

PRE-JOB SAFETY MEETING SCORECARD

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
	EXAMPLE	2	0	2*0=0
1	Everyone performing the job was present at the meeting.	4		
2	The discussion was held as close to the work as reasonably possible.	4		
3	Major work steps required to complete the job were identified and discussed.	4		
4	Necessary tools and equipment were identified and discussed.	3		
5	Hazards associated with the job were identified and discussed.	5		
6	Hazards posed by the environment or surrounding work were identified and discussed.	4		
7	Controls for each identified hazard were identified and discussed.	5		
8	<u>All</u> life-threatening hazards and their controls were verbally <u>differentiated</u> and <u>emphasized</u> .	5		
9	Hazards and necessary controls were documented.	3		
10	<u>All</u> required permits were discussed before the work begins.	3		
11	Potential changes were identified and discussed and a plan to address change was created.	4		
12	The <u>importance of</u> stopping work to address an unexpected change, disruption, or hazard was discussed.	4		
13	Emergency response plans were reviewed, including individual roles and responsibilities.	3		
14	Crew actively demonstrated their understanding of their work steps, hazards, and controls.	3		
15	All crew members participated in the discussion by identifying hazards and controls.	3		
	TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (sum weighted scores for items 1 through 15)			



PRE-JOB SAFETY MEETING SCORECARD

This page provides <u>example</u> characteristics of a high-quality pre-job safety meeting. This is not a comprehensive list and the observer should use their best judgement when scoring.

SIIUU	nould use their best judgement when scoring.				
1	Everyone performing the job was present at the meeting.	 Everyone performing the planned task was present for the entire pre-job meeting. If working alone, plans were discussed with a supervisor, mentor, or co-worker. 			
	The discussion was held as close to the work	Meeting was held at or near where the work will be performed.			
2	as reasonably possible.	 Workspace was reviewed by the crew before starting the meeting. 			
3	<u>Major</u> work steps required to complete the job were identified and discussed.	Crew identified and discussed the major work steps.			
	Necessary tools and equipment were	Crew identified and discussed tools and equipment needed to safely complete			
4	identified and discussed.	the work.			
	identified and discussed.	Facilitator confirmed that the crew had all necessary tools and equipment.			
5	Hazards associated with the job were identified and discussed.	$\hfill\square$ Crew identified and discussed hazards associated with their tasks.			
	Hazards posed by the environment or	Crew identified and discussed the hazards created by other crews.			
6	surrounding work were identified and	Crew discussed how hazards they create may impact other crews.			
	discussed.	Crew identified and discussed hazards posed by the environment.			
7	Controls for each hazard were identified and discussed.	 Crew identified and discussed controls or management strategies associated with each identified hazard. 			
	All life-threatening hazards and their controls	Crew emphasized <u>all</u> hazards with the potential to cause serious injury or fatality.			
8	were verbally differentiated and emphasized.	Crew emphasized all controls for all hazards with potential to cause serious injury			
		or fatality.			
_	Hazards and necessary controls were	Crew completed required pre-job documentation.			
9	documented.	Facilitator confirmed that pre-job documentation is readily accessible.			
10	All required permits were discussed	Facilitator discussed all required work permits before the work began.			
	before the work begins.	Example permits are lock-out-tag-out, hot work, clearance, confined space.			
	Potential changes were identified and				
11	discussed and a plan to address change was	Crew identified and discussed possible changes to the work and work			
	created.	environment. Crew discussed the impacts of those changes on the safety.			
		Crew identified and discussed potential work conditions to use Stop Work			
	The importance of stopping work to address	Authority.			
12	an unexpected change, disruption, or hazard	 Crew discussed the protocol for using Stop Work Authority. 			
	was discussed.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	Emorgancy recomes plans were reviewed	Crew identified potential emergencies.			
13	Emergency response plans were reviewed,	Crew discussed the protocol to address emergencies.			
	including individual roles and responsibilities.	Crew discussed individual roles and responsibilities during an emergency.			
	Crow actively domentated their	Crew verbally acknowledged the hazards and controls.			
	Crew actively demonstrated their	 Crew demonstrated that they understand the safety expectations. 			
14	understanding of their work steps, hazards,	Facilitator confirmed that the crew members understand their roles and			
	and controls.	responsibilities.			
	All crow members participated in the				
15	All crew members participated in the discussion by identifying bazards and controls	Crew was active in the conversation by identifying hazards and controls, voicing			
	discussion by identifying hazards and controls.	comments or concerns, and providing specific details.			