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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report contains the recommendations and analysis of the Branch Review Working Party regarding the structure and function of branches. The review has taken place over a 20 month period and has gathered detailed information and views in order to develop a set of recommendations which will strengthen and support both the branch volunteer network and associated branch structure.

1.1 AIMS OF REVIEW

Branches have been an inherent part of IOSH, since the Institution’s inception in 1945, with a small number being the founding force of the very strong and well established branch structure we have today.

As a result of analysis and conclusions emerging from three major pieces of research, these being the brand research in 2005, member survey in 2006 and branch research in early 2007, a paper was presented to the Board of Trustees in June 2007 with the request for a formal review of branches.

Key findings from the brand research highlighted the following:–

- Members have a purely functional relationship with IOSH
- IOSH is seen as distant and operating at arm’s length from branches, and therefore, from members
- Members get their networking and support through branches
- Branches “own” the emotional relationship with members
- but, Branches are seen as unrepresentative of the membership, reinforcing an old-fashioned image.

The request to implement a review was agreed and in July 2007, a Branch Review Working Party (BRWP) consisting of volunteer branch members and IOSH staff was formed with the specific role to consider the following:–

- the aims and roles of branches
- the governance architecture surrounding the branch network, including reporting lines, accountability etc.
- the branch experience
- the support structures which are needed for the branch network

1.2 METHODOLOGY

The branch review was conducted via information gathering, evaluating the data and putting forward recommendations.

Information was gathered from a number of sources including questionnaires, surveys (including those mentioned above in section 1.1) and extensive consultation. Views were obtained from branch officials, Council members and staff directly involved with branches.

A comprehensive evaluation of this information was undertaken, which led to the following recommendations being proposed:–
1.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the Board of Trustees confirms that the overarching mission for Branches is to strengthen and add value to the relationship between IOSH head office and the wider membership, and re-confirms its support of the previously agreed position of the role and scope of branches, outlined below: -

- Provide CPD, learning opportunities and local support to IOSH members
- Support the IOSH corporate strategy and aim to link activities to central objectives or campaigns
- Support and reflect the IOSH corporate brand and aim for high quality/professionalism
- Offer networking opportunities for members
- Be a conduit for 2-way communication between the membership and IOSH corporate structures
- Retain existing IOSH members by offering local services (as above)
- Engage branch members and increase branch attendance
- Engage with local communities and raise the profile of IOSH and the profession on a local level
- Adapt to meet local members’ changing needs
- Be accountable for their performance and funding (report on objectives and plans)
- Recruit new members to IOSH

RECOMMENDATION 2

A branch co-ordination committee be established, to act as a conduit to BoT (and Council), and for this Committee to report into the Communications and International Committee on an interim basis (until Mike Garstang is able to view the reporting line holistically as part of his Standing Committee Review Working Party). It is further recommended that the committee be populated by branch officials, elected by all branch and district officials and supported by professional staff from the Grange.

Budgetary impact: £3,940 committee, plus £1,104 postal vote carried out by the Electoral Reform Services.

RECOMMENDATION 3

That branch funding move to a system which finances branches against their planned activities (with certain basic materials being funded centrally in order to give inter-branch consistency), with an additional contingency fund as outlined in section 4.3.

Budgetary impact : in theory cost should be neutral but in practice there may be a cost, as per details in section 4.3.
RECOMMENDATION 4

The recruitment of three full-time employed (FTE) Networks Officers to provide additional support to the branch network. Supporting documentation is provided in Appendices E & F.

Budgetary impact: £99,240, and these three positions have been included in the 09/10 budgets.

RECOMMENDATION 5

That the President’s Distinguished Service Award be given greater prominence and publicity and be used more widely to recognise those members who have played a significant role in our branch network.

Budgetary impact: Presidential Team travel and accommodation costs may increase but this is hard to determine at this stage.

RECOMMENDATION 6

That a training programme, incorporating a communications campaign to promote the branch review recommendations, be established such that all branch officials are aware of the review and the findings, and that over an extended period of time all branch officials would receive appropriate training. The training and communications campaign would cover all aspects of the agreed recommendations, as well as very clear details and direction concerning the financial changes, as well as the operational aspects of the branch network, and the strategy, structure and objects of the Institution. A more detailed breakdown is given in Appendices G & H.

Budgetary impact: £36,020 based on 2 sessions per year for UK and International Branch Officials.

RECOMMENDATION 7

That a branch handbook be developed as quickly as possible. The structure of the handbook to be in at least two parts – mandatory elements – finance, branding etc and guidance, maximising attendance, selecting venues etc.

Budgetary impact: £8500 (approximately) (based on 1 person full-time x 4 weeks and providing 600 hard copies and 600 CDs and distribution).

RECOMMENDATION 8

The working party recommends that a branch kit be purchased for all branches and districts (who do not have a current up to date set) to give a consistent corporate brand presentation.

Budgetary impact: The worst case cost of this is £14,630 however the most likely budgetary impact will be in the order of £10,973 as approximately a quarter of the branches already have up to date material.
RECOMMENDATION 9

The recommendation of the Branch Review Working Party is that international branches continue to be supported directly, that they be funded against plan, but that where there is a specific strategic need for additional resources that this be specifically approved by the BoT on a case by case basis (an example of this would be the Development Manager position in Ireland).

Budgetary impact: Neutral

1.4 CONCLUSION

These recommendations are designed to ensure that the branch network is fit for purpose going forward, and has the underlying support structure to ensure that the branches are able to effectively engage in the delivery of both the objects of the Institution (as described in the Royal Charter and Byelaws – see section 2) and in IOSH’s corporate strategy.
2. INTRODUCTION

The Board of Trustees (BoT) established a working party to review the structure and function of branches; specifically the role of the working party was to consider:

- The aims and roles of branches
- The governance architecture surrounding the branch network, including reporting lines, accountability etc.
- The branch experience
- The support structures which are needed for the branch network

The Branch Review Working Party (BRWP) has engaged in an extensive consultation exercise since its inception and has developed a set of recommendations which we believe will serve to strengthen the IOSH branch structure and the volunteer foundation of our organisation.

The branches and districts are critical to the Institution. Not only are branches the primary source of active volunteers for our various activities, they are essentially the human face of IOSH to many members. With the exception of the mass communication tools (SHP magazine, Connect, Connect Diary and the website) the branches and districts represent our main source contact with members and they are certainly our main source of face to face contact with our membership.

Our member survey in 2006 showed that just over 40%\(^1\) of our membership has contact with a branch every year. In addition over 500 members are actively involved in organising and delivering the activities of our 29 branches, both in the UK and overseas.

The high level of interaction with our members and the large number of meetings and seminars delivered by our branch network means that they are a primary means for us to discharge the objects of the Institution (as described in the Royal Charter and Byelaws), as well as playing a very valuable part in contributing towards the delivery of IOSH’s strategic priorities.

The objects of the Institution which are relevant to branches are repeated below and these are:

a. to promote systematic and organised methods of improving occupational safety and health and to advocate, advise upon, disseminate, explain and advance the principles
b. to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas amongst the members of the Institution.

To discharge these objects the Institution is given a range of powers including:

4 a. to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas amongst the members of the Institution
4 i. to form, promote and encourage branches and groups of the Institution as may be necessary or desirable for, or conducive to, the attainment or development of the objects of the Institution.

---

\(^1\) 2006 Member survey: 43.8% of members attend a branch meeting once or more than once per year.
Furthermore, it can be clearly demonstrated that there are a number of priorities within IOSH’s corporate strategy [2008-2012], to which the branch network plays a very important and measurable role, these being:

- Raising the profile of health and safety and the influence of IOSH
- Increasing membership
- Developing internationally
- Leading OSH thought
- Developing people

More detail as to how the branches network undertakes this is covered under Section 2.

Whilst the branch network delivers a great deal to our membership there are a number of areas of concern and as the branches are so critical to the delivery of the Institution’s objects a review of the branches was commissioned by the BoT.

Concerns exist because there is significant variation between the branches which attract the greatest support and those which don’t; there are often inconsistent approaches to meetings; branding and brochure design are particularly contentious issues and there are frequent conflicts with the head office staff, who are responsible not only for the provision of support services but also for ensuring a standard approach across all networks. Conflicts occur particularly in relation to email distribution, the level of support provided and, as mentioned previously, branding issues. Most worryingly, whilst most branches support the corporate objects of IOSH there are instances where the strategic objectives of the Institution are being undermined by the activities of some members of the branch committees. In short the member experience of branches can be extremely variable.

The relationship between the branches and the head office staff of IOSH, although improving, is often fraught and in a small number of cases is entirely dysfunctional.

Part of the reason for dispute is that some volunteers disagree about where the overall direction of the organisation should come from. Some argue that the branch membership should drive the organisational agenda and that the head office structures should serve that direction, whilst others recognise that overall policy and direction should be set by the central IOSH structures and that the branches are there to support the members and to help IOSH achieve its organisational aims.

However at the root of most of this disquiet is a concern about the lack of communication between volunteer members and staff. The concerns around communication are clearly identified in the recent customer satisfaction survey\(^2\), and can be traced back to a lack of resources in the team involved.

The current funding structure also causes some concerns, for small and newly formed branches the funding structure can be overly restrictive; the structure does not encourage forward planning; the structure can also incentivise branches to spend towards the end of the financial year so that they maximise their income from the head office grants and finally the system does not allow for innovation. In addition, some branches “stockpile” funding, and have been known to think of it as “our money, not IOSH’s” and some seem reluctant to spend it.

\(^2\) Satisfaction survey Aug-Sep 08 of UK branch officials – Appendix I
The aim of the BRWP was to identify proposals which would help the branch network to be as effective as it can be and at the same time introduce mechanisms for minimising and resolving potential areas of dispute.

The working party now wishes to make recommendations to the BoT regarding:

1. The role and scope of branches
2. The reporting structure for branches
3. The financing of branches
4. The support provided to branches
5. Processes for recognising the contribution made by branches and individuals
6. The training of branch officials
7. The branch handbook
8. Branch identity
9. International branches
10. Transition arrangements
3. CONTEXT

3.1 Branches – current situation

As the table below highlights, there are currently 29 branches and 17 districts, with 34,276 members\(^3\) (as of 1 March 09) currently assigned to this network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Number of members (Mar 09)</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol and West</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chiltern</td>
<td>821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>Anglia South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>Forth and Tay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humber</td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Metropolitan</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>Central Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Cumbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Cumbria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>East North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North of Scotland</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Inverness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Wales</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>West Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Downs</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South East</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South West</td>
<td>819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tees</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thames Valley</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trent Valley</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyne and Wear</td>
<td>990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West of Scotland</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Eastern North Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isle of Man</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Consensus database – Mar 09
IOSH members based in either the UK or in the location of one of the five International branches are automatically allocated to that particular branch/district.

3.2 Support

At present, support and administration of Branches is provided by 3.5 full-time staff, plus 1 member on a fixed term contract (a Manager plus 3.5 support staff) within the Networks and International Directorate.

3.3 Financial cost to IOSH

The cost to IOSH of having a branches structure for 2007/08 was £525,114, with the branches bringing into IOSH an income of £144,081. For the financial year 2007/08, this resulted in a cost to IOSH of having the branch network of £11.75 4 per member.

3.4 Contribution to the Corporate Strategy

As indicated in the introduction, the branches network plays a key role in enabling IOSH to achieve its strategic priorities, and provides a mechanism through which members at large can feel engaged and connected with the strategy. An outline of ways that this is achieved in relation to specific priorities is detailed below :-

3.4.1 Raising the profile of health and safety and the influence of IOSH:

Branches contribute in a wide variety of ways to this particular priority with examples being given below, however the raison-d’être of the branches network is its ability to strengthen and improve the relationship between IOSH and the membership at large in both a functional capacity and in a way that has direct relevance to individual members.

- Assisting in rolling out national campaigns, thereby increasing the scope of media relations.
- Branch attendance is not static, and the branches network plays a vital role in encouraging members (as well as non-members) to attend meetings, events etc.
- Those members who volunteer to be branch officials have a pivotal role to play in many outwardly facing aspects, not least in the crucial role of brand ambassadors for IOSH.
- Encouraging more members to volunteer to both the Branch and to other representative roles. e.g. Vice-President, future President.

3.4.2 Increasing membership:

Branches provide a crucial support role in achieving this priority through the wide variety of services they offer to members, for example :-

- Mentoring; CPD, IPD
- Member development, Tech IOSH to Chartered Member
- Assisting with member retention
- Promoting member services
- Career counselling

4 Based on 07/08 Annual report
• Assisting IOSH Head Office (HQ) in the development of new services for members.

3.4.3 Developing internationally

For IOSH to promote itself as a truly international organisation, sustainable investment has to be made into those aspects which can support that statement. IOSH is able to demonstrate and promote the statement with credibility through a number of factors, including :-

• IOSH has over 4,000\(^5\) members based overseas,
• There are five International branches, members of whom all assist in achieving the listed strategic priorities
• An international branch expansion plan underpins the support being offered to IOSH members
• Dedicated staff support focus on a prioritised set of international projects and supporting the international branches.
  o A Development Manager in Ireland was appointed in January 09.

3.4.4 Leading OSH thought

Currently, due to the priority of ‘leading OSH thought’ being focussed on the UK, the UK’s branch network gives great value in providing the following :-

• an efficient mechanism for contributing in a practical way to regional and national lobbying initiatives
• Facilitating a better response for consultations, thereby giving IOSH a more powerful voice
• Facilitating the sharing OSH knowledge (IOSH to member to IOSH).

3.4.5 Developing people

Branches are by their nature a focal point for developing people, both branch officials as well as members engaged with the branches. Specific deliverables towards this priority include :

• Mentoring programmes run by branches
• Training for branch officials e.g. treasurers training.

\(^5\) Figures obtained from Consensus as at 2 March 09
4. DETAILED DISCUSSION OF EACH AREA OF RECOMMENDATION

4.1 THE ROLE AND SCOPE OF BRANCHES

Clearly it is important to define the role and scope of branches before any further recommendations are agreed. Previously the BoT have approved the following as the role and scope of branches. This description of the role has wide support from the membership.

The role of the branch is to:

- Provide CPD, learning opportunities and local support to IOSH members
- Support the IOSH corporate strategy and aim to link activities to central objectives or campaigns
- Support and reflect the IOSH corporate brand and aim for high quality/professionalism
- Offer networking opportunities for members
- Be a conduit for 2-way communication between the membership and IOSH corporate structures
- Retain existing IOSH members by offering local services (as above)
- Engage branch members and increase branch attendance
- Engage with local communities and raise the profile of IOSH and the profession on a local level
- Adapt to meet local members' changing needs
- Be accountable for their performance and funding (report on objectives and plans)
- Recruit new members to IOSH

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the Board of Trustees confirms that the overarching mission for Branches is to strengthen and add value to the relationship between IOSH head office and the wider membership, and re-confirms its support of the previously agreed position of the role and scope of branches, outlined above.
4.2 THE REPORTING STRUCTURE OF BRANCHES

Historically branches had a direct input via a linked representative on the Council of Management, each branch had their own Council member, however this link has progressively been broken, first with the move to regional representatives and then with the full move to nationally elected representatives. The link has never been replaced with an alternative mechanism.

The BRWP is recommending to BoT that a branch co-ordination committee be established.

It is further recommended that the committee be populated by branch officials, elected by all branch officials (to be representative of Branches and Districts) and supported by the IOSH professional staff.

To ensure a reasonable degree of geographical balance in the membership of this committee it is recommended that each branch (including their associated districts) only be allowed to nominate one candidate.

The branch co-ordination committee will be made up of officials (as of the date of the election) of the UK branches, the views and requirements of international branches will be represented by the IOSH international team. This arrangement will be reviewed after one year of operation. The terms of office would initially work on a staggered basis i.e. one year, two years and three years to allow for continuity and succession planning.

This is an unusual proposal and as such some of the questions which have been discussed are outlined in Appendix A to help the BoT with their discussion. A summary of the two stages of consultation on this issue is detailed in Appendix B.

Furthermore, Mike Garstang has been involved and given valuable input into the discussions relating to this specific recommendation.

The costs associated with this recommendation relate to an election and the operating cost of a committee of 8-12 members conducting approximately 4 meetings per year.

RECOMMENDATION 2

The recommendation is that:

A branch co-ordination committee be established, to act as a conduit to BoT (and Council), and for this Committee to report into the Communications and International Committee on an interim basis (until Mike Garstang is able to view the reporting line holistically as part of his review).

Budgetary impact: £3940 committee £1104 postal vote carried out by the Electoral Reform Services. (Detailed breakdown of the costs are in Appendix C)
4.3 BRANCH FINANCE

Branch finances are a thorny issue; the current funding arrangements do not adequately reflect the balance of fixed and variable costs that are faced by new and small branches. If we wish the branch network to be dynamic and growing, with a reasonable degree of governance then the issue of the funding has to be considered.

Having consulted extensively on this issue the BRWP recommends that we move gradually over a 12 month period to an approach which finances branches against their planned activities (with certain basic materials being funded centrally in order to give inter-branch consistency).

The planning process should be as simple as possible and should be supported with additional staff resource.

However, to ensure that branches can be innovative and dynamic and respond during the financial year it is also recommended that each branch have a contingency fund. This would be based on their membership levels.

Comprehensive detail of the new proposed funding arrangements, and precisely how the objectives would be achieved are provided in Appendix D.

The budgetary impact of this proposal is broadly neutral with branch grants continuing to be approximately 10% of membership income.

In 2007/08 Branches had net expenditure (total expenditure less external income ignoring grants paid to them) of £223K. Had they spent all the grant due to them they would have spent £285K. In practice £34K was withheld due to the capping process. In practice £223K was spent, in theory it could have been £285K. This is the latest year for which figures are available.

RECOMMENDATION 3

That branch funding move to a system which finances branches against their planned activities (with certain basic materials being funded centrally in order to give inter-branch consistency), with an additional contingency fund as outlined in section 4.3.

Budgetary impact : in theory cost should be neutral but in practice there may be a cost, as per details in section 4.3.
4.4 THE SUPPORT PROVIDED TO BRANCHES

All of the research that we have reviewed indicates that a vibrant and effective branch structure is much more likely if it is properly supported by paid staff.

From the comments received in the various consultation exercises it is clear that the area of branch support at The Grange is currently very under resourced and this is causing a great deal of frustration within the branches and is actively damaging IOSH’s reputation with our engaged members. Anecdotal comment from a management consultant, Bob Empson of White Maple Consulting, immediately following participation in a Networks and International Directorate staff workshop, was that the Networks area [NB: branches and groups together] was about 6 staff short of what is needed for the present customer demands and work volumes. [This estimate included any unfilled vacancies and was the basis for the CE’s approval, in late February, of the recruitment of six one-year FTC staff].

Whilst due consideration is given to the current economic climate, and the pressures faced by both IOSH and our members, the issue of supporting branches at this time needs to be considered in the wider context.

Firstly for those of our members who are employed it may be more difficult to make time available to support voluntary activities, meaning that for a period it may be more difficult to get active branch volunteers. At the same time for those who are not employed the need for strong networks and access to low cost CPD activities becomes increasingly important. It should also be recognised that the discharge of our charitable objectives is the fundamental reason for our existence and the branches are pivotal in discharging our charitable objects.

Taking into account these various factors the BRWP recommends the recruitment of three FTE Networks Officers to provide additional support to the branch network, with full details of the costing, plus evidence to support this provided in Appendices E & F.

The proviso to this recommendation is that staffing levels should be reviewed every two years, to ensure that resource keeps pace with volunteer/member demand, and that due to the strategic importance of the branches network, that the BoT be open to these staffing requests, on a case by case basis.

RECOMMENDATION 4

The recruitment of three full-time employed (FTE) Networks Officers to provide additional support to the branch network. Supporting documentation is provided in Appendices E & F.

The financial impact of this recommendation is: £99,240 plus on-going salary costs.

6 6 Satisfaction survey Aug-Sep 08 of UK branch officials – Appendix I
4.5 PROCESSES FOR RECOGNISING THE CONTRIBUTION MADE BY BRANCHES AND INDIVIDUALS

Recognition falls into two categories – the individual and the branch activities.

Many of our members give significant time over many years to further develop the aims of IOSH. It is right that there should be some form of recognition for those who make a substantial contribution to the Institution.

The recommendation of the working party is that the President’s Distinguished Service Award be given a higher profile. In particular that the award be publicised within the branch network and that illustrative criteria be set around length of service or exceptional service or for specific achievements so that branches can recognise who should be nominated for this award.

Nominations would have to come from branch committees and where possible the awards would be presented by a member of the Presidential Team (including the new pool of Vice Presidents), or if this is not possible then they would be presented by the branch chair, but this would be supplemented by a personal letter from the President.

The recognition of branches is somewhat different in that the aim of any recognition scheme is to help to identify and spread best practice. One of the first activities of the Branch Co-ordination Committee should be to examine how we recognise and spread best practice.

There may additional costs in the Presidential budget for additional travel and accommodation if there is an increase in branch visits the cost implication of this is difficult to determine at this stage.

RECOMMENDATION 5

That the President’s Distinguished Service Award be given greater prominence and publicity and be used more widely to recognise those members who have played a significant role in our branch network.

Budgetary impact: Presidential Team travel and accommodation costs may increase but this is hard to determine at this stage.
4.6 THE TRAINING OF BRANCH AND DISTRICT OFFICIALS

Currently we do not train all our branch and district officials, resulting in a wide variation in knowledge and different views of the various roles and responsibilities of the executive committee. Indeed it also results in a difference in understanding in the very role and aim of the branches themselves.

The working party recommends that over a period of time all branch and district officials receive appropriate training. A fundamental part of the initial training will be to communicate the agreed recommendations of the Branch Review in a very timely way, and to ensure that all branch officials fully understand the many implications of the report.

In addition the training would cover both the operational aspects of the branch network, and the strategy, structure and objects of the Institution (a more detailed breakdown is given in appendix 4), the aim would eventually be to develop a consistent level of understanding and a consistent culture amongst our volunteer network.

Initially branches and districts would be asked to nominate a small number of key individuals for training. Additionally all newly elected executive committee members would be offered the training. The cost of this training is outlined below. After the communications campaign, we would plan to run two events during the year, one mid year and one which is either side of the groups and branches networking conference.

Cascade training should be used to brief the branch officials who are not immediately able to attend so that everyone has consistent information. In addition video conferencing and other remote training options will be investigated.

Functional training (e.g. for treasurers), particularly in view of the proposed changes to the finance arrangements will form a critical part of the training.

RECOMMENDATION 6

That a training programme, incorporating a communications campaign to promote the branch review recommendations, be established such that all branch officials are aware of the review and the findings, and that over an extended period of time all branch officials would receive appropriate training. The training and communications campaign would cover all aspects of the agreed recommendations, as well as very clear details and direction concerning the financial changes, as well as the operational aspects of the branch network, and the strategy, structure and objects of the Institution. Detailed costs are provided in Appendices G & H.

Budgetary impact: £36,020 based on providing this training in two separate sessions per year for UK and International Branch Officials.
4.7 THE NETWORK HANDBOOK

It is clear that if we are to develop consistency in the way the networking activities of IOSH are managed and delivered then we need to develop effective operational protocols. A Networks handbook is an essential element in developing effective and consistent networks. It is envisaged that the handbook will cover things such as role and responsibilities, accountability, planning and budgeting etc.

The networks handbook will be divided into two parts – mandatory elements – finance, branding etc and guidance, maximising attendance, selecting venues etc.

The handbook will be pivotal in driving harmonised approaches between branches and between branches and groups. The handbook should be delivered as quickly as possible.

RECOMMENDATION 7

That a branch handbook be developed as quickly as possible. The structure of the handbook to be in at least two parts:

1. Mandatory elements i.e. finance, branding etc
2. Guidance ie maximising attendance, selecting venues etc.

Budgetary impact: £8500 (approximately) based on 1 person full-time x 4 weeks plus the costs of producing a hard copy and sending the handbook as a CD Rom to all Branch Officials.
4.8 BRANCH AND DISTRICT IDENTITY

Currently there is no consistent requirement for the use of corporate imagery as branches and districts can choose whether to purchase imagery or not. Each branch and district has to fund any imagery they use from their own reserves. This gives rise to inconsistent brand presentation. It is entirely possible to attend an IOSH branch or district meeting and for there to be no visible indication that it is an IOSH event.

RECOMMENDATION 8

The BRWP recommends that a branch kit be purchased for all branches and districts (who do not have a current up to date set) to give a consistent corporate brand presentation.

Budgetary impact: The worst case cost of this is £14,630 however the most likely budgetary impact will be in the order of £10,973 as approximately a quarter of the branches already have up to date material.
4.9 INTERNATIONAL BRANCHES AND DISTRICTS

International branches are different, this is a simple fact. Our international branches are at different stages of development, operate within different legal frameworks and have to use different banking systems. International branches are important to our overall strategic objectives. If we are to use international branches as part of our growth strategy then we need to support them differently.

The needs and views of the international branches and districts will be represented on the branch co-ordination committee via the professional staff of the International Team. This arrangement should be reviewed after one year of operation.

RECOMMENDATION 9

The recommendation of the Branch Review Working Party is that international branches continue to be supported directly, that they be funded against plan, but that where there is a specific strategic need for additional resources that this be specifically approved by the BoT on a case by case basis (an example of this would be the Development Manager position in Ireland).

Budgetary impact: Neutral
5. NEXT STEPS AND IMPLEMENTATION

Should the Board of Trustees approve any or all of these recommendations the Branch Review Working Party will meet to determine suitable transition and implementation arrangements. This may include agreeing communication regarding future changes, overseeing the initial round of elections to the branch co-ordination committee, developing a working brief for the branch co-ordination committee, agreeing the transition phase and arrangements for moving to a funding against plan system.

Neil Budworth
Chair of Branch Review Working Party       February 2009
APPENDIX A

BRANCH CO–ORDINATION COMMITTEE

Why Establish an Additional Committee?

Branches and districts are unique (and powerful) in that:

- They are fundamental to the way in which the Institution discharges its charitable objectives, through their networking and development activities.

- In real terms no current committee has the time to overview the operation and effectiveness of the branch network, meaning that operational review and resolution of disputes is largely undertaken by overstretched professional staff.

- Their annual budget (not including staffing) runs into hundreds of thousands of pounds and the branches make contact with up to 40% of the membership on a routine basis.

- They are a significant part of the outward, public face of IOSH and can be a huge strategic asset in either promoting or potentially damaging our brand, our relationship with members, and how our partners in the industry see us.

- With the exception of the mass communication channels (the SHP, Connect and our website) the branch network is the only activity that interacts with such a large proportion of our membership and branches are one of the very few ways where the views of the membership can be gathered.

- They can be potentially damaging to our brand, our relationship with members, and how our partners in the industry see us if they are not bound by a common set of objectives.

- On a routine basis, in the order of 500 members are actively involved in the management of branches and districts. The branch network represents our activist base. Many of the structures of the Institution are populated with members who developed through involvement in the branch network.

- A committee comprising of branch officials will facilitate peer to peer challenge, which is likely to be more acceptable than a professional staff to volunteer challenge.
Why should this committee be populated by election rather than by the Nominations Committee?

There was an extremely strong reaction against the use of nominations committee by the branch executives. One of the reasons that the population of this committee is so critical is that there is a very distinct lack of trust between the executives of a significant number of branches and the head office structure. This lack of trust is largely historical and unfounded, but needs to be tackled. If we are asking the co-ordination committee to have oversight of the branch plans then this activity will only be readily accepted by the branch executives if it is undertaken by their peers.

What election process should be used?

The Branch Review Working Party has consulted very widely on this issue, particularly around who should be the electorate and how should an election be conducted.

After an extensive consultation (for a summary see Appendix B) it is recommended that only serving branch district officials (at the date of the election) be eligible to stand and vote in any election for this committee. Although there is an argument for opening this up to the whole membership the reality is that the majority would be voting blind and the vast majority would not vote.

We consulted widely engaging members through the SHP and through branch meetings and the vast majority of the responses favoured election by branch officials only.

The second debate was around whether an election process should be a ‘straight’ election, or should involve some form of cyclical or regional system to ensure a spread of representation. There was much debate on this issue and very strong views were expressed during the consultation process. The result was an almost even split between those favouring some kind of regional system and those favouring a ‘straight’ election.

Given that views were evenly balanced and taking into account a. our experience of regional elections and their effectiveness and b. the relative additional complexities and cost in regional elections the recommendation is that the election be a ‘straight’ election process.

However to ensure a reasonable geographic spread of membership it is recommended that branches (including their districts) be only allowed to nominate one candidate each.

What should be the terms of Reference for the Branch Co-ordination Committee?

Essentially the Terms of Reference for the Branch Co-ordination Committee should be:

- To support the Board of Trustees and the branch structure in delivering the strategic objectives of the Institution. Specifically to support the:-
  - Exchange of information and ideas amongst the members of the Institution
  - Promotion, dissemination, explanation and advancement of systematic and organised methods for improving occupational safety and health
• To support the Board of Trustees by providing governance of the branch network by providing
  • Overview the effectiveness and efficiency of branches
  • A review of significant variances in branch budgets and plans
  • Assurance that branches and districts are paying due regard to the agreed role of branches
  • Assurance that branches and districts are paying due regard to the agreed strategy of the Institution
  • Reviewing branch/district boundaries and making recommendations for change
• To provide a route for the voices of members into the formal structures of the Institution
• To identify and spread best practice and develop any mechanisms required to achieve this aim
• To discuss and where necessary make recommendations on any issues of policy raised by branches and districts.
• To ensure that lines of communication to and from branches are operating effectively.
• To regularly review the support needs of branches

However it is clear that these will need to be refined as the committee starts to operate.

*Illustration of reporting line from Branches to BoT*
Illustration of Communication Line with Permanent Staff

- Reporting through IOSH staff structure, through networks and international to CEO,
  day-to-day details
- Additional central branch specific support
- Board of Trustees
- Communication and International Committee
- Branch Co-Ordination Committee

Branches: Branch 1, Branch 2, Branch 3
APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON THE ELECTION PROCESS TO BE USED TO POPULATE THE BRANCH CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

The first stage of the consultation with all Branch Officials (approx 500) on the proposal as detailed below took place in March/April 08

Proposal that a standing committee should be created to provide a reporting structure for branches and groups up to the Board of Trustees. This committee should be populated using the Nominations Committee process.

53% of respondents agreed with the proposal
32% made comments on the proposal

The majority of comments were raised via the way that the committee should be populated and how the branches should be represented and queries regarding the structure and in particular a need for more explanation.

A very strong case against using the Nominations Committee was made “Nominations Committee removes too many suitable candidates ……. Needs to be democratic and Nominations Committee doesn’t allow this…….weakens the democratic process”.

Second stage consultation

The second stage of the consultation was to establish the reporting line of the Branches Co-ordination Committee and the process of election. Again this consultation was sent out to all the individual UK branch and District committee members.

Responses have been received collectively from 19 branches and 9 individuals. 4 branches did not send in a response Merseyside, Edinburgh, North Wales (not sure if L Bamber response was also the views of the branch) and Yorkshire.

A summary of the responses are as follows:

1. Where the temporary reporting line of the branches co-ordination committee should be:

Branches responses: 3 x Board of Trustees (BoT), 8 x Communications and International Committee (C&IC) (1 temp), 1 x abstained, 4 x not answered, 1 x wait until after committee review, 1 x more information (Terms of Reference), 1 x no strong view, 1 x did not support proposal.

Individual responses: 1 x BoT or Council, 3 x C&IC, 4 x not answered, 1 x need more information.

2. Whether the committee should be elected by all members or only by branch officials?

Branches responses: 13 x Branch Officials (BO), 3 x all IOSH membership (all), 1 x abstained, 2 x more information, 1 x need more information.
Individual responses: 4 x BO (1 x last 5 years), 2 x all, 2 x not answered, 1 x not supported.

3. Whether you accept the working party's recommendation of a straight election process to populate the committee?

Branch responses: 9 x straight election, 7 x regional + (1 NI region or cyclical), 1 x abstained, 2 x more information, 1 x not supported.

Individual responses: 4 x straight election (+1 if not all branches included in regional), 2 x not answered, 1 x not supported, 2 x regional (or 1 cyclical), 1 x need more information.
APPENDIX C

BREAKDOWN OF THE ELECTION COSTS AND THE ANNUAL COSTS RELATING TO THE RUNNING OF A BRANCH CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

INSTITUTE OF OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY & HEALTH
10/03/09

INDEPENDENT ADMINISTRATION OF A COMMITTEE ELECTION

POSTAGE
Despatch of 600 UK ballot packs 2nd class £162
(Assuming pack <100gms & <5mm thick)

Return of 300 ballot papers 2nd class £77
(Based upon 50% response rate)

ENVELOPES
600 Despatch Envelopes C5 £25
(overprinted with ERS helpline number and details)

600 Pre-paid stock reply £25
(Overprinted with ERBS reply license/address)

PRINTING / ARTWORK / PROOFREADING / FOLDING
Ballot Papers security printed & sequentially numbered;
Printed 1 page A4 / 1 constituency version/ 600 £175

Candidate statements / 2 page A4 / B&W / 600 £140
(Printed on reverse of ballot paper to save cost if possible)

ADMINISTRATION FEE
Independent administration of the election procedures for 600 members in 1 constituency. ERS to receive and process address data and laser directly to despatch envelopes for the ballot mailing. Preparation and inserting of ballot material and reply envelopes into C5 envelopes. ERS to receive back ballot papers and scan valid ballot forms. Count using ERS certified count software. Submission of a certified independent scrutineer’s report of voting for the election. Includes all election consultancy by phone and meeting at ERS. £500

Costs exclusive of VAT

The above prices are an estimate of anticipated costs for the project based upon ERS’s understanding of the client’s requirements at the time that the estimate was prepared. Any subsequent changes to the project specifications will affect the costs. Please feel free to request an updated cost estimate at any time if your requirements change. Please note that our fees include any meetings you wish to arrange at our offices at no additional charge but that external meetings will have to be charged @ £50 per hour of travel and meeting time spent out of the office plus any travel costs incurred. Postage costs subject to any Royal Mail increases prior to the election taking place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch Co-ordination committee</th>
<th>Costs £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 people (3 internal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lunch and refreshments</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel x Scotland (3)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel x Northern Ireland</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxis (airport, train)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel other x 5</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation x 3</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 4 meetings</td>
<td>5880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less 33% non attendance</td>
<td>-1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

Currently branches are funded per member, which tends to favour larger branches. For a branch to operate effectively, it must have a funding mechanism that works flexibly, providing additional resources when there are key projects to deliver and recognising the different challenges faced by branches.

The BRWP recommends the following proposal:-

That IOSH gradually moves to an approach that finances branches against their planned activities (with certain basic materials being funded centrally to give inter-branch consistency). This approach would be phased in over a three-year period. The planning process should be as simple as possible and be supported with extra resources.

To make sure branches have the freedom to be innovative, dynamic and responsive, the BRWP also recommends that each branch has a fund for discretionary spend.

2. CURRENT POSITION

A quarterly grant is paid over to each branch based on the number of paid up members at each quarter end. This includes interest income due to the branch and any expenditure paid by The Grange on behalf of the branches which is deducted from the quarterly grant.

Branches can hold funds equal to £10 per each paid up member before grants are capped. Capping occurs at the beginning of the financial year and continues (for those branches originally capped in quarter 1) until their funds fall back into line i.e. £10 per paid up member.

3. CONSULTATION

The main consultation exercise undertaken with Branch Officials resulted in the following outcome :-

51% of the respondents agreed with the proposal
50% had comments on the proposals
15% wanted more information7

Respondents were almost equally divided by whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposal.

In agreement, respondents felt the proposal was more equitable and less discriminating of small branches; and that branch activities and budgeting needed to be done in a more business like manner.

---

7 Source – main Branch Consultation document: summary in Appendix K
However the contrary view was that the system could become over bureaucratic and IOSH HO be too controlling; bigger branches require more funding; the current method is simple and effective.

Further information and an opportunity for questions was subsequently provided at the Branch Action Day in September, with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay “as is” with the current situation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move towards a new system along these lines … subject to the proposals being worked up to take account of the issues raised and caveats (particularly looking at appeals process, incentive issue, timescales for budget submissions)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. CONSIDERATIONS RAISED DURING THE CONSULTATION EXERCISES

The costs of branch meetings may vary greatly depending on the geographical location/venue costs etc, and it is not directly linked to the membership of the branch – so per capita allocation of funds may not be appropriate and may penalise branches in more ‘costly’ areas and especially smaller branches. Costs of newsletters/mail shots etc. should also be considered, although usage of Connect will bring savings.

IOSH recognises that Branches are run by volunteers whose time is limited and who may not have a background in finance, although we should also ensure that they are aware of the responsibility of holding and utilising the Institution's funds, and the requirements which are attached to this.

We've tried to keep it simple for all concerned and HO support will be available in order that branches understand and can achieve deadlines both for the budget and also the year end. The new system is also designed to encourage branches to use their funds for the benefit of their members, which some appear reluctant to do.

5. DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

There will be three specific areas which make up the total funds transferred:

1. The approved budget i.e. income less expenditure for the financial year,
2. The grant, based on member numbers sliding scale
3. Opening branch bank balance

5.1 Budget

Each branch is to submit their budget to the Networks & International Director (N&ID) detailing planned income and expenditure for the following financial year. Where
branches cover districts, the district submission is to be included within that of the branch and identified as such. The N&ID and Branches team will review and any significant variances (compared to previous year end actuals) to be referred to the Branch Co-ordination Committee and included within the N&I Directorate area budget submission. The deadline for budget submissions is the end of November, in line with the Institution’s budget timetable. The review and approval process will be the same as that for all IOSH budgets.

Budgets should include the following :-

- Basic running costs -
- Funding of branch meetings (including speaker/venue/refreshments)
- Committee meetings etc. (N.B. These to be based on current costs plus price increase if known, with the number of meetings to be factored into the calculation)
- Bids for additional activities e.g. development of branch (included in the budget submission with supporting paperwork)

The budgets should include proposed events which fall into the financial year, with full costings, showing income, sponsorship and expenditure calculations. Events are not required to generate a surplus, they can be subsidised by the branch if they so wish.

The Accounts Department will provide a template for completion based on previous year end actuals.

N.B Where figures vary significantly from previous years actual then branch must give reasons for this, as justification will be required as part of the review process. This will allow branches to provide for the relevant number of meetings regardless of take-up or membership.

5.2 Grant

The grant will be based on the number of members at the start of the financial year, with branches being grouped into bands according to their membership numbers at the beginning of the financial year as per the table below.

This will provide all branches with an allocated sum of money, dependent on their size. This in effect is the branches minimum bank balance and will act as a buffer during the year.

New Branches [separate arrangements apply]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>x 7.0</td>
<td>£3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>x 6.0</td>
<td>£4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 1500</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>x 5.0</td>
<td>£6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 – 2500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>x 4.75</td>
<td>£9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501 – 3500</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>x 4.5</td>
<td>£13,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Bank Balance

There will be winners and losers, but the branches’ starting bank balances will be made up to the value of the approved budget plus the grant to enable them to carry out all of their planned activities.

In the following example Branch A has a membership of 2800, and Branch B has 221.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved budget</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant (sliding scale)</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Total funds required for annual activity

| Less branch bank balance at start of financial year | 18,000 | 3,000 |

= Top up from The Grange

Top up + opening bank balance = total monies required for annual activity

The grant will be paid over in May each year and will be calculated as follows:

Grant + approved budget less branch bank balance = grant payable

This will top up the branch bank balance to meet the total requirements approved, allowing for a contingency over and above their budgeted requirement. Where a branch is responsible for a district or a number of districts, the collective bank balances and budgets for all of the associated areas will be used for the above calculations.

Branch bank accounts must remain in credit at all times, as they do now. In exceptional circumstances where a branch may be in danger of going overdrawn, it can apply to N&I Directorate for additional funding, detailing the reasons for this requirement. The Branch Co-ordination Committee to review this arrangement as required.

Any surplus from an event will remain in the branch bank account for that year, and will only be taken into account when the next year's grant is calculated.

6. CENTRAL FUNDING

Stationery, banners and other items which branches are required to display/utilise by staff at The Grange will be budgeted for by the Branches Department at The Grange, not by individual branches.

IOSH HO will supply a set-up kit to all branches, to get them started and ensure consistency. HO will also pay for certain items centrally (saving branches the VAT) and then re-charge the net amount to the individual branches each quarter, e.g. printing of event brochures, mailings, large items etc. The procedure for this will remain unchanged, with the Accounts Department reconciling the account each quarter, calculate the monies owed, advise the branches, and ask them to contact Accounts if there is any query with the calculation before transferring the monies out of the branch account to cover this.
At the same time Accounts will review the interest income and make the transfer into the branch accounts.

7. INTERNATIONAL BRANCHES

Budgets of the International branches will be reviewed by the International Department/N&ID, and this arrangement will be reviewed by the Branch Coordination Committee after one financial year of operation.

Prepared by Gina Cooke
### APPENDIX E

**CURRENT ANNUAL BRANCH TEAM RESOURCE ALLOCATION – AVERAGE PER PERSON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions/Tasks</th>
<th>Actual Days</th>
<th>Percentage of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding with Branches/responding to enquiries.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support organising events.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Branches.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Team – internal communications, briefings etc.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal meetings on behalf of Branches (e.g. website).</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with the Branches &amp; their programmes Help Branches market themselves Support Branches to attract Members Increase visibility of IOSH in local area</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per person</strong></td>
<td>**225 ***</td>
<td>**100% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of working days for the team</strong></td>
<td><strong>787.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total number of working days per year, taking into account statutory holidays, annual leave, average sick leave per person

** The particular tasks are undertaken currently by 3.5 members of staff
## Proposed Annual Branch Team Resource Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions/Tasks + factor increase</th>
<th>Actual days</th>
<th>Proposed number of days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration x 1.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding with Branches/responding to enquiries x 2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support organising events x 2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Branches x 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Team – internal, communications, briefings etc x 1.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal meetings on behalf of branches (e.g. website) x 1.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function specific training e.g. media, treasurers training, event planning etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing presentations to communicate key messages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with the Branches &amp; their programmes x4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Branches market themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Branches to attract Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase visibility of IOSH in local area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work days per team member

| Work days per team member | 225 | 442 |

**Calculation**

The current team of 3.5 people working 225 days per person gives total working days per team of 788 days.

Proposed increase to workload results in total working days for the team of 442 x 3.5 staff = 1547 days

1547 days divided by working days per person of 225 = 6.8 staff. **Request for 3 additional staff**.
APPENDIX F

RECRUITMENT COSTS

NETWORKS OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary average (based on officer level)</td>
<td>24,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS NIC</td>
<td>2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension 5%</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC/monitor</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrix licence</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>x 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,080</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>99,240</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>x 3 positions</strong></td>
<td><strong>99,240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

TRAINING FOR IOSH VOLUNTEERS - POSSIBLE CONTENT

IOSH
- IOSH background and history
- Current structure and meeting key people
- Strategy
- Aims and objectives
- Culture and values
- Member benefits

Communications
- Strategy
- Brand
- Campaigns
- Events
- E mail and communication protocols
- Dealing with the media

Finance and Operational issues
- Branch evaluation (self and via reporting structure)
- Branch roles
- Branch handbook
- Branch accounts
- Planning
- Accountability
### APPENDIX H

### BRANCH TRAINING/UPDATE DAYS

#### BREAKDOWN OF COSTS BASED ON 64 BRANCH OFFICIALS, INCLUDING HEAD OFFICE STAFF AND PRESIDENTIAL TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lunch and refreshments</td>
<td>£640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation UK delegates (11 members)</td>
<td>£880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue (no charge if Conference room available)</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel UK, Edin x 2 Glas x1 ,Aberdeen x 2</td>
<td>£800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 x3,250x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxis</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other travel (45 x £60)</td>
<td>£2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External speakers</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate packs</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7,920</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### International travel x 1 rep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IoM</td>
<td>£150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin (5)</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>£180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxis</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional accommodation (6 x 2 nights)</td>
<td>£960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch and refreshments (10)</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£10,090</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total x 2 sessions (International 36,020 delegates)**
APPENDIX I

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

Presentation on subsequent pages.
Satisfaction survey ~ Aug/Sept 2008

Helen McCrorie
Alchemy Business Communication
Summary of presentation

1. The Satisfaction Survey process
2. Results
   • Overview
   • Satisfaction ~ efficient (responsive, timely)
   • Satisfaction ~ effective (proactive, collaborative, style)
   • Fit for the future ~ priorities
   • Resources
3. Invite comments and discussion
4. Summary and conclusions
5. Next steps

The Satisfaction Survey process

• To supplement the Branch Review process
• Surveyed 427 UK-wide Branch & District Committee Members
• Almost 1/5 … 20% response (conscious of potential holiday period)
• All represented .. reasonable spread
• 41% offered further non-directive comments
• Statistically valid …probably found the ‘elephants’ but may miss some detail … so useful to discuss face to face and add more subtle points
• Purposely encouraged respondents to make priority decisions
• Intend to conduct same/similar survey annually to track progress
Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Area</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of service

- 48% of respondents have served 5+ years
- Some suggestion that those who serve for more than 3 years are less satisfied than those who have served 0-3 years.
- For example … on average, 34% of those with 3+yrs service are satisfied that enquires and requests are replied to promptly. While 64% of those under 3yrs service are satisfied.

- COMMENT?
Overview

• While there are specific areas for improvement, 2 out of 3 of you score satisfaction with the performance of the BLT as adequate or above … and say performance remains the same level year on year or is getting slightly better.

• There’s a feeling that either some, or significant, improvement is needed to support the Branches and Districts particularly considering plans for the future development in membership

• It is felt strongly that it’s important to put more resources into this support …but also that resources should address quality of support (eg: business processes, training, communication) not just quantity (numbers of staff!)

Overall satisfaction with performance

Question 20. Overall, how do you rate satisfaction with the quality of support provided by the head office Branch Liaison Team to your branch/district?

- Excellent: 7%
- Good: 28%
- Adequate: 31%
- Poor: 18%
- Not acceptable: 9%
- Don’t know or not applicable: 7%
Overall satisfaction year on year

Question 21. Overall, compared to last year, is the performance of the head office Branch Liaison Team...

- Getting much better: 5%
- Getting better: 20%
- Staying at about the same level: 35%
- Getting worse: 11%
- Getting much worse: 2%
- Don't know or not applicable: 27%

Fit for purpose - future

Question 22. And, how 'fit for purpose' is the support to branches/districts? (particularly thinking about the future growth and developments in membership)

- Fit for purpose: 22%
- Adequate: 25%
- Needs some improvement: 9%
- Requires significant improvement: 7%
- Don't know or not applicable: 37%
Efficient ~ Responsiveness

- 4. Responds to requests and enquiries promptly
- 6. Is competent and efficient
- 8. Communicates clearly and effectively
- 10. Meets timescales and deadlines

Efficient ~ Timeliness

- 15. Publicises branch meetings effectively and in good time
- 17. Provides timely notice for head office consultations
Effective ~ Collaborative

9. Keeps me informed of progress
   - Highly satisfied: 8%
   - Satisfied: 36%
   - Adequate: 32%
   - Unacceptable: 15%
   - Don't know or not applicable: 8%

7. Works with me to find solutions
   - Highly satisfied: 11%
   - Satisfied: 35%
   - Adequate: 31%
   - Unacceptable: 7%
   - Don't know or not applicable: 16%

5. Understands my requirements and deals with issues appropriately/effectively
   - Highly satisfied: 12%
   - Satisfied: 35%
   - Adequate: 28%
   - Unacceptable: 15%
   - Don't know or not applicable: 9%

Effective ~ Proactive and visible

19. Liaises effectively with other head office departments on behalf of my branch/district
   - Highly satisfied: 16%
   - Satisfied: 29%
   - Adequate: 29%
   - Unacceptable: 1%
   - Don't know or not applicable: 39%

18. Supports the exchange of knowledge, ideas and experience between branches
   - Highly satisfied: 22%
   - Satisfied: 28%
   - Adequate: 21%
   - Unacceptable: 20%

16. Is visible and visits branches and districts
   - Highly satisfied: 24%
   - Satisfied: 32%
   - Adequate: 25%
   - Unacceptable: 11%

12. Is proactive
   - Highly satisfied: 29%
   - Satisfied: 38%
   - Adequate: 25%
   - Unacceptable: 15%
Effective ~ Personal style

13. Honest

14. Courteous

Fit for the Future ~ High priorities

1. Improving communication between branches and HO to improve understanding of their respective roles

2. Improving communication between branches/districts to share knowledge and expertise

3. Supporting branches to share best practice and develop common standards to improve consistency

- Critical 27% ~ High 54%
  Total 81%

- Critical 14% ~ High 65%
  Total 79%

- Critical 14% ~ High 62%
  Total 76%
Fit for the Future ~ Medium priorities

4. Develop training for branch / district officials
5. Support to increase attendance at branch events
6. Support branches/districts to raise profile IOSH locally
7. Allocate dedicated BLT key contact
8. BLT to visit branches/districts more often
9. BLT to be more proactive

- Critical 18% ~ High 57%
  Total 75%
- Critical 16% ~ High 59%
  Total 75%
- Critical 20% ~ High 52%
  Total 72%
- Critical 12% ~ High 60%
  Total 72%
- Critical 9% ~ High 60%
  Total 69%
- Critical 6% ~ High 60%
  Total 67%

Fit for the Future ~ OK as is

10. Improve network opportunities
11. Improve skills, quality and knowledge of BLT
12. Restructure BLT to locate individual in each region

- Critical 13% ~ High 46%
  Total 59%
- Critical 7% ~ High 44%
  Total 51%
- Critical 6% ~ High 33%
  Total 39% (Not a priority 16%)

- COMMENTS?
Resources

- 29% thought it ‘very important’ and a further 52% thought it ‘important’ to put resources into support for the Branches and Districts (81% in total)
- Furthermore 38% would definitely support and a further 30% maybe support an increase in financial resources to provide an enhanced service to branches and districts … while another 25% still wanted an improved service, but from within current financial arrangements
- Only a total of 5% of those responding thought it ‘not at all important’ or would ‘prefer to allocate resources elsewhere’

- COMMENTS?
APPENDIX J

Branch Review – Outline and questionnaire

Introduction

The Board of Trustees established a working party to carry out an operational review of the structure and function of branches. The working party looked at:

- the aims and roles of branches
- the architecture surrounding the branch network, including reporting lines, accountability and so on
- the branch experience
- the support structures that are needed for the branch network.

The working party has tried to make sure all branch officials have been kept informed and consulted on various aspects of the review.

As part of this consultation process, we invite you to consider and comment on the issues below by 30 May. When you've finished, please return it to mary.sturgess@iosh.co.uk, or post it to:

Mary Sturgess
Branch Liaison Manager
IOSH
The Grange
Highfield Drive
Wigston
Leicestershire
LE18 1NN
1. The role and scope of branches

If we are to provide strong support to our members and improve the standards of health and safety internationally, every part of IOSH must work in concert and have a clear view of their role and scope. Therefore, it is critical that we set out the role and scope of branches.

The working party evaluated research gathered from a number of sources, including the PARN membership survey, workshop sessions with branch officials in August 2007 and the branch networking conference in November 2007. As a result of consultation with branch officials, there is strong support for the following roles for branches:

- provide CPD, learning opportunities and local support to members
- support the IOSH corporate strategy, and aim to link to central objectives or campaigns
- support and reflect the IOSH corporate brand, and aim for high quality and professionalism
- offer members networking opportunities
- be a conduit for two-way communication between members and IOSH head office
- retain existing IOSH members by offering local services
- engage branch members and increase branch attendance
- engage with local communities and raise the profile of IOSH and the profession at a local level
- adapt to meet local members’ needs
- be accountable for their performance and funding (report on objectives and plans)
- recruit new members to IOSH.

Do you agree with these roles? If not, which do you disagree with and why?

Do you think branches should have any additional roles?
2. How branches and districts are funded

Currently branches are funded per member, which tends to favour larger branches.

For a branch to operate effectively, it must have a funding mechanism that works flexibly, providing additional resources when there are key projects to deliver and recognising the different challenges faced by branches.

We recommend that IOSH gradually moves to an approach that finances branches against their planned activities (with certain basic materials being funded centrally to give inter-branch consistency). This approach would be phased in over a three-year period. The planning process should be as simple as possible and be supported with extra resources.

To make sure branches have the freedom to be innovative, dynamic and responsive, we also recommend that each branch has a fund for discretionary spend. This would be based on a percentage of total operating costs.

Do you support these recommendations? If not, please say why.
3. Where branches and districts are located
At present, branches and districts are determined by postcode (which can often overlap county borders or regions), and a member can belong to any branch or district.

Are the current arrangements satisfactory? If not, please say why and, if possible, provide an alternative solution.
4. How the branch executive operates
   a. Training branch officials

Currently, IOSH doesn’t train its volunteers, and this results in a wide variation in knowledge and different views of the various roles and responsibilities of the executive committee. It also results in different understandings of the role and aims of the branches.

We recommend that, over a period of time, all branch officials should be given training. Training would cover both the operational aspects of the branch network, and the strategy, structure and objectives of the Institution. The overarching aim would be to develop a consistent level of understanding and a consistent culture among our volunteer network.

Initially, branches and districts would be asked to nominate a small number of key individuals for training. Also, all newly elected executive committee members would be offered this training. The cost of training has yet to be quantified. To keep the costs at a reasonable level, we recommend treating UK and international branches differently. In principle, we would plan to run two events a year – one mid-year and one either before or after the group and branch networking conference. International branches would only be invited to the latter to minimise travel costs. Cascaded training or podcasts would be used to brief the branch officials who are not immediately able to attend so that everyone has consistent information. Video-conferencing and other remote training options will be investigated.

Functional training (eg for treasurers) will continue as normal.

| Do you agree that, over a period of time, all branch officials should receive this training? If not, why? |
b. The branch handbook

It’s clear that if we’re to develop consistency between branches and spread the good practice that has developed, we need to develop effective operational protocols. In our view, a branch handbook is an essential element in developing an effective and consistent branch network. We envisage that the handbook will cover things such as roles and responsibilities, accountability, planning and budgeting.

The branch handbook will be divided into two parts:
- mandatory elements, such as finance, branding and so on
- guidance and good practice examples, for example how to maximise attendance and select venues.

A draft handbook will be available for comment later this year.

**What do you think should be included in the branch handbook?**
5. Governance, including the branch reporting structure

Historically, branches had a direct link to Council as each branch had its own Council member. This link progressively eroded, first with the move to regional representatives and second with the change to nationally elected representatives. The link has never been replaced.

In the current reporting structure, both branches and groups report to standing committees: the Communications and International Committee and the Technical Committee, respectively – neither of which has networking or volunteer activities as a major focus.

We suggest that the reporting structure for branches and groups should be integrated at the standing committee level, the terms of reference of which would be to:

- overview the effectiveness of these networks to provide a route for members’ voices to the Board of Trustees
- identify and spread best practice in branches and groups
- deal with any issues of policy that are raised by branches or groups.

The rationale for this is that branches and groups share similar activities and challenges – essentially, they’re both networking structures.

We also suggest that the committee should be populated using the nominations committee process, rather than through election, so that members are clear that they represent the interests of the Institution and not the views of any particular branch or group. The reporting structure we’re proposing is in diagram form below.

It’s clear that both branches and groups are currently undergoing significant change. The groups already have a committee to manage the change process. We suggest that the current branch working party continues to develop the details needed to manage the change to the new arrangements, for a period of between 18 months and 2 years.
Proposed reporting and support structure

IOSH staff structure, reporting through Networks and International. Day-to-day details

Board of Trustees

Networks Co-ordination Committee

Reporting on performance and seeking policy decisions

Provision of support

Additional resource (exact nature of resource to be agreed)

Branch

Branch

Branch

Do you agree with the proposed reporting structure? If not, which aspects do you disagree with?

Do you agree with the proposal that the Networks Co-ordination Committee should be populated using the nominations committee process? If not, please say why.
6. Processes for recognising the contribution made by branches and individuals

Recognition falls into two categories – the individual and the branch.

Many of our members give a significant amount of their time over many years to further the aims of IOSH. It's right that there should be some form of recognition for those who make a substantial contribution to the Institution.

We recommend that the President's Distinguished Service Award be given a higher profile. In particular, the award should be publicised within the branch network and illustrative criteria should be set around length of service or exceptional service, or for specific achievements, so that branches can recognise who should be nominated for the award.

Nominations would come from branch chairs and where possible the awards would be presented by a member of the presidential team. Where this wasn’t possible, they would be presented by the branch chair, and be supplemented by a personal letter from the president.

The recognition of branches is somewhat different in that the aim of any recognition scheme is to help to identify and spread best practice.

Branches would be encouraged to apply with examples of best practice that support the IOSH strategic objectives.

Awards would be presented at the group and branch networking conference.

Do you agree with the recommendations for recognising individuals? If not, which do you not agree with and why? Can you suggest any other ways that individuals could be recognised?
The next steps

One important issue not covered here is how branches and districts are administered and supported.

All of the research that we’ve reviewed indicates that a vibrant and effective branch structure is much more likely if it is properly supported by paid staff.

From the comments we received in the first consultation exercise in November and December 2007, it’s clear that the area of branch support is currently very under-resourced and this is causing a great deal of frustration within the branches.

To make sure we develop an appropriate response, we’ll be sending you a service satisfaction survey within the next few weeks.

After this consultation, representatives from each branch and district will be invited to attend a workshop to be held at the Grange in early summer to look at the findings.

Once the final recommendations are agreed, a report will be presented to the Board of Trustees. The Branch Review Working Party will then start the work of implementing the new proposals.

Neil Budworth
Chair of Branch Review Working Party
April 2008
APPENDIX K

Branch Review Consultation

1. Introduction

This report describes the outcomes of the consultation paper which was sent out to all Branch and district officials, designed to gather feedback on a number of proposals suggested by the Branch Review Working Party.

2. Process for Branch Review

The Branch review has to date followed a process consisting of Working Party meetings, presentations to Branch Officials, dissemination of consultation paper A to all Branches, feedback discussed by the Working Party, proposals refined, consultation paper B\(^8\) disseminated to all Branch and District officials (518) and analysis of consultation paper B.

The above process is pictorially represented within Appendix 1 and shows the subsequent steps and processes needed to be undergone.

3. Aims and objectives of consultation paper B

3.1 Aim

Two of the strategic priorities within IOSH’s strategy 2008-2012 are to develop people and manage the Institution efficiently and effectively. Since the branch network is a critical component of IOSH’s membership these priorities underpin why it is essential that the Branch review is undertaken in a thorough and rigorous way.

The Branch network is a vibrant one and sound decisions and recommendations, that will withstand scrutiny from the Board of Trustees, need to be made in order to ensure that the Branch network continues to grow and develop in a sustainable and efficient way.

The aim of consultation paper B was ensure that Branch and District Officials were engaged and played an active part in the Branch Review process.

3.2 Objectives

Obtain Branch and District Officials views and opinions on proposals suggested by the Working Party on the following issues :-
- The role and scope of branches
- How branches are funded
- Where branches and districts are located
- How the branch executive operates
- Governance of branches including a reporting structure
- Processes for recognising the contribution made by branches and individuals

As well as providing a mechanism for Officials to provide alternative suggestions and proposals on the issues and to use the feedback to assist in

\(^8\) Detailed in Appendix J
the development of the final proposals which will be taken to the Board of Trustees.

4. Evaluation of feedback

The feedback was obtained from undertaking an on-line consultation survey, which was sent to all IOSH Branch and District officials, in total 518 people. This included representatives from all of the International branches.

5. Headline outcomes

5.1.1 Response rate
Out of the 518 recipients, 112 responses were received, giving a 22% response rate. This percentage is extremely encouraging and is over and above the accepted figure for validating the results.

NB. Some of the responses were collective branch/district responses but the source of the response hasn’t been differentiated in within the results, meaning that the number of people the responses represents would in reality be higher.

6. Achievement of objectives

It is clear that a higher than average response rate to the Consultation document has been achieved with views representing over a fifth of Branch Officials.
The high number of literal comments demonstrated that Officials do feel very engaged and passionate about the particular topics and issues discussed and had seized the opportunity to provide comments on these areas, plus other topics that Officials felt needed to be aired.

6.1 Roles and scope of branches

• provide CPD, learning opportunities and local support to members
• support the IOSH corporate strategy, and aim to link to central objectives or campaigns
• support and reflect the IOSH corporate brand, and aim for high quality and professionalism
• offer members networking opportunities
• be a conduit for two-way communication between members and IOSH head office
• retain existing IOSH members by offering local services
• engage branch members and increase branch attendance
• engage with local communities and raise the profile of IOSH and the profession at a local level
• adapt to meet local members’ needs
• be accountable for their performance and funding (report on objectives and plans)
• recruit new members to IOSH.

76% of the respondents agreed with the roles and scope of branches as above
52% of the respondents made comments on this issue
The broad acceptance of these roles is demonstrated in a number of the comments given:
“Fully agree with the roles”, “These are present and correct and have been embedded in the Branch I represent for a long while now”
“Nice to see someone else has noticed then as well”
“I support the whole of the list wholeheartedly”

6.2 How branches are funded

Recommendation that IOSH gradually finances branches against their planned activities (with central funding for certain basics). Each branch also to have a fund for discretionary spend.

51% of the respondents agreed with the proposal
50% had comments on the proposals
15% wanted more information

Respondents were almost equally divided by whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposal.

In agreement, respondents felt the proposal was more equitable and less discriminating of small branches; and that branch activities and budgeting needed to be done in a more business like manner.

However the contrary view was that the system could become over bureaucratic and HQ be too controlling; bigger branches require more funding; the current method is simple and effective.

6.3 Where branches and districts are located

Question asked as to whether the current arrangements of determining branches and districts by postcode are satisfactory.

66% of the respondents thought the arrangements are satisfactory
40% had comments on the issue

Whilst two thirds of the respondents felt that current arrangements are suitable and sensible, requiring no update, it was felt that a member should have the opportunity to decide for him/herself which branch they belong to.

“very good… sensible option… they work… present arrangements are suitable… deemed satisfactory… branch map is good… no reason to change the current system… current arrangements are fine as they are…”

However, those against the arrangements cited geographical issues such as members working in one area and living in another and rural areas covering a very wide geographic area.

6.4 How the branch executive operates

Part a. Recommendation that all branch officials should be given training covering both operational and strategic aspects.

90% of the respondents agreed with this
64% had comments on issues relating to the training
The percentage of respondents agreeing to the suggestion of training was extremely positive, however a significant proportion felt that there were issues regarding training that needed to be raised.

“[Training] is essential if we want to sing from the same hymn sheet… I fully support this proposal… useful to all branch officials… training officials is an excellent idea and would encourage people to be more involved in executive committees and take on key roles … This is a must for all officials… this will bring positive changes in IOSH operation”.

These issues were predominately concerned with who should be trained and how the training should be delivered.

<Online learning/distance learning and networking should be explored>
<Training should be open to everyone – all committee members>

Part b. Asked for topics that should be included in the branch handbook

87% of the respondents provided details of topics

Whilst it was stated that the handbook would be divided into two parts, mandatory and guidance/good practice examples, other topics that were regularly highlighted included defining committee roles and committee members, events – particularly identifying speakers and writing speakers briefs, communications both in dealing with the media and general communications issues.

Feedback was also provided on the preferred format of the handbook.

6.5 Governance, including the branch reporting structure

Proposal that a standing committee should be created to provide a reporting structure for branches and groups up to the Board of Trustees. This committee should be populated using the Nominations Committee process.

53% of respondents agreed with the proposal
32% made comments on the proposal

The majority of comments were raised via the way that the committee should be populated and how the branches should be represented and queries regarding the structure and in particular a need for more explanation. A very strong case against using the Nominations Committee was made “Nominations Committee removes too many suitable candidates …… Needs to be democratic and Nominations Committee doesn’t allow this……weakens the democratic process”.

6.6 Processes for recognising the contribution made by branches and individuals

Recommendation that the Presidents Distinguished Award (which recognises individuals) should be given a higher profile.
Part a. Feedback requested for other ways of recognising individuals.

35% of the respondents agreed with the recommendation
46% provided additional ways of recognising individuals and

Many of those respondents who agreed with the recommendation did however query the process of the nomination as well as the award itself. “Yes I agree with recognising individuals and branches”; “Nominations should come from the Branch EC, not just the Branch chair”; “Too many members who, or have worked for the Institution are not being recognised”

Part b. Feedback on which areas of branch activity should be recognised through an awards process.

78% of the respondents felt that branch activity should be recognised
56% provided comments

Support for an award for branch activity was certainly higher than for individual activity, with a significant number of suggestions being given regarding recognising service to a branch and on a practical level, ways of assessing eligibility, process of nomination and presenting the award.

7. Next steps / recommended action

Taking into account the percentages of respondents agreeing with the various suggestions and recommendations, plus the percentage of respondents providing comments, each proposal can be assessed as to whether the proposal remains as per the initial suggestion, or whether re-working needs to be undertaken, and a course of action is proposed.

In addition, issues arising within the context of the proposals will be considered along with recommended actions.

Summary of outcomes

See attached table providing a summary of the outcomes. The Working Party is asked to comment on the recommendations and agree the course of action for each of the points. This will then ensure that the proposals that have majority support from Officials are adopted within the final recommendations, subject to sub-issues being considered, whilst those proposals where opinion was equally divided are considered further and refined recommendations brought back to the Working Party and subsequently to Branch Officials at the Branch Action Day for the final stage of consultation.
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