Overview of DOE Evaluation Project & Report

- WTP and the National Clearinghouse are working on completing an evaluation project and report for the DOE program as a whole.

- This project will include an analysis of evaluation methods and best practices (2015 – 2018) in an attempt to report the following:
  - Common themes
  - Successes
  - Challenges of evaluation
Methods

• Pull evaluation profiles for all DOE grantees from 2012 evaluation workshop
  o Send profiles to PIs and request that they review and update the profiles

• Review all evaluation reports submitted by grantees in DMS between 2015 and 2018 (in progress)
  o Analyze reports for common themes, challenges, and successes (in progress)

• Compile an overall analysis report that:
  o Summarizes DOE grantees, history at sites, and evaluation methods/processes
  o Highlights innovative evaluation methods being used, as well as themes, challenges, successes, and impacts
  o Highlights gaps of current evaluation methods or findings
  o Provides recommendations (as needed) regarding future evaluation efforts
Preliminary Findings

Types of information collected from trainees included:

- Demographics
- Work experience
- Worker protection and use of PPE
- Hazards faced on the job (e.g., heat, falls)
Preliminary Findings

Evaluation methods

- Paper-based (e.g., eval forms)
- Self audits
- Online tools and databases
- Trainee anecdotes and stories
- Trainee follow-up
- Specific programs and co-teaching opportunities (e.g., Instructor Evaluation Program; Mentor and Local Instructor Program)
- Third-party evaluations

Major categories evaluated

- Course format and content
- Instructors and peer trainers (e.g., knowledge, teaching skills, performance)
- Materials
- Teaching/course delivery (e.g., hands-on activities)
- Training effectiveness
Preliminary Findings

Outputs (for trainees)

- More aware of health/safety issues
- Increased capacity to recognize hazards
- Conduct pre-job analysis
- Improved workplace conditions
- Wearing proper PPE
- Gained skills on specific jobs
- How to protect self and peers
- Awareness of emergency response actions and drills

Outputs (for grantees)

- New courses and course formats for grantees
- Trainee recommendations used to update course delivery and activities
Preliminary Findings

Examples of trainee anecdotes and impacts:

…a worker from Piketon said, “I was on a crew of workers that were supposed to transport old items for packaging. There was a sign that read there was a possibility of asbestos above six feet only. When questioned, the supervisor stated the chemical operators decontaminated the lower six feet. Because of the HAZWOPER training, our crew paused the job. We questioned the possibility of the asbestos becoming airborne due to the movement of the items. Because of the training we received, our crew is more aware of the hazardous chemicals we face every day on a D&D project and has brought solidarity to fight for a safer workplace.”
Preliminary Findings

Examples of trainee anecdotes and impacts:

• An IUPAT member from North Carolina took the asbestos refresher training in Georgia and reported that in one case, dust containing asbestos spilled onto the top of a scaffold. Instead of sweeping the dust to remove it, he and his team put on Tyvek suits and respirators, damped down the dust with a H2O sprayer that had liquid surfactant in it to wet the dust and prevent it from flying through the air, thus enabling it to be contained.

• “Because of the HAZWOPER training provided by the ___ Center, our crew paused the job until we get the right equipment for the job task. An example is obtaining the right attachment for the forklift before proceeding with the job. In most cases, it just takes a few minutes to change one or two things to make the job safer and easier for the worker.”
Preliminary Findings

A twenty-year metal trades employee, who took Hazwaste refresher training at Hammer, in the summer of 2016, told how training was responsible for deescalating what could have been a much more serious chemical exposure.

• The event occurred at 200 West Pump & Treat, which is part of the Hanford Site. It as a “legacy site” where ground water contamination is being remedied. An incident took place in the spring of 2016 at the water treatment plant where large conveyor belts transport the chemicals. Someone had failed to close the vents on top of some of the tanks so that the chemicals in the tanks generated sulfur dioxide that was released into the air above the tanks, exposing two of the workers to the fumes.

• Once the workers were exposed, they could not breathe; they backed away from the open vents and were treated at the hospital and returned to work later that day. They did not suffer long-term effects.

• The result of this incident was a re-evaluation of the use of the chemicals that injured the two workers and the elimination of those chemicals. Because both workers had been trained, they knew the proper procedure to follow in such an emergency and did so by backing away and leaving the area where they had been exposed.
Next Steps & What We Need From You

• We will email 2012 evaluation profiles to PIs and request that these be updated and sent back
  o In this email, we will indicate what information and reports we have available in the DMS
  o Anticipate a **two-week turnaround** for updated profiles – is this feasible?

• Are there **other ongoing evaluation analyses** going on within your organizations?

• Any **other ideas of things that we should consider** looking at for the purpose of the analysis/evaluation report?