

PRE-JOB SAFETY MEETING SCORECARD

SOLUTION TO
EXCELLENT VIDEO

Edited by Edison Electric Institute's Power to Prevent SIF project teams.

Guidance on using this scorecard and rating a pre-job safety meeting is provided on the reverse side.

	STATEMENT	WEIGHT	TRUE = 1 FALSE = 0	WEIGHTED SCORE
	<i>EXAMPLE</i>	2	0	2*0=0
1	Everyone performing the job was present at the meeting. <i>Facilitator confirmed that everyone was there.</i>	4	1	4
2	The discussion was held as close to the work as reasonably possible. <i>Reasonable assumption that they're close to work</i>	4	1	4
3	<u>Major</u> work steps required to complete the job were identified and discussed. <i>Discussed work steps in order.</i>	4	1	4
4	Necessary tools and equipment were identified and discussed. <i>Tools and equipment discussed in detail.</i>	3	1	3
5	Hazards associated with the job were identified and discussed. <i>Most of the hazards were identified and discussed.</i>	5	1	5
6	Hazards posed by the environment or surrounding work were identified and discussed. <i>Discussed traffic in alley, traffic from homeowners, dogs, uneven ground, etc.</i>	4	1	4
7	Controls for each identified hazard were identified and discussed. <i>Discussed a control for each hazard identified</i>	5	1	5
8	<u>All</u> life-threatening hazards and their controls were verbally differentiated and emphasized. <i>All were identified and specifically emphasized.</i>	5	1	5
9	Hazards and necessary controls were documented. <i>Facilitator is holding the documentation.</i>	3	1	3
10	<u>All</u> required permits were discussed before the work begins. <i>Permit (OCC) will be obtained before work begins</i>	3	1	3
11	Potential changes were identified and discussed and a plan to address change was created. <i>Traffic, dogs, someone needing to leave garage</i>	4	1	4
12	The <u>importance</u> of stopping work to address an unexpected change, disruption, or hazard was discussed. <i>Did not emphasize the importance: just talked about stopping the work if a car pulls up</i>	4	0	0
13	Emergency response plans were reviewed, including individual roles and responsibilities. <i>No mention of emergency or response plans.</i>	3	0	0
14	Crew actively demonstrated their understanding of their work steps, hazards, and controls. <i>Crew actively engaged and confirmed.</i>	3	1	3
15	All crew members participated in the discussion by identifying hazards and controls. <i>Crew members actively participated.</i>	3	1	3
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (sum weighted scores for items 1 through 15)			50 ~ 88%	

Maximum Score = 57

PRE-JOB SAFETY MEETING SCORECARD

**SOLUTION TO
GOOD VIDEO**

Edited by Edison Electric Institute's Power to Prevent project teams.

Guidance on using this scorecard and rating a pre-job safety meeting is provided on the reverse side.

	STATEMENT	WEIGHT	TRUE = 1 FALSE = 0	WEIGHTED SCORE
	EXAMPLE	2	0	2*0=0
1	Everyone performing the job was present at the meeting. <i>Facilitator confirmed that everyone was there.</i>	4	1	4
2	The discussion was held as close to the work as reasonably possible. <i>Reasonable assumption that they're close to work</i>	4	1	4
3	<u>Major work steps</u> required to complete the job were identified and discussed. <i>In general, they went over the major worksteps. No detailed sequence is required to score 1.</i>	4	1	4
4	Necessary tools and equipment were identified and discussed. <i>Tools and equipment discussed in detail.</i>	3	1	3
5	Hazards associated with the job were identified and discussed. <i>Most of the hazards were identified and discussed.</i>	5	1	5
6	Hazards posed by the environment or surrounding work were identified and discussed. <i>Discussed traffic in alley, traffic from homeowners, dogs, uneven ground, etc.</i>	4	1	4
7	Controls for each identified hazard were identified and discussed. <i>Discussed a control for each hazard identified</i>	5	1	5
8	<u>All life-threatening hazards</u> and their controls were verbally differentiated and emphasized. <i>All were identified but NOT specifically emphasized.</i>	5	0	0
9	Hazards and necessary controls were documented. <i>Facilitator is holding the documentation.</i>	3	1	3
10	<u>All</u> required permits were discussed before the work begins. <i>Permit (OCC) was NOT obtained before work begins</i>	3	0	0
11	Potential changes were identified and discussed and a plan to address change was created. <i>Did not talk about car pulling out where they will have to stop.</i>	4	0	0
12	The <u>importance of stopping work</u> to address an unexpected change, disruption, or hazard was discussed. <i>No discussion about stopping work or change</i>	4	0	0
13	Emergency response plans were reviewed, including individual roles and responsibilities. <i>No mention of emergency or response plans.</i>	3	0	0
14	Crew actively demonstrated their understanding of their work steps, hazards, and controls. <i>Crew actively engaged and confirmed.</i>	3	1	3
15	All crew members participated in the discussion by identifying hazards and controls. <i>Crew members actively participated.</i>	3	1	3
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (sum weighted scores for items 1 through 15)			38 ~ 67%	

Maximum Score = 57

PRE-JOB SAFETY MEETING SCORECARD

**SOLUTION TO
POOR VIDEO**

Edited by Edison Electric Institute's Power to Prevent project teams.

Guidance on using this scorecard and rating a pre-job safety meeting is provided on the reverse side.

	STATEMENT	WEIGHT	TRUE = 1 FALSE = 0	WEIGHTED SCORE
	EXAMPLE	2	0	2*0=0
1	Everyone performing the job was present at the meeting. <i>Phone rang and one crew member left.</i>	4	0	0
2	The discussion was held as close to the work as reasonably possible. <i>Reasonable assumption that they're close to work</i>	4	1	4
3	<u>Major work steps</u> required to complete the job were identified and discussed. <i>No sufficient discussion of work steps, instead mentioned their experience.</i>	4	0	0
4	Necessary tools and equipment were identified and discussed. <i>Insufficient discussion about tools/equipment.</i>	3	0	0
5	Hazards associated with the job were identified and discussed. <i>Some but did not capture most of the hazards.</i>	5	0	0
6	Hazards posed by the environment or surrounding work were identified and discussed. <i>No discussion about adjacent hazards such as traffic, etc.</i>	4	0	0
7	Controls for each identified hazard were identified and discussed. <i>Insufficient discussion around controls.</i>	5	0	0
8	<u>All life-threatening hazards</u> and their controls were verbally differentiated and emphasized. <i>Missed hazards, no emphasis on the life-threatening.</i>	5	0	0
9	Hazards and necessary controls were documented. <i>Facilitator is holding a COFFEE CUP.</i>	3	0	0
10	<u>All</u> required permits were discussed before the work begins. <i>Permit (OCC) was NOT discussed at all.</i>	3	0	0
11	Potential changes were identified and discussed and a plan to address change was created. <i>No discussion about potential changes.</i>	4	0	0
12	The <u>importance of stopping work</u> to address an unexpected change, disruption, or hazard was discussed. <i>No discussion about stopping work or change</i>	4	0	0
13	Emergency response plans were reviewed, including individual roles and responsibilities. <i>Mentioned they will call 911 in case emergency</i>	3	1	3
14	Crew actively demonstrated their understanding of their work steps, hazards, and controls. <i>Crew member was missing, no explicit validation of understanding.</i>	3	0	0
15	All crew members participated in the discussion by identifying hazards and controls. <i>Crew member was missing, other crew member participated in casual conversation mostly.</i>	3	0	0
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (sum weighted scores for items 1 through 15)			7 ~ 12%	

Maximum Score = 57