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ASK ANY PLANT MANAGER or superintendent what each supervisor is achieving in parts produced per hour, reject percentages, control of direct labor and department machine use, and he most likely will provide an immediate and fairly accurate response. Ask that same senior officer about the safety performance or safety contributions achieved by each supervisor, and he might be hard-pressed to remember something as basic as department injury totals.

Many companies do not have a formal system for measuring and rating first-line supervisors for safety performance; it is not uncommon, however, for a company to use at least a basic system of safety in salary review. A basic system usually focuses on the number of accidents in a department. This is a noteworthy cause, but it falls short. Too often, a target is established for accident reduction that if met leads to some incentive in the annual salary review. Should the department experience zero injuries, the supervisor becomes a real hero. The question remains: Was the injury reduction due to the supervisor’s diligence in safety compliance and enforcement, or was it just luck?
Supervisors should be held accountable for preventing and reducing injuries in their departments. They should also be held accountable for compliance with prescribed company safety programs. By requiring the supervisor to achieve specific projects or tasks that improve departmental safety, injury reduction should logically follow. Those specific safety items assigned as objectives should be in line with what the organization is trying to achieve in safety performance.

As in all objective setting/planning, targets should be attainable and realistic, but not so easily attained that they carry no meaning or significance. In addition, specific objectives should be adjusted to the supervisor’s ability; it would be of no value to assign tasks or projects to supervisors who lack training and knowledge needed to achieve those tasks.

Objectives may need to be tailored to a department as well as to department supervisors. The supervisor’s annual salary review is a perfect time to measure the past year’s accomplishments. The review also serves as a golden opportunity to draft next year’s objectives. All objectives, including safety, should be measurable; every attempt should be made to use quantitative measurements and minimize qualitative measurements/judgments.

Specific safety program targets must be established by management, and each item should carry an assigned value or weighting for the purpose of salary review. With specifically assigned annual objectives that carry numerical weightings, the supervisor will always have a clear understanding of responsibilities. Supervisors can be assured of achieving safety objectives (with the possible exception of accident totals) because safety program items are within their control.

**What Objectives/Targets Should Be Used?**

Management must determine what is essential and necessary to the safety program, and what is assigned to each supervisor. For the sake of example, I have listed six specific safety program objectives for a typical supervisor’s salary review rating sheet. A model for a supervisor’s salary review rating sheet has also been included (pg. 57). An organization can determine any specific objective for salary review. I recommend the following objectives be used for rating each supervisor:

1. Safety meetings and training;
2. Department safety and health inspections;
3. Job safety analysis;
4. Accident investigations;
5. Investigation and correction of incidents;
6. Overall safety attitude of the supervisor.

An organization can require items other than those listed. The total number of program objectives can be increased or decreased depending on what is considered to be important. Now, let’s look at these safety objectives individually.

**Safety Meetings/Safety Training**

Education and communication are essential components of any safety program. Supervisors should be held accountable for conducting safety meetings in their departments. Some organizations require monthly department meetings for all employees; other organizations require weekly 10- to 15-minute toolbox talks. Safety meetings, however, should be a required element in any safety program, and each supervisor should be held accountable for the completion of meetings and personal attendance at safety training.

Management must determine desired frequency and duration of safety meetings between the supervisor and employees. The supervisor should know this in advance and plan the safety meeting schedule around it. Some form of documentation should follow each meeting. It is also important that a supervisor attends safety meetings concerning total plant safety.

In addition to management determining meeting frequency and duration, the quality of safety meetings must be part of the overall evaluation. It is essential that a supervisor attend scheduled safety training to improve or update personal safety skills. Recommendations for salary review considerations in this category are:
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✓ Complete and document scheduled safety meetings in the department.
✓ Attend plant or safety committee meetings.
✓ Attend first-aid, CPR, forklift, fire extinguisher or right-to-know training.
✓ Provide safety training for new employees assigned to the department.

Department Safety & Health Inspections

Safety inspections within a particular department are vital to loss control and overall accident prevention. The inspection form used by each supervisor should be specifically designed for the department being inspected. Items on the inspection list should be specific and necessary for OSHA-type compliance. Where possible, a member of a safety committee should assist in the inspection. Inspection frequency should be determined by management. A formal, monthly inspection may be adequate in one company; in others, semi-monthly or weekly inspections may be required. Recommendations for salary review considerations in this category are:

✓ Conduct a comprehensive department safety and health inspection at least monthly.
✓ Use a specific form for the inspection.
✓ Correct unsafe conditions and unsafe acts upon discovery when possible.
✓ Submit maintenance requests for those items that cannot be corrected, and follow up for corrective action.

Job Safety Analysis

If the organization is using a job safety analysis (JSA)-type program, each supervisor should be involved. A key to improved department safety is to analyze jobs so hazards can be eliminated. Employees should also be involved in this program; JSAs should always be completed with input solicited from employees—they know more about how a job is performed than anyone else. It makes sense to ask them to participate.

Each supervisor should be the first step. Priority should be given to those jobs that have caused the most serious injury, have a high potential for injury or have resulted in the greatest frequency of injuries. Jobs involving new operations or new machinery should also be on the priority list. With the advent of the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard, it is essential to perform JSA on chemicals handled in a particular department.

Management must decide the frequency of JSAs to be completed in each department. Each supervisor should be required to fully complete a set number of JSAs between salary reviews. Requirements should be based on need as well as the supervisor’s ability to complete the JSA properly. Initially, learning JSA techniques can be difficult for a supervisor; it requires repetition as well as ongoing coaching to produce quality JSAs. Quality of completed JSAs is far more important than quantity. Recommendations for salary review considerations in this category are:

✓ Complete a specific number of JSAs. One completed JSA every 2 to 3 months is reasonable.
✓ Include employees in the JSA process so that proper job performance is identified.
✓ Assess the overall quality of completed JSAs. Quality does not have to be a subjective measurement if management has a good model program by which to make comparisons.

Accident Investigation

When an accident occurs, proper accident investigation and problem-solving techniques can significantly aid in preventing future accidents. Supervisors must use correct problem-solving procedures and techniques; management must ensure that problem solving results in a safer department.

Supervisors must be measured on correct/proper accident investigations. Management should review and sign-off on all accident investigations. All contributing causes should be identified and corrected; correction should be for those items for which the supervisor is responsible and able to correct. Recommendations for salary review considerations in this category are:

✓ Has the accident investigation form been properly completed within a given time period (24 to 48 hours)?
✓ Was the proper form used and was it properly completed?
✓ Were items identified as in need of corrective action properly completed or resolved by the supervisor?

Should a supervisor complete a salary review year without an injury in the department, management should require the completion of a “simulated” accident investigation to ensure that the supervisor maintains the proper skills for this task.

Investigation & Correction of Incidents

Each member of management must be aware that there are far more incidents in the workplace than there are accidents. Incidents can be described as accidents waiting to happen; events such as near-hits, close calls, and damage to equipment, property or product can all be referred to as incidents. Incidents usually do not cause bodily harm with the exception of those involving minor first aid. If you have ever heard someone say, “I knew someone would get hurt doing that one of these days,” you have just heard reference to an incident.

Accidents that cause injury are costly to an organization. Occurrences such as product damage, equipment stoppage and damage to company property are far more costly and, therefore, deserve management’s attention. Daily correction of these dangerous situations, which many people regard as commonplace, must be part of the supervisor’s responsibilities. Management should have a formal
## Supervisor's Review Rating Sheet for Safety Performance

(Circle appropriate evaluation points for performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Items</th>
<th>None or N/A</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Safety Meetings/Safety Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does supervisor conduct a safety meeting each month for his/her department?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does supervisor attend a department or plant safety meeting each month?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does supervisor attend training programs such as first aid, CPR, forklift, etc.?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does supervisor give new or transferred employees a safety orientation?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Safety &amp; Health Inspections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is supervisor conducting monthly safety/health inspections?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is a proper form being used?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are unsafe actions or conditions being corrected as soon as possible?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are corrective action work orders being submitted on time?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) Job Safety Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is one JSA completed every other month?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are employees participating in each JSA?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is quality of JSA meeting standards?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Accident Investigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completed and submitted within 24 to 48 hours?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completely filled out on company form?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have recommendations for corrective action been completed?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5) Incident/Noninjury Reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are significant incidents being investigated?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the completed incident form being submitted with photos?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is corrective action taken on the incident?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6) Supervisor’s Safety Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does supervisor demonstrate a sincere interest in his/her employees’ safety?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Key
- 30-48 points = Adequate @ 5% of review
- 49-55 points = Average @ 10% of review
- 56-63 points = Excellent @ 15% of review
- 64-72 points = Distinguished @ 20% of review

**TOTAL SCORE**

Date: ____________________________

Name of Supervisor: ____________________________

Signature of Manager: ____________________________

Facility: ____________________________

Overall Point/Performance Total: ____________________________
program that requires recording, reporting and correction of incidents. Because incidents of varying degrees of severity occur on an ongoing basis, only those of significance should be investigated; otherwise, the supervisor could spend valuable time just completing incident reports.

To help protect a company’s bottom line, enhance profitability and productivity, and reduce injuries, an organization should require each supervisor to:

✓ Investigate significant incidents, record details and take corrective action.
✓ Forward completed forms to management (with photos, where possible). There is no limit on how many incident reports can be submitted.
✓ Follow up to ensure corrective action in resolving the problem.

Supervisor’s Safety Attitude
This section of the salary review form requires a subjective judgment by management. If the supervisor has attained high marks in all of the five previous sections, s/he most likely has a positive safety attitude. This should be apparent to the management member conducting the salary review. The supervisor should also identify and help resolve safety problems in other departments, and s/he should make it apparent that s/he regards department safety as an integral part of the job.

Consistent enforcement of the safety rules is another key indicator of positive attitudes. Recommended measurement items listed in this category should ask that the supervisor demonstrates, in a way apparent to management, a consistent interest in the safety of employees in the department.

How to Use the Rating System
Note the scoring key at the bottom of the rating sheet (pg. 57). This sheet uses five separate categories for rating a supervisor. The rating categories are:

• None or Not Acceptable: Either not complete or not applicable.
• Adequate: Just passing or sufficient, the lowest rating possible.
• Average: Average performance by a supervisor, meeting expectations.
• Excellent: Well above average performance, significant accomplishments for the program.
• Distinguished: Highest rating possible—fully satisfies all categories.

After rating the supervisor, add all the circled points awarded in each category and apply the point total to match the appropriate rating category. The supervisor will likely have an interest in how s/he is being rated; s/he should already know if the safety tasks assigned the previous year have been successfully completed.

Because safety performance is only one area of responsibility for salary review considerations, the percentage applied in this category should be meaningful. The percentage attached to safety should be equal to management’s desire for improvement; it is not unreasonable to attach 20 to 25% of the supervisor’s annual review to safety performance. The rating sheet used in this article uses a 20% rating as an example. An organization can simply adjust the numbers on the form for any percentage it wishes to use for safety performance. The maximum points available in this example are 72.

The scoring or point values can be adjusted depending on items being measured. Once points have been totaled, compare point value to percentage of salary increase identified on the form.

Conclusion
Using a formal salary review rating system and program such as this helps establish objectives and ultimately helps ensure a safer workplace. Supervisors would know in advance what is required—they realize that if they achieve assigned objectives, they can at least count on 20% (as in the example) of their total allotted salary increase. Management can also identify the achievers, and each will profit in many ways by improving overall safety. Professional growth of the supervisor is also enhanced through this formal system.

A program such as this helps simplify management’s rating of safety performance and provides the supervisor with firmly established objectives. A formal rating sheet helps reduce ambiguity; it also makes full use of the key elements in the company safety program that senior management wants the supervisor held accountable for. A formal system also helps lower injury rates and costs, and enhances OSHA compliance.

A study conducted by the author several years ago supports the use of safety performance evaluation in supervisor’s salary review. Forty-seven safety directors from 22 different industries in 11 states participated in the study. When given a list of 10 items ranging from salary review, hazard identification, newsletters, off-the-job safety and various incentive programs, 33 of the 47 respondents voted that the use of this type of program was mandatory. Another 11 participants voted that the use of safety performance in salary review was appropriate in most situations. Of the 10 items listed in this section of the study, the use of salary review performance was placed first.

It is recommended that any organization wishing to move toward a more professional organization should use a program such as the one outlined in this article.
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