

Submission
No 145

INQUIRY INTO EMERGENCY SERVICES AGENCIES

Organisation: Public Service Association

Date received: 17 August 2017

Public Service Association of New South Wales
General Secretary: Stewart Little ♦ President: Kylie McKelvie
160 Clarence Street, Sydney
GPO Box 3365, Sydney NSW 2001



Telephone: 1300 772 679
Facsimile: 02 9262 1623
E-mail: psa@psa.asn.au
Internet: www.psa.asn.au
ABN: 83 717 214 309

In reply please quote: sl:it

The Hon Robert Borsak MLC Chair
Legislative Council Portfolio Committee No. 4 – Legal Affairs
Parliament House
Macquarie Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000
By email 15 August 2017

Dear Mr Borsak

Re: Inquiry into Emergency Services Agencies

The Public Service Association of NSW welcomes the opportunity to contribute to this Inquiry.

Please find attached the Association's submission. The PSA is available to discuss this submission with your Committee.

Please contact my office on 9220 0982 if further information is required.

Yours sincerely

Stewart Little
General Secretary

15 August 2017



Inquiry Into Emergency Service Agencies

Legislative Council Portfolio Committee No. 4

August 2017

Public Service Association

Contents

Recommendations	1
Summary.....	2
PSA Survey.....	2
The regulatory approach to bullying.....	3
Reluctance to enforce Public Sector Workplace Bullying.....	4
Code of Practice for Preventing and Responding to Workplace Bullying	5
Psychological Risk Management Regulation (Psychosocial)	5
Scope of the Inquiry	6
Worker Safety is for all	8
Emergency Situations and Combat Agencies.....	9
Non-Emergency Service personnel in High Risk Roles and Access to Risk Information.....	10
Critical Incidents affecting PSA members in the last few years.....	11
Research.....	12
Survey.....	13
Comparison of key survey findings: agencies included in Inquiry compared to Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and National Parks and Wildlife Service.....	14
Summary of survey findings for Emergency Services agencies.....	17
Attachment 1: Survey responses from PSA members in the Emergency Services agencies.....	21
Attachment 2: Summary of survey findings for Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service	38
Attachment 3: Draft Workplace Health & Safety Psychosocial Regulation	58

Recommendations

- Expand the Terms of Reference of the Inquiry to include all public sector workers at high risk of discrimination, harassment and bullying in the workplace
- Consider including all public sector workers at high risk of discrimination, harassment and bullying in the workplace in the outcomes of this Inquiry
- Amend the workers compensation laws to ensure that Post Traumatic Stress Disorder is a deemed disease for all emergency services workers
- Extend the definition of an emergency services organisation in the State Emergency and Rescue Management Act (1989) to include all agencies mentioned in the Terms of Reference for this Inquiry and Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice, Roads and Maritime Service, National Parks and Wildlife Services, and Forestry Corporation
- Consider the specific protections that should be offered to public sector workers when operating as an employee of a designated “Combat Agency”
- Equalise, to the highest common denominator, the Workers’ Compensation provisions by restoring pre-2012 levels of cover to all workers in NSW
- Review and recommend responses to particular risks faced by Public Sector workers in high risk categories
- Adopt the *Guide for Preventing and Responding to Workplace Bullying* as a Code of Practice in NSW
- Amend the Work Health and Safety Regulation to include a specific Regulation on Psychological Risk Management.
- Reinstate tripartite management of SafeWork NSW and its enforcement policy
- Commission research through the Centre for Work Health & Safety into the effectiveness of workplace bullying prevention policies and practices
- Implement appropriate legislation to allow agencies to share relevant safety and security information with staff of other agencies sufficient to allow adequate risk management of interactions with the public
- While there is a diversity of opinion within the PSA membership on the issue of relocation of the Rural Fire Service to Orange, Dubbo or Parkes, on balance the PSA recommends that relocation to a rural area not take place. This recommendation is on the basis of the risk of bullying increasing during and after relocation, as well as disruption to business functions.

Summary

The Public Service Association of NSW (PSA) is an active, member-driven union. Our members have a long and proud tradition of improving the lives of the people of New South Wales through delivering a diverse range of services in the public sector and related entities, state owned corporations, TAFE NSW and universities. We proudly represent 36,000 members spread over almost 5,000 worksites.

The PSA represents employees throughout the various agencies and emergency services of this state. These include members within Police, Fire & Rescue NSW, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice, the State Emergency Service (SES), National Parks and Wildlife, Roads and Maritime Services, the Rural Fire Service, and Forestry Corporation.

We welcome the opportunity to participate in this inquiry. We do so as part of a broader movement and acknowledge the roles of our fellow Unions and their members. We endorse the submissions of other unions and add our voice to their recommendations.

The PSA is proud of the skill, professionalism and dedication of its Emergency Service members in providing such a valuable service to the community.

Mental stress injury claims are costly. They are the largest average cost per claim to the NSW Workers Compensation scheme. The dollar cost of mental stress injury claims is only one measure of the cost of not addressing issues of discrimination, harassment and bullying in the workplace bullying and its causes.

The PSA welcomes this Inquiry but is concerned that the Terms of Reference limit the Committee to a sub-set of workers exposed to the risks of discrimination, harassment and bullying within the Public Sector.

A wide range of roles within the Public Sector perform duties within high risk environments and all Public Servants workers should be treated equally.

The Association advocates for increased protections for all workers, including through restoration of Workers' Compensation protections removed in 2012.

PSA Survey

Findings from a recent survey the PSA conducted of its members in the Emergency Services agencies are included in this submission. These indicate a high prevalence of discrimination, harassment and bullying.

The PSA also surveyed its members in Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS). These agencies also perform some functions that are similar to emergency service agencies. Findings from these agencies are similar, indicating a high prevalence of discrimination, harassment and bullying.

A comparison of key data from the survey is included in this submission (see Tables 2 - 5). This comparison shows there are only minor differences in the responses from the agencies included in this Inquiry when compared to responses from Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS.

Responses suggest workers in all agencies surveyed face similar high levels of exposure to discrimination, harassment, bullying, and misconduct / wrongdoing. Emergency services workers

and workers in NPWS, Corrective Services and Juvenile Justice have similar experiences.

The PSA acknowledges that its survey (like the Public Service Commission's People Matter Employee Survey) is not compulsory and is therefore self-selective.

However, sufficient data were gathered in the PSA survey to indicate further actions need to be taken to secure the work health and safety and welfare of staff in both the emergency services agencies and staff employed in Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS.

Significant issues from the survey of members include that:

- in the last year:
 - ◆ 51% of emergency personnel had experienced bullying, 41% had experienced harassment, and 32% had experienced discrimination
 - ◆ 66% of emergency personnel had witnessed bullying, 54% had witnessed harassment, and 43% had witnessed discrimination
- high numbers of respondents felt they would not be protected from reprisal for raising concerns about discrimination (65%), harassment (67%), or bullying (70%)
- less than a quarter of respondents rated their agency's policies as effective, with most stating policies were not complied with; 72% of respondents disagreeing that they had confidence that their organization would effectively resolve the matter
- injured workers indicated that they were unlikely to make a workers compensation claim, but would take other leave including sick leave; 52% of those who had been injured felt their organisation supported reasonable adjustment

The regulatory approach to bullying

Unfortunately, there has been very little change to the regulation of workplace bullying in NSW since the three parliamentary Inquiries involving the role and performance of WorkCover, including the responsibility to regulate bullying in NSW workplaces.¹ The Public Service Association submits that this is for two reasons:

- a reluctance by the NSW workplace safety regulator to get involved too deeply in enforcing the WHS legislation in terms of mental stress and bullying, particularly in the NSW public sector where this risk of injury is most prevalent
- the lack of an enforcement framework that includes a specific WHS Regulation and a Code of Practice to address the risk of bullying

¹ *Inquiry into Allegations of Bullying in WorkCover NSW* (General Purpose Standing Committee), 2013, *Review of the Inquiry into Allegations of Bullying in WorkCover NSW* (General Purpose Standing Committee) 2014, *Review of the exercise of the functions of the WorkCover Authority* (Law and Justice Committee), 2014

Reluctance to enforce Public Sector Workplace Bullying

The NSW Public Service is ground zero for workplace bullying. Workers compensation claims for mental stress have a high average cost per claim for NSW public servants covered by the Treasury Managed Fund.

The PSA does not have the specific claims data for the different agencies in focus in this Inquiry. However, Table 1 shows recent information for the agencies included in the state government Treasury Managed Fund:

Table 1: Claims by bodily location, State Government sector, 2013`/14 to 2015/16

Bodily location of injury/ disease	Number of claims	Number of major claims	% of all claims	% of major claims	Total Gross incurred Cost (\$)	Average Gross incurred Cost (\$)	Total time lost (weeks)	Average time lost (weeks)
Psychological System a)	5,840 b)	3,359	11	56	283,225,170 c)	48,497	198,941	34.1 d)

Source: SIRA²

Notes: a) Includes other stressors other than bullying
 b) Second highest bodily location or injury type
 c) Average over \$140 million spent on mental health claims per year
 d) Highest average time off work

SafeWork NSW (former WorkCover) is the regulator of workplace health and safety, but unfortunately despite having gone through previous Inquiries through this Parliament, is yet to demonstrate a commitment to enforce worker's rights to health and safety in terms of causes of mental stress such as work-related harassment and workplace bullying.

As a key cause of psychological system claims that are most costly to workers and their families and the NSW Government, causes of mental stress such as work-related harassment and workplace bullying requires a more effective regulatory approach than we have now.

A part of the problem with how the regulator acts is a reluctance to address systematic mental stress issues in its enforcement approach. Mental stress issues such as work-related harassment and workplace bullying need to be addressed in a timely manner, and there is a widespread belief in workplaces that reprisals can occur if reports of wrongdoing are made. This fear of reprisal is illustrated in the survey data included in this submission.

In reviewing the governance and enforcement mechanisms of the SafeWork organisation, it is clear that there is no community input as to how SafeWork applies its enforcement mechanisms.

Despite a requirement in the model laws for tripartite consultation with the regulator, employers and unions, this has not occurred since the abolition of the WorkCover Advisory Council, Industry Reference Groups and the WorkCover Board. There is currently no tripartite mechanism to manage SafeWork enforcement policy or practice as the organisation is now subsumed into the Department of Finance Services and Innovation.

Therefore the Public Service Association recommends tripartite governance of the SafeWork Authority is re-instituted especially to manage issues such as enforcement policy and of workplace bullying.

² State Insurance Regulatory Authority, Government Sector Report, Analysis and Insight, (2017)

Code of Practice for Preventing and Responding to Workplace Bullying

The PSA notes that it has provided submissions to previous Inquiries with similar Terms of Reference, including:

- Inquiry into Allegations of Bullying in WorkCover NSW (General Purpose Standing Committee)
- Review of the Inquiry into Allegations of Bullying in WorkCover NSW (General Purpose Standing Committee)
- Review of the exercise of the functions of the WorkCover Authority (Inquiry, and Law and Justice Committee)

At the time of those Inquiries, Safe Work Australia was developing a proposed draft Code of Practice under the Work Health and Safety (WHS) legislation to provide a standard for preventing and managing workplace bullying.

We note that despite previous assumptions by those Parliamentary Inquiries that a Code of Practice for bullying would be implemented in NSW, no such WHS Code of Practice was declared at Safe Work Australia. Instead, the document was published as the [Guide for Preventing and Responding to Workplace Bullying](#). In NSW this publication remains as optional guidance material. It has not been adopted as a Code of Practice, with a stronger weight in law.

In passing, the PSA notes that despite the draft national Code of Practice being reviewed numerous times by Safe Work Australia members and expert academics, the NSW jurisdiction voted at Safe Work Australia to not endorse the publication as a Code of Practice.

There is no clear legal standard about what is expected from employers and employees regarding the prevention and management of workplace bullying. This makes enforcement of a standard by SafeWork, or implementation by Employers (Persons Conducting a Business or Undertaking) very difficult.

The PSA recommends that the NSW Parliament adopt the [Guide for Preventing and Responding to Workplace Bullying](#) as a Code of Practice, which can be recognised and enforced as the legal standard for preventing and managing workplace bullying.

Psychological Risk Management Regulation (Psychosocial)

The PSA also notes that after harmonisation of the Work Health and Safety legislation there has been a reduction in the legislation's effect on workplace bullying. The only mention occurs through reference to the requirement to maintain workers welfare, and the definition of "health" including physical and psychological health.

As psychological illness is such a big and growing cost to NSW workplaces, especially emergency services workplaces, the PSA recommends the formulation and gazettal of a Work Health and Safety (Psychological Risk Management) Regulation.

A draft Psychological Risk Management Regulation was proposed by Unions NSW previously to this Parliament and is included as Attachment 3.

It is recommend that a Work Health and Safety (Psychological Risk Management) Regulation be developed and adopted in NSW.

Scope of the Inquiry

Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice, Roads and Maritime Service, National Parks and Wildlife Service, and Forestry Corporation fall outside of the scope of this Inquiry. The Association proposes that these agencies should also be considered by the Inquiry on the basis that they conduct the same work as emergency service agencies in different contexts.

The State Emergency and Rescue Management Act (1989) defines an emergency services organisation: “emergency services organisation means the NSW Police Force, Fire and Rescue NSW, Rural Fire Brigades, Ambulance Service of NSW, State Emergency Service, Volunteer Rescue Association or any other agency which manages or controls an accredited rescue unit.”

However, the reality is that there are many more people involved in emergency work than this definition suggests. For example, recent bush fires in the Blue Mountains involved SafeWork inspectors, child protection workers and housing officers from Family and Community Services, NPWS fire fighters, as well as all the emergency services provided by the above Act.

There are also officers not covered by the Act who undertake emergency work. These are listed below.

Corrective Services and Juvenile Justice

We are aware that the Parliamentary Committee has decided not to include Corrective Services and Juvenile Justice in the scope of this Inquiry. However, the Association recommends that the Committee consider making a recommendation to amend the definition of what is covered by emergency services and the scope of this Inquiry. This should occur for the following reasons:

- Offenders pose a risk often in the same way to Correctional Officers and Youth Officers as they do to Police
- Offender management creates an emergency environment by its definition. There are Safe Operating Procedures to manage inmate and youth detention and escapes, which are considered a critical incident.
- Correctional Officers are required to undertake a range of “emergency service” or “first responders” functions as part of their role. They are required like the other emergency services to undertake a para-military role where there is a requirement for ongoing vigilance and a requirement to be alert to breaches of policy and security. Many officers are in a response position. Youth Officers are required to respond to violent situations and have recently suffered injuries requiring hospital treatment.
- Correctional Officers are required to play the role of police officer including detective and investigator in relation to offences and behaviours inside custody. They undertake searches of cells, undertake interviews of inmates, and keep a case record which is then used to assess classification, readiness for work release, and ultimately access to parole and freedom. They are also required to make witness statements of offences that they witness for the application of discipline and justice in the internal and court justice processes. They are required to contribute towards overall security intelligence and individual behaviour affecting parole length. Youth Officers are required to manage often violent young offenders and are required to follow harm minimisation guidelines.
- Correctional Officers and Youth Officers are required to act in a range of emergencies in relation to violence between inmates, violence against officers, escapes and riots. They all have a role in emergencies and at times many are required to apply reasonable force.
- Correctional Officers also play the role of paramedics. All prison officers are required to have first aid and are regularly called upon to administer first aid in emergencies. Youth Officers are

required to provide first aid in emergency situations. The adult and juvenile prison population have poorer physical and mental health, higher levels of drug dependency than the general population. This leads to many occasions to where Correctional Officers will be required to utilise the first aid. Many experienced Correctional Officers and Youth Officers have been required to undertake CPR on inmates who have passed away or committed suicide prior to further medical assistance arriving on multiple times during their career.

- Correctional Officers and Youth Officers, due to the secure environment of a prison complex are required to undertake primary fire-fighting response in order to protect the inmates and the gaol or Juvenile Justice complex. These officers are trained in not only evacuation but also active fire-fighting.
- Correctional Officers have also a similar management structure as other emergency services due to the para military nature of the workplace structure, and the command and control nature of the work. They suffer the same problems in accessing consultation over basic issues up to and including more complex issues such as their health and safety. Similar to other organisations the correctional management environment relies upon an entrenched hierarchical approach that does not encourage “soft” management skills. The constant vigilance of offender management also enshrines a perception that the hierarchy must always apply, even when the scenario is not an emergency. This runs contrary to the provisions of the Work Health and Safety legislation (section 48) for consultation and valuing input of workers, and often leaves these workers feeling as though they experience bullying behaviours.

First responder’s legislation

The experience from overseas is that Correctional Officers have been deemed first responders. Examples of where this has occurred include in Canada. In Canada the mental health problems for prison officers have led to prison officers being included in first responders legislation. The *Supporting Ontario's First Responders Act (Post traumatic Stress Disorder), 2016*, for example provides amendment to the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act to allow Post traumatic Stress Disorder to be deemed to have been caused because of work for Police officers, firefighters, paramedics, emergency response teams, correctional officers/ youth services workers, people involved in the dispatch of police, firefighter and ambulance services.³

These laws act in two ways. They provide greater protections for workers in high risk environments to prevent injury occurring under their health and safety legislation, as well as reducing the risk of exacerbating and prolonging injury through what is often bullying behaviour when making a claim to get early support. Similar approaches have been adopted by the Western Australian government and is being proposed by the Tasmanian government for selected emergency services workers.

Non-Custodial workers and Community Corrections

These workers have many of the similar hazards as Correctional Officers and Youth Officers. They are also required to visit or interview violent offenders in the community often without the same protections as officers inside a prison complex. They will often do this alone, and do not have any of the equipment that is available to officers inside a prison complex.

Depending on the location and the offender, they will often also have limited information regarding hazards and risks of the location they are attending, including other people of interest at the location, whether there is drug manufacturing present, or fire arms registered. This information is available to Police, but not shared with community corrections.

³ <https://news.ontario.ca/mol/en/2016/04/supporting-ontarios-first-responders-act-posttraumatic-stress-disorder-2016-1.html>

As non custodial and Community corrections have a requirement to remain vigilant, and also have a command and control hierarchical structure they also suffer in much the same way as other emergency services the problems of bullying that the other emergency services do.

National Parks and Wildlife Service (and Forestry Corporation)

National Parks and Wildlife have a limited law enforcement role and also a significant firefighting role. This firefighting role has been confirmed in the case *The Australian Workers' Union, New South Wales v Office of Environment and Heritage* [2012] NSWIRComm 133.

This case allowed National Parks officers undertaking firefighting work to claim the more beneficial workers compensation regime of prior to 2012. As firefighters, NPWS officers will often spend many days at work fighting fires in emergencies. Their coping mechanisms are at the limit, and operate in a highly structured emergency environment. This environment is a high risk environment for bullying behaviours.

Roads and Maritime Service

The Roads and Maritime Service undertakes traffic incident management and law enforcement of heavy vehicles. These workers are not considered emergency workers but manage traffic incident emergencies such as collisions, and truck explosions on major highways. Despite the viewing of severe injuries and fatalities from time to time, a psychological support service has been stripped back, and there is a presence of behaviors that could be categorized as bullying behaviours.

It is recommended that:

- the workers compensation laws are amended to ensure that Post Traumatic Stress Disorder is a deemed disease for all emergency services workers
- the definition of emergency services is extended to include all agencies mentioned in this Inquiry and also be extended to NPWS, Forestry Corporation, RMS, Corrective Services and Juvenile Justice.

Worker Safety is for all

No worker should have to go to work and experience discrimination, harassment or bullying. Unfortunately, the reality is that many of our members do experience these issues in their workplaces.

It is the responsibility of the workplace, in consultation with workers, to ensure proper measures are in place to effectively prevent and manage these issues.

Emergency service situations are inherently dangerous. Such situations contain many high risk factors such as shock, mental illness, and drug and alcohol abuse. However, these risks are not exclusive to these situations.

Many workers have roles not defined as Emergency Service roles but face similar risks to emergency service personnel during hazardous situations or declared emergencies.

Many public servants perform roles that expose them to high risk situations on a daily basis.

Emergency Situations and Combat Agencies

Apart from agencies that are deemed to have Emergency Service personnel, there are many different government agencies that gain the status of Combat agencies during declared emergencies. Many of these are groups that would not usually be associated with emergency situations.

Fire emergencies will empower Fire and Rescue or the NSW Rural Fire Service as the Combat Agency while storm or flood emergencies, whilst the SES takes the lead.

Law enforcement during a declaration or a terrorism threat triggers the NSW Police taking a lead role.

The NSW Department of Primary Industries has responsibility for a large range of hazards including animal and plant disease, rodent or insect plague and food industry emergencies. The Hendra virus outbreak in 2011 saw the Department of Primary Industries take the lead as the recognised Combat Agency in NSW.

A pandemic outbreak would create a situation where the Department of Health would take the lead role.

The powers of these bodies during these declared emergencies needs to be recognised by the Committee when it considers risks and protections for workers.

Emergency Service Personnel

The PSA has a number of members in emergency service roles in NSW. However, a far greater group of members of the PSA work for Emergency Service agencies in roles not defined as emergency service personnel. Examples of these include administration and support services within Police, Fire & Rescue and SES.

Many other members work in roles that don't appear at first glance to be emergency service related but who perform vital duties within declared disaster zones or emergency situations. Examples of these roles include Forestry NSW staff, National Parks and Wildlife Rangers and RMS Traffic Management, Family and Community Services staff..

All these members are often subjected to the same risks when performing duties required as part of their work roles. Yet none of these members receive the higher level of Workers Compensation protection afforded to Emergency Service personnel under the changes made to the Workers Compensation scheme in 2012.

The result of this is that two workers, one deemed an emergency service worker while the other is not, assaulted by a common assailant would be treated differently in regards to their support and return to work rights.

Non-Emergency Service personnel in High Risk Roles and Access to Risk Information

The largest group of members covered by the PSA in high risk roles for psychological injury and exposure to bullying are those performing roles that are not considered Emergency Service roles.

The PSA has over 10,000 members in high risk roles within the Public Service who are not considered by the Terms of Reference of this Inquiry.

In Corrective Services the PSA has Corrective Service Personnel, both within custodial and the community, who frequently face violent situations. The dangers faced by custodial staff on a daily basis are well established, yet after violent and other serious incidents there is often little concern for the workers involved or supporting them. The government has repeatedly denied the PSA's pleas to restore Worker's Compensation protections to these workers to pre-2012 levels. Community Corrections staff usually perform their roles in similarly high risk environments, visiting released offenders and those on community service orders in their homes with no control over the environment they will face when they arrive.

In Community Service, workers in Child Protection roles face risk on a daily basis. Particularly when it is considered that many of the people they deal with are known to Police. Our members enter private residences and deal with unknown situations without the protections afforded to Emergency Service personnel. In the worst of situations, after a decision has been made to remove a child from their family, it is Community Service members who are tasked with entering the premises and taking physical custody of that child. Despite the presence of police councilors or other supports it remains the fact that it is our members who will be the focus of the attention of family members. The Association has a number of examples when workplace bullying has caused a worker to enter residences when they were not certain as to the safety of the client or the location.

In Disability Services the members working in group homes also face severe risk of violence and workplace bullying. Delegates have long advocated for increased support from management against the twin threats posed by clients and their families in their workplaces. In the case of group homes, it should be noted that their worksites are also the residences of the clients and staff cannot simply remove themselves from these environments but are required to remain and ensure care for clients. Many members report instances where they have had to place themselves in danger to protect clients from others in the house or experienced workplace bullying from family of clients.

Additionally, officers responsible for meeting public housing clients in their homes, or emergency housing clients, face risks given little or no knowledge of the circumstances they face, when meeting people who may have complex issues and behaviours.

In the Court System over the past decade, the government enacted a much needed upgrade of court house security at venues throughout the state. In some places, such as Parramatta Justice precinct, new court complexes have incorporated specialist screening and security features to protect the public and workers. Of greater difficulty has been the efforts to retrofit and alter the existing, and in many cases heritage listed, court houses of this state. Despite these efforts, court officials in many jurisdictions remain at increasing risk from violence within their work environment. Accompanying this physical alteration has been a substantive change in the role of Sheriff Officers. As well as increasing exposure on security duties within court complexes and tribunals, Sheriffs are responsible for the execution of civil court orders such as repossessions and summons in the community. Many Sheriff Officer report not being informed of relevant safety matters, with information not forthcoming in order to undertake their roles safely.

Juvenile Justice members face risk every day in the custodial environment. Our members in this area face unique challenges based on the special circumstances of managing an incarcerated juvenile population.

The PSA wrote to the government in April 2017 with a log of claims on behalf of our Special Constables members. One of the key points of this log was the request for Special Constables to be provided with access to the Police Blue Ribbon Insurance scheme by way of salary sacrifice. Despite the increasing responsibilities of these officers, standing watch as frontline security on major government buildings, they are not classified as Emergency Service personnel nor do they have additional protections despite the fact they are authorised to carry and use firearms in their duties.

Legal Aid solicitors and Public Prosecutors both currently have access to a simplified process for obtaining silent voter status to improve their anonymity from the public. Despite their role as impartial agents in the justice system, both groups can find themselves as targets for defendants and the victims of crime. Police prosecutors who arguably undertake a similar function are considered an emergency service.

In addition to these major groups of members, many other agencies and members of the PSA deal with high risk situations, such as Food Authority Inspectors, Fisheries Inspectors, Safe Work Inspectors and National Parks and Wildlife Service Rangers. The incident involving an Office of Environment and Heritage Inspector Glen Turner in July 2014 is the ultimate example of the risk public servants face.

Despite all of these occupations facing the same dangers as declared emergency services officers, they have limited access to from their employer relevant safety information about their clients. For example a police officer will be in touch the the Police Communications Unit or VKG. They will advise the officer whether there are people present with a record, and associations, or fire arms. Most of the above occupations will be required to go to the same location and not have the same information so that they can make decisions about their own risk in servicing that client. Many public servants are bullied and threatened into attending unsafe scenarios and information is withheld from workers that should have the right to know about the safety and risk profile of the location they are attending.

The PSA recommends that the NSW parliament implement appropriate legislation to allow agencies to share relevant safety and security information with staff of other agencies sufficient to allow adequate risk management of interactions with the public.

Critical Incidents affecting PSA members in the last few years

On 29 July 2014 an incident occurred near Moree between two Office of Environment and Heritage Inspectors and a local landowner. A Public Servant, Glen Turner, was shot and killed. A coronial Inquiry has been established including what risk information was known prior to the murder.

On 2 October 2015, Public Servant, Curtis Cheng, was shot and killed in Parramatta. The assailant was killed by the Special Constable on duty before Police could respond to the incident. Special Constables and Mr Cheng were both not considered emergency personnel.

There have also been numerous incidents of physical assault on Correctional staff. On 31 July 2016 it was reported in the Sunday Telegraph that assaults on Correctives personnel in prisons had more than doubled, to 49 assaults in a 47 day period over June and July, from the same period in 2015.

Jason Gould, a Correctional Officer at Broken Hill Correctional Facility, shows the human costs

associated with these figures. Struck in the face with a billiard ball thrown at him by an inmate in January 2011, Mr Gould endured years of medical treatment in an attempt to restore sight to his ruptured eye. The retrospective changes to Workers' Compensation in 2012 affected coverage of his medical expenses.

In January 2007 Correctional Officer Wayne Smith was killed in the line of duty after being assaulted by an inmate. Suffering from a broken jaw and serious head injuries, he died after a six week battle by medical staff to save him.

These incidences show that the role and function of an emergency service worker and the hazards they deal with is blind to whether the same client is in the community or in custody. No greater price can be paid in the service of the community of NSW and yet these incidents, and many others, will not be considered as part of this Inquiry, nor the inadequacy of bullying behavior and support provided to these workers.

Research

Researchers at the Cochrane Collaboration published a systematic review of *Interventions for prevention of bullying in the workplace* in March 2017. The purpose of the review was to answer the question: *Are there ways in which workplace bullying can be prevented?*

The authors note: *"There has been much research about bullying in the workplace. However, most studies have looked at how to manage bullying once it has happened, rather than trying to stop it happening in the first place"*.

Knowing what works to prevent bullying in the workplace is important for many reasons.

The conclusion from this review *"shows that organisational and individual interventions may prevent bullying in the workplace. However, the evidence is of very low quality. We need studies that use better ways to measure the effect of all kinds of interventions to prevent bullying ..."*

There is very low quality evidence that organisational and individual interventions may prevent bullying behaviours in the workplace. We need large well-designed controlled trials of bullying prevention interventions operating on the levels of society/policy, organisation/employer, job/task and individual/job interface. Future studies should employ validated and reliable outcome measures of bullying and a minimum of 6 months follow-up".

The PSA considers that it is important for research to be conducted in line with the conclusion of this review.

The PSA welcomes the 2017 NSW state budget announcement of \$2.5 million funding for a new Centre for Work Health & Safety within SafeWork NSW. According to a media release on 20 June 2017 from the Minister for Innovation and Better Regulation, Matt Kean, the Centre "would be the first of its kind in Australia aimed at translating research into improved work health and safety practices".

Research to evaluate the effectiveness of bullying prevention policies and practices is clearly a candidate for priority funding support from the Centre for Work Health & Safety.

The PSA recommends that research into the effectiveness of workplace bullying prevention policies and practices be commissioned through the Centre for Work Health & Safety.

Survey

The PSA conducted a survey of its members in the Emergency Services agencies included in the terms of reference for the Inquiry. There were 357 respondents. Detailed findings are included at Attachment 1. Agency level data from the survey are available on request.

For comparative purposes the PSA also sent the same survey to its members in Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. These agencies also perform some functions that are similar to emergency service agencies and have a high prevalence of discrimination, harassment and bullying reported to the PSA. Selected Roads and Maritime Service workers dealing with critical incidents and emergency responses could not be surveyed in a manner to ensure confidentiality.

There were 458 respondents from Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Detailed findings are included at Attachment 2.

Agency level data from the survey in Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and the National Parks and Wildlife Service are available on request.

To encourage uptake of the survey only one question was compulsory to answer: "What agency do you work for?" This means that although there were 357 individual respondents, not all questions in the survey had this many responses.

Many of the survey questions are similar to questions included in the People Matter Employee Survey conducted by the NSW Public Service Commission. The PSA acknowledges that this survey (like the People Matter Employee Survey) is not compulsory and is therefore self-selective.

However, sufficient data were gathered in the PSA survey to indicate a significant presence of workplace bullying and that further actions need to be taken by government to secure the work health and safety and welfare of staff in emergency services agencies.

The following descriptions were provided as guidance within the survey:

Discrimination occurs when someone is treated unfairly because they belong to a particular group of people or have a particular characteristic.

Harassment occurs when someone is subjected to behaviour they do not want, and this behaviour offends, humiliates or intimidates, and creates a hostile environment, and is targeted because of their sex, pregnancy, breastfeeding, race, age, marital or domestic status, homosexuality, disability, transgender status or carer's responsibilities, or that of their relatives, friends or associates.

Bullying is repeated and unreasonable behaviour directed towards a worker or a group of workers that creates a risk to health and safety. Repeated behaviour refers to the persistent nature of the behaviour and can involve a range of behaviours over time. Unreasonable behaviour means behaviour that a reasonable person, having considered the circumstances, would see as unreasonable, including behaviour that is victimising, humiliating, intimidating or threatening.

Misconduct/wrongdoing is behaviour other than discrimination, harassment and bullying that is unethical or illegal, or breaches your agency's code of conduct, or that compromises your duties.

Comparison of key survey findings: agencies included in Inquiry compared to Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and National Parks and Wildlife Service

Key data in Tables 2 - 4 show the prevalence of discrimination, harassment, bullying, and misconduct / wrongdoing are similar within all the agencies surveyed.

Table 5 shows a similar pattern of fear of reprisal for reporting issues exists in all agencies surveyed.

There are only minor differences in the pattern of responses from the agencies included in this Inquiry when compared to responses from Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Responses suggest workers in all agencies surveyed face problems of discrimination, harassment, bullying, and misconduct / wrongdoing on a similar scale.

As mentioned earlier in this submission, the PSA acknowledges that this survey (like the Public Service Commission's *People Matter Employee Survey*) is not compulsory and is therefore self-selective.

However, sufficient data were gathered in the PSA survey to indicate further actions need to be taken to secure the work health and safety and welfare of staff in both the emergency services agencies and staff employed in Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Table 2: Comparison of key survey findings, ever witnessed or experienced discrimination, harassment, bullying, misconduct / wrongdoing

Since starting work with your current employer have you ever experienced and / or witnessed:		
Percentage and number experienced		
	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS
Discrimination	43.64% 120	50.71% 178
Harassment	57.19% 159	62.98% 228
Bullying	74.73% 210	71.27% 258
Misconduct / wrongdoing	45.13% 125	47.14% 165
Percentage and number witnessed		
	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS
Discrimination	53.79% 142	66.28% 226
Harassment	68.06% 179	73.10% 250
Bullying	81.95% 218	79.82% 273
Misconduct / wrongdoing	70.30% 187	72.67% 250

Table 3: Comparison of key survey findings, witnessed or experienced discrimination, harassment, bullying, misconduct / wrongdoing in the last 12 months

Since starting work with your current employer have you ever experienced and / or witnessed:		
Percentage and number experienced		
	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS
Discrimination	31.60% 85	35.50% 120
Harassment	41.03% 112	43.71% 153
Bullying	51.09% 140	52.54% 186
Misconduct / wrongdoing	33.58% 90	35.00% 119
Percentage and number witnessed		
	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS
Discrimination	42.58% 109	48.20% 161
Harassment	53.75% 136	58.73% 195
Bullying	65.77% 171	68.58% 227
Misconduct / wrongdoing	56.42% 145	54.65% 182

Table 4: Comparison of key survey findings, currently experiencing discrimination, harassment, bullying, misconduct / wrongdoing

Since starting work with your current employer have you ever experienced and / or witnessed:		
Percentage and number experiencing		
	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS
Discrimination	20.28% 57	18.21% 67
Harassment	23.38% 65	21.95% 81
Bullying	33.10% 94	28.84% 107
Misconduct / wrongdoing	21.38% 59	13.11% 48

Table 5: Percent and number of responses, comparison of key survey findings, protection from reprisal for reporting

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? I am confident that I would be protected from reprisal for reporting the following:						
	Agency	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Discrimination	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	40.75% 119	24.32% 71	18.15% 53	12.67% 37	4.11% 12
	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS	32.63% 124	31.84% 121	21.32% 81	11.32% 43	2.89% 11
Harassment	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	41.30% 121	25.94% 76	17.41% 51	12.29% 36	3.07% 9
	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS	32.89% 125	32.89% 125	21.32% 81	10.26% 39	2.63% 10
Bullying	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	44.86% 131	24.66% 72	16.44% 48	11.30% 33	2.74% 8
	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS	33.95% 129	33.16% 126	20.26% 77	9.74% 37	2.89% 11
Misconduct / wrongdoing	Agencies within scope of Inquiry	40.27% 118	25.60% 75	17.41% 51	12.29% 36	4.44% 13
	Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and NPWS	32.72% 124	29.02% 110	22.96% 87	11.08% 42	4.22% 16

Summary of survey findings for Emergency Services agencies

Organisational issues

There is a high level of concern reported for the following:

- "Workplace change is well managed in my organisation" - 78% disagree / strongly disagree
- "Performance is managed appropriately in my organisation" - 74% disagree / strongly disagree
- "It is ok to speak up and share a different view to my colleagues and manager" - 74% disagree / strongly disagree
- "The level of stressors in my workplace are acceptable" - 64% disagree / strongly disagree
- "My workload is acceptable" - 46% disagree / strongly disagree
- "My manager treats employees with dignity and respect" - 40% disagree / strongly disagree
- "People in my workgroup treat each other with respect" - 39% disagree / strongly disagree
- "My organisation respects individual differences (e.g. cultures, working styles, backgrounds, ideas)" - 37% disagree / strongly disagree
- "Age is not a barrier to success in my organisation" - 35% disagree / strongly disagree

Bullying

- 82% of respondents (218) had witnessed bullying with their current employer while 75% (210) had experienced bullying
- 66% of respondents (171) had witnessed bullying with their current employer in the past 12 months while 51% (140) had experienced bullying
- 33% of respondents (94) were currently experiencing bullying
- 47% of staff (120) who have experienced or witnessed bullying have reported it
- 3 respondents (1%) were currently on leave due to discrimination, harassment and / or bullying

Harassment

- 68% of respondents (218) reported they had witnessed harassment with their current employer while 57% (159) reported they had experienced harassment
- 54% of respondents (136) reported they had witnessed harassment with their current employer in the past 12 months while 41% (112) reported they had experienced harassment
- 23% of respondents (65) reported they were currently experiencing harassment
- 37% of staff (94) who have experienced or witnessed harassment have reported it.

Discrimination

- 54% of respondents (142) reported they had witnessed discrimination with their current employer while 44% (120) reported they had experienced discrimination
- 43% of respondents (109) reported they had witnessed discrimination with their current employer in the past 12 months while 32% (85) reported they had experienced discrimination
- 20% of respondents (57) reported they were currently experiencing discrimination
- 27% of staff (66) who have experienced or witnessed discrimination have reported it

Reporting

- Most respondents (approximately 80%) know how to make a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing
- About 60% of cases of discrimination, harassment, bullying and misconduct / wrongdoing experienced or witnessed are reported (Table 15)
- The main reasons for not making a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing were "Afraid of reporting it" (67%) and "Advised to not report it" (24%)
- Most respondents (approximately 65%) do not feel confident that they would be protected from reprisal for reporting discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing
- Only a small number of staff (19) who made a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing were satisfied with the outcome, while a further 41 staff were partially satisfied
- The top three reasons staff who made a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing were not satisfied with the outcome were:
 - ◆ "Action taken after I made the report did not fix the problem" - 35%
 - ◆ "I suffered adverse consequences because I made the report" - 35%
 - ◆ "No action was taken after I made the report" - 33%

Support services

- Peer support (39%) and Employee Assistance Programs (32%) were rated as the top two types of support services for staff who have experienced mental health issues as a result of their work
- 30% of respondents had asked for support from their current employer during a period of poor mental health
- One third (33%) of those who had asked for support from their current employer during a period of poor mental health thought their employer responded well. About half (51%) thought their employer responded poorly or very poorly.
- 17% (38) of those who experienced discrimination / harassment / bullying with their current employer made a workers' compensation claim
- The top three reasons given by those who experienced discrimination / harassment / bullying with their current employer for not making a workers' compensation claim were:
 - ◆ "Afraid of consequences if I made a claim" - 55%
 - ◆ "Don't know the claim procedure" - 16%
 - ◆ "Doctor and / or family and friends advised against claiming" - 8%

Policies and Procedures

- Few respondents rated as effective or very effective the policies and procedures to prevent and deal with:
 - ◆ discrimination (23%)
 - ◆ harassment (19%)
 - ◆ bullying (16%)
- Few respondents agreed or strongly agreed their agency was genuinely committed to preventing and properly managing instances of:
 - ◆ discrimination (32%)
 - ◆ harassment (30%)
 - ◆ bullying (26%)
- Few respondents agreed or strongly agreed their agency complied with its own policies on:
 - ◆ discrimination (23%)
 - ◆ harassment (20%)
 - ◆ bullying (18%)
- 72% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that they have confidence in the ways their organisation resolves reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing.

Relocation of Rural Fire Service

- There were 109 respondents from the RFS. 89 of these provided comment on the idea of relocating the RFS headquarters to Orange, Dubbo or Parkes.
- 21 (24%) of respondents provided comment that recognised both advantages and disadvantages of relocation
- 38 (43%) of respondents opposed the idea of relocation
- Common reasons against relocation were:
 - ◆ disruption to the organisation from loss of staff
 - ◆ disruption to the organisation by isolation from other government agencies
- 29 (33%) of respondents supported the idea of relocation
- Common reasons for relocation were:
 - ◆ increased job opportunities for regional workers
 - ◆ the need for senior RFS staff to be a part of the rural community
- Several respondents noted that:
 - ◆ the new RFS headquarters at Olympic Park was not large enough and did not offer on site parking for staff
 - ◆ RFS headquarters would be better located further west in Sydney than at present
 - ◆

A number of staff indicated they would be forced to leave the RFS if they were forced to move locations.

- The evidence regarding the level of workplace bullying and harassment, and lack of consultation in the Rural Fire Service indicates movement to a regional location could enable greater bullying behavior during the move and once the workers are relocated

Appropriateness of uniforms provided to personnel

- There were around 100 comments provided on uniforms. Common reasons for negative comments included:
 - ◆ poor design
 - ◆ poor comfort
 - ◆ impractical design
 - ◆ old styling
 - ◆ unsuited for hot / cold work environments
 - ◆ poor sun protection
- There were several comments opposed to the concept of uniforms
- Several comments referred to a potential to be identified as a terrorist target by wearing uniforms

Other issues

- There were about 80 comments provided in a free text field for Other Issues.
- Comments here supported the themes that are present in the quantitative data, including:
 - ◆ the prevalence of discrimination, harassment, bullying and misconduct / wrongdoing
 - ◆ low levels of accountability for acting on complaints
 - ◆ poor Work Health Safety standards generally
 - ◆ different standards of workers compensation available to staff facing similar levels of risk
 - ◆ increasing levels of job insecurity contributing to mental stress
 - ◆ divisions between occupation groups of staff (uniformed and civilian staff, for example)
 - ◆ the need for better recruitment and promotions of managers who are capable of leading and training staff
 - ◆ concerns about the accuracy of workers compensation claims reported in agencies Annual Reports

Attachment 1: Survey responses from PSA members in the Emergency Services agencies

Table 6: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, current employer

NSW Police	53% 189
NSW Rural Fire Service	31% 109
NSW State Emergency Service	8% 30
Fire and Rescue NSW	8% 29
Total	357

Table 7: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, main work location

Field	12% 41
Office	88% 313

Table 8: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Age is not a barrier to success in my organisation	12.88% 42	21.78% 71	26.69% 87	32.52% 106	6.13% 20	326
Cultural background is not a barrier to success in my organisation	8.92% 29	11.69% 38	32.92% 107	38.15% 124	8.31% 27	325
Disability is not a barrier to success in my organisation	7.36% 24	17.79% 58	41.10% 134	28.53% 93	5.21% 17	326
It is ok to speak up and share a different view to my colleagues and manager	27.38% 89	30.46% 99	13.85% 45	23.08% 75	5.23% 17	325
My manager treats employees with dignity and respect	23.38% 76	16.92% 55	16.92% 55	30.46% 99	12.31% 40	325
My organisation respects individual differences (e.g. cultures, working styles, backgrounds, ideas)	15.74% 51	20.99% 68	23.46% 76	34.57% 112	5.25% 17	324
My workload is acceptable	12.00% 39	34.15% 111	17.85% 58	33.23% 108	2.77% 9	325
People in my workgroup treat each other with respect	14.42% 47	24.23% 79	16.26% 53	36.50% 119	8.59% 28	326
Performance is managed appropriately in my organisation	36.73% 119	37.35% 121	13.27% 43	11.11% 36	1.54% 5	324
Sexual orientation is not a barrier to success in my organisation	8.62% 28	11.38% 37	33.54% 109	38.46% 125	8.00% 26	325
The level of stressors in my workplace are acceptable	25.54% 83	37.85% 123	12.31% 40	21.85% 71	2.46% 8	325
Workplace change is well managed in my organisation	45.06% 146	32.72% 106	14.51% 47	6.79% 22	0.93% 3	324

Table 9: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Since starting work with your current employer have you ever experienced and / or witnessed:			
Experienced			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	43.64% 120	56.36% 155	275
Harassment	57.19% 159	42.81% 119	278
Bullying	74.73% 210	25.27% 71	281
Misconduct / wrongdoing	45.13% 125	54.87% 152	277
Witnessed			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	53.79% 142	46.21% 122	264
Harassment	68.06% 179	31.94% 84	263
Bullying	81.95% 218	18.05% 48	266
Misconduct / wrongdoing	70.30% 187	29.70% 79	266

Table 10: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

In the last 12 months with your current employer have you experienced and / or witnessed:			
Experienced			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	31.60% 85	68.40% 184	269
Harassment	41.03% 112	58.97% 161	273
Bullying	51.09% 140	48.91% 134	274
Misconduct / wrongdoing	33.58% 90	66.42% 178	268
Witnessed			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	42.58% 109	57.42% 147	256
Harassment	53.75% 136	46.25% 117	253
Bullying	65.77% 171	34.23% 89	260
Misconduct / wrongdoing	56.42% 145	43.58% 112	257

Table 11: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Are you currently experiencing:			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	20.28% 57	79.72% 224	281
Harassment	23.38% 65	76.62% 213	278
Bullying	33.10% 94	66.90% 190	284
Misconduct / wrongdoing	21.38% 59	78.62% 217	276

Table 12: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If you have ever experienced discrimination / harassment / bullying / misconduct / wrongdoing with your current employer AND taken leave as a result, approximately how much leave did you take?							
	1 - 2 days	3 - 5 days	6 - 10 days	11 - 20 days	More than 21 days	Not applicable	Total
Sick leave	8.43% 22	11.88% 31	8.43% 22	5.75% 15	11.88% 31	53.64% 140	261
Flex leave	12.89% 29	4.89% 11	3.11% 7	1.78% 4	1.33% 3	76.00% 171	225
Recreation leave	1.72% 4	6.44% 15	9.01% 21	6.44% 15	9.87% 23	66.52% 155	233
Extended leave	0.00% 0	2.34% 5	2.34% 5	0.93% 2	4.67% 10	89.72% 192	214
Unpaid leave	0.00% 0	0.48% 1	0.48% 1	0.00% 0	2.42% 5	96.62% 200	207
Workers compensation	0.45% 1	0.00% 0	0.90% 2	2.69% 6	11.21% 25	84.75% 189	223

Table 13: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? In my workplace I know how to report the following:						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Discrimination	7.85% 23	10.92% 32	10.24% 30	56.66% 166	14.33% 42	293
Harassment	7.88% 23	9.59% 28	9.25% 27	58.56% 171	14.73% 43	292
Bullying	8.87% 26	9.56% 28	9.90% 29	57.00% 167	14.68% 43	293
Misconduct / wrongdoing	8.53% 25	8.87% 26	9.90% 29	58.02% 170	14.68% 43	293

Table 14: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? I am confident that I would be protected from reprisal for reporting the following:						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Discrimination	40.75% 119	24.32% 71	18.15% 53	12.67% 37	4.11% 12	292
Harassment	41.30% 121	25.94% 76	17.41% 51	12.29% 36	3.07% 9	293
Bullying	44.86% 131	24.66% 72	16.44% 48	11.30% 33	2.74% 8	292
Misconduct / wrongdoing	40.27% 118	25.60% 75	17.41% 51	12.29% 36	4.44% 13	293

Table 15: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Since starting work with your current employer have you reported an experience or witness of:			
Experienced / Witnessed			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	44.31% 113	55.69% 142	255
Harassment	59.92% 157	40.08% 105	262
Bullying	74.16% 198	25.84% 69	267
Misconduct / wrongdoing	54.23% 141	45.77% 119	260
Reported			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	26.72% 66	73.28% 181	247
Harassment	37.01% 94	62.99% 160	254
Bullying	46.51% 120	53.49% 138	258
Misconduct / wrongdoing	37.55% 95	62.45% 158	253

Table 16: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If you have ever experienced or witnessed discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing since starting work with your current employer but not reported it, why not?	
Not applicable - did not experience or witness anything	12.92% 31
Did not know how to report it	10.83% 26
Afraid of reporting it	67.50% 162
Advised to not report it	24.17% 58
Did not think it important enough to report	15.00% 36

Table 17: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If you have ever made a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing since starting work with your current employer were you satisfied with the outcome of your report?	
Yes	6.51% 19
No	44.18% 129
Partly satisfied	14.04% 41
Not applicable - never reported anything	35.27% 103

Table 18: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If your report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing was not resolved to your satisfaction. Please explain why are you not satisfied.	
No action was taken after I made the report	32.92% 53
Action taken after I made the report did not fix the problem	35.40% 57
No formal investigation was taken after I made the report	33.54% 54
Poor formal investigation was taken after I made the report	26.71% 43
I suffered adverse consequences because I made the report	35.40% 57

Table 19: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

You may have been bullied by more than one person in the past 12 months. Please answer only about the person who did the most serious bullying for the following question.	
A client or customer	1.47% 4
A fellow worker at your level	7.72% 21
A member of the public other than a client or customer	0.00% 0
A senior manager	21.69% 59
A subordinate	4.78% 13
Your Immediate Manager/Supervisor	17.65% 48
Prefer not to say	5.88% 16
Not applicable	30.51% 83
Other (please specify)	10.29% 28

Table 20: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If you have been bullied in the last 12 months please provide the frequency per behaviour.(please select one option only for all of the following behaviours)						
	Never	Once	Twice	3-5 times	More than 5 times	Total
Abusive, insulting or offensive language or comments	43.00% 86	8.00% 16	9.00% 18	20.50% 41	19.50% 39	200
Aggressive and intimidating conduct	31.68% 64	9.41% 19	8.42% 17	22.77% 46	27.72% 56	202
Belittling or humiliating comments	31.90% 67	9.05% 19	7.14% 15	21.43% 45	30.48% 64	210
Victimisation	50.99% 103	5.45% 11	7.43% 15	16.83% 34	19.31% 39	202
Practical jokes or initiation	78.72% 148	5.32% 10	2.66% 5	7.98% 15	5.32% 10	188
Unjustified criticism or complaints	33.49% 70	6.22% 13	10.05% 21	19.62% 41	30.62% 64	209
Deliberately excluding you from work-related activities	46.86% 97	6.28% 13	10.63% 22	14.01% 29	22.22% 46	207
Withholding information that is vital for effective work performance	46.57% 95	4.41% 9	8.33% 17	13.24% 27	27.45% 56	204
Setting unreasonable timelines or constantly changing deadlines	57.79% 115	1.01% 2	4.52% 9	13.07% 26	23.62% 47	199
Setting tasks that are unreasonably below or beyond your skill level	70.56% 139	4.57% 9	4.57% 9	5.08% 10	15.23% 30	197
Giving you inappropriate work for your job level and experience	69.54% 137	3.55% 7	5.08% 10	6.09% 12	15.74% 31	197
Denying access to information, supervision, consultation, resources to your detriment	54.41% 111	3.92% 8	5.39% 11	13.73% 28	22.55% 46	204
Spreading misinformation or malicious rumours	49.49% 98	6.06% 12	8.59% 17	15.15% 30	20.71% 41	198
Changing work arrangements such as rosters and leave to deliberately inconvenience you	72.02% 139	4.66% 9	4.15% 8	8.29% 16	10.88% 21	193

Table 21: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

The following behaviours are criminal acts and/or harassment. Please provide the frequency per behaviour you have experienced in the last 12 months (please select one option only for all of the following behaviours)					
	Never	Once	Twice	3-5 times	More than 5 times
Threat of physical harm	93.88% 230	2.86% 7	2.04% 5	1.22% 3	0.00% 0
Actual physical harm	98.76% 239	0.41% 1	0.41% 1	0.41% 1	0.00% 0
Sexual harassment	93.44% 228	1.23% 3	1.64% 4	1.64% 4	2.05% 5

Table 22: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

How effective are the following support services in your agency for staff who have experienced mental health issues as a result of their work:					
	Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Effective	Very effective
Post-incident counselling	21.37% 53	17.34% 43	35.89% 89	19.35% 48	6.05% 15
Professional supervision	21.63% 53	26.94% 66	34.69% 85	11.02% 27	5.71% 14
EAP	14.40% 36	15.60% 39	37.60% 94	24.40% 61	8.00% 20
Peer support	17.89% 44	12.60% 31	31.30% 77	31.71% 78	6.50% 16

Table 23: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

In the last five years have you ever asked for support from your current employer during a period of poor mental health?	
Yes	29.39% 82
No	50.18% 140
Please comment	20.43% 57

Table 24: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If you have answered Yes to the previous question, how well did your employer support you with reasonable adjustment?	
Very poorly	30.08% 37
Poorly	21.95% 27
Neither well nor poorly	15.45% 19
Well	16.26% 20
Very Well	16.26% 20

Table 25: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Are you currently on leave due to discrimination, harassment and / or bullying?	
Yes	1.09% 3
No	95.29% 263
If yes, approximately how many days leave have you taken?	10 responses

Table 26: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If you have experienced discrimination / harassment / bullying with your current employer did it cause you to make a workers' compensation claim?	
Yes	16.89% 38
No	83.11% 187

Table 27: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If No to the previous question, why didn't you make a claim for workers compensation?	
Don't know the claim procedure	16.15% 26
Doctor and / or family and friends advised against claiming	8.07% 13
Manager and / or work colleagues advised against claiming	6.21% 10
Afraid of consequences if I made a claim	55.28% 89
Other (please specify)	44.10% 71

Table 28: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

How effective are the policies and procedures in your agency at preventing and dealing with the following issues:						
	Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Effective	Very effective	Total
Discrimination	19.85% 52	29.01% 76	28.63% 75	19.08% 50	3.44% 9	262
Harassment	25.19% 66	31.30% 82	24.81% 65	16.41% 43	2.29% 6	262
Bullying	30.53% 80	31.30% 82	22.52% 59	13.74% 36	1.91% 5	262

Table 29: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Is your agency genuinely committed to preventing and properly managing instances of the following:						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Discrimination	19.33% 52	24.16% 65	24.91% 67	25.65% 69	5.95% 16	269
Harassment	23.70% 64	26.67% 72	20.00% 54	25.19% 68	4.44% 12	270
Bullying	27.78% 75	26.67% 72	19.63% 53	21.85% 59	4.07% 11	270

Table 30: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Does your agency comply with its own policies on:						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Discrimination	22.43% 59	25.10% 66	30.04% 79	18.63% 49	3.80% 10	263
Harassment	25.29% 66	30.27% 79	24.14% 63	17.24% 45	3.07% 8	261
Bullying	29.55% 78	28.41% 75	24.24% 64	15.15% 40	2.65% 7	264

Table 31: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

I have confidence in the ways my organisation resolves reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing	
Strongly disagree	38.75% 105
Disagree	33.21% 90
Neither disagree nor agree	16.24% 44
Agree	9.59% 26
Strongly agree	2.21% 6

Table 32: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Do you have suggestions for improving how your organisation prevents and manages reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing?
Answered: 142 Skipped: 215

Table 33: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Has your organisation improved its practices to prevent and manage reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing in the past few years?
Answered: 159 Skipped: 198

Table 34: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

The Parliamentary Inquiry is seeking information on "the appropriateness of uniforms provided to personnel in emergency services agencies". Do you have any comments on this issue?
Answered: 161 Skipped: 196

Table 35: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Are there any other related matters that you would like to comment on?
Answered: 110 Skipped: 247

Table 36: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If you would like to provide more detailed information to the Inquiry committee, or like to speak with the Inquiry committee, or would like more information from the PSA then please leave your contact details here. Your information will be kept confidential within the PSA.
Answered: 41 Skipped: 316

Attachment 2: Summary of survey findings for Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service

Organisational issues

There is a high level of concern reported for the following:

- "Workplace change is well managed in my organisation" - 77% disagree / strongly disagree
- "Performance is managed appropriately in my organisation" - 71% disagree / strongly disagree
- "It is ok to speak up and share a different view to my colleagues and manager" - 49% disagree / strongly disagree
- "The level of stressors in my workplace are acceptable" - 66% disagree / strongly disagree
- "My workload is acceptable" - 40% disagree / strongly disagree
- "My manager treats employees with dignity and respect" - 36% disagree / strongly disagree
- "People in my workgroup treat each other with respect" - 41% disagree / strongly disagree
- "My organisation respects individual differences (e.g. cultures, working styles, backgrounds, ideas)" - 28% disagree / strongly disagree
- "Age is not a barrier to success in my organisation" - 32% disagree / strongly disagree

Bullying

- 80% of respondents (273) had witnessed bullying with their current employer while 51% (178) had experienced bullying
- 69% of respondents (227) had witnessed bullying with their current employer in the past 12 months while 53% (186) had experienced bullying
- 29% of respondents (107) were currently experiencing bullying
- 70% of staff who have experienced or witnessed bullying have reported it
- 3 respondents (1%) were currently on leave due to discrimination, harassment and / or bullying

Harassment

- 73% of respondents (250) reported they had witnessed harassment with their current employer while 63% (228) reported they had experienced harassment
- 59% of respondents (195) reported they had witnessed harassment with their current employer in the past 12 months while 44% (153) reported they had experienced harassment
- 22% of respondents (81) reported they were currently experiencing harassment
- 62% of staff who have experienced or witnessed harassment have reported it

Discrimination

- 66% of respondents (226) reported they had witnessed discrimination with their current employer while 51% (178) reported they had experienced discrimination
- 48% of respondents (161) reported they had witnessed discrimination with their current employer in the past 12 months while 36% (120) reported they had experienced discrimination
- 18% of respondents (67) reported they were currently experiencing discrimination
- 56% of staff who have experienced or witnessed discrimination have reported it

Reporting

- Most respondents (approximately 70%) know how to make a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing
- About 60% of cases of discrimination, harassment, bullying and misconduct / wrongdoing experienced or witnessed are reported (Table 46)
- The main reasons for not making a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing were "Afraid of reporting it" (54%) and "Advised to not report it" (27%)
- Most respondents (approximately 65%) do not feel confident that they would be protected from reprisal for reporting discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing
- Only a small number of staff (21) who made a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing were satisfied with the outcome, while a further 59 staff were partially satisfied
- The top three reasons staff who made a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct / wrongdoing were not satisfied with the outcome were:
 - ◆ "Action taken after I made the report did not fix the problem" - 35%
 - ◆ "I suffered adverse consequences because I made the report" - 43%
 - ◆ "No action was taken after I made the report" - 34%

Support services

- Peer support (34%) and Employee Assistance Programs (29%) were rated as the top two types of effective support services for staff who have experienced mental health issues as a result of their work
- 20% of respondents had asked for support from their current employer during a period of poor mental health
- 27% of those who had asked for support from their current employer during a period of poor mental health thought their employer responded well. About half (49%) thought their employer responded poorly or very poorly
- 10% (27) of those who experienced discrimination / harassment / bullying with their current employer made a workers' compensation claim
- The top three reasons given by those who experienced discrimination / harassment / bullying with their current employer for not making a workers' compensation claim were:
 - ◆ "Afraid of consequences if I made a claim" - 57%
 - ◆ "Don't know the claim procedure" - 16%
 - ◆ " Manager and / or work colleagues advised against claiming " - 10%

Policies and Procedures

- Few respondents rated as effective or very effective the policies and procedures to prevent and deal with:
 - ◆ discrimination (23%)
 - ◆ harassment (19%)
 - ◆ bullying (17%)
- Few respondents agreed or strongly agreed their agency was genuinely committed to preventing and properly managing instances of:
 - ◆ discrimination (27%)
 - ◆ harassment (22%)
 - ◆ bullying (22%)
- Few respondents agreed or strongly agreed their agency complied with its own policies on:
 - ◆ discrimination (23%)
 - ◆ harassment (21%)
 - ◆ bullying (20%)
- 64% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed that they have confidence in the ways their organisation resolves reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing.

Other issues

- There were about 110 comments provided in a free text field for Other Issues.
- Comments here supported the themes that are present in the quantitative data, including:
 - ◆ the prevalence of discrimination, harassment, bullying and misconduct / wrongdoing
 - ◆ low levels of accountability for acting on complaints
 - ◆ poor Work Health Safety standards generally
 - ◆ different standards of workers compensation available to staff facing similar levels of risk
 - ◆ increasing levels of job insecurity contributing to mental stress
 - ◆ divisions between occupation groups of staff (uniformed and civilian staff, for example)
 - ◆ the need for better recruitment and promotions of managers who are capable of leading and training staff

Survey responses from PSA members in Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service

Table 37: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, current employer

Corrective Services	80% 365
National Parks & Wildlife Services	13% 58
Juvenile Justice	8% 35
Total	458

Table 38: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, main work location

Field	52% 238
Office	48% 217

Table 39: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Age is not a barrier to success in my organisation	10.57% 46	21.38% 93	27.59% 120	35.17% 153	5.29% 23	435
Cultural background is not a barrier to success in my organisation	4.36% 19	12.39% 54	29.82% 130	43.81% 191	9.63% 42	436
Disability is not a barrier to success in my organisation	9.89% 43	18.85% 82	42.53% 185	24.60% 107	4.14% 18	435
It is ok to speak up and share a different view to my colleagues and manager	20.46% 89	28.74% 125	19.77% 86	27.82% 121	3.22% 14	435
My manager treats employees with dignity and respect	20.00% 87	15.63% 68	20.23% 88	34.94% 152	9.20% 40	435
My organisation respects individual differences (e.g. cultures, working styles, backgrounds, ideas)	9.86% 43	17.66% 77	28.44% 124	38.76% 169	5.28% 23	436
My workload is acceptable	10.57% 46	29.43% 128	21.84% 95	35.86% 156	2.30% 10	435
People in my workgroup treat each other with respect	14.81% 64	25.69% 111	20.37% 88	32.41% 140	6.71% 29	432
Performance is managed appropriately in my organisation	34.25% 149	36.78% 160	17.01% 74	11.03% 48	0.92% 4	435
Sexual orientation is not a barrier to success in my organisation	6.70% 29	12.70% 55	31.64% 137	39.03% 169	9.93% 43	433
The level of stressors in my workplace are acceptable	26.15% 114	39.45% 172	17.20% 75	15.83% 69	1.38% 6	436
Workplace change is well managed in my organisation	37.93% 165	38.85% 169	14.48% 63	7.59% 33	1.15% 5	435

Table 40: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

Since starting work with your current employer have you ever experienced and / or witnessed:			
Experienced			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	50.71% 178	49.29% 173	351
Harassment	62.98% 228	37.02% 134	362
Bullying	71.27% 258	28.73% 104	362
Misconduct / wrongdoing	47.14% 165	52.86% 185	350
Witnessed			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	66.28% 226	33.72% 115	341
Harassment	73.10% 250	26.90% 92	342
Bullying	79.82% 273	20.18% 69	342
Misconduct / wrongdoing	72.67% 250	27.33% 94	344

Table 41: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

In the last 12 months with your current employer have you experienced and / or witnessed:			
Experienced			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	35.50% 120	64.50% 218	338
Harassment	43.71% 153	56.29% 197	350
Bullying	52.54% 186	47.46% 168	354
Misconduct / wrongdoing	35.00% 119	65.00% 221	340
Witnessed			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	48.20% 161	51.80% 173	334
Harassment	58.73% 195	41.27% 137	332
Bullying	68.58% 227	31.42% 104	331
Misconduct / wrongdoing	54.65% 182	45.35% 151	333

Table 42: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

Are you currently experiencing:			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	18.21% 67	81.79% 301	368
Harassment	21.95% 81	78.05% 288	369
Bullying	28.84% 107	71.16% 264	371
Misconduct / wrongdoing	13.11% 48	86.89% 318	366

Table 43: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

If you have ever experienced discrimination / harassment / bullying / misconduct / wrongdoing with your current employer AND taken leave as a result, approximately how much leave did you take?							
	1 - 2 days	3 - 5 days	6 - 10 days	11 - 20 days	More than 21 days	Not applicable	Total
Sick leave	16.24% 57	9.97% 35	5.98% 21	5.13% 18	8.26% 29	54.42% 191	351
Flex leave	5.10% 15	4.76% 14	1.70% 5	0.00% 0	1.70% 5	86.73% 255	294
Recreation leave	1.93% 6	5.47% 17	5.79% 18	7.72% 24	6.11% 19	72.99% 227	311
Extended leave	1.04% 3	2.77% 8	1.38% 4	2.42% 7	3.46% 10	88.93% 257	289
Unpaid leave	3.47% 10	0.69% 2	0.69% 2	1.04% 3	2.43% 7	91.67% 264	288
Workers compensation	0.66% 2	1.32% 4	0.99% 3	0.00% 0	8.61% 26	88.41% 267	302

Table 44: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? In my workplace I know how to report the following:						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Discrimination	3.97% 15	11.11% 42	14.55% 55	56.35% 213	14.02% 53	378
Harassment	3.71% 14	10.08% 38	13.79% 52	58.36% 220	14.06% 53	377
Bullying	4.24% 16	9.55% 36	13.79% 52	58.36% 220	14.06% 53	377
Misconduct / wrongdoing	4.24% 16	9.55% 36	13.53% 51	57.03% 215	15.65% 59	377

Table 45: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? I am confident that I would be protected from reprisal for reporting the following:						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Discrimination	32.63% 124	31.84% 121	21.32% 81	11.32% 43	2.89% 11	380
Harassment	32.89% 125	32.89% 125	21.32% 81	10.26% 39	2.63% 10	380
Bullying	33.95% 129	33.16% 126	20.26% 77	9.74% 37	2.89% 11	380
Misconduct / wrongdoing	32.72% 124	29.02% 110	22.96% 87	11.08% 42	4.22% 16	379

Table 46: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

Since starting work with your current employer have you reported an experience or witness of:			
Experienced / Witnessed			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	45.87% 150	54.13% 177	327
Harassment	58.43% 194	41.57% 138	332
Bullying	62.95% 209	37.05% 123	332
Misconduct / wrongdoing	53.19% 175	46.81% 154	329
Reported			
	Yes	No	Total
Discrimination	26.81% 85	73.19% 232	317
Harassment	37.93% 121	62.07% 198	319
Bullying	46.23% 147	53.77% 171	318
Misconduct / wrongdoing	43.96% 142	56.04% 181	323

Table 47: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

If you have ever experienced or witnessed discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing since starting work with your current employer but not reported it, why not?	
Not applicable - did not experience or witness anything	19.87% 63
Did not know how to report it	8.83% 28
Afraid of reporting it	54.26% 172
Advised to not report it	27.44% 87
Did not think it important enough to report	15.46% 49

Table 48: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

If you have ever made a report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing since starting work with your current employer were you satisfied with the outcome of your report?	
Yes	5.56% 21
No	42.33% 160
Partly satisfied	15.61% 59
Not applicable - never reported anything	36.51% 138

Table 49: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

If your report of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing was not resolved to your satisfaction. Please explain why are you not satisfied.	
No action was taken after I made the report	34.42% 74
Action taken after I made the report did not fix the problem	34.88% 75
No formal investigation was taken after I made the report	27.91% 60
Poor formal investigation was taken after I made the report	33.95% 73
I suffered adverse consequences because I made the report	43.72% 94

Table 50: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

You may have been bullied by more than one person in the past 12 months. Please answer only about the person who did the most serious bullying for the following question.	
A client or customer	2.72% 9
A fellow worker at your level	12.08% 40
A member of the public other than a client or customer	1.21% 4
A senior manager	20.24% 67
A subordinate	5.44% 18
Your Immediate Manager/Supervisor	12.08% 40
Prefer not to say	8.46% 28
Not applicable	32.33% 107
Other (please specify)	5.44% (18)

Table 51: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

If you have been bullied in the last 12 months please provide the frequency per behaviour.(please select one option only for all of the following behaviours)						
	Never	Once	Twice	3-5 times	More than 5 times	Total
Abusive, insulting or offensive language or comments	41.67% 105	7.94% 20	8.33% 21	17.46% 44	24.60% 62	252
Aggressive and intimidating conduct	38.31% 100	9.58% 25	10.73% 28	20.31% 53	21.07% 55	261
Belittling or humiliating comments	35.34% 94	7.89% 21	9.40% 25	24.81% 66	22.56% 60	266
Victimisation	57.96% 142	6.53% 16	8.16% 20	14.69% 36	12.65% 31	245
Practical jokes or initiation	69.71% 168	4.15% 10	4.15% 10	11.62% 28	10.37% 25	241
Unjustified criticism or complaints	35.85% 95	7.17% 19	12.08% 32	20.75% 55	24.15% 64	265
Deliberately excluding you from work-related activities	59.26% 144	4.53% 11	9.47% 23	10.29% 25	16.46% 40	243
Withholding information that is vital for effective work performance	51.98% 131	5.95% 15	8.73% 22	11.11% 28	22.22% 56	252
Setting unreasonable timelines or constantly changing deadlines	65.71% 161	4.49% 11	4.90% 12	9.80% 24	15.10% 37	245
Setting tasks that are unreasonably below or beyond your skill level	72.57% 172	5.06% 12	3.38% 8	6.75% 16	12.24% 29	237
Giving you inappropriate work for your job level and experience	72.88% 172	2.12% 5	7.20% 17	6.36% 15	11.44% 27	236
Denying access to information, supervision, consultation, resources to your detriment	59.76% 147	2.85% 7	7.72% 19	11.79% 29	17.89% 44	246
Spreading misinformation or malicious rumours	47.81% 120	6.37% 16	11.16% 28	12.75% 32	21.91% 55	251
Changing work arrangements such as rosters and leave to deliberately inconvenience you	67.50% 162	5.00% 12	6.25% 15	6.67% 16	14.58% 35	240

Table 52: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

The following behaviours are criminal acts and/or harassment. Please provide the frequency per behaviour you have experienced in the last 12 months (please select one option only for all of the following behaviours)					
	Never	Once	Twice	3-5 times	More than 5 times
Threat of physical harm	86.08% 266	5.83% 18	1.62% 5	3.24% 10	3.24% 10
Actual physical harm	94.79% 291	1.30% 4	0.98% 3	1.63% 5	1.30% 4
Sexual harassment	93.46% 286	1.31% 4	1.63% 5	2.29% 7	1.31% 4

Table 53: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

How effective are the following support services in your agency for staff who have experienced mental health issues as a result of their work:					
	Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Effective	Very effective
Post-incident counselling	21.57% 66	29.08% 89	30.07% 92	16.01% 49	3.27% 10
Professional supervision	26.97% 82	25.33% 77	31.58% 96	13.82% 42	2.30% 7
EAP	19.11% 60	20.70% 65	30.89% 97	24.84% 78	4.46% 14
Peer support	19.42% 60	18.12% 56	28.80% 89	25.89% 80	7.77% 24

Table 54: Percent and number of responses Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

In the last five years have you ever asked for support from your current employer during a period of poor mental health?	
Yes	19.88% 68
No	67.84% 232
Please comment	12.28% 42

Table 55: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

If you have answered Yes to the previous question, how well did your employer support you with reasonable adjustment?	
Very poorly	33.33% 37
Poorly	15.32% 17
Neither well nor poorly	24.32% 27
Well	16.22% 18
Very Well	10.81% 12

Table 56: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

Are you currently on leave due to discrimination, harassment and / or bullying?	
Yes	0.89% 3
No	96.15% 325
If yes, approximately how many days leave have you taken?	

Table 57: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

If you have experienced discrimination / harassment / bullying with your current employer did it cause you to make a workers' compensation claim?	
Yes	9.75% 27
No	90.25% 250

Table 58: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

If No to the previous question, why didn't you make a claim for workers compensation?	
Don't know the claim procedure	15.79% 33
Doctor and / or family and friends advised against claiming	8.61% 18
Manager and / or work colleagues advised against claiming	9.57% 20
Afraid of consequences if I made a claim	56.94% 11
Other (please specify)	34.93% 73

Table 59: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

How effective are the policies and procedures in your agency at preventing and dealing with the following issues:						
	Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Effective	Very effective	Total
Discrimination	20.43% 66	24.77% 80	31.58% 102	21.36% 69	1.86% 6	323
Harassment	22.91% 74	28.79% 93	29.41% 95	17.03% 55	1.86% 6	232
Bullying	26.48% 85	29.28% 94	26.79% 86	16.20% 52	1.25% 4	321

Table 60: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

Is your agency genuinely committed to preventing and properly managing instances of the following:						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Discrimination	17.23% 56	26.15% 85	29.23% 95	24.31% 79	3.08% 10	325
Harassment	20.31% 66	31.38% 102	25.85% 84	20.00% 65	2.46% 8	325
Bullying	23.15% 75	31.79% 103	22.84% 74	19.44% 63	2.78% 9	324

Table 61: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

Does your agency comply with its own policies on:						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total
Discrimination	19.14% 62	26.54% 86	31.17% 101	20.99% 68	2.16% 7	324
Harassment	21.36% 69	29.41% 95	28.17% 91	18.89% 61	2.17% 7	323
Bullying	24.07% 78	30.86% 100	25.31% 82	17.59% 57	2.16% 7	324

Table 62: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

I have confidence in the ways my organisation resolves reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing	
Strongly disagree	34.05% 111
Disagree	30.06% 98
Neither disagree nor agree	24.54% 80
Agree	9.82% 32
Strongly agree	1.53% 5

Table 63: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

Do you have suggestions for improving how your organisation prevents and manages reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing?
Answered: 141 Skipped: 317

Table 64: Percent and number of responses, Corrective Services, Juvenile Justice and Rural Fire Service, perceptions of organisation

Has your organisation improved its practices to prevent and manage reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying or misconduct/wrongdoing in the past few years?
Answered: 157 Skipped: 301

Table 65: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

The Parliamentary Inquiry is seeking information on "the appropriateness of uniforms provided to personnel in emergency services agencies". Do you have any comments on this issue?
Answered: 146 Skipped: 312

Table 66: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

Are there any other related matters that you would like to comment on?
Answered: 108 Skipped: 350

Table 67: Percent and number of responses, all Emergency Services agencies, perceptions of organisation

If you would like to provide more detailed information to the Inquiry committee, or like to speak with the Inquiry committee, or would like more information from the PSA then please leave your contact details here. Your information will be kept confidential within the PSA.

Answered: 54 Skipped: 404

Attachment 3: Draft Workplace Health & Safety Psychosocial Regulation

1. Person in control of a business or undertaking to identify psychosocial hazards

(1) A person in control of a business or undertaking must identify and control the psychosocial risks associated with, but not limited to

- (a) Job Control
- (b) Organisational Culture
- (c) Career Development
- (d) Home-work interface
- (e) Workplace Design
- (f) Violence
- (g) Bullying
- (h) Harassment
- (i) Fatigue
- (j) Time pressure
- (k) Work pace
- (l) Workload
- (m) Task Variety
- (n) Emotionally demanding tasks
- (o) Working hours
- (p) Shift work
- (q) Task design
- (r) Working with people
- (s) Mental task demands
- (t) Hazardous work
- (u) Workplace conflict
- (v) Job and skill match

(2) A person in control of a business or undertaking must ensure that effective procedures are in place, and are implemented, to control psychosocial hazards:

- (a) immediately prior to using premises for the first time as a place of work,
- (b) before changes to work practices and systems of work are introduced,
- (c) while work is being carried out,
- (d) when new or additional information becomes available
- (e) the results of consultation by the duty holder under the Act or these Regulations indicate that a review is necessary;
- (f) a health and safety representative requests the review.

(3) Person in control of a business or undertaking to eliminate or control risks

Subject to subclause (2), a person in control of a business or undertaking must eliminate any foreseeable psychosocial risk to the health or safety of:

- (a) any worker of the person in control of a business or undertaking, or
- (b) any other person legally at the person in control of a business or undertaking's place of work, or both, that arises from the conduct of the person in control of a business or undertaking.

If it is not possible to eliminate the risk, the person in control of a business or undertaking must control the risk as far as reasonably practicable.

(4) A person in control of a business or undertaking must ensure that all measures that are adopted to eliminate or control psychosocial risks to health and safety are properly used, maintained, evaluated, redesigned and implemented. (need to check the hierarchy of control regulation)

Suggested clauses given the Risk assessment clauses

Managing risks to health and safety

A person conducting a business or undertaking must manage the risk of a psychosocial Hazards.

Specific control measure - Administrative control

A person in control of a business or undertaking must ensure that effective procedures are in place, and are implemented, to control psychosocial hazards:

- (a) immediately prior to using premises for the first time as a place of work,
 - (b) before changes to work practices and systems of work are introduced,
 - (c) while work is being carried out
-