

Dear PSA and Transformation Team

The members of the SafeWork VG had a meeting to seek feedback, questions, concerns with the RMP. Attached to this submission is the direct feedback obtained from members using the MS Whiteboard functionality.

The SafeWork VG Executive has also provided a synopsis of this feedback above each of the stream points. To obtain feedback etc we identified specific streams or areas that we knew were of topic / interest this included:

- Structure
- Team Coordinator role
- RSO's
- Impacts
- Other items

When it came to the **Structure** stream, many believed that critical harms had not been adequately addressed or considered. That certain subject expertise would be lost due to specialist teams being in essence dissolved.

Boundary issues raised concerns with members as to how this works in practicality as well as consistency of decision making with concerns around vehicle selection, access to training, specialised programs not being run.

Many identified that the proposed organisational chart appears to be heavy at the top with more Directors and now with more managers being they, State Coordinators and or Team Coordinators.

Some Directorates are very large such as those with DG&E, MHF and TPV being mixed with licensing, these teams though are not licensing and should be with the compliance-based directorates.

Concerns were also raised around potential introduction of more silo's and risks of elitist cultures being established with the way teams and directorates have been proposed. In addition reporting line concerns have been raised with ASI's and State Inspector's in some areas in the proposed structure reporting to a TC when this was expressly said at briefing's that this would not happen.

Structure:

- An Occupational Dust Disease Directorate has been suggested many times but has not been recognised in the structure. Considering many organisations now have dust diseases as part of their remit. i.e.: NSW Dust Disease Tribunal etc.
- There has been a longstanding gap between MHF and DG&E in the ability to address potential major hazard facilities (PMHFs) (Sch15 10% threshold) due to resourcing constraints. Unlike MHF and DG&E, which each have dedicated attention to their respective PCBUs, PMHFs have not received the same level of focus and pose a concerning level of risk. WorkSafe VIC has a specific team for PMHFs, highlighting the gap currently present in SWNSW.
- The current structure has asbestos & demolition in "specialist harm prevention". The team should be in operations and enforcement.

- Why has working environment, return to work and health been dissolved when between them they are responsible for around 27 hazard areas - who will do this work when they are in metro?
- Boundary - regional being merged with metro in some locations and no information shared about how this might work.
- The structure is top-heavy with Managers.
- Asbestos & Demolition is now "asbestos, demolition & dust diseases (silica). We are struggling at the best of times without the added works associated with "dust diseases and silica"
- The similarity in work, why wasn't Working Environment placed in specialist harms like H&T and Engineers
- The "Authorisations" team Now has a span of control across Major Hazard, TPV, DG&E, SAIA and a very large group (licensing) The name makes no sense to what we do day to day. But more importantly has 112 people in the team (average director has 60 reports approx.) The focus/span is too great! In addition Hygiene and Tox are not in with DG&E. We share the same chapter within the regulations and teach new inspectors together.!
- Specialist teams such as those in CESA are not recognised as 'state based' teams. This has an impact when requiring certain resources, budgets, fatigue, risk, vehicles and staffing. Geographically this has not been considered by the organisation.
- The model still enables generalist areas to be a dumping ground for jobs which may not be clear. A model which is risk based , i.e. the reverse of what they have done, is more appropriate. Rather than dissolving the specialist areas and building the metro space, why not remove the metro team and place the inspectors under managers which are responsible for hazards which are structured similar to the legislation
- Construction identified in Newcastle and Wollongong - agree there is a big construction industry presence and need, however Wollongong and Newcastle would be better kept regional and the work managed accordingly, the Manager needs line of sight of all team members, this proposed structure continues to stretch resources not fix it. Alternative - have inspectors take turns in "general" and "construction" this maintains skills, avoids regulatory capture, and allows the team to manage peaks of work and staff absences
- The addition of Dust Diseases (incl. Silica) would not sit best with the A&D team in the new proposed structure. Dust hazards manifesting into dust diseases would still fall under the Hazardous Chemicals chapter of the legislation and best suited to be addressed by inspectors with Science/Occupational Hygiene Backgrounds - especially given the scrutiny and public/media attention around Silica.
- Interventions - challenges with collaboration, timing, resources etc as it is, opportunity in proposed structure to have clear leadership and direction that is consistent and consistently meets customer needs i.e., currently each directorate uses different templates, software platforms, competes for Comms resources, does own data mining, evaluations differ etc this leads to inconsistency and inefficiency.
- Feedback was provided to the reform team relating to the structure of asbestos and demolition prior to the initial release. There has been no feedback or reasons provided as to why the structure is the way it is
- Managers/TCs need have their whole office i.e., Regional office or team report to them (not split into TC/Manager reporting lines), this is a major pain point now with smaller Regional/Construction inspectors in regional areas. If they are split into 'more senior' inspectors and other, we will have the same issues as now - not enough resources. It is

also important for more experienced inspectors to be available to support newer/less experienced inspectors. It will also create an 'elitist' culture.

- Regional North and South - what work works well now is a singular Director for WHS Regional and Construction (construction regional and metro are naturally working in unison), splitting into North and South will just create competition, will both Directors really agree and be consistent. More efficient to have one leader to manage resources, operations and programs.
- Why are we even adding another level of Management? If the Managers are overworked, we should employ more Managers where required.
- Specifically in regional offices there should be more Managers, SI and ASI positions. The majority of SI and ASI roles exist in Metro or advisory functions.
- What is EXEMPLAR - how is this measured, considered
- Why are some direct reports going to Team Manager and others to Team Coordinator? Surely the Team Coordinator would need to have oversight over all the operational needs/resources of their hub to adequate equitably. Under the proposed structure, this would be disjointed, create inconsistencies and some confusion as to who would attend to high priority and escalated issues (e.g., media, high profile and critical events, personnel resources for the area, stakeholder engagement, office management e.g., safety/assets etc) and if a Team Manager and Coordinator are both active in this space
- ASI and SI roles were said to report to Team Manager level (during the briefing 02.07.24), this has been inconsistently applied in the proposed structure. Furthermore, this limits the operational deployment of personnel to manage work, support others
- Proper distribution of staff is required. The numbers, particularly in the Metro and Specialist areas there are teams with 4 people, then some with 15+, totally inequitable.
- The proposed structure in Investigations & Response is too big for a Directorate. The Advisor Services, Triage & Response should form another Directorate. Investigations Inspectors do not give advice during investigations, rather enforce compliance. This should align with the National Compliance and Enforcement Framework.
- The High Risk Workplaces & Repeat Offenders Unit would suit being in the Investigations Directorate along with Legal.
- Shouldn't there be a position above the Manager and not below? There seems to be a big gap between the Manager role and the Director role.
- There is also an opportunity for Advisory Services, Response Coord & Triage to join with High Risk Workplaces & Repeat Offenders - the referral from notification of incidents would be smooth.
- To stop job dumping or not completing jobs in certain areas of the business, there could be an argument to bring back a similar structure to the old industry teams. Construction would do all facets of Construction, Transport / Storage, Retail / Wholesale etc.
- Advisory Services to take in incident notification / triage function as they already take RFS's. The RCWV team, instead of answering phones for large periods, can be spread to areas in need of more Inspectors in the field completing compliance work. Incidents that need to be released, by an Inspector can be done by the relevant Duty Phone (Construction, Metro, Regional area, where they can also directly refer through to the appropriate Manager that will organise a response.
- Why do we need another Management role. Inspectors are paid the lowest, complete majority of the field work which carries the risk and stress. An ASI and/or SI should be in each office with a local manager doing some of the "management" workload if it cannot

be handled (Which I don't know with a manager in each office this cannot be completed!), We don't need another role which requires an Inspector to justify the role or another team/position demanding results from Inspectors.

- The Auditor General's report, and the McDougal review highlighted a need for a more effective strategic and data driven approach. The new structure does little to free up managers timer be involved in strategic planning and TC's are not the answer!
- There should be consideration of bringing back industry teams so as to ensure appropriate resources are available
- The Authorisations directorate is too large (112) and licensing is not a good fit with MHF, DG&E. Both of these teams are operational i.e.. cradle to grave, in regards to dealing with PCBU's From inception/notification of a site, verification, investigation, provide advice, compliance, involved in prosecution and involved in safe end-of-life closure of a site/removal.
- No rationale being given as to current specialist inspector workloads (e.g. committees; working groups etc) ... How will this continue when we are to be generalist inspectors in this new framework

The **Team Coordinator** stream identified that many actually do not believe there is a need to return this role (as also identified in the structure stream) but to fill the gap between the Director and State Coordinator roles and introduce more senior level Inspectors such as ASI's and State Inspectors with operational skills, knowledge to take on the technical functions such as specialist assistance, guidance, mentoring of lower level Inspectors.

The current draft role descript did not align with the Inspector's Award requirements around a need for an Advanced Diploma but that these roles must have operational knowledge and skills and should come from the Inspectorate.

The number of direct reports was also considered to be too high. The risks of educating non-Inspectors into the TC roles was identified as significant and that as it stands now, a new Inspector is not really ready to go it alone as an Inspector for 12 plus months. This will apply to TC roles where not filled by current Inspectors.

Team Coordinator

- TC Role description requires Adv Dip this is not required under the Inspectors Award
- TC role direct reports started at 20 and are now 15. This is still too high. What does the GSE say about direct reports for this type of role?
- Team Coordinator roles and supporting their training will have a significant impact, particularly if high levels are recruited externally. Does clause 17.2 apply to these roles?
- If TCs recruited externally or recruited internally from existing clerical staff, then the full Diploma is required - right? With an increased number of individuals completing qualifications, there will inevitably be additional workload for the RTO and the many inspectors who train and assess new inspectors.
- If recruited internally from the existing Inspectorate then a specialised program will need to be developed to cater for 'gap training'. This will also lead to vacancies in the Inspectorate and further recruitment that could likely attract more external candidates requiring NITP training so there is an ongoing flow on effect.
 - This, on top of the proposed additional service delivery requirements for BCT/RTO, (training 'all employees') will significantly impact the team and those

across the organisation who contribute to the various programs and support new inspectors in the field e.g. Mentors.

- What is the pay disparity between manager and TC and TC/State Inspector. Also how is it determined that some SI/ASI's report to TC and in other teams those grades report direct to Manager. Why would someone want TC role if doing just as much as manager if not more?
- It appears the organisation is trying to make the TC role a "one size fits all" rather than if / where a specific need would be required. It also appears that the TC RD is a merge of the old DC and the current SI RD's although no thought to the administrative burden against the "field" expectation. Add to this the span of control issues where it is the belief that you shouldn't manage more than 7 people to be an effective leader, they have flagged 15!
- The only team in the new Specialist Harm prevention directorate that had no TC role is the H&T team. If TC's are being added into other teams, then H&T should also receive this position.
- TC's are not really required. There needs to be an assessment of the Director and Manager roles, as the last restructure resulted in a lot of dumping of activities from the existing directors. The RSO's are positioned more widely, when no RSO was available, There is an opportunity to look how the RSO and Manager will work together BEFORE the role out of a TC.
- If externally recruited, TCs will take at least a year or more, to attain their authorities and competencies, learn the art of inspecting, and grasp our systems, procedures etc. Who will be expected to train them i.e., the RTO and the people who will report to the role
- The RMP states TCs will manage the junior inspectors yet there isn't an equal balance between junior and senior inspectors (ASI & SI). How will this work?
- More Front line inspectors required for boots on ground rather than a hybrid TC, which will simply be to busy doing managers work to be field based.
- TC's will be a hindrance to good communication in some teams. They will not be able to manage the numbers and be more "boots on the ground"
- Some areas that a TC have been earmarked will still leave some Managers with over 10 direct reports, this does not reduce any workload. At least the pre March 2016 structure (pre GSE "compliance") helped have appropriate structure to the organisation / Inspectorate.
- For those SI's who already undertake the same role as a combined TC/SI in smaller teams, why hasn't a reconsideration of the SI2 role been considered for smaller teams to provide some of the TC functions without having to influence without authority?
- The TC is a double edged sword for teams / managers. No sane manager or team would refuse another position which may have capacity for an inspector role. The issue is that it's probably the wrong type of role for a majority, if not all teams. If they're willing to give all teams a TC, then why not let the team nominate a role up to the TC grade?
- remuneration levels for managers and TCs needs to be increased
- With the Inspectors award, as said we have a Y shape which has Technical ASI & SI Arm and then Leadership /manager Arm. Part of the issue is we have not used the ASI/SI arm as a technical review and mentoring role. Instead we expect all managers to do technical and people management roles. While ASI & SI are not to do people

management or supervisory roles, we should be looking at what they can do to help reflect the award

- This TC role is another management/admin role which is going to micromanage Inspectors and just another position who needs Inspectors to do tasks to justify the role.
- If TC role has to manage 15 reports, mentor and review jobs of those 15 then it is not going to be boots on the ground role intended for the purpose of its reintroduction
- Role of the TC and reporting lines. Too many reporting under a TC, Is also a working inspector with potentially limited ability to be in the field. Will not be able to perform their duties satisfactorily. Significant burn out (this will be across the board). Recipe for Psych injury, work overload, stress claims (this will be across the board)

RSO's were identified as being a critical component of ensuring Inspector's can be in the field as much as possible. That team's have been missing administrative support for many years, which has had an impact on administrative burdens within the Inspectorate and that the proposed structure does not address this.

The work of the RSO was recognised as being a critical function within SafeWork that supports the Inspectorate in undertaking their duties and that no reduction in these roles should occur and if anything increased numbers should be considered.

RSOs

- Less RSO positions will increase workload of Inspector's as these roles do multiple administrative tasks for the Inspectorate
- Specialist teams rely on RSO's for a number of support services. Large volumes of admin (such as travel booking, bulk trimming etc.) may not be possible for the smaller teams where inspectors are already in short supply.
- RSOs do more than Trimming. Customer liaison in office and in field, office management (they complete safety observation checklists, are often our fire wardens, HSRs and first aid officers) liaise with tradies and service provides (secure bins, pest control, repairs, visitors to office etc) if the McDougall and Audit reports want to relieve the Inspector admin burden, reducing RSOs will impact Inspectors who will likely have to perform these tasks
- RSO RD - the ROSO is not an accurate reflection of RSO role. If SW is making a decision about this role based on this RD, it is not an accurate reflection of what they do.
- Opportunity for RSOs to take on more customer support e.g., more in field liaison at field days, events, exhibits, representing SW to promote advisory products and services. Our RSOs have done a stellar job in coordinating our 9 regional consultation HSR forums
- Increase inspector and TC role, but reducing RSOs who provide support for each – what will happen when RSOs are on leave, will they have to cover 4 or more regional areas! This is too much work
- How can RSOs put in EOI for a role that the ROSO RD doesn't reflect their current work
- With lesser RSOs, how will all our Inspector accountable books be managed for Regional teams

- A reduction in admin support will increase to admin work required by inspectors. This workload is already taking inspectors away from carrying out field visits. Inspector productivity will be further impacted.
- RSO's are not evenly distributed and some teams do not have access to an admin support office at all. While some teams have multiple. Eg regional offices where rso position removed in new structure Investigations teams were rso report to another manager.
- Some RSO roles have already been filled/fenced as they are in specialist teams EG, MHF, DG&E. This decision was made to minimise disruption during a time of major change and because the RSO has specialised expertise/experience. This should not change to make others feel good. Stick with your decision.
- Explain how getting rid of RSO's is going to free up more time for inspectors given the amount of admin work we already have to do!!!

Impacts were identified in a number of ways, this could have been individual impacts, team, directorate and organisational impacts.

Concerns were raised that the proposed 53 administrative losses is just that and that these positions should not be counted off against the proposed 31 new TC positions, due to the reasons raised above with the TC roles.

Work complexity and specialist functions appears to have been missed or lost in the RMP and proposed structure. With critical work not been identified at all.

Data is not being used appropriately and this is not being used to respond to the issues raised in the external review reports against this RMP.

Boundary maps changing that can have considerable impact on availability or the type of work being conducted as well as provisions in the Inspectors Award and the Crown Employees Award for Regional workers not being considered.

Impacts

- 53 Administrative staff losses - more workload onto an already over worked Inspectorate
- Concerns raised that regional construction (Newcastle. & W/Gong) are being mapped to construction metro and may lose the Regional Inspector classification and some conditions such as the selection of motor vehicles, regional travel and overnight accommodation benefits when required to travel to Sydney etc.
- Who will do the specialist work that Working Environment, RTW & Health currently do? The work won't go away.
- Complexity of types of work the different teams do that have specific requirements
- There has been no explanation into what teams will be doing. Asbestos & Demolition cover multiple issues / tasks. Will these change or will it be the same?
- Data is needed to be shared to show the decisions are accurate. However it must also include business number and worker numbers not just the RFS & Incidents.
- I was just on that hook up via phone. I have a question about , if the specialist teams are not going to be around, then that will affect NITP training with specialist training and also as a new inspector, I can call upon specialist teams for advice. If the teams are no longer available and just mixed anywhere, than a lot of experience has been lost. Construction

also has projects like electrical and scaffolding! Will these projects no longer happen in regional areas as teams will be mixed, just my thoughts.

- Interventions - return identified inspectors to field, this would immediately boost operational resources in regional and metro areas, alternatively inspectors can still participate and collaborate to develop programs or offer technical expertise via EOI or nomination
- Each directorate needs business governance support - CSG have just opened temp recruitment for relieving PO role, great idea to support the directorate, manage this work, this supports inspectors who can do more field work and less admin
- what is happening to people going through a recruitment process right now? I know a position will start regionally next week, and in another couple of weeks, they will be doing something different because of this restructure i.e., "this is not the job I signed up for"
- WHS legislative Delegations will need to be revised to reflect the new TC role
- In 2020 when Regional Construction was commenced, it was identified through WSMS that 1/3 of the work in the regions was construction related, and 2/3 was WHS related. Now fast forward down the track, construction does not appear a priority outside Newcastle / Sydney / Wollongong. Wonder if WSMS was consulted.
- Directorates do the same thing differently from Workload reviews (frequency, templates), TRIM and records management, stakeholder engagement, project development/design/project documentation and templates/evaluation, WSMS. This restructure is a positive opportunity to improve consistency in our application of policies/procedures, but we need a structure that supports this.
- Newcastle picking up the central coast council will increase the Newcastle businesses by 47% yet only 3 additional inspectors from metro. If the construction border for Newcastle is narrowed to only Lake mac and Newcastle LGA, it will further add jobs and businesses to the Newcastle office.
- has consideration being given to extending the consultation?
- Numbers of front line inspectors does not match the previous structure, or the propose org chart to the tables!
- How with this restructure affect our working agreement with SIRA - referrals for non-insurance, etc?
- I have observed first hand, the immense negative impact of the reduction in RSO positions in Regional offices.
- Why are Inspectors so far down the line with salary (As discussed the "TC and Managers role isn't enough money") Its frustrating when the Inspectorate has 4 levels of management (ASI, SI, TGC & Manager) getting paid well, when the inspectors competing most of the field work has 3 levels - Inspectors (Entry to Principle) are not really paid well and is never discussed. Everyone requires Inspectors to do their job to justify theirs, we have to deal with personal complaints, court, the complex, stressful jobs, work load etc. - Inspectors are being left behind as normal in this structure.
- Not considering workers with a disability and the impact of returning to front-line duties for Inspector with hearing loss trying to hear/talk n a noisy workplace)
- Bandage process moving specialist operational inspectors to Metro to increase numbers.
- Boundary change is an issue (again looks like a bandage solution to reduce the WHS Metro operational stress)

- If a manager was not successful, would they have a priority EOI or be considered for a TC role and also, what would happen if that was likely to be in the same office as the manager (the notes in the updated org chart indicate that managers and TC will be at alternate offices).
- What would happen if a manager was not successful, or did not want to apply for either Manager or TC role? Would they be considered as part of the mobility process, or would they be slotted back into the inspectorate because they have authorities.

Other issues / items raised included members raising serious concerns about the RTO and how the RTO was identified as being exemplar but this proposal is likely to diminish this. In addition to this, recognition that training is actually provided by SafeWork's own subject matter experts.

Concerns around safety risks including those associated with psychosocial were not considered prior to the all staff announcement.

Other items

- SafeWork RTO / ICPD/MCPD - Team will go from servicing 370 Inspectors to 800+ staff with the same resourcing. Training provided to the Inspectorate will be significantly reduced.
- The functions of the current Reviewable Decisions Coordinator RD (not in new structure) have been moved under the 2 x new Internal Review Advisor roles which will be using the newly created Senior Assurance Officer RD. The new RD is inadequate and does not refer to internal reviews which is a delegated legislative function enshrined across multiple Acts. IRs are not assurance or compliance activities, but are external appeals against SafeWork decisions that involve communication with external stakeholders such as applicants and can necessitate Court appearance and cross examination. The new RD makes no reference to external stakeholders or legislative functions of IRs.
- Expanding the scope of the current Business Capability Team to provide all training for all staff (800+) with no additional resourcing will have a detrimental impact on existing Inspector training programs (NITP, Adv Dip, ICPD/MCPD). Shame as the McD and AO reports had positive views for the continuation of Insp training. Opens the Regulator up to increased risk.
- While the expansion of providing training and development services to all employees is well intended, this will come at a cost to the existing solid program of inspector education, as confirmed by the recent McDougall review, impacting SafeWork's strategic objectives. The team see benefit in offering L&D to all SW employees however, strongly propose that the offerings are confined to programs directly related to building and enhancing the regulatory posture of SafeWork, that is, programs that build regulatory capability rather than a focus on NSW PSC capabilities. There are many external training companies who can provide general skills training.
- The current BCT team composition is 9 team members including our Manager. Transferring to the Training and Development team, we are anticipated to be responsible for all SafeWork T&D, moving from only training for SW Inspectors and Managers. More team resources should be considered for the increased newly identified 5 main focus areas to be able to continue meeting the McDougall and Audit report outcomes and to meet the new business requirements.

- Many reviews have identified the critical need for ongoing capability development for Inspectors to reduce the risk of regulatory failure and to ensure that actual practice aligns to SafeWork's policies and procedures. In the proposed structure, the BCT is being reallocated to serve 'all employees', which will significantly reduce the focus on Inspectorate refresher training and potentially the quantity and quality of refresher training for the Inspectorate. The team has concerns about this, as numerous reports have highlighted the importance of this function, including the NSW Ombudsman Report, SRRP, Auditor General's Report, and McDougall Review.
- The GSE has always been explained to us that maximum numbers are allocated against each position type. Why is that not clearly visible and determining direct report numbers?
- Excessive number of directors and executive directors.
- Proposed changes to RTO RDs to be SPO/PO/APO: The 5 staff in the RTO side of BCT provide a regulated function with specific requirements to adhere to ASQA standards. Current RD of Senior Advisor RTO Services, Advisor RTO Services and RTO Services Officer clearly outline the responsibilities and the team are unsure as to the rationale behind the proposed change as the work they perform does not align with that of Project Management. The RTO RDs should be retained for consistency and to acknowledge the specialised function and services provided.
- hasn't the SafeWork ELT applied Clauses 55C & 55D and the Code of practice psychosocial to the current process. This is a legal requirement.
- Geographical boundaries for Hunter / Central coast plus other boundaries have not been provided
- application of legislative requirements for consultation and psychosocial considerations
- Some Specialist teams have all state Inspector and ASI roles while other specialist teams are not given the same recognition for the specialist skills and background they bring into the organisation. These teams still require inspectors, senior inspectors and Principal inspectors to conduct the same level of work as ASIs and State Inspectors - This should be addressed.
- As of 16/7/24 impacted workers have not been contacted directly. We can't ask specific questions at Q&A sessions. Where is the individual support?
- The DCS 4PSQ base office determines an inspectors access to any SafeWork office. This means those state based inspectors who must travel are unable to access Safework resources when undertaking their daily duties and are unable to address this issue.
- This appears to be a re-arranging of deck chairs with little consideration of team functions. If the reform team have put this together, they should explain their reasoning
- There was a 2 day leadership forum where there seems to be much "lost in translation". There was a missed step of consultation in having those persons shown the structure to prevent misunderstanding and prevent angst
- Due to a lack of clarity, some teams are subject to fear mongering and are unable to seek clarity about their job security. The basic answer from the organisation is the EAP.
- In the olden days we used to have Learning and Development officers who delivered content and assessed new inspectors. Inspectors still participated in delivery but were relieved of the burden of a lot of admin. When we had 5 new inspector intakes, this was hard on the RTO and the many inspectors as UoCCs and mentors not only to develop

and deliver content, but also to keep up with all the assessment marking. Appetite to restore more LDOs?

- The Directorates that have been pieced together, particularly in the Specialist areas aren't matched against function, let alone outcomes required.
 - Also a lot of specialist teams are "Operational" not just give advice! My team is a full end to end service and continually do field / compliance work, not just sit at a desk. There are many others that do the same.
- Why did government not use a third party organisation to develop the RMP? This is common function across all levels of government to keep things fair and impartial. FedGov in the past have used organisations such as Deloitte etc to undertake these functions to ensure there was no questions about impartiality.
- I have not heard anything from our HSR regarding the restructure, is it that they have not had enough information or enough time
- Inspector in Transformation role - more info needed
- When the proposed structure has been agreed to, can we please have a SafeWork directory like the old days!
- This can also be used for TC (if at all anyone want to put their hand up for that role) Interview / negotiation process can be used if there are more candidates for any roles
- Bring back the Rotational process (ease of mobility) into various teams for inspectors as a development / learning opportunity.
- Revise the EOI process to be easy and simple. In today's world I will not apply for any position due to complexity in the process, it is depressing and cumbersome
- No Question just an observation, we are dealing with peoples livelihood here, it seems that you are talking at people not to people
- What about work allocation? If a TC and Manager have a split workforce for the same area (i.e., TM has ASI/SI reports and TC has other inspectors) and the TC is expected to do field work too, who will allocate work to the TC? We are not permitted to self-allocate, so would the manager allocate WSMS jobs to the TC? Or would the TC tell the Manager which jobs to allocate to them (kind of defeats the purpose, that's still self allocation in essence)
- agree with comments re mobility / EOI process. The GSE legislation allows for subsequent assignment - i.e. transfer at grade.
- concerned about the increase of workload for the SW RTO without an increase in resourcing
- Has there been any consideration from the change team as who will train WHS Inspectors that may have no construction experience and vice-versa?
- State wide teams that do a lot of regional travel (e.g. TPV, DG&E, Investigations) spend a lot of time reconciling expenses (multiple receipts every day) in expnse8 which then require manager approval on every receipt. Administrative burden on inspector and manager. Overnight travel should be claimed as an allowance on one single form - this will reduce this admin task significantly.