

August 2019

The Supply Chain School Special Interest Group on Wellbeing

Initial meeting: summary,
actions & Terms of Reference

i. Summary

The Wellbeing SIG launched on 24th July at Marshalls Design Space, attended by approximately 20 School Partners.

The discussion benchmarked current activities on wellbeing in Partner organisations and their supply chains and examined opportunities for the School to support future work in this area.

Emerging themes:

- Most organisations have or are in the process of developing a corporate wellbeing policy;
- Emphasis at this stage is on desk-based employees and has not cascaded into the supply chain (i.e. the more strategic *occupier* piece is missing)
- Actions taken are currently on the low capex scale and are relatively easy wins, owing to absence of data to support the business case
- There was collective appetite for generating and sharing case studies, with some Partners more advanced in wellbeing programmes than others

Partner priorities:

- Developing the **business case for investing in wellbeing** i.e. link between productivity and wellbeing, understanding extent of mental health impact on the sector;
- Sharing **best practice, guidance and case studies** that showcase successes and failures
- Understanding the role of key stakeholders from the outset of built environment design to ensure that wellbeing is '**designed in**'
- Ability to push **maturity** on wellbeing, both internally and within the supply chain

ii. SIG Objectives

Proposed objectives (discussed at the meeting)

- To develop the business case for the wellbeing of users/occupiers of the built environment, by:
 - Developing a common language on wellbeing;
 - Understanding why wellbeing is important to business;
 - Establishing how wellbeing affects different stakeholders in the built environment;
 - Understanding the how the School may assist Partners to embed wellbeing in the supply chain.

Feedback on objectives

- Broad consensus on the substance of the objectives and a common understanding that these may develop as the SIG progresses
- Suggested emphasis was on developing the business case (particularly productivity), common metrics, best practice, maturity matrices and balance scorecard approaches, which touch on the intended outputs.
- Appetite to work with external partners and to avoid re-inventing the wheel (e.g. explore with Mind the extent to which mental health impacts the built environment sectors)
- Action on emergent trends and the role of the built environment (e.g. designing for wellbeing, access to nature, facilitating movement and physical activity, etc)

Revised objectives

- To demonstrate the business case for investing in wellbeing in the built environment, with reference to impacts on productivity, physiological and psychological health.
- To communicate the key trends driving occupier wellbeing and the implications for the built environment value chain
- To research and gather evidence of the impacts of wellbeing investments on downstream occupiers of the built environment (e.g. productivity)
- To develop School materials that reflect best practice on increasing supplier focus on wellbeing throughout the built environment value chain.

iii. Benchmarking current wellbeing activity among Partners

- **What?** Partners are engaged in a variety of internal initiatives to address the wellbeing of their workers. e.g. walking meetings, mental health first aiders, gym discounts, etc.
- **Why?** Partners identified the following common reasons for embedding wellbeing, although robust case studies to substantiate this had not been identified at this stage: Retention, cost saving from absenteeism, EMS compliance, Competitive advantage, Productivity, Attracting talent.
- **Who?** Partners identified their primary stakeholders as sitting at the employee/contractor end of the spectrum. Occupiers and downstream beneficiaries were not emphasised. A wide range of external charities and service providers have been engaged by Partners to address various elements of wellbeing. Partner

stakeholders are primarily engaged in wellbeing via corporate policies, internal communications, mental health champions, with a few citing case studies.

- **How?** Wellbeing is primarily monitored and measured with reference to HR data on absenteeism/ sickness, usage reports of EAP and similar, uptake of rewards schemes, interaction with Champions, wellness checks, employee engagement surveys, and to a lesser extent on air quality monitors, real time feedback and wellbeing KPIs. Responses on how wellbeing is reported were limited, with reference being made to Board reports, annual Sustainability reports, monthly HR updates, financial reports including cost savings data from wellbeing programmes.

iv. Future planning on wellbeing in the built environment

What more could the School do to help Partners embed wellbeing in the supply chain?

- Raise the level of ambition on wellbeing among partners (e.g. via maturity matrix)
- Move dialogue beyond employees (site or office based) to all downstream users and occupiers of the built environment
- Develop the business case for wellbeing (look at retrofitting wellbeing into business plan, or introducing balanced score card, front-end planning, collaboration between teams at all stages)
- Share best practice case studies and lessons learned
- Guidance on strategic collaboration for wellbeing in the design process (through case studies and step-by-step guide)
- Enable learning for organisations at different stages of progress on wellbeing through the supply chain
- Integrate wellbeing into other School events, groups and materials
- Demonstrate modular approach to designing in wellbeing to allow for adaptability to different projects, stakeholders and sectors.

What materials or resources do Partners need to do more?

There is a need for materials and resources that:

- Communicate wellbeing trends and updates to legislative and regulatory frameworks
- Encourage Partners and suppliers to move beyond the baseline
- Enable Partners and suppliers to make a convincing argument for wellbeing investments within their businesses

- Assist the rollout of wellbeing through the supply chain via guidance, tools, best practice
- Are applicable across the entire built environment
- Highlight joint responsibility for wellbeing i.e. not just the role of employees

Ideas for specific materials

- Wellbeing-specific learning module
- Guidance, case studies that reflect successes, failures and learnings, best practice within the sector and across different markets
- Visual materials such as a short film
- Workshop/ Toolbox talks / lunch and learn / webinar
- Update to the resource library
- Standard-form (but adaptable) matrix for assessing maturity on wellbeing

v. Terms of Reference

1. Definition. A group that meets as agreed, consisting of Partners and the Delivery Partner who wish to develop the School's Action on Wellbeing.

2. Aim. The aim of the Group is to increase knowledge and understanding of, and action on, wellbeing in the context of the built environment.

3. Objectives

- a) To develop the business case for investing in the wellbeing of users and occupiers of the built environment, including its impact on productivity and physiological and psychological health
- b) To communicate the key trends driving wellbeing and their implications for the built environment value chain
- c) To evidence the impacts of wellbeing investments on downstream users and occupiers of the built environment (e.g. productivity)
- d) To develop School materials that promote and guide best practice on embedding wellbeing in the built environment

4. Outcomes

- a) A collective rationale for investing in wellbeing of downstream users and occupiers of the built environment
- b) Increased learning, competence and ambition on wellbeing within the built environment sector

- c) An understanding of the scope of benefits derived from investments in downstream users and occupiers of the built environment
- d) A common language on wellbeing that is supported by School materials and enables Partners and other built environment stakeholders to assess wellbeing maturity

5. Representation

- a) The Group will consist of a Secretariat appointed by the Delivery Partner and who wish to support the School in this group and influence the outcome.
- b) A mix of active partners drawn from across the different School "departments".
- c) No more than one representative per organisation at meetings
- d) The School will assume the principle of "Collective Responsibility". In other words, all partners will be invited to participate but those who elect not to participate will empower the group to establish a position on behalf of the School

6. Substitution. One substitute per organisation; substitutions acceptable by people who are briefed and knowledgeable on the work of the group

7. Selection. The group will be self-selecting from Partners who wish to participate

8. Leadership & Delivery

- a) Chair, TBC
- b) Secretariat, Claire Bradbury

9. Timeframe. The Group will commence in July 2019 and run until approx. 1 May 2020.

vi. Next steps for the SIG

- Date of second meeting in Oct/Nov to be confirmed
- Partners to flag available venues
- Circulate Terms of Reference
- Prepare shortlist of outputs to be discussed at the next meeting
- Draft budget against proposed outputs to be shared at the next meeting

Appendix: Attendee list, 24 July 2019

	Name	Organisation
1	Emma-Jane Allen	Supply Chain Sustainability School
2	Laura Boccadamo	Berkeley Group
3	Claire Bradbury	Wellbeing Lead, Supply Chain Sustainability School
4	Andy Burrows	Lynch
5	Robert Cheeseman	Balfour Beatty
6	Clare Chinnock	Kier
7	Emma Davie	NG Bailey
8	Andrew Day	Telford Homes
9	Nicola Della Mura	Canary Wharf Group
10	Fiona Dowling	VGC Group
11	Feila Egan	Danny Sullivan Group
12	Katie Heron	Canary Wharf Group
13	Liz Holford	Supply Chain Sustainability School
14	Jayne Magee	Highways England
15	Emma Ramell	HBF
16	Denise Southard	Wates
17	James Timon	Bouygues
18	Mark Turner	Supply Chain Sustainability School
19	Penelope Ware	Carmichael