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The country of Japan has the fastest, most efficient train system in the world. It transports more than 40 million people each year, and the “Point and Call” safety system is given credit for its high efficiency. This system has been proven to avoid mistakes by requiring every worker to call out what they are doing or what is happening as they point to it. For example, “I’ve checked the engines” or “I am closing the doors right now.”

The Japanese Industrial and Health Association adopted the “Point and Call” occupational safety method that requires co-action and co-reaction communication. The result is the engagement of the operators’ brains, eyes, mouths, hands, and ears. Gesturing and speaking out the status requires and maintains focus and attention. It guarantees intentionality and keeps the employees and riders safe. Efficiency increases productivity. While Japanese train drivers first used the method, it is now commonly used in other Japanese industries. It is also used in our own New York City subway system.

While some perceive this system as impractical for many businesses, it warrants consideration because it demonstrates that a relationship between safety, efficiency, and productivity exists. Efficiency is, in part, the result of a successful safety record. Efficiency always increases productivity. Productivity results in more significant revenue, and revenue drives everything in business. It all loops back to safety. There is enormous value in training and implementing safe work practices. As necessary, it is the responsibility of the business owner to provide a safe place for employees.

Provide a Safe Physical Environment
Creating a safe physical environment for employees and customers is essential. Maintaining the physical building and its property requires monitoring for safe conditions to prevent accidents. While the property owner is ultimately responsible, a business owner wants to do all he can to keep employees and customers safe. The most common accident in an office setting are accidents that involve falls, so to increase workplace safety, consider posting warning signs for icy conditions, and conducting seasonal inspections to confirm walkways remain level. Confirm that all entrances, exits, and parking lots are well-lit. Install handrails and non-skid stair treads, runners or stair tape on concrete stairs, and keep hallways and floor space clear of obstructions. Following all safety measures may not prevent an accident, but it will reduce the chances for one.

Establish a Written Evacuation Route
Regardless of the size of the building, every business should post a written evacuation route in plain site of employees and visitors in the event of a fire or emergency. An
annual fire drill should also be planned where employees gather at a safe meeting site near, but off, the property. Managers must account that every team member is present.

A plan for the emergency condition weather condition of tornados should also be in view. One customer said she was visiting a business when the emergency broadcast system interrupted the music playing in the reception area with menacing and repeated warnings of “take shelter immediately.” With a glance out the window at the green sky told everyone the threat was severe. The employees of the business panicked. They were at a loss and offered no guidance. The customers in the building were the ones who asked for the location of the nearest stairwell and interior walls. It was an intense and chaotic scene. While the tornado touched down nearly one mile away, the reputation and expertise of the business suffered in the minds of the customer who experienced this threat. It is the responsibility of the company to ensure it keeps both its employees and its customers safe on the property.

**Know the Risks of Vehicles on the Job**

Another area where a lack of safety knowledge can impact the business financially is vehicular accidents on work time. Firms who provide work (fleet) vehicles recognize the potential for accidents. They routinely train for safety, monitor the driving records of employees, and have adequate liability insurance. Small business owners that do not offer fleet vehicles may underestimate the likelihood that an employee driving their vehicle to run work errands presents a potential danger for the business. Should an accident occur, the business may be targeted for legal action. A large workman’s compensation claim and higher premiums may be the result of an injury to the employee. A smart business owner plans for the unexpected.

First, identify all employees who utilize fleet or personal vehicles to perform duties for the company in any capacity. This includes the service tech who is on the road each day as well as the admin clerk who purchases cleaning and office supplies at Costco each week and goes to the bank and post office each afternoon. While it doesn’t include private contractors who work for the company, it does include the salesperson visiting potential clients, the management person checking on employees or visiting current clients, as well as the vice president meeting with a client to negotiate a contract.

Many companies fail to recognize that any employee performing duties for the company that would be considered “work” is liable for the safe action of the employee in the general public. Therefore, it is essential to consider the driving record for all employees who drive while on the clock. Whether the employee is in a company or personal vehicle, implementing a safe driving program will provide long-term benefits for the employee and the company. For the small business without a fleet, the driving program may be
regular safe driving discussions at the daily huddles or monthly staff training. It should always include awareness for monitoring the driving records of any employee who spends any portion of their workday in a vehicle.

Why is safety important? For every dollar invested in a good safety program, four to six dollars are recovered through lower workman compensation costs, increased productivity, and higher employee morale. The Japanese “Point and Call” method may not be necessary for every business or occupational setting, but there is a compelling need for co-action and co-reaction communication. When employees and employers incorporate safety into their efficiency and productivity efforts, a business can truly thrive.

Employee dies in trench collapse attempting to rescue co-worker

Merriell Moyer

A fatal trench collapse involving a worker killed attempting to save a co-worker serves as a tragic reminder that rescue attempts should only be made when it’s safe to do so and only by trained individuals.

Responding to the incident without first checking to see if the scene was safe cost one worker his life as he tried to save an employee who was buried when the trench collapsed.

Trench had no shoring

Jonathan Stringer, 24, was working on the Skookumchuck Wind Project – a 38-turbine project being constructed by RES-Americas – in a remote area of Ranier, WA, attempting to place a pipe under a culvert.

Heavy equipment was used to make a trench for the pipe, which cable would later be run through, but due to the location and angle of the culvert, a trench typically dug 4 feet deep, had to be dug down to about 15 feet.

A worker climbed down into the trench, which wasn’t protected with shoring or any other protective measures, to attach a strap to the sleeve so it could be pulled into position by a track-hoe.

As the worker attached the strap, a piece of the east side of the trench caved in, completely covering him with 12 to 18 inches of dirt and rock, according to a story in The Daily Chronicle.

No hesitation

Without hesitation, Stringer climbed into the trench along with another worker to rescue their co-worker, using their bare hands to dig at the dirt and rock.

However, another section of the east side of the trench gave way, burying Stringer completely and covering the other rescuer to his knees.

The second rescuer dug himself out, called for help on a radio he was carrying and jumped back into the trench to try to free Stringer and the other man.
About 25 other workers arrived with shovels to help dig the two men out.

One dead, one critically injured

The first victim of the collapse was found critically injured but alive and he was safely extracted from the trench.

Stringer could be heard calling out to his co-workers, but after 30 minutes he went silent. His co-workers eventually uncovered his left arm, torso and neck, but there was no pulse.

The local sheriff’s office and the Washington Department of Labor & Industries are still actively investigating the incident.

Ensure scene is safe before attempting rescue

This incident clearly illustrates the reason why only those trained to respond to emergencies should make rescue attempts and only if they can confirm the scene is safe for them to enter.

First responders are trained to always ensure a scene is safe before attempting a rescue because rushing in and adding another person who needs to be rescued will only complicate an already bad situation.
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For Workers’ Comp World, Coronavirus is a Real “Snake in the Grass” - abridged

Thomas A. Robinson

The world is transfixed by a new enemy: the coronavirus. I just received an email from my bank reminding me how I can use my accounts’ electronic features so as to avoid personal contact. In the last two working days, I’ve received two emails and a phone call from concerned HR officials asking what impact I thought the virus might have on the workers’ compensation world.

Channeling justice Moschzisker, then a justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in an opinion penned more than 100 years ago, I told them, “As far as I’m concerned, the coronavirus is a real snake in the grass.” Let me explain.

McCauley v. Imperial Woolen Company

Initially, may I note justice Moschzisker’s splendid metaphor. The case, McCauley v. Imperial Woolen Co., 261 Pa. 312, 104 A. 617 (1918), involved a “wool sorter” who went to work healthy one morning in 1916, got a scratch on his neck, and died three days later of anthrax poisoning.

In this time before occupational disease coverage — wool sorters were known to be more susceptible to anthrax than the general public — the justice saw the circumstances as essentially being equivalent to an accident injury.

According to the justice, McCauley’s exposure to anthrax was just as though a serpent, concealed in the material upon which he was working, had unexpectedly and suddenly bitten him [McCauley v. Imperial Woolen Co., 261 Pa. 312, 104 A. 617, 622-
623 (1918), additional citation omitted; emphasis added].

**Coronavirus is Not an Occupational Disease**

I mention this old case to make my first point: as I argued here more than five years ago about the ebola virus, coronavirus disease is not an occupational disease. As noted in Larson’s Workers’ Compensation Law, § 52.03[3], in most jurisdictions, the “principal component in the occupational disease definition is the distinction from diseases which might as readily be contracted in everyday life or in other occupations.”

That is to say that while the risk of contracting the disease may be much greater among those in the healthcare community, the disease isn’t actually an incident of healthcare work as, for example, byssinosis was an incident of work within Southern cotton mills decades ago. With rare exception, byssinosis could not be contracted outside of the textile industry. The risk of coronavirus isn’t limited to those who treat patients. Just ask the people who disembarked from the cruise ship in Oakland, California yesterday.

That is, the straightforward question becomes, “Did the coronavirus condition arise out of and in the course of the employment?” Ample precedent for this sort of analysis exists within our courts.

Employees who can show either an actual risk of disease or who face an increased risk are likely to be able to establish their claims for coronavirus disease, utilizing AOE/COE rationale.

**Traveling Employees**

Traveling employees will also see significant success in establishing claims. The arguments here are somewhat similar to those involving nurses and other healthcare workers: it can easily be argued that those whose work requires travel to China, Italy, or other “hot zones” are more susceptible to the virus. That claim will be buttressed by the expansion of compensation rules available to traveling employees [see Larson’s Workers’ Compensation Law, §§ 14.01, 25.01, et seq.].

Thus, in Pacific Employers Ins. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com., 19 Cal. 2d 622, 122 P.2d 570 (1942), the Supreme Court of California affirmed an
award of benefits to a coffee salesperson who contended he had contracted Valley Fever in connection with his work. Indeed, he had been hired to travel through California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. The Commission found that there was strong evidence that the disease was endemic to the San Joaquin Valley, and that the employee had not been in the San Joaquin Valley except in the course of his employment. The court found that where an employee’s duties required him to travel and he suffered injuries in the course of that travel, the injury arose out of and occurred in the course of employment.

Other travel cases include the following:


**Arising Out of the Employment Issue**

As can be seen in the cases in which benefits have been awarded, the claimant was successful in showing not only that the disease was contracted in the course of the employment — that is, during the time and place of the employment — but that the risk of injury arose from the employment. For those outside the healthcare field or those whose employment requires extensive travel to “hot zones,” the arising out of the employment test will likely spell doom for their claims.

**Hypothetical**

It’s in this discussion that I tend to get the firmest push-back from some of you. Pretend we’re back in law school and consider the following hypothetical:

You work in an office with a cubicle arrangement for workstations. Your standing at your “cube” talking to a coworker about some work-related issue, when she sneezes on you. Three days later, you notice that you have some symptoms of flu. You’re out of work for a week. Do you have a compensable claim?

In most jurisdictions, the categorical answer is, “No.” Aside from the medical causation issue — i.e., did you catch the flu from the coworker or from the flu germs on the shopping cart at the local Harris-Teeter — it will be difficult to show that your flu resulted from a risk of employment; you face the same sort of risk when you go home or when you walk about in public. I argue that the same should be true for the coronavirus.

Parenthetically, there appears to be but one case in which workers’ compensation benefits have been awarded for the flu [see Lawhead v. United Airlines, 59 Haw. 551, 584 P.2d 119, 125 (1978)]. Crucial to that decision, however, was Hawaii’s strong presumption of compensability. Since no other state has such a strong presumption, the case will be of little help to those whose claims involve the flu.
Coronavirus is a Snake in the Grass — Not a Risk of Employment (for Most of Us)

The coronavirus, while certainly dangerous and scary — might we please bear in mind that according to data released by the Centers for Disease Control, during 2017-2018, our country endured 45 million cases of influenza, resulting in more than 810,000 hospitalizations, and more than 61,000 deaths — is simply not a risk that arises out of the employment for most of us. As I say, it’s a real snake in the grass. It is going to continue to be disruptive — check your 401(k) balances — and some of us may even contract it during the next few months. It will be weaponized by politicians and it will be the opening news story on many nightly broadcasts.

Natural disasters sell newspapers (used to sell?); now they increase viewership of online news sources and television. North Carolina stations note that hurricane season bumps up viewership, so reporters head for the Outer Banks between June and October each time the wind blows and the barometer tracks lower. There may be plenty to worry about out there, but the ability of the workers’ compensation system to endure the claims that may be filed is not something that should be too disruptive.

If you disagree, email me at tom@workcompwriter.com.

The Workcomp Writer

Blog

March 10, 2020
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10 OSHA Myths That Still Impact Attitudes Toward Safety

David Paoletta

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) sets and enforces safety standards for the workplace. It’s a simple job description but a huge undertaking. And given that negative attitudes toward the agency are pervasive among U.S. employers and workers, OSHA’s authority has taken on an almost mythical quality, and many
misconceptions about the agency’s powers remain. It’s not just negative attitudes toward OSHA that affect how your program is managed, though. Even positive misconceptions need to be corrected if they’re leading you to waste time and energy on the wrong things. Let’s bust a few enduring OSHA myths.

**Myth 1: True Compliance Is Impossible Due to the General Duty Clause**

While many see the General Duty Clause as a catch-all under which inspectors can fine you for almost any general safety violation, the clause only requires you to remove recognized hazards that pose a risk of serious injury or death to your employees.

To cite you under the General Duty Clause, the inspector has to demonstrate that a hazard exists and that no other safety standard applies. This is complicated and time consuming for the agency because the Area Director is required to review all proposed Section 5(a)(1) violations. However, if the hazard is serious, recognized, and able to be corrected, they will cite you.

To bust this myth, release your employees from the pressure to immediately correct the smallest of potential hazards. Instead, assess your overall operations and safety practices, and implement the programs required to control serious risks, such as lockout/tagout and machine guarding for a manufacturing company.

**Myth 2: If I Invite OSHA to Inspect My Business, I Will Be Immune to Citations**

If you invite OSHA to inspect your business, it will send a consulting team, not an inspection team. Any potential violations will be noted by the consultation inspector, and your company will be expected to correct them. However, if you fail to correct the hazards identified during your consulting audit within the deadline provided, OSHA can (and will likely) still cite you.

OSHA may also conduct a compliance audit if a complaint is filed or a serious incident occurs at the facility, regardless of your having worked with the consultation section.

It’s still a great idea to invite OSHA to inspect your company, especially if your workers regularly assume fall risks by working on ladders, scaffolding, or rooftops. Bust this myth by taking the inspectors’ reports seriously and improving worker safety.

**Myth 3: OSHA Prioritizes Large Companies**

It can be true that with large companies, more employees are likely to be at risk when a safety concern is present. Therefore, if OSHA prioritizes inspecting a large company, it’s because of the perceived level of risk, not the size of the company alone.
OSHA inspections follow a hierarchy based on what type of workplace hazard has been brought to the agency’s attention. The hierarchy is imminent danger situations, severe injuries and illnesses, worker complaints, referrals, targeted inspections, and follow-up inspections. So, a small company presenting an imminent threat will always be higher on the list than a large company without one.

To bust this myth, remember that OSHA citations of large and recognizable companies are more likely to make the news. Any place can get inspected and cited if it has a fatality, a serious injury, or an imminent threat to workers in its offices, factories, or jobsites.

Myth 4: OSHA Inspectors Will Enforce Our Written Safety Policy

Totally false! OSHA inspectors can only enforce violations of OSHA Health and Safety Standards that apply to your work situation and/or Section 5(a)(1)—they won’t even enforce standards written in OSHA publications.

To bust this myth, improve your safety policy with additional consensus standards provided by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), or the American Society of Safety Professionals (ASSP)—and don’t sweat it.

Myth 5: If OSHA Comes to Inspect You, Employees Should Stop Working

This tongue-in-cheek joke has turned into a jobsite myth in some circles. Yes, you may refuse to allow a site inspection without a warrant, and it’s smart to escort the inspector to applicable areas of your worksite. However, if you order your employees to stop working during an inspection, you risk legal repercussions that may include criminal charges or additional fines. OSHA investigators must verify that workers are safe during an on-site audit.

If you know roughly when the inspector is coming (although the vast majority of inspections are unannounced), it’s a good idea to perform a preinspection of your own to make sure no obvious unsafe conditions are present. Provide training for your workers on what to do in the event of an inspection, and ensure they understand that they should cooperate and answer an inspector’s questions truthfully. Employees also have the right to speak with the inspectors privately if they request to without fear of retaliation from the company.

Myth 6: You Should Place Incidents That Required First-Aid Treatment on Your OSHA 300 Log, Just in Case

OSHA recordkeeping rules stipulate that serious work-related injuries, such as
death; injuries requiring days away from work (when ordered by a doctor), restricted work, or a transfer to another job; or loss of consciousness, be recorded on the OSHA 300 log. Also, any injury requiring medical treatment beyond first aid must be recorded. However, minor injuries requiring basic first aid are exempted from recording—and you may be cited with a de minimis violation if you record them anyway.

**Myth 7: OSHA Is Funded by Penalty Fines, or Inspectors Have a Citation Quota**

Since OSHA’s federal budget cut made the news in 2017, this myth has become less pervasive. Even so, it’s still tempting to believe inspectors have an incentive to find as much wrong with your worksites as possible. Actually, any funds generated from enforcement actions go to the U.S. Treasury, and OSHA’s budget is set by Congress.

Bust this myth by reminding yourself and your team that OSHA inspections primarily occur when there is a report of imminent danger or there has been a fatality or multiple recordable serious injuries. When viewed through that lens, it makes sense as to why inspectors would be thorough during an inspection—lives are on the line.

**Myth 8: OSHA Will Cite the Temp Agency or Contractor, Not My Company, for Violations Involving Temp or Contracted Employees**

Although companies that use temporary workers can avoid some of the hiring requirements and Human Resources paperwork that go along with “direct hire” employees, OSHA compliance and recording of work-related accidents are the responsibility of the company directing the employees’ work.

According to OSHA, “Temporary staffing agencies and host employers share control over the worker, and are therefore jointly responsible for temporary workers’ safety and health.... Therefore, it is essential that both employers comply with all relevant OSHA requirements.”

When you take on temporary hires, ensure they are trained, well-supervised, and included in all aspects of your safety program.

**Myth 9: We Need OSHA-Certified Training and PPE to Be Compliant**

OSHA requires site- or job-specific worker training to comply with certain safety standards like hazard communication, emergency action plans, forklift operations, etc. However, OSHA does not specifically certify one training class or training provider over another.

The same is true for personal protective equipment (PPE) and other types of safety equipment like fall prevention harnesses. OSHA adopts guidelines established by standard-setting...
organizations such as the ANSI and NFPA to set testing and performance requirements for manufacturers to follow. As standards change, OSHA enforces them to ensure the latest, best materials and techniques are used in the workplace to provide maximum employee safety.

Myth 10: OSHA Can Shut Down Worksites and/or Order Arrests

This isn’t exactly a myth. OSHA technically can do both of those things but only under very specific circumstances. Although an OSHA inspector can halt or pause operations when an imminent danger situation exists (such as finding workers in an unprotected trench), total shutdowns happen extremely rarely and require a court order. It is also not likely that OSHA would initiate arrests during or after a facility inspection. OSHA is required to refer cases of a suspected criminal nature (usually criminal negligence that leads to a fatality or major incident) to the U.S. Department of Justice for action. Inspectors don’t have the authority to make arrests.

Shift Your Thinking and Transform Your Safety Program

Today, most business owners have realized safety is not a productivity hang-up. It’s a vital workplace system that should be fully integrated into project management processes and technology.

Having an effective safety and health program saves money by preventing accidents that stop production and injuries that lead to lost productivity and huge hospital and insurance costs. Likewise, OSHA is not the faceless enforcer of pointless rules—it’s the guardian of commonsense safety practices in the United States.

EHS Daily Advisor
Online Edition
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5 Levels of Leadership by John C. Maxwell

Toolshero

Background 5 Levels of Leadership

No matter we’re talking about a business man, a football trainer or a teacher; the thing they have in common is that they are leaders. But at what level of leadership are they, how do they treat their employees, what do they think about results, deadlines and so on? Every leader operates at his own level. According to John C. Maxwell, there are five levels. John C. Maxwell is a well-known American author of mainly leadership books. In this book The 5 Levels of Leadership, he describes 5 leadership levels that eventually lead to a phase of maturity. With this book, he wants to help leaders understand and increase their effectiveness.

What are the 5 Levels of Leadership?

The first level is the starting point of leadership. For each level, John C. Maxwell explains how the
respective leader can be identified and what that leader can do to grow to the next, higher level. The leadership level can vary per person and even has to do with the type of organisation someone works in and the personal development leaders go through.

The levels start with insight into personal relationships and the connections with the results that are being achieved. From there, it continues to the level at which employees believe in their leader’s vision. A result of that is that leaders will properly train their successors. It ends when the leader is perceived as an example by the people around them. According to Maxwell, after every level there is always the possibility to grow to the level above it.

1. Position

This is the starting point of leadership. It is the level at which the leader has achieved the right to lead in an organisation without any difficulty. Anyone can be appointed to this position. For that reason, it tells you nothing about the person’s leadership qualities. At this level, the leader is not or barely able to influence others and he uses his job title to get things done. John C. Maxwell argues that the expression, ‘it is lonely at the top’ is typical for this level of leadership; employees do not see the leader as someone they can trust. Let alone someone to discuss things with. Employees who report to a leader like that are generally unmotivated, prefer to avoid him and even consider changing jobs.

This level is common in growing organisations. Departments are getting larger and that means an increased need for managers. Usually, one of the employees is given the newly awarded status of leader. Because he has little or no experience, it is only about his status and not about who he is or how he handles his employees. Only when this new leader realises that there is more to leadership, will he be able to grow to the next level. This level is therefore a fine starting point to experience and learn the ropes of leadership.

2. Permission

This leadership level is about the human relationships that the leader has built up around him. It is like he is given ‘permission’ to act as leader; he is a trustworthy individual and his employees tend to agree with the decisions he makes. Because he has a good relationship with them, the leader realises that it becomes easier for employees to make extra effort. Part of their motivation comes from themselves, but it is also a result of their leader believing in them. Vice versa, the employees believe in their leader and the goals he strives for. Good relationships strengthen the cooperation and increase loyalty and mutual trust.

A leader at this level would do well to show genuine interest in his colleagues and employees and get to know them better personally. Colleagues and employees have a home life, health issues, personal traits and hobbies that
definitely deserve attention. It is also wise to compliment colleagues and employees and bring out the best in them. The building of a good relationship, one based on mutual respect, leads to a pleasant working atmosphere and team spirit. However, it does not necessarily always leads to positive results. That requires growing towards leadership level 3.

3. Production

It is about the measurable results that have been achieved under the leader’s leadership. What has the leader meant to the company. The fact that this level comes after building good interpersonal relationships, has to do with the fact that colleagues and employees are vital to achieving positive results. Only when a team can take steps together, believe in one another and trust each other, will it be possible to achieve proper production. When employees are only told to work hard without any show of interest or empathy towards them from the leader, there is the risk that they will burn out. The leaders at this level use their good relationships to make their vision reality. As such, it is important that a leader makes clear to everyone in the organisation what his vision is, so everyone can follow the same course.

This leader is much loved within his team. But that is also where a danger lies. If this leader gets another position within the organisation, it is likely that the team will disintegrate. After all, they are dependent on the guidance they used to receive from their leader. To avoid leaving the team as a ship adrift in a situation like that, it is possible for the leader to grow to the fourth level of leadership.

4. People development

At this management level, it is about the development and stimulating of employees. It is essential for a growing organisation to have leaders at this fourth level. This leader thinks it is important to train his employees. That is why he delegates work to them. By delegating, he gives them confidence and empowers them to develop themselves. This confidence has to be genuine and communicated clearly to the employee. According to John C. Maxwell, the level 4 leader spends about 80% of his time on coaching colleagues and employees, and only 20% on his own productivity. In contrast to level 3 leadership, it means letting go. The focus on results is of secondary importance.

The main challenge for leaders at this level is to put the growth of others first, above their own interests. The more leaders with the right qualities, the better this will be for the organisation’s mission and vision. The more new leaders are trained, the more this leads to productive teams. Furthermore, these newly trained employees will appreciate what the leader has done for them personally. Some of those ‘mentor relationships’ are likely to last a lifetime.

5. Pinnacle

The leader at this level has reached the top of what is possible. His status is based
on a foundation of respect. His employees and colleagues appreciate the leader in see an example in him. This is about leaders who remain in the employees’ thoughts even after they leave, making them live on as legends. From level 4, they will also leave behind new leaders in the company, which will ensure a constant flow of new generations of leaders.

The use of this type of leaders also creates level 5 organisations, who are (globally) successful and whose founders are still famous. Examples of this are the brewer Heineken and the technology company Philips that became successful through research and innovation. The founders themselves were typical level 5 leaders, who left behind a positive reputation through their dedication.

5 Levels of Leadership: Cumulative Growth from one level to the next happens slowly but steadily. It is however important to start at the first level; from here leaders can develop and improve, which enables them to take the step to the next level. All levels are built on top of each other and therefore cumulative. A leader will still use the skills he had at level 2 after he reaches level 3. Only when he is effective enough at the 2nd level, can he take the step to the 3rd level. This way, no knowledge or experience is lost and can the leader continue to improve himself.

Now it is your turn

What do you think? How could you apply the 5 levels of leadership in your working environment? Do you recognize the practical explanation or do you have more suggestions? What are your success factors for good leadership?
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Local Chapter Information

The North Florida Chapter of the American Society of Safety Professionals, formerly the American Society of Safety Engineers, was chartered in 1952 and currently has over 200 members.

Professional meetings are held nine times per year in the Jacksonville area. Meeting notices are distributed, and RSVP’s are returned by email. If you are a member of ASSP and are not receiving notices by email, please email the Chapter Secretary.

Job Market Links

General Employment Links

- ASSP
- BCSP General Safety Jobs
- BCSP Construction Safety Jobs
- BCSP Industrial Hygiene Jobs
- EHS Careers

ASSP Chapter Links

Find us on the web at:
- ASSP NFL
Find us on Facebook at:
- ASSP NFL

Local Chapter Officers and Chairs

Elected Officers

- President - Bob Dooley
- President Elect - Eric Gray
- Secretary - Steve Wilson
- Treasurer - Yaniv Zagagi
- Delegate – Paul Thomas

Appointed Chairs

- Membership Chair
  Mark Gibson
- Newsletter Chair
  Allen Davis
- Nominations Chair
  Steve Brown
- Past President
  Steve Brown
- Program Chair
  Dan Hempsall
- Social Chair
  Phil Baker
- Social Media Chair
  Vernon Adams
- SPY Awards Chair
  Open
- Scholarship Chair
  Stephen Brown
LOCAL CHAPTER MEETING SCHEDULE

March 18, 2020
Annual OSHA Update
CANCELED

April 15, 2020
Ergonomics
Location: NEFSC
1725 Art Museum Drive
Building B, Classroom D
Jacksonville, FL 32207
11:30 Lunch & Networking
12 Noon Meeting

April 28, 2020
Worker’s Memorial
Location: NEFSC
1725 Art Museum Drive
Building B, Classroom D
Jacksonville, FL 32207
11:30 Lunch & Networking
12 Noon Meeting

May 20, 2020
TBA

Help us prepare for the lunch. Please RSVP
For ALL meetings, please
RSVP Steve Wilson at
steven_wilson1@me.com
Lunch Cost:
Members: $15
Non-Members: $20

Lunch Cost:
Members: $15
Non-Members: $20