



THE LATEST FROM THE NAVAL SAFETY CENTER

May 2015

1. Aviation and Afloat “Surveys” Are Now “Assessments” – One of the Naval Safety Center’s tried-and-true services, the safety survey, continues to undergo important revisions. With the advent of the Fleet Safety Campaign and our focus on safety management systems (SMS), many problems with the old process became apparent. They tended to be too programmatic, checklist-driven, and emphasized compliance. They didn’t effectively assess unit safety culture

For the afloat community, we intend to embed our assessment teams with INSURV inspections, which will allow us to assess crews in an at-sea environment while the crew is conducting normal at-sea operations and INSURV material inspections. We will focus on safety culture and risk-management, with the assessment and formal debrief following the SMS framework. We will observe processes rather than apply checklists. We will provide the ISIC with a formal in-brief and a roll-up debrief. Sailors involved in the assessment will complete a short, pre-assessment questionnaire. We plan to include ISIC, TYCOM, and other safety professionals in the process. Finally, assessments will not be tied to periodicity; they will be based on INSURV schedules and data indicators.

For the aviation community, we will start assessing air station, wing, operational squadrons simultaneously. We will focus on safety culture and risk management. The assessment and formal debrief will follow the SMS framework. We will give the ISIC and the NAS or MCAS CO with formal in-brief and & roll-up debrief. Sailors and Marines will complete a brief pre-assessment questionnaire. We will include ISIC, TYCOM, and other safety professionals in the process. The visits won’t be tied to periodicity; they will be based on data indicators and ISIC input.

[From the minutes of the Fleet Operational Safety Council Meeting, 9 April 2015]

2. WESS Injury Verification Feed Update – NAVSAFECEN continues to receive medical data from the Navy and Marine Corps Public Health Center (this is an approved use of medical data under HIPAA). The data lists command personnel who received treatment at an MTF or TRICARE provider for any injury or occupational illness that appears to meet the mandated reporting thresholds. The events are filtered using the codes that are used by medical personnel. We email a link to the WESS injury-verification dashboard to the person(s) in the command UICs who are the command-designated WESS Authority. That person must review the details of each incident and determine if it meets the reporting threshold (OPNAVINST 5102.1D for on-duty and off-duty mishaps; OPNAVINST 3750.6R for aviation).

Since January 2015, approximately 35,000 medical-feed records have been identified. However, because 59% of the commands don’t have a WESS User associated with the UIC, there is no medical-feed analyst for nearly 27,000 of the records. Action is pending on 4,986 records. 729 have been identified as reportable, and 2,690 as not reportable.

[From the minutes of the Fleet Operational Safety Council Meeting, 9 April 2015]



3. MCPON Tapes Motorcycle-Safety Spots – Working with the Defense Media Activity (DMA) and his staff, we were able to get the MCPON (who is a rider) to tape a motorcycle safety spot and a short piece to complement our new "I Ride Safe Because" series. Here are the links:

- MCPON's motorcycle-safety spot:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bGEm3ImOTTc>
- MCPON's "I Ride Safe Because" spot:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HHvaxbfx15s>



4. **Commands Can Improve Safety Culture by Optimizing Key Safety Processes** – How does your command stack up in the following areas?

Near-Miss Reporting. Fatalities are rare, serious injuries more common, minor injuries more common than serious ones, near-misses more common than serious injuries, and at-risk behaviors more common than near-misses. By decreasing at-risk behaviors and near-misses, an organization can reduce injuries and fatalities. However, near-miss reporting is often weak. How effective are your command's processes?

Minor Injury Reporting. If you asked the personnel in your command whether employees were punished for reporting minor injuries, what would they say? Identifying the causes of minor injuries sets you up to prevent the more serious ones.

Incident Analysis and Discipline. Far too often, leaders default to a "blame the worker" mindset when it comes to root-cause analysis of incidents. In turn, they fail to analyze broader organizational and system contributions such as production pressure and increased workload as a result of manning shortfalls. Punishment should be reserved for those rare times when willful negligence or sabotage is involved.

Safety Rules and Policies. They exist to prevent our people from getting hurt and should be clear, consistent, and enforced.

Safety Training. How engaging and effective is your safety training? Do you use hands-on training and dynamic guest speakers or is just the typical "death by PowerPoint" safety stand down? Do you give relevant safety training at Command Indoctrination, and do you have a sound schedule for that periodic refresher training?

Hazard Recognition and Correction. Are your routine safety audits and inspections effective or have they become a check in the block? Does your command immediately fix identified hazards and then communicate that back to the affected personnel?

Safety Communication. Do you try to communicate statistics or demonstrate you care through the use of storytelling? Which would you better respond to?

[Adapted from "Keeping People Safe" by Josh Williams]

5. **"Best of the Friday Funnies" Available** – This special issue magazine, featuring the highlights (lowlights?) of the past 13 years, is now in stock and in the mail to the *Decisions* magazine mailing list. If you'd like your very own hard copy, send your mailing address to safe-mediafdbk@navy.mil.

