
  - Neutral: 14%
  - Positive: 46%
  - Strongly Positive: 28%
- Q14 Management publishing a policy on the value of employee safety:
  - Strongly Negative: 6%
  - Negative: 27%
  - Neutral: 27%
  - Positive: 44%
  - Strongly Positive: 22%
- Q21 Management providing adequate safety staff:
  - Strongly Negative: 4%
  - Negative: 12%
  - Neutral: 51%
  - Positive: 27%
  - Strongly Positive: 17%
- Q31 Management setting a positive safety example:
  - Strongly Negative: 4%
  - Negative: 18%
  - Neutral: 40%
  - Positive: 52%
  - Strongly Positive: 25%
- Q34 Management participating in safety activities on a regular basis:
  - Strongly Negative: 3%
  - Negative: 6%
  - Neutral: 45%
  - Positive: 45%
  - Strongly Positive: 12%
- Q40 Management including safety in job promotion reviews:
  - Strongly Negative: 3%
  - Negative: 8%
  - Neutral: 33%
  - Positive: 37%
  - Strongly Positive: 20%
- Q49 Management setting annual safety goals:
  - Strongly Negative: 3%
  - Negative: 12%
  - Neutral: 37%
  - Positive: 35%
  - Strongly Positive: 13%

Color legend:
- Strongly Negative
- Negative
- Neutral
- Positive
- Strongly Positive
Supervisor Engagement Components

This page displays another view of the NSC Safety Barometer component percentile scores, average response scores, and percent distributions for only Supervisor Engagement components.

Percentile Scores of Supervisor Engagement Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q05 Supervisors maintaining a high safety performance standard</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 Supervisors behaving in accord with safe job procedures</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 Supervisors enforcing safe job procedures</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Supervisors understanding employees job safety problems</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28 Supervisors acting on employee safety suggestions</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32 Supervisors integrating safety into work routine</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38 Supervisors providing helpful safety training or guidance</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43 Supervisors reducing employees fear of reporting safety problems</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44 Supervisors involved safety incident investigations</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Response Scores of Supervisor Engagement Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q05 Supervisors maintaining a high safety performance standard</td>
<td>1.2684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 Supervisors behaving in accord with safe job procedures</td>
<td>1.4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 Supervisors enforcing safe job procedures</td>
<td>1.1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Supervisors understanding employees job safety problems</td>
<td>1.0963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28 Supervisors acting on employee safety suggestions</td>
<td>1.1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32 Supervisors integrating safety into work routine</td>
<td>1.0382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38 Supervisors providing helpful safety training or guidance</td>
<td>0.9124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43 Supervisors reducing employees fear of reporting safety problems</td>
<td>1.0190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44 Supervisors involved safety incident investigations</td>
<td>0.7292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Distributions of Supervisor Engagement Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q05 Supervisors maintaining a high safety performance standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 Supervisors behaving in accord with safe job procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 Supervisors enforcing safe job procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Supervisors understanding employees job safety problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28 Supervisors acting on employee safety suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32 Supervisors integrating safety into work routine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38 Supervisors providing helpful safety training or guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43 Supervisors reducing employees fear of reporting safety problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44 Supervisors involved safety incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee Involvement Components
This page displays another view of the NSC Safety Barometer component percentile scores, average response scores, and percent distributions for only Employee Involvement components.

Percentile Scores of Employee Involvement Components

Component | 2022 | Percentile Score
--- | --- | ---
Q01 Employees identifying and eliminating hazards | | 50.0
Q04 Employees being involved in safety and health practices | | 45.3
Q11 Employees believing that their actions can protect coworkers | | 49.6
Q18 Belief that employees understand safety and health regulations | | 48.2
Q20 Employees using basic precautions for hazardous materials | | 11.0
Q25 Employees following procedures to isolate hazardous energy sources | | 38.5
Q37 Employees take part when accident/incident investigations occur | | 72.4
Q46 Employees using necessary personal protective equipment | | 57.8
Q50 Employees taking part in the development of safety requirements | | 83.2

Average Response Scores of Employee Involvement Components

Component | 2022 | Average Response Score
--- | --- | ---
Q01 Employees identifying and eliminating hazards | | 1.1504
Q04 Employees being involved in safety and health practices | | 0.5049
Q11 Employees believing that their actions can protect coworkers | | 1.3651
Q18 Belief that employees understand safety and health regulations | | 1.2149
Q20 Employees using basic precautions for hazardous materials | | 0.4898
Q25 Employees following procedures to isolate hazardous energy sources | | 0.7364
Q37 Employees take part when accident/incident investigations occur | | 0.6665
Q46 Employees using necessary personal protective equipment | | 0.7604
Q50 Employees taking part in the development of safety requirements | | 0.6233

Response Distributions of Employee Involvement Components

- **Q01 Employees identifying and eliminating hazards**: 4% strongly negative, 11% negative, 48% neutral, 36% positive, 3% strongly positive
- **Q04 Employees being involved in safety and health practices**: 6% strongly negative, 13% negative, 33% neutral, 37% positive, 14% strongly positive
- **Q11 Employees believing that their actions can protect coworkers**: 2% strongly negative, 7% negative, 48% neutral, 35% positive, 11% strongly positive
- **Q18 Belief that employees understand safety and health regulations**: 7% strongly negative, 45% negative, 32% neutral, 14% positive, 2% strongly positive
- **Q20 Employees using basic precautions for hazardous materials**: 3% strongly negative, 38% negative, 18% neutral, 38% positive, 20% strongly positive
- **Q25 Employees following procedures to isolate hazardous energy sources**: 9% strongly negative, 35% negative, 46% neutral, 19% positive, 15% strongly positive
- **Q37 Employees take part when accident/incident investigations occur**: 5% strongly negative, 30% negative, 44% neutral, 19% positive, 19% strongly positive
- **Q46 Employees using necessary personal protective equipment**: 11% strongly negative, 29% negative, 39% neutral, 39% positive, 29% strongly positive
- **Q50 Employees taking part in the development of safety requirements**: 0% strongly negative, 10% negative, 90% neutral, 10% positive, 0% strongly positive
Safety Support Activities Components

This page displays another view of the NSC Safety Barometer component percentile scores, average response scores, and percent distributions for only Safety Support Activities components.

**Percentile Scores of Safety Support Activities Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Percentile Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q06 Frequency of detailed and regularly scheduled inspections</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08 Frequency of safety meeting occurrence</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Designated employees well trained in emergency practices</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Effectiveness of award and recognition programs in promoting safe behavior</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 Presence of safety training in new employee onboarding</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 Occurrence of emergency response procedures testing</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 Effectiveness of safety committee (like ESC, SAC, and OU) in improving safety conditions</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33 Quality of preventive maintenance system operation</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41 Availability of safety coordinator to provide assistance</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Response Scores of Safety Support Activities Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q06 Frequency of detailed and regularly scheduled inspections</td>
<td>0.8111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08 Frequency of safety meeting occurrence</td>
<td>0.4004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Designated employees well trained in emergency practices</td>
<td>0.7207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td>0.7451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Effectiveness of award and recognition programs in promoting safe behavior</td>
<td>0.1737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 Presence of safety training in new employee onboarding</td>
<td>1.1382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 Occurrence of emergency response procedures testing</td>
<td>0.5188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 Effectiveness of safety committee (like ESC, SAC, and OU) in improving safety conditions</td>
<td>0.5279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33 Quality of preventive maintenance system operation</td>
<td>0.5058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41 Availability of safety coordinator to provide assistance</td>
<td>0.9490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response Distributions of Safety Support Activities Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Strongly Negative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Strongly Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q06 Frequency of detailed and regularly scheduled inspections</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08 Frequency of safety meeting occurrence</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Designated employees well trained in emergency practices</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Effectiveness of award and recognition programs in promoting safe behavior</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 Presence of safety training in new employee onboarding</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 Occurrence of emergency response procedures testing</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 Effectiveness of safety committee (like ESC, SAC, and OU) in improving safety conditions</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33 Quality of preventive maintenance system operation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41 Availability of safety coordinator to provide assistance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page displays another view of the NSC Safety Barometer component percentile scores, average response scores, and percent distributions for only Safety Support Climate components.

### Percentile Scores of Safety Support Climate Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q03 Priority of safety relative to productivity</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Belief that management shows it cares for employee safety</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 Belief that management does more than law requires</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 Safety standards relative to production/work output standards</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 Belief that management is sincere in safety efforts</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35 Perception that the safety coordinator has high status</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39 Perception that medical resources are sufficient</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45 Perception that good environmental conditions are kept</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48 Belief that management insists supervisors think about safety</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Response Scores of Safety Support Climate Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q03 Priority of safety relative to productivity</td>
<td>0.8491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Belief that management shows it cares for employee safety</td>
<td>1.1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 Belief that management does more than law requires</td>
<td>0.7594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 Safety standards relative to production/work output standards</td>
<td>0.1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 Belief that management is sincere in safety efforts</td>
<td>1.2744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35 Perception that the safety coordinator has high status</td>
<td>0.5437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td>0.6127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39 Perception that medical resources are sufficient</td>
<td>0.5119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45 Perception that good environmental conditions are kept</td>
<td>0.3275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48 Belief that management insists supervisors think about safety</td>
<td>0.9390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Distributions of Safety Support Climate Components

[Response Distributions Diagram]
### Percentile Scores of Organizational Climate Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentile Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q02 Frequency of employee/management interactions</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q09 Condition of departmental teamwork</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Condition of employee morale</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Stability of workforce</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47 Significance of job stress for employees</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Response Scores of Organizational Climate Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q02 Frequency of employee/management interactions</td>
<td>0.9153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q09 Condition of departmental teamwork</td>
<td>0.6299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Condition of employee morale</td>
<td>0.6215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Stability of workforce</td>
<td>0.7518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47 Significance of job stress for employees</td>
<td>0.0923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Distributions of Organizational Climate Components

- **Q02 Frequency of employee/management interactions**
  - Strongly Negative: 2%
  - Negative: 7%
  - Neutral: 16%
  - Positive: 48%
  - Strongly Positive: 28%

- **Q09 Condition of departmental teamwork**
  - Strongly Negative: 4%
  - Negative: 8%
  - Neutral: 25%
  - Positive: 44%
  - Strongly Positive: 18%

- **Q16 Condition of employee morale**
  - Strongly Negative: 6%
  - Negative: 11%
  - Neutral: 20%
  - Positive: 42%
  - Strongly Positive: 21%

- **Q42 Stability of workforce**
  - Strongly Negative: 3%
  - Negative: 10%
  - Neutral: 17%
  - Positive: 49%
  - Strongly Positive: 21%

- **Q47 Significance of job stress for employees**
  - Strongly Negative: 9%
  - Negative: 24%
  - Neutral: 26%
  - Positive: 33%
  - Strongly Positive: 9%
Q59 Adequate job-specific training to perform work activities safely is
Q62 Likelihood of reporting a near miss while working
Q61 Likelihood of reporting safety-related incidents

Examination of the average response scores generated for these items shows that on average employees are likely to report both safety-related incidents and near-misses. The likelihood of reporting safety-related incidents generated the most positive average response score of 1.47 with 92% of employees responding positively. The item with the least positive average response score was Hazard reviews (JHA) reduce risks related to my work (Q53) with approximately 4% responding negatively. Hazard reviews (JHA) reduce risks related to my work (Q53) had the least positive average response score with 14% of employees responding negatively.

Supervisor

Q51 Hazardous activities performed have hazard review provided
Q52 Hazard reviews (JHAs) revised and reviewed when process change
Q53 Hazard reviews (JHA) reduce risks related to my work
Q54 There is a positive safety culture at NIST
Q55 NIST’s safety culture is improving
Q56 Safety requirements are followed in work areas
Q57 Supervisors encourage reporting unsafe conditions
Q58 Supervisors create environments for raising safety concerns
Q59 Adequate job-specific training to perform work activities safely is
Q60 Incidents and lessons learned are discussed in work areas

The custom item(s) address safety aspects that are of special interest to your organization. On this page, a description of the item(s), percent distribution of responses, and average response scores for each role (Manager, Supervisor) are provided. The average response scores by role show the likelihood of employees responding positively or negatively to the items. For example, the likelihood of reporting safety-related incidents (Q61) and near-misses (Q62) was higher among Managers compared to Supervisors. The percent distribution of responses for each role shows the percentage of employees responding positively or negatively to each item, with Manager responses generally higher than Supervisor responses.

Custom Item Average Response Scores by Role (Q61-Q62)

Custom Item Top Box (Positive)/Bottom Box (Negative) Comparisons (Q51-Q60)

Custom Item Percent Distribution of Responses and Average Response Scores (Q51-Q60)
NSC Safety Barometer results for both benchmarked groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Percentile Scores</th>
<th>NSC Safety Barometer Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q01 Employees identifying and eliminating hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q02 Frequency of employee/management interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03 Priority of safety relative to productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q04 Effective communication efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q05 Frequency of detailed and regularly scheduled inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q06 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q07 Management stressing the importance of safety in communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08 Frequency of safety meeting occurrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q09 Condition of departmental teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Belief that management shows it cares for employee safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 Employees believing that their actions can protect coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 Supervisors behaving in accord with safe job procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Management including safety in job promotion reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 Management participating in safety activities on a regular basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Supervisors enforcing safe job procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Condition of employee morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 Employees following procedures to isolate hazardous energy sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 Presence of safety training in new employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 Management setting annual safety goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 Effectiveness of award and recognition programs in promoting safe behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 Employees using basic precautions for hazardous materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Management providing adequate safety staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25 Management including safety in job promotion reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 Management setting annual safety goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 Belief that management insists supervisors think about safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31 Management providing adequate safety staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33 Management including safety in job promotion reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43 Supervisors reducing employees fear of reporting safety problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45 Management including safety in job promotion reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49 Management setting annual safety goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53 Management including safety in job promotion reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57 Management including safety in job promotion reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q60 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61 Management including safety in job promotion reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q62 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q64 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65 Management including safety in job promotion reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q66 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q67 Presence of safety training in employee onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q68 Thoroughness of near miss incident investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q69 - Federal Employee Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall and Performance Category Average Response Scores

Safety Component Average Response Scores

Overall Average Response Score

Evaluation of Safety-related Communication and Participation Opportunities

These responses were used to conduct analyses and provide these subgroup comparisons.

Section 15

2022: Average Response Scores by Tenure

Average response scores, on a scale of -2 to +2, were calculated for tenure. The following tables and figures present cross-sections, by the six performance categories and overall, of the data. This indicates that targeted efforts to increase safety-related communication and participation opportunities across the 50

Involvement

Overall and Performance Category Average Response Scores

Safety Component Average Response Scores

Overall Average Response Score

Evaluation of Safety-related Communication and Participation Opportunities

These responses were used to conduct analyses and provide these subgroup comparisons.
### 2022: Average Response Scores by Primary Work Location

Average response scores, as a cut of 1 to 5, were calculated for the primary work location. The following tables and figures reflect these comparisons, indicating perceptions from that location group. Arial respondents were used in contact analysis to provide these subgroup comparisons.

#### Overall and Performance Category Average Response Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of Supervisors</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Involvement</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Support Activities</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparison by Primary Work Location

#### Safety Support Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaithersburg</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supervision and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaithersburg</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaithersburg</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaithersburg</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaithersburg</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Response Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaithersburg</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2022: Section 16

### Comparison by Primary Work Location

Survey respondents were asked to provide a demographic of information in the conclusion of the ASCE Safety Workforce. This information was used in contact analysis to provide these subgroup comparisons. In order to plot gender and race, the age of the individual, and to avoid making inaccurate generalizations based on race and gender, samples were not included if individuals were not included. Mean scores were used in contact analysis to provide these subgroup comparisons.
units should be represented in future action planning efforts to ensure a cohesive application of the safety management system.

Q50 Employees taking

Q49 Management

Q47 Significance of job

Q46 Employees participating in preventive

Q45 Communication about safety

Q44 Supervisors

Q43 Frequency of maintenance system

Q42 Frequency of safety representative,

Q41 Availability of training

Q40 Employees taking more than law requires

Q39 Employees caring for employee

Q38 Supervisors

Q37 Condition of equipment

Q36 Condition of employee

Q35 Employees involved in safety and health practices (EI)

Q34 Employees involved in safety and health practices (EI)

Q33 Employees involved in safety and health practices (EI)

Q32 Supervisors

Q31 Safety standards (MC)

Q30 Safety standards (MC)

Q29 More than law requires

Q28 Behavior of employees

Q27 Behavior of employees

Q26 Behavior of employees

Q25 Employees

Q24 Employees

Q23 Effectiveness of management in promoting employee morale (OC)

Q22 Effectiveness of management in promoting employee morale (OC)

Q21 Effectiveness of management in promoting employee morale (OC)

Q20 Effectiveness of management in promoting employee morale (OC)

Q19 Effectiveness of management in promoting employee morale (OC)

Q18 Effectiveness of management in promoting employee morale (OC)

Q17 Effectiveness of management in promoting employee morale (OC)

Q16 Condition of equipment

Q15 Thoroughness of safety meeting

Q14 Designated supervisor

Q13 Designated supervisor

Q12 Safety committee

Q11 Employees

Q10 Safety specialist

Q09 Condition of equipment

Q08 Frequency of safety director

Q07 Management

Q06 Frequency of training

Q05 Supervisors

Q04 Management

Q03 Management

Q02 Frequency of training

Q01 Frequency of training

Q00 Frequency of training

40 - Innovation and Industry Services

61 - NIST Center for Neutron Research

18 - Office of Information Systems Management

67 - Communications Technology Laboratory

63 - Material Measurement Laboratory

61 - NIST Center for Neutron Research

60 - Laboratory Programs

00 - Director's office

49 - Office of Advanced Manufacturing

14 - Office of Innovation

15 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

48 - Physical Infrastructure and Facilities

68 - Physical Infrastructure and Facilities

37 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

36 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

35 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

34 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

33 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

32 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

31 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

30 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

29 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

28 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

27 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

26 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

25 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

24 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

23 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

22 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

21 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

20 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

19 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

18 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

17 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

16 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

15 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

14 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

13 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

12 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

11 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

10 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

9 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

8 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

7 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

6 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

5 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

4 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

3 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

2 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

1 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

0 - Office of Safety, Health, and Environment

These responses were used to conduct analyses and provide these subgroup comparisons.
efforts to increase safety-related communication and participation opportunities across divisions will be beneficial.
Comparison by Role

2022: Average Response Scores by Role

Table showing average response scores for different roles.

安全管理投入、管理承诺和员工参与的六项关键指标，以及总体的安全支持气候。这些指标用于评估不同角色的安全支持程度。在进行相似样本的比较时，会使用这些指标来评估不同群体之间的差异。

表中展示了不同角色的安全支持气候平均响应分数。

安全管理投入

- 管理层的平均响应分数：0.97
- 督导员的平均响应分数：0.91
- 非管理层的平均响应分数：0.82

管理承诺

- 管理层的平均响应分数：1.10
- 督导员的平均响应分数：1.15
- 非管理层的平均响应分数：1.10

员工参与

- 管理层的平均响应分数：0.71
- 督导员的平均响应分数：0.77
- 非管理层的平均响应分数：0.77

安全管理气候

- 管理层的平均响应分数：0.61
- 督导员的平均响应分数：0.61
- 非管理层的平均响应分数：0.59

安全管理支持活动

- 管理层的平均响应分数：1.10
- 督导员的平均响应分数：1.15
- 非管理层的平均响应分数：1.10

安全管理支持活动

- 管理层的平均响应分数：1.10
- 督导员的平均响应分数：1.15
- 非管理层的平均响应分数：1.10

安全管理支持活动

- 管理层的平均响应分数：1.10
- 督导员的平均响应分数：1.15
- 非管理层的平均响应分数：1.10

安全管理支持活动
2022: Average Response Scores by Work Status (JHA or HRA)

The average response scores, on a scale of 1 to 4, were calculated for JHA or HRA. The following tables and figures reflect these responses across the six performance categories, Employee Involvement, Supervisor Engagement, Safety Support Activities, and Organizational Climate. The group comparisons by the six performance categories and overall, a blue ^ indicates perceptions from that particular group were significantly higher than the other group, whereas a red v indicates perceptions from that particular group were significantly lower than the other group.

Safety perceptions can vary for both the JHA and HRA group and the two groups do differ. Nonetheless, the overall average response score generated by both groups is similar. However, there are meaningful differences in the scores generated in the Management Commitment, Supervisor Engagement, and Employee Involvement categories. In the coding process, it may be beneficial to sustain efforts in these areas of safety interactions to elevate the safety reputation for a team moving forward each group.

Comparison by Work Status (JHA or HRA)

Survey respondents were asked to report demographic information at the conclusion of the questionnaire. Safety responsiveness to questions is independent of the work status (JHA or HRA). In order to protect respondent anonymity and to avoid making inaccurate generalizations based on the matched-pair sample data, comparisons were not computed for groups with more than 50 respondents.

Employee Involvement
Yes, I do perform work that falls under a JHA or HRA
No, I do not perform work that falls under a JHA or HRA

Supervisor Engagement

Safety Support Activities

Organizational Climate

Employee Involvement

Yes, I do perform work that falls under a JHA or HRA
No, I do not perform work that falls under a JHA or HRA

Average Response Score by Work Status (JHA or HRA)

Q68 - JHA or HRA
Q50 Employees taking part in the development of safety requirements (EI)
Q49 Management setting annual safety goals (MC)
Q48 Belief that management insists supervisors think about safety (SSC)
Q47 Significance of job stress for employees (OC)
Q45 Perception that good environmental conditions are kept (SSC)
Q43 Supervisors reducing employees fear of reporting safety problems (SE)
Q42 Stability of workforce (OC)
Q41 Availability of safety coordinator (OU safety program coordinator, division safety representative, etc.) to employees (SSA)
Q40 Management including safety in job promotion reviews (MC)
Q39 Perception that medical resources are sufficient (SSC)
Q38 Perception that the safety office has high status (SSC)
Q37 Employees take part when accident/incident investigations occur (EI)
Q36 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed (SSC)
Q35 Perception that the safety coordinator (OU safety program coordinator, division safety representative, etc.) is influential in the organization (SSC)
Q35 Perception that the safety office has high status (SSC)
Q34 Management participating in safety activities on a regular basis (MC)
Q33 Quality of preventive maintenance system operation (SSA)
Q32 Supervisors integrating safety into work routine (SE)
Q31 Management setting a positive safety example (MC)
Q30 Effectiveness of safety committee (like ESC, SAC, and OU) in improving safety conditions (SSA)
Q29 Occurrence of emergency response procedures testing (SSA)
Q27 Belief that management is sincere in safety efforts (SSC)
Q26 Employees following procedures to isolate hazardous energy sources (EI)
Q24 Supervisors understanding employees job safety problems (SE)
Q23 Safety standards relative to production/work output standards (SSA)
Q22 Effectiveness of award and recognition programs in promoting safe behavior (SSA)
Q21 Management providing adequate safety staff (MC)
Q20 Employees using basic precautions for hazardous materials (EI)
Q19 Employees being involved in safety training (EI)
Q18 Employees being asked about job safety (EI)
Q17 Belief that management does more than law requires (SSC)
Q16 Condition of employee morale (OC)
Q15 Employees being given the opportunity to voice their safety concerns (EI)
Q14 Management publishing a policy on the value of employee safety (MC)
Q13 Designated employees well trained in emergency practices (SSA)
Q12 Supervisors behaving in accord with safe job procedures (SE)
Q10 Belief that management shows it cares for employee safety (SSC)
Q09 Condition of departmental teamwork (OC)
Q08 Frequency of safety meeting occurrence (SSA)
Q07 Management stressing the importance of safety in communications (MC)
Q06 Frequency of detailed and regularly scheduled inspections (SSA)
Q05 Management showing their concern for employee safety (SSC)
Q04 Employees identifying and eliminating hazards (EI)
Q03 Priority of safety relative to productivity (SSC)
Q02 Safety training program being used in the workplace (SSA)
Q01 Employees identifying and eliminating hazards (EI)

Safety Component Average Response Scores

Overall and Performance Category Average Response Scores

Overall Average Response Score

Responses by Work Status (JHA or HRA)

In order to protect respondent anonymity and to avoid making inaccurate generalizations based on the matched-pair sample data, comparisons were not computed for groups with more than 50 respondents.

Overall average response score

Employee Involvement

Yes, I do perform work that falls under a JHA or HRA
No, I do not perform work that falls under a JHA or HRA

Overall Average Response Score

Q68 - JHA or HRA
Q50 Employees taking part in the development of safety requirements (EI)
Q49 Management setting annual safety goals (MC)
Q48 Belief that management insists supervisors think about safety (SSC)
Q47 Significance of job stress for employees (OC)
Q45 Perception that good environmental conditions are kept (SSC)
Q43 Supervisors reducing employees fear of reporting safety problems (SE)
Q42 Stability of workforce (OC)
Q41 Availability of safety coordinator (OU safety program coordinator, division safety representative, etc.) to employees (SSA)
Q40 Management including safety in job promotion reviews (MC)
Q39 Perception that medical resources are sufficient (SSC)
Q38 Perception that the safety office has high status (SSC)
Q37 Employees take part when accident/incident investigations occur (EI)
Q36 Belief that hazards not fixed right away will still be addressed (SSC)
Q35 Perception that the safety coordinator (OU safety program coordinator, division safety representative, etc.) is influential in the organization (SSC)
Q35 Perception that the safety office has high status (SSC)
Q34 Management participating in safety activities on a regular basis (MC)
Q33 Quality of preventive maintenance system operation (SSA)
Q32 Supervisors integrating safety into work routine (SE)
Q31 Management setting a positive safety example (MC)
Q30 Effectiveness of safety committee (like ESC, SAC, and OU) in improving safety conditions (SSA)
Q29 Occurrence of emergency response procedures testing (SSA)
Q27 Belief that management is sincere in safety efforts (SSC)
Q26 Employees following procedures to isolate hazardous energy sources (EI)
Q24 Supervisors understanding employees job safety problems (SE)
Q23 Safety standards relative to production/work output standards (SSA)
Q22 Effectiveness of award and recognition programs in promoting safe behavior (SSA)
Q21 Management providing adequate safety staff (MC)
Q20 Employees using basic precautions for hazardous materials (EI)
Q19 Employees being involved in safety training (EI)
Q18 Employees being asked about job safety (EI)
Q17 Belief that management does more than law requires (SSC)
Q16 Condition of employee morale (OC)
Q15 Employees being given the opportunity to voice their safety concerns (EI)
Q14 Management publishing a policy on the value of employee safety (MC)
Q13 Designated employees well trained in emergency practices (SSA)
Q12 Supervisors behaving in accord with safe job procedures (SE)
Q10 Belief that management shows it cares for employee safety (SSC)
Q09 Condition of departmental teamwork (OC)
Q08 Frequency of safety meeting occurrence (SSA)
Q07 Management stressing the importance of safety in communications (MC)
Q06 Frequency of detailed and regularly scheduled inspections (SSA)
Q05 Management showing their concern for employee safety (SSC)
Q04 Employees identifying and eliminating hazards (EI)
Q03 Priority of safety relative to productivity (SSC)
Q02 Safety training program being used in the workplace (SSA)
Q01 Employees identifying and eliminating hazards (EI)
Please suggest one activity, program, or change that you believe would contribute most to improving safety at your organization. Describe your idea and the problem(s) it would solve.

This report provides you with verbatim comments and comment theme analysis in response to this question. Please refer to the one activity, program, or change that you believe would contribute most to improving safety at your organization. Describe your idea and the problem(s) it would solve.

Verbatim Comments

Responses by Employee Subgroup...
Focus areas were also similar across both sets of management is sincere in safety efforts (Q27).

When compared with only the industry-specific sector grouping (NAICS 54, 61, and 92), many of the top strengths are similar to the strengths identified in Supervisor Engagement, especially related to supervisors behaving in accord with safety job procedures (Q12) and supervisor reducing employees fears of reporting safety problems (Q43). This industry-specific sector grouping has more positive average response scores in 23 of the 50 standard items (when compared to most recent NSC Database count of 1,530 businesses). There are also two components that surface as top performers only in this industry-specific sector grouping (NAICS 54, 61, and 92), the value of employee safety (MC) and employee job safety climate (SSC). It is recommended that this data be used as a supplement to the primary NSC benchmarking in action planning.

In 2022, scores are higher overall and in four of the six performance categories when NIST is compared only to industry-specific businesses. It is recommended that this data be used as a supplement to the primary NSC benchmarking in action planning.

Overall and Performance Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Commitment</th>
<th>Supervisor Engagement</th>
<th>Employee Involvement</th>
<th>Safety Support Activities</th>
<th>Safety Support Climate</th>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results Summary

Your safety culture, as derived by employee perceptions, generally received moderately high ratings on the NSC Safety Barometer survey when compared with responses from 1,530 businesses in the NSC Database. Percentile scores for the six safety performance categories range from a percentile score of 51.6 for Employee Involvement to a percentile score of 86.8 for Supervisor Engagement. All six performance categories had percentile scores above the NSC Database average of 50. The overall NSC Safety Barometer percentile score is a score of 64.3 out of 100, meaning that your organization scored higher than 64.3% of businesses in NSC Database.

Closer examination shows that your organization scored above the 50th percentile for thirty-six of the 50 standard components (including both variations of Q35 only counted once). It is generally recommended that safety program components with percentiles less than 50 receive attention. However, the ten lowest-scoring components with percentiles at or below 38.5 may be used to establish initial improvement priorities.

Percentile score comparisons between employee status groups showed that non-federal employees generated a higher overall percentile score compared to federal employees.

Analysis of tenure groups shows that employees with 21 years or more of tenure held the highest overall average response score, whereas employees with 1-10 years of tenure generated the least positive overall perceptions. Average response score comparisons by primary work location revealed meaningful differences in perception across the board, with employees who indicated ‘Other’ receiving the highest overall average response score. Evaluation by organizational unit showed that Office of Advanced Manufacturing held the most positive overall perceptions while the Office of Safety, Health, and Environment held the least positive overall perceptions. Across divisions, employees from the Public Safety Communications Research Division generally held the most positive perceptions, while Facilities Services Division generated the lowest overall score. Among roles, managers and supervisors reported more positive perceptions than non-management. Between work status groups, both groups generated similar overall scores but showed differences in performance category perceptions. The more groups interact and communicate the more similar their perceptions become concerning common issues. A shared perspective greatly aids management in effectively driving safety program improvements.

It is recommended that you use these results as a guide for making continuous safety improvements. The data presented in this report can also be used to measure future progress. Employee involvement in the NSC Safety Barometer process is an important example of employees taking responsibility for the success of the safety management system and ultimately developing and maintaining a positive safety culture. Communications efforts by leadership should be made as soon as possible to follow-up with employees. Thanking employees, communicating results of the survey, and involving employees in the decision making process are fundamental aspects of a healthy safety culture.

Path Forward - Action Planning

NSC recommends to use these results as a catalyst and guide for making future safety management system improvements.

Leadership

Each focus area identified should be examined by leadership using a three-step process to:

1. investigate, discuss, and understand why the areas might have been identified as lower scoring priorities by survey respondents
2. decide whether attention to each candidate priority component aligns with broader cultural and strategic initiatives of the organization
3. select and implement specific action-oriented strategies for focus areas that are systemic or demand leadership action (e.g., Management Commitment components or areas that require substantial resources)

Employee-led Action Planning Teams

In order to maximize use of survey results, engage in employee-led action planning that will strengthen safety at your organization. Effective action plan development and management is key to real and sustained workplace safety improvement. Strong communication, timely action in response to employee-identified priorities, and involvement from leadership and employees are essential to your success.

- Build a team or teams of employees, supervisors, and leadership to interpret the survey results with the same three-step process described above
- Engage to develop, champion, and execute SMART action plans
- Monitor action plans and create timetable for measuring success through resurveying

Action Planning Teams should include a cross-section of employees from all levels and departments of the organization. This will allow for diverse perspectives and representatives from multiple teams to be part of the process, while also increasing interdepartmental cooperation.