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Leading safety from the top

Culture change can be a challenging and lengthy process in large organisations, and executive support is required for any meaningful changes to culture in supporting OHS professionals and new safety initiatives.

A common complaint of many businesses is that regulation – especially around OHS – is a burden and overcomplicated. This red tape is imposing not only a massive burden on our economy, including in relation to sustainable jobs, but perversely can also reduce both personal and process or major accident safety, according to Kym Bills, CEO of the Western Australian Energy Research Alliance (WA:ERA). There are ways to cut red tape while improving safety and preventing major accidents, as he argues in his opinion piece (see page 12).

Also in this issue our cover story (page 18) focuses on Toll and the journey it has undertaken to improve its safety track record and build a strong culture. For a business the size of Toll – with a presence in more than 50 countries, some 1200 sites and more than 45,000 employees – realising sustainable safety change has taken time. But the implementation of its safety strategy has worked: in mid-2008, its LTIFR was running at about seven, and this has fallen to about 1.7 today, and in 2008 its TRIFR stood at about 45 compared to today’s rate of 16.

This feature demonstrates the importance of executive support for meaningful safety initiatives, and as Mark Cowley, group general manager OHS at Toll Group observes, a committed MD and executive team are crucial to driving long-term, sustainable safety changes within any business.

On a different note, Martin Ralph, managing director of the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention (IFAP), explores the “no-blame” approach to culture (page 24) and argues that a misunderstanding of this concept as adopted by its earliest pioneers has led to a range of problems. He argues that the most important characteristic to focus upon when aspiring towards a positive, supportive safety culture is to focus upon the “just” aspects, of which “no-blame” plays an important part.

The events feature for this issue covers OSIT2014; the 2nd international conference on Occupational Safety in Transport, which is being held on the Gold Coast in September. One of the keynote presenters at this event is Commander of the 1st Joint Movements Group, Colonel Simon Tuckerman. As he observes in this article, Defence is often presented with a unique and dynamic range of risks, from moving personnel and explosives into and around a war zone using a variety of aircraft and ground transport assets, including buses, trucks or manual handling equipment. In doing so, the commander has to maintain oversight of the WHS requirements throughout this complex supply chain. For more see page 32.
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Would you like to become a Corporate Partner or Corporate Member of the SIA?
Please contact Danielle Laffey on 03 8336 1995 to discuss the many options available.
GM’s message

Daniel Laffey, General Manager – Operations, SIA

Building a bigger and better SIA

“We look forward to bringing you many new benefits over the coming months and appreciate your support of the SIA”

In building a better SIA, it is important to remember and reflect on the past and the history of the SIA; this reminds us how far we have come and remember those members who have served the SIA over the past 65 years. In a new initiative we will be forming a Members Memoriam on our website to remember and honour those SIA members that have passed.

Our sincerest thoughts and sympathy for the families of Professor Chris Winder who passed away 20 May 2014 and Mr Thomas John Campbell Reeves who passed on the 10th April 2014. Both men were integral parts of the SIA and contributed so much to their profession. They will be sorely missed.

Our monthly webinar series was recently launched; I am sure these will be of great benefit and value to all members but particularly to those members who are in regional parts of Australia. If you do have any suggestions for webinars please contact me at danielle@sia.org.au

Safety in Numbers – our membership drive is continually growing our membership but we still need YOUR assistance to recruit even more new Members. By recruiting new members you are assisting in building the profile & capability of the profession, contributing to your profession and with an increase in members the SIA can be more influential and this will enable the profession to become professional. You can win fabulous prizes just by recruiting new members!

The Safety Institute of Australia together with the Australian OHS Education Accreditation Board announced the winners of the National OHS education awards at the recent Dr Eric Wigglesworth Memorial Lecture held in Melbourne on Tuesday 25 March 2014.

Dr Christine Teague from Edith Cowan University was awarded the Eric Wigglesworth OHS Education (Research) Award for her thesis on Reducing risk and injury to transit officers.

Cameron Stevens who completed a Masters of Ergonomics, Safety and Health at Latrobe University was awarded the National OHS Education Award at the Postgraduate level. Christine and Cameron receive a study grant of $5000 and $2000 respectively together with membership of the SIA Ltd.

As part of our new membership special offers we have negotiated a great new deal with the Mantra Group – as a Member of the SIA you are now able to receive 10% off the advertised price of all Mantra Group Hotels just by logging into www.bizbeds.com.au and using the following login name safety_institute and password mantra123

I am delighted to welcome our new Silver Corporate Partner – HazTab. HazTab makes workplace safety and compliance fast and efficient, whilst providing ‘Safety at Your Fingertips’. HazTab is the paperless safety solution designed from the ground up by a mining and construction industry worker in collaboration with Formitize, Australia’s leading developer of paperless forms. Please go to haztab.com for more information.

I also delighted to announce and welcome our new Corporate Members:

CodeSafe Solutions, Ernst & Young, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, HR Business Direction, O’Brien Safety Environmental Systems, Prescare, St John of God Health Care Inc.

Have you thought about signing up your organisation as a Corporate Member or Corporate Partner of the SIA? There are so many benefits in becoming a Corporate Partner/Member including advertising opportunities and group discounts for renewals – if you would like further details about this fantastic opportunity please contact me for further information.

It’s almost the start of the new financial year, with renewal notifications being sent to all Members, we thank all those Members that have renewed so promptly and we are glad to offer your many new options to renew this year including Bpay and Direct Debit request which allows you to set and forget your renewal for a time that suits you!

We look forward to bringing you many new benefits over the coming months and appreciate your support of the SIA, the coming year promises to be bigger and better than ever before.

If you do require any assistance please do not hesitate to contact the friendly team here at the office.

Stay safe.

Danielle Laffey
General Manager – Operations
Safety Institute of Australia
Over the past few months I have had a number of conversations with members about the future direction of the Institute. These are valued conversations and are important to understand the aspirations of our members. The Board are very keen to ensure that what has been done well in the past is not lost but in fact modernised and rejuvenated and to ensure that learnings are applied along the way and where necessary new initiatives are pursued. We do this in the interests of making our Institute a better place that delivers on its objectives.

With this in mind, recruitment has commenced for the replacement of the CEO. This decision has not been taken lightly and is critical in achieving further positive change within the organisation. For more information see the advertisement on the inside back cover. In addition we are also seeking to recruit two additional Non Executive Directors. The roles are voluntary and are necessary to complement the existing skills of the current Board and provide an external perspective. There have also been some changes to the composition of the Board sub-committees to further strengthen and drive performance of the organisation. These changes are also necessary to maintain continuity and stability as we approach the election period for three Director roles later this year.

Our membership drive is going well with many new members joining our Institute. Many of our colleagues are joining each month which contributes to growing a stronger Institute. Many tens of thousands of people work in safety or a related role within this country and ensuring we have a combined energy and passion is important in building a stronger profession and practice. In addition, we continue to search for new and additional benefits for members and each month forward we intend to be sharing more of these with you.

The Board has also devoted substantial time to the matter of Certification and conveyed a number of key messages and positions for our representative, Phil Lovelock, to feed into this project. We have advocated for a separation of activities of certification from the SIA itself ending the auspicing arrangement. We have also argued for stronger stakeholder engagement and communications, a need to reduce potential impacts and costs for members and a need to ensure appropriate governance and standards are in place. Certification has the potential to improve the standing of our profession and practice and as this evolutionary milestone is upon us we need to ensure it is done in the right way, for the right reasons, with the right level of commitment and support, both financial and non-financial.

The Board also progressed the re-establishment of the research fund and this will provide the mechanism for members to donate to that fund through the renewal process. I am excited about this, because the fund coupled with the reformation and active engagement of the National Technical Panel assists us in being renowned as the peak OHS body within this country.

The Board are also strengthening our relationships with our partners, sponsors and members. One such example of this involves the Industrial Foundation for Accident prevention (IFAP) where we have started to explore opportunities for collaboration between the two organisations. This will continue in June with a joint session of the IFAP & SIA Boards.

The Board remain busy working through the emerging issues some more pressing than others and are appreciative of hearing your constructive views, thoughts and feedback in shaping and prioritising this work while providing the necessary governance for the organisation. Improving the Institute, its standing and reputation to make it a strong force within this country is a continuous journey and a journey that we take together. It is important to remain connected and networked with other members and so I encourage you to make the most of the various Branch events, gatherings and meetings that are offered. Be involved and engaged.

Patrick Murphy, Chair, Board of Directors, SIA

“A journey of continuous improvement
Improving the Institute, its standing and reputation to make it a strong force within this country is a continuous journey

Patrick Murphy CFSIA
Chair – Board of Directors
How Alcoa standardised safety practices

While there are a number of benefits in standardising safety process across multiple sites and business units, a key challenge in this processes is ensuring all stakeholders are brought together and on board, according to Danny Spadaccini, director of safety for Alcoa Australia. “We invest time explaining what we are striving to achieve and the expected outcomes from both an organisational and a personal perspective,” he said. “We identify key skills and subject area strengths within our team of safety professionals. Once we know these, each individual prepares a topical brief for sharing across the organisation.” The broader group of safety and other professionals are then able to review this work, and he said this ensures that all parties are engaged and participating.

Leadership, culture and priorities keys to safety

Organisational complexity and constant change dilute responsibility and accountability for safety within organisations, according to a global expert in aviation and maritime transport safety. Furthermore, managing safety by committee and consensus leads to poor outcomes, while cultures of conformity discourage awkward but necessary questions, said a High Court Judge of England and Wales, Charles Haddon-Cave. The British Government asked him to lead an inquiry into a 2006 disaster in which an RAF Nimrod aircraft caught fire while on a routine flight over Afghanistan, leading to an explosion and the deaths of all 14 people on board. Speaking at the recent APPEA 2014 conference, Haddon-Cave said the incident had been the result of a fundamental failure of leadership, culture and priorities.

Avoiding contractor management pitfalls

Organisations often fall into the trap of thinking “not my employee, not my problem” when it comes to contractor management, but this is not the case in the eyes of the law, according to a national law firm. “Contractors create a legal and practical conundrum,” said Simon Billing, partner at Corrs Chambers Westgarth. Contractors are generally engaged to provide specialist expertise or services, but as a temporary workforce, he said they are often unfamiliar with the site that they work in (and its particular hazards), the people that they work with and the relevant safety system. “This presents a unique challenge for principal employers/head contractors who are, in most circumstances, legally responsible for the health and safety of their contractors and their contractor’s employees – as if they were their own employees,” he said.

Managers behind most workplace bullying incidents

More than two-thirds of anti-bullying applications to the Fair Work Commission in the first quarter of 2014 alleged that the immediate manager was the perpetrator of the workplace bullying. From 1 January 2014 to 31 March 2014 the Commission received 151 anti-bullying applications, according to its first Anti-bullying Quarterly Report. Most complaints (67) came from businesses with more than 100 employees, while 109 workers alleged that the perpetrator of bullying was their manager. A further 27 said it was another worker and 20 alleged it was a group of workers. The report said that the majority of applicant workers were employees (133) while four were a contractor or subcontractor and three were employees of a labour hire company.

How safety can boost productivity

Safety is in need of a paradigm shift and needs to be approached in a more holistic and innovative way in order to improve productivity within organisations and contribute to business outcomes, according to WA-based safety think tank. “Safety needs to be thought of as a broad skill-set that encompasses all levels of an organisation, and which includes both specialists and non-specialists,” said Mark Griffin, director of the University of Western Australia’s Centre for Safety. “Look to your safety leaders as innovators and give them the freedom to be innovative. Recognise and value the two-way street through which the whole organisation contributes to safety, and also safety contributes to the whole organisation.” Griffin also said that traditional approaches to safety that are effective in more stable environments be ineffective or even harmful in more dynamic and unpredictable environments.

Warning over petroleum and gas safety

Inspections and investigations by Queensland’s petroleum and gas inspectorate continue to have identified gaps in how operators and contractors coordinate activities and expose workers to the risk of injury or death at coal seam gas (CSG) sites, according to Stewart Bell, Queensland’s Commissioner for Mine Safety and Health. A number of significant incidents that have occurred in the resources sectors across Australia have related to contractors and have been either fully or partly linked to inadequate contractor management systems not being in place, he said in a recent Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines safety alert. “These incidents highlight a need for all industry sectors to ensure that, safety management plans, at all stages of the plant’s life, include processes to effectively manage contractors and multiple operating plant working at the same site,” said Bell.

How safety can boost productivity

Safety is in need of a paradigm shift and needs to be approached in a more holistic and innovative way in order to improve productivity within organisations and contribute to business outcomes, according to WA-based safety think tank. “Safety needs to be thought of as a broad skill-set that encompasses all levels of an organisation, and which includes both specialists and non-specialists,” said Mark Griffin, director of the University of Western Australia’s Centre for Safety. “Look to your safety leaders as innovators and give them the freedom to be innovative. Recognise and value the two-way street through which the whole organisation contributes to safety, and also safety contributes to the whole organisation.” Griffin also said that traditional approaches to safety that are effective in more stable environments be ineffective or even harmful in more dynamic and unpredictable environments.

Avoiding contractor management pitfalls

Organisations often fall into the trap of thinking “not my employee, not my problem” when it comes to contractor management, but this is not the case in the eyes of the law, according to a national law firm. “Contractors create a legal and practical conundrum,” said Simon Billing, partner at Corrs Chambers Westgarth. Contractors are generally engaged to provide specialist expertise or services, but as a temporary workforce, he said they are often unfamiliar with the site that they work in (and its particular hazards), the people that they work with and the relevant safety system. “This presents a unique challenge for principal employers/head contractors who are, in most circumstances, legally responsible for the health and safety of their contractors and their contractor’s employees – as if they were their own employees,” he said.
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What are the greatest challenges facing the OHS profession?
The challenge for the OHS profession is to keep a lookout to the horizon, to the emerging issues that are likely to be tomorrow’s crises. The information technology revolution, particularly in the area of communication, has transformed the way we interact, access information, share news and experience events. We are all glued to our smart mobile devices whether they are smart phones (iPhones and Android phones) or tablets. But not enough is known about the effects of that technology, nor are traditional controls adequate to manage any risks arising from it. What we do know is not always great news. We know that carbon nanotubes display similar characteristics to asbestos, for example. Nanotechnology is used widely in confectionery to give mints and other coloured sweets that irresistible shine, but we don’t fully understand the health effects they have on us. The tools that are available to manage the risks are deficient, often recording “Safety by design is embraced in Australia – although we were late to the table on that issue, we have adapted to it very eagerly”

What are the greatest achievements of the OHS profession?
The resilience of Australian OHS professionals never ceases to amaze me. Our OHS professionals are world class. They combine theory with practice seamlessly. They have embraced the principles behind safety leadership and safety culture. They have avoided the pitfalls of behaviour-based safety, focusing instead on getting the foundation right. Safety by design is embraced in Australia – although we were late to the table on that issue, we have adapted to it very eagerly. We have resisted the temptation of a compliance-driven approach, preferring instead a more holistic approach anchored in the desire to improve safety outcomes rather than to merely achieve compliance. This is no small achievement considering the oxygen that the legislative reforms have been given over the past five years.

(iPads or equivalents). This represents its own risks from exposure to electromagnetic radiation to the distraction that such devices represent. However, our addiction to them has changed the way we learn and expect information to be presented to us. Systems have to adapt to those challenges.

The prevalence of nanotechnology also presents significant challenges. The technology which shrinks material to nano-size – a size at which the material starts to display different characteristics which can be exploited for commercial or industrial applications – has been widely embraced in manufacturing and medicine and food production, to name a few. characteristics of the materials in their normal state rather than their nano-state.

Finally, psychological harm continues to be a challenge. Stress, depression and mental health present a challenge to a profession more accustomed to injuries that are more readily observable. Bullying appears to have emerged as a pandemic in recent years. Although everyone is quick to identify it, few have worked through the solutions for it which require an organisational as well as an institutional response. Time will tell whether the new Fair Work Commission jurisdiction will have an impact on the prevention of instances of bullying.
Sarah Binstead,
Health, safety & environment leader for GE

What are the greatest achievements of the OHS profession?
As we talk to OHS professionals in Australia, it is heartening to hear the optimism they have for the future of OHS in Australian business.

Our leaders in Australia are increasingly recognising the value that sound OHS performance brings to their organisations and service projects. This increased recognition has been brought about through a more sophisticated approach by members of our industry as they work to show that OHS is a differentiator in the commercial world. OHS professionals in Australia should see this as a great achievement.

Most notably, there are three aspects of business where OHS shines as a winner. The first of these is in the competition for work. It is not uncommon for improvements in OHS to be driven by customers. For example, many contracts require clients and contractors to be accredited with AS4801 or to have in place behaviour-based safety programs before contracts will be awarded; the power of the supply chain is driving OHS improvement. Similarly, business recognises that good OHS performance facilitates the completion of projects on time. The time and cost involved in investigating near misses and incidents is well known to all of us. Most of all, however, as OHS keeps our greatest assets safe and able to return to work the following day, the related business costs associated with this are now being acknowledged as a real “value add” to business. The positive morale and high productivity generated is correctly seen as translating to high staff retention with significant advantage to business.

Sidney Dekker,
Professor, Safety Science Innovation Lab, Griffith University

What are the greatest achievements of the OHS profession?
Our greatest achievement is surviving the slight downturn in business activity over the past year or more, particularly in contracting and services (I say “slight” as I came here from Europe a few years ago – there, the notion of “tough economic times” has a different depth and meaning to it). The OHS profession has not gone through this unscathed, of course (indeed, it has led to redundancies in various places), but this has also forced it to start reflecting on the efficiency and effectiveness of its work. Indeed, you might think that our survival through these slightly tougher times has less to do with our inherent value than with the many regulatory and statutory requirements and relationships that keep us in place. In our more arrogant or self-serving moments, we can always strut on the ethical high ground, of course; as in: “we take people’s safety seriously, we stand up for them. That itself should be enough to keep us.” But such posturing cloaks our own vested interests: the silent power we have to influence business decisions from design to operations, the voice we might give to concerns on either side of the industrial relations table, our role in post-incident compensation expectations and practices, our own kind of bureaucratic entrepreneurship that creates paperwork that demands more paperwork so that we can stay in our jobs. Building on the achievement to survive tougher economic times will require us to critically consider how we add value to businesses, instead of being seen as a drag on production and efficiency.

What are the greatest challenges facing the OHS profession?
Our greatest challenge is staying relevant. The profession’s success in helping bring down injury and incident rates over past decades has brought it to a place where it is increasingly difficult to be even more successful. The safer our organisations get – at least in terms of their numbers of negative events – the harder it is to help them get even safer. As a result, the OHS profession finds itself doing ever more of the same. But this will simply lead to more of the same. This is why the safety trajectory of many industries has gone asymptotic, or flatlined, over the past decade or so. The challenge of staying relevant will require the profession to be bolder and more innovative in thinking differently about safety. Instead of seeing people as a problem to control, it might want to engage with emerging ideas about resilience which explain how people actually are the solution, the resource to harness. Instead of focusing on compliance and constraint (both in its education and execution), the profession may want to understand the many different ways in which people create safety every day, despite the messy details and goal conflicts and resource constraints of their organisation, by being innovative, inventive, resourceful. Seeing the current regulatory environment as a barrier to such innovation is, in a mature democracy, a cop-out. Those laws and rules came from somewhere; they were made by politicians who had battles to win, interests to defend, moral projects to undertake. That they were once made by politicians who represent us, means that this can happen again. But it won’t happen by itself. We, as the OHS profession, need to show that different ways of doing safety – ways that can actually break through the asymptote rather than sustaining it – are possible and fruitful. Once we have some runs on the board, others will start paying attention: managers, directors, unions, media, politicians.
Reducing the red tape burden

There are ways to cut red tape while improving safety and preventing major accidents. Craig Donaldson speaks with Kym Bills, CEO of the Western Australian Energy Research Alliance (WA:ERA) about this issue and implications for the OHS profession

Is Australia at risk of OHS over-regulation? Examples?

Yes, I think we are already seriously over-regulated as a result of factors like duplication and unnecessary differences across jurisdictions, failing to take adequate account of the circumstances of small and medium enterprises, a bias towards writing new legislation and regulations to address legal concerns at the expense of innovation and productivity, and not taking into account the time workers and supervisors have to read and understand OHS regulations. This is imposing not only a massive burden on our economy, including in relation to sustainable jobs, but perversely can also reduce both personal and process or major accident safety.

In a foreword to a 2012 report Common Sense Common Safety, Britain’s Prime Minister David Cameron talks about the standing of health and safety having never been lower, with businesses drowned in red tape and confusion and in fear of being sued for even minor accidents.

In Australia the new Federal Government has a major deregulation agenda including to reduce ‘red and green tape’ and to work with the states and territories to reduce duplication and unnecessary regulation. The challenge is to make sure this happens but does not compromise safety by adding to the very significant ongoing cost of workplace fatalities and injuries or to the risk of a low probability/high consequence major accident event like the Montara well blow-out and oil spill offshore Australia in 2009 or the 2010 29 fatality underground coal mine disaster at Pike River in New Zealand.

Over-regulation is pervasive and insidious. The volume of legislation, regulation and codes of practice is formidable as a visit to the SafeWork Australia website can quickly demonstrate. Add to this industry specific regulation and differences among jurisdictions and the complexity rises sharply. Some industry-specific regulation is required by international agreements such as for international civil aviation or maritime safety. Other regulation appropriately addresses serious hazards to ensure that well known controls are put in place, such as to address the risk of a methane gas and coal dust explosion in an underground coal mine. But there is much more where the mass of detail can prevent seeing the wood from the trees and dull the exercise of appropriate responsibility and mindfulness.

What impact is this having on business, particularly in the mining or offshore oil and gas industry?

To survive and thrive business has to make a profit and to comply with its regulatory and other obligations. Mining and oil and gas like other tradeable goods and services need to be internationally competitive. While Australia doesn’t and shouldn’t adopt a lowest common denominator approach, we do need to reduce unnecessary regulation that could undermine, for example, investment in the next $180 billion or so of major oil and gas projects currently on the drawing board. If we don’t, North America or East Africa is more likely to get the new investment and Australia may lose jobs and revenue and not overtake Qatar as the world’s largest LNG exporter.

Many mining and oil and gas companies and associated contractors operate across Australia. For example, a mining company operating in Queensland, Victoria and South Australia could be required to satisfy both industry specific and model Work Health and Safety Act requirements in Queensland, older forms of OHS Act and industry safety regulation in Victoria, and model Work Health and Safety Act based legislative requirements in South Australia. The time and resources devoted to managing this complexity and the risk of error it engenders impose costs on industry and detract from safety. Problems flow from a failure to fully implement national OHS harmonisation and from the volume of regulation and burden of dealing with multiple regulators with different enforcement practices. Workers too fly around the country for work and unnecessary regulatory and site differences contribute to safety risk.

In Western Australia, offshore oil and gas industry safety is regulated by several different State Acts and by the Commonwealth Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Safety ACT 2006. There is also different State and Commonwealth environmental legislation. As David Agostini and I found when investigating the billion dollar Varanus Island gas pipeline explosions of 2008, a high pressure pipeline can pass from Commonwealth waters, to State coastal waters, to an island treated as if it were on the mainland, to State internal waters and then to mainland WA. At each regulatory interface confusion can arise and safety risk can increase. Ideally the whole offshore petroleum industry would be regulated as a single safety (and environmental) system. Western Australia has announced that it is moving to introduce one new Act and I hope that at a minimum, this will mirror revised and simpler Commonwealth provisions and that regulators in NOPSEMA and in
the Western Australian Department of Mines and Petroleum will work even more closely together to minimise overlaps and differences faced by industry.

**Is there a better system that is more proportionate and less bureaucratic?**

Yes and it is not new. The elements are still to be found in two British reports by Lord Robens in 1972 and by Lord Cullen in 1990. Robens in addressing the perceived mass of OHS over-regulation argues for a much simpler regime with less detailed legislation and regulation based on a ‘duty of care’ and greater use of codes of practice and guidance material. But he was at pains to point out that for high risk industries greater detail such as in relation to controlling hazards, may still be required. Following 167 fatalities on offshore platform Piper Alpha in the North Sea, Cullen proposed a ‘safety case’ regime to provide operators with the flexibility to introduce a safety management system to address their own hazards and safety risks and then make the case to justify their choices to regulators. This was instead of a more prescriptive regime that was prone to box ticking and was stifling of innovation. Such an objectives-based regulatory system requires maturity and experience from both industry and regulators and the discipline to not allow documentation to become excessive and replace careful thought.

**Where is the balance between cutting red tape and reducing regulation, while improving safety and preventing major accidents?**

Of course, there is no simple answer and history demonstrates that there is a risk of overshoot in either direction. The balance needs to be set through a mix of encouraging safety in design, applying known controls to major hazards, simplifying written material, ALARP with guidance about what is grossly disproportionate and what is intolerable, reducing unnecessary duplication and overlap, ensuring rigorous regulatory impact statements, working collaboratively with industry, acknowledging that small businesses may require help of different treatment, and the exercise of informed regulatory discretion in prioritising strategies for data-driven and risk-based compliance.

**What advice would you offer OHS professionals in managing regulation and compliance while contributing to productivity?**

A first step is to ensure that safety regulation and compliance are integrated into an enterprise-wide management system and culture and not just treated as an ‘add on’ and viewed as imposing unnecessary costs. This should be linked to the organisation’s risk appetite and driven from Board/senior management down and incorporate real and ongoing workforce and other stakeholder input. The principles of Australian Standard 3806 apply here. Risk management and compliance should engage business units and provide a framework to enable not stifle innovation.

To reduce unnecessary imposts, OHS professionals should simplify OHS material and ensure it reflects the reality of the workplace. One or two pages are more likely to be helpful than 20 or more. OHS professionals should help form a bridge from business units to senior management and corporate lawyers and reduce differences between what Professor Erik Hollnagel called on his recent SIA tour ‘work as imagined’ versus ‘work as done’. OHS professionals need to be seen as informed facilitators of good safety outcomes not blockers and pedants. Of course, this requires judgement and empowerment to help strip away unnecessary or over-complicated internal policies and procedures while maintaining necessary compliance and the ability to demonstrate it to Boards, auditors and regulators.

Kym Bills also spoke at Safety in Action 2014: Perth Safety Conference, held from 11-12 June 2014 at the Perth Exhibition and Convention Centre.

“OHS professionals need to be seen as informed facilitators of good safety outcomes not blockers and pedants”
How to manage complexity

Increased complexity is a challenge facing many organisations. David Bond examines the implications of this for OHS professionals and looks at how they can effectively manage complexity

Most efforts to improve safety are still based on the assumption that our safety management systems are safe and effective, and that it is the behaviours of individuals, who break rules or fail to follow procedures, that create unsafe workplaces. This belief is highlighted by the often-quoted statistics that suggest that more than 80 per cent of incidents are the result of human error or violations.

When we put our faith in systems we must understand that while an individual safety management system may be coherent and logical, it is always surrounded and impacted by other systems. These include operational systems, environmental systems, quality systems and security systems, to name a few. In addition, we also need to consider the external systems, such as the laws (and the regulators who enforce the laws), government bodies, industry standards and societal expectations.

The important point here is that each of these systems and processes has an end purpose or goal, so it follows that each of these goals has an influence on how work is completed and where attention is focused. Unfortunately these systems and goals, while each important and valid in its own right, interact in such a way that they create layers and complexities that are rarely intended or well understood.

This nested and often messy entanglement introduces the risk of inefficiencies and incompatible goals that are often difficult for our workforce to reconcile. This can result in a significant gap between “work as imagined”, based on idealistic compliance with our safety systems and procedures, and “work as done” where our workforce does their best to balance these competing priorities.

In managing safety, I believe that organisational leaders need to develop a greater understanding of the complexities that exist within our systems and within the organisation in which we operate. This type of understanding would include the recognition of how difficult it can be for our frontline managers, supervisors and workforce to understand, rationalise and meet the intent of all the systems we apply in practice. In other words, while our safety systems look great in the comfort of our offices, we really need to look at them from the perspective of our teams in the field.

Understanding and managing complexity

One of the most significant pitfalls to understanding complexity in safety is oversimplification. Oversimplification is a common phenomenon, often seen in
incident investigations, when with the benefit of hindsight, the causes of an event or situation become all too obvious.

When this occurs you will commonly hear comments such as “What was he thinking”, “If she had only paid more attention” or “We need to raise awareness”. Comments of this nature, that focus on the behaviours or actions of the individual, almost always arise from hindsight bias and fail to take into account the reality of the situation from the perspective of those involved prior to the event.

It must be remembered that an investigator looking back on the sequence of events, with full knowledge of what happened, will invariably have more information about the circumstances than those involved prior to the event. With this clear and filtered knowledge, it is all too easy for an investigator to highlight the “flawed decisions” and “missed opportunities”, and to explain how the task should have been done.

To overcome the effects of oversimplification and hindsight bias we must accept that the situation and the actions being taken by the individual prior to the event would have seemed completely rational. This is called the local or bounded rationality principle – a concept that was first discussed by Herbert Simon in the 1950s.

The challenge for organisational leaders and OHS professionals today is to move beyond the simple application of hindsight and seek to understand why the situation looked rational to the person at the time. When we can achieve that level of understanding, we will have the greatest opportunity to identify the competing goals, complexities and systemic influences that, if addressed, have a much greater chance of preventing a recurrence.

**Addressing the challenges**

The ideas already discussed may challenge some common beliefs, however, I feel that questioning and challenging our current safety paradigms is the responsibility of every OHS professional. Safety today seems to be full of rote answers and pre-packaged solutions, while what I believe we need are better questions and a greater focus on critical thinking.

I could be accused of overcomplicating matters, but the fact remains that the societies we operate in, the economy and our business dealings are complex. Overlay these factors with the moral, societal and regulatory expectations associated with safety and we can quickly identify some very interesting dilemmas. We can try to segregate safety and our safety management systems from these other influences, but this is just another form of oversimplification.

My advice to organisational leaders and safety professionals wanting to embrace a new and fresh approach to safety is to acknowledge the complexities, both systemic and personal, that exist in modern workplaces. We must broaden our view to include not only what makes up our safety management system, but all the extraneous factors that potentially interact with the operation of our systems.

Adopting this approach will encourage leaders to avoid deconstructing individual elements of a system when trying to find why something went wrong, and will encourage them to look at the system as a whole.

While we can never see all the possible relationships, if we engage and listen more carefully to our workforce and embrace complexity by looking at systems holistically, we will have the chance to see the layers and interactions. This will provide the opportunity to proactively identify and mitigate some of these risks and to change the way that we and our workforce perceive safety.

David Bond is group manager health & safety for Thiess and a member of OHS Professional magazine’s editorial board.
Have you ever launched a safety initiative to mediocre applause? Have you ever introduced a new HSE policy, practice or training and met resistance? “No one told me about this!” “That doesn't apply to me!” “It's just change for change sake!”

I recently attended some professional development on change management and project management to assist me to better plan for successful implementation of HSE initiatives by understanding how to overcome potential obstacles.

There are three critical elements for a successful initiative:
- A structured change management approach
- A structured project management approach
- An active and visible executive sponsor (typically a senior manager).

**Change management**

Change management is the application of a structured process and set of tools for leading the people side of change to assist with the transition from a current to a future state. Research has shown that effective application of change management can increase the success rate of organisational changes by up to 96 per cent. Projects with excellent change management effectiveness are six times more likely to meet or exceed project objectives.

The discipline of change management emerged in the 1980s and was initially adopted by large corporations capable of deriving significant savings by implementing new programs more efficiently. During the 1990s, industries undergoing significant and rapid change in information technology and human resources began highlighting the benefits of change management programs. The 2000s marked widespread acceptance of change management as a competency for business success. This was validated through research by Prosci, IBM and McKinsey. In 2011, the industry’s first global association for change management practitioners was formed – the Association of Change Management Professionals (ACMP).

The basic premise for change management is that it’s not the organisation that changes but rather the behaviour of individuals. There are many change management models to enable successful personal transitions and achievement of organisational results. One such model is the Prosci ADKAR Model that has five key building blocks:
- Awareness of the need for change
- Desire to participate and support the change
- Ability to implement required skills and behaviours
- Reinforcement to sustain the change.

You can't build the desire for change without awareness. Lack of awareness of the reasons and the need for change is one of the biggest causes of resistance; however, resistance is normal and should not be
feared. A structured change management approach helps to first minimise resistance but also provides a framework for managing resistance and issues that arise. Early engagement with and input from managers and employees is a key success factor for achieving change and minimising resistance, while line managers play a major role in communicating change to their staff.

It’s important to understand that managers and employees can often resist changes that are poorly communicated, forced upon them, and that alter a prescribed way of working. Pushback may occur, resulting in retraction, rework, workaround or even more training on the subject. You need to understand your stakeholders and how they are affected by the change, as they will be affected differently and to varying degrees. This will inform how you approach each stakeholder group in managing the change. Success will come from engaging and communicating with each stakeholder in ways that they’re receptive to (e.g. some will be OK with emails, others will need face-to-face meetings, webinars etc). There’s no “one size fits all” approach.

It’s essential to have a close correlation between change management and project management – which are the people and technical sides of change respectively – as you move from a current to a future state.

**Project management**

Project management is the application of knowledge, skills, tools and techniques to project activities to meet project requirements. As a discipline, project management developed from several fields including civil construction and engineering. There has been rapid worldwide growth of project management as a strategic organisational competence. The project management processes are guided through five stages: initiation, planning, executing, controlling and closing.

Combining the key processes from change management and project management leads to a number of important elements for launching a successful HSE initiative:

1. Clearly define the project (initiative) scope – Why are we changing? What are we changing? Who will be changing?
2. Select a diverse project team – include people with project or change management skills, technical knowledge, end users, and people from another function (e.g. HR). It may pay to have someone who is not receptive to change to be on the project team, as they can be a sounding board.
3. Develop a project and change management plan – activities, deliverables, timeframes and resources. Identify risks and develop appropriate controls. Review the plan regularly.
4. Find a supportive sponsor – select a senior manager who will be active and visible throughout the project. This can make or break the success of the project.
5. Conduct a change management assessment to understand risks and identify appropriate communication tools for the project – communicate change through the immediate (frontline) manager of the worker or work area in a face-to-face mode. Be sure to clearly include “What’s in it for me?”
6. Road test the project across a range of supervisors and workers prior to final release – invite open and constructive feedback.
7. Celebrate success.

I highly recommend change management and project management as professional development for the modern HSE professional to achieve successful implementation and adoption of HSE systems, practices and tools by managers and employees. You may even be able to apply these skills to other business processes, as changes are likely to occur during some point in your employment history.

**FURTHER READING:**

http://www.safetyrisk.net/ohs-change-management/
http://www.prosci.com/change-management/definition/
http://www.pmi.org/About-Us/About-Us-What-is-Project-Management.aspx

Dr Angelica Vecchio-Sadus is HSE leader for CSIRO Process Science and Engineering, a Board Director of the Safety Institute of Australia and a member of OHS Professional magazine’s editorial board.
Over the course of the past few years, Toll has taken a step up in its safety journey, with a more concerted drive to embed rigorous safety processes and practices into the operations and culture of the business. This shift in Toll’s approach to safety was driven by its managing director, Brian Kruger, who wanted to shift from a direct management approach to one of leadership and stronger workforce engagement, according to Mark Cowley, group general manager OHS at Toll Group.

This new approach is articulated in Toll’s global “Think safe. Act safe. Be safe.” strategy, which is designed to achieve a consistent and systematic approach to leading and managing health and safety across the business.

Three key elements

In driving this strategy, Cowley says there were three key elements to its success – the first of which was a deliberate focus on frontline leaders who are directly leading the business’ operational workforce. Toll partnered with a specialist consulting firm, Enhance Solutions, to help develop a global safety leadership training program for managers. Direct line leaders undertake a two-day program while senior managers and functional leaders undertake a one-day program. “In these we go through the strategy and broader approach to safety, and we really spend a lot of time on how you lead safety, with particular emphasis on engagement and communication and how to drive culture change through the business,” says Cowley.

“We didn’t know how that would go, but it’s been extremely successful. We’ve been running it for about nine months now across some 20 different countries and we’ve put about 3000 people through this program, and it’s had a big impact on how our leaders and managers interact with the workforce.”

“ predefined text

“You can have good safety performance but not necessarily a great safety culture”

Mark Cowley, group general manager OHS at Toll Group
Another key to the success of the program has been a strong focus on engagement of the business with its health and safety vision and principles, which are fourfold:

1. Each person is responsible for acting safely without risk to themselves or others, and working safely is a condition of all employment arrangements
2. Management at all levels is responsible and accountable for workplace health and safety
3. Providing training to work safely is essential
4. Consultation and engagement with all who work in or with the business is fundamental to improving safety performance.

“We’ve really tried to keep the message simple and consistent, and to make things very personal in our communications and engagement,” says Cowley. “For instance, in our vision there’s a statement: ‘No task is so important it can’t be done safely.’

You go around our organisation now, and people will often quote that line. People really resonate with that. I contrast that with a lot of organisations – and this isn’t being critical of them – but a lot of other organisations’ taglines are around zero harm and no injuries. It’s hard to actually engage a workforce around those.”

The third key element to the success of the strategy has been a shift in the approach Toll takes to managing health and safety on a day-to-day basis. “Our biggest risk is obviously on-road safety,” says Cowley. “We have around 30 different business units that have exposure to on-road safety, so we established what we call fleet safety networks. There are three networks with sponsorship and participation from executives, the chairman and general manager levels, and the intent of these networks is to share best practice and implement what we might call group standards. These have been very successful in being able to quickly get runs on the board, getting people connected to the strategy and having a high level of commitment from the executive in adopting it right across the group.

“Across industry, and the transport industry in particular, things are challenging. Regulations are changing and there’s a lot of focus on the industry, so our strategy has placed us very well to demonstrate improvements and standardisation of strong safety practices very quickly.”

Safety challenges
For a business the size of Toll – with a presence in more than 50 countries, some 1200 sites and more than 45,000 employees – realising sustainable safety changes, especially when it comes to organisational culture, is not without its challenges. In rolling out safety leadership training and helping line managers to take responsibility for and engage their teams in safety, Cowley says there were some people who initially responded: “Hey, this isn’t my job. It’s a safety professional’s job. We’ve got people employed to do this and it’s someone else’s responsibility.’ That’s where the education comes in about the responsibility of a line manager towards their people and looking after them to make sure people get home safely.”

Another challenge for Toll has been safety engagement in international businesses, particularly in countries where an understanding of safety risks and concerns is not as advanced. “In some other countries, people don’t get that. They’re oblivious to safety concerns and risks. In our business at the workplace level, we have on-road vehicles, forklifts, stacking equipment and lots of moving objects, and people were at times not recognising the potential hazards. In such cases, we’ve
done a lot of training around identifying hazards," says Cowley.

A third challenge has been around continuous improvement. “There’s a difference between performing well and having a good safety culture from my perspective. The way we’ve tried to keep on pushing improvements and overcome attitudes around complacency is personalising the message. We try to tell more stories. We unashamedly ask people, ‘How do you think your family would feel about not having you home?’ Rather than saying ‘We’re going to budget for an LTI frequency rate next year of one’, it’s more effective to say, ‘So you’re going to accept that 20 people are going to be seriously hurt next year? Who are those 20 people?’ Get away from the stats and personalise the message.”

Safety results
The results of the strategy to date have been “very promising”, according to Cowley, with demonstrated improvements in a suite of lead and lag performance indicators, including Lost Time Injury Frequency Rates (LTIFR) and Total Recordable Injury Frequency Rates (TRIFR), risk and hazard management indicators, employee engagement in safety, Incident Reporting Rates (IRR), safety observation participation rates as well as compliance indicators such as assessment against safety management standards.

In mid-2008, Toll’s LTIFR was running at about seven, and this has fallen to about 1.7 today – an improvement of about 75 per cent. Toll’s TRIFR has also shown improvement, and in 2008 this stood at about 45 compared to today’s rate of 16, which is about a 65 per cent improvement.

“So these are impressive lag indicators, but we’ve brought in some lead indicators and have really focused on measures such as hazard identification,” says Cowley. Each business in Toll has to report its performance via a measure called the incident report rate, while another lead indicator includes a process called “safety observations”.

“This is where someone – it doesn’t have to be a manager or leader – observes someone doing a task. They go up and engage the worker in a conversation or discussion about the task, and talk about the consequences of not doing the task correctly and the injury risks. This is another engagement process, and all these measures are reported up to the board and exec levels. There is an increasingly strong focus on these positive indicators rather than the lag ones,” he says.

Last year, the business also conducted a global employee engagement survey, and there was a 92 per cent positive rating with people connecting to the safety message and considering safety first before making decisions at work.

A recent Citi Research report, which analysed the safety reporting and results of 117 ASX listed companies, has also placed Toll in the top 40 per cent of companies when it comes to LTIFR rates. “Given our industry’s recognised as the most dangerous and highest risk, given the number of fatalities, we think that’s a good result,” says Cowley. “We also compare very favourably against the road transport industry in general.”

Advice for OHS
“There’s no doubt if you want an effective safety culture, it has to be driven from the very top – and that’s the MD,” says Cowley. “Without commitment from the MD and strong buy-in from the exec team,
you don’t get anywhere. That’s where I think I’ve been extremely lucky. I’ve got an MD who’s very passionate and very committed to safety. With that, I’ve got a huge amount of support, and Brian is very visible in this. So how do you get the commitment of your top management? Without that level of commitment, how do you influence that and get that mindset changed? That’s a really important one.”

Another important consideration is the process of building a great safety culture. “You can have good safety performance but not necessarily a great safety culture. We contract into many different industry sectors, so if you look at the mining and resources sector, as a general example, they have extremely good performance and outstanding records,” he says.

“However, they realises this by an extremely stringent, rule-based compliance approach. They put in lots of people to police it. So they get a good outcome, but they’re not necessarily winning the hearts and minds of people. If you want a good safety culture, it’s about moving away from the top-down management and compliance approach to one of ‘How do we engage our people with stronger leadership?’”

Cowley, who doesn’t come from an OHS professional background, believes line managers should own safety and says this is a key to strong safety engagement. “I’ve been a line manager,” he says. “Line management must own safety. This is actually sometimes a bit of a threat and challenge for OHS professionals. But at the end of the day, as an OHS professional, you’re really a technical expert who advises and supports. You can’t drive all the outcomes, because you don’t have all the people working for you. So try to get that right balance between the role of the OHS professional as an adviser and a technical support person, versus line managers who have got to own and take responsibility for safety.”

Another important consideration for

Give Your CV a Safety Overhaul

Work Health and Safety programs

RMIT’s Work Health Safety (WHS) programs are practical and industry relevant, equipping you with the skills and know-how to further your career.

RMIT offers a Certificate IV and Diploma in Work Health Safety. So whether you’re a WHS officer looking for a formal qualification or you’re looking to progress into WHS management or a senior role, RMIT has the program for you.

The Certificate program is offered part-time or fully online. Fully online gives you the flexibility of learning at your own pace and may take up to a year to complete. Part-time offers the flexibility of attending one Saturday class a month with support and resources available online.

The Diploma program can be completed part-time over one year, or as a fast-tracked program in approximately six months.

RMIT also offers WorkSafe approved training for Health and Safety Representatives:

• HSR Initial OHS Training Course
• HSR refresher program

This training is delivered with Victorian and Commonwealth Government funding.

> For more information including start dates contact Namrita Kaul on 03 9925 4309 or email namrita.kaul@rmit.edu.au

www.rmit.edu.au/programs
About Toll Group

Toll was founded in Newcastle, Australia, in 1888 by Albert Toll when he began hauling coal by horse and cart. By the time of his death in 1958 at the age of 95, Albert was operating a fleet of trucks in five locations. The business was purchased in 1959 by National Minerals, and in the following decade, it became part of mining conglomerate Peko Wallsend, which developed it into a national carrier. In 1986, Toll was bought by its management team, led by then managing director Paul Little and Toll's first chairman, Peter Rowsthorn. The business was listed on the Australian Stock Exchange (ASX) in 1993. Today, it has a presence in more than 50 countries and operates an extensive network of some 1200 sites. It employs more than 45,000 people and in 2013 generated annual revenues of $8.7 billion.

OHS professionals is to be careful in what they measure, according to Cowley, who says most people respond to what they're measured by. "So if you're not measuring the right things around safety, you can drive the wrong behaviours. For example, we had a strong focus on lost-time injury frequency rate in the past, and people were so focused on that, we were probably missing other opportunities to improve safety generally. Having the right suite of measures that focus on getting the right behaviours and culture in place, is really important."

While Cowley says it is possible to get some quick wins on the board through the safety by management approach, a leadership approach does take longer as behavioural change is harder to effect. "We've now gone into a higher level, which is about mindset change. This takes time. Don't expect to magically change things in a year or two. We're probably talking three to five years to build a strong safety culture. Don't try and do too much. Aim to do the right things and do them well. It's better to focus on the few things that are really important and do them really well."
No-blame cultures: flawless or flawed?

A misunderstanding of the concept of “no-blame” as adopted by its earliest pioneers has led to a range of problems, writes Martin Ralph, managing director of the Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention (IFAP).

In his seminal paper delivered in 1999, Patrick Hudson from the Centre for Safety Science, Universiteit Leiden, The Netherlands stated that “culture is notoriously difficult to define”, but offered a general approach as “culture is ... who and what we are, what we find important and how we go about doing things around here”. He further added “a safety culture is a special case of such a culture, one in which safety has a special place in the concerns of those who work for the organisation.”

Hudson cites others working in the safety culture space (especially Reason, 1997) that have identified a number of characteristics that go into building a supportive safety culture, and suggests that the culture should be based upon:

1. Information (access to current knowledge of critical performance parameters)
2. Reporting (the entire workforce are encouraged to report errors and near misses)
3. Being “just” (an atmosphere of trust is present)
4. Flexibility (a non-reliance on hierarchy for decision making), and
5. Learning (willing and competent to draw right conclusions from OHS related data).

Underpinning the development of a supportive safety culture is the need to establish high levels of trust and information flow across an organisation. Therefore, in my opinion, the most important characteristic to focus upon when aspiring towards a positive, supportive safety culture is to focus upon the “just” aspects, of which “no-blame” plays an important part.

Problems with the no-blame approach

Unfortunately, many new entrants into the organisational culture space appear to take the concept of no-blame at face value, and interpret the notion of no-blame to mean that “no-one in an organisation is responsible for anything”, and that the “system can be blamed for every error or omission, whether intended or not”.

Herein lies the problem with the phrase “no-blame culture”, and why alternatives such as “just culture” are more widely used nowadays. While I agree that the term “just” is more suitable to the contemporary argument, the fundamental problem isn’t “just” is more suitable to the contemporary argument, the fundamental problem isn’t with the “no-blame” handle, it is with a misunderstanding of the concept of “no-blame” as adopted by its earliest pioneers.

For example, as early as 1996, (if not earlier) Professor E. Scott Geller, widely acclaimed as one of the founders of the behaviour (now people) based safety movement, was advocating a “situational analysis” approach to blame. Geller’s position was that following an accident or at-risk behaviour, the work process should be checked for:

1. Human error such as slips and lapses
2. System-induced human error, such as poor work design, or
3. System-encouraged at-risk behaviour such as payment of production bonuses.

If none of the above three influencers could be attributed to contributing to the accident or at risk behaviour, then, (and only then) it could be ascertained that a wilful and deliberate intentional action had been performed, and blame could be apportioned. Once blame has been assigned (almost as a position of last-resort) performance counselling could be entertained.

So, the primary issue with adopting a no-blame approach is not about shifting accountability from those who deliberately choose to flout workplace safety requirements, it is about ensuring that blame is not used as the first option for determining what went wrong and why.

Research and no blame cultures

Given that the concept of organisational culture has been in existence for the better part of two decades, one could be forgiven for thinking that the concept of “no-blame” or “just” culture might be thought of as somewhat passé.

However, we need to look no further than two (fairly) recent publications to determine that in fact, organisational safety culture is still extremely relevant to the contemporary safety movement:

1. Safety: a Wicked Problem (Wegner and Associates, 2010), in which 21 Australian CEOs were involved in a research project, and identified “developing the right culture and mechanisms for workforce engagement” as one of the major challenges facing Australian businesses, and
2. Report on 2012 Health and Safety Conference (International Council on Mining and Metals, 2013) which reported that “emergent theme number 2.2.4 of the conference was ... the need to evolve from a culture of blame to one of care, ownership and accountability ...”.

I would argue that many of the academicians in the organisational safety culture space have reached consensus on what is required to build the foundations of just (no-blame) cultures. However, the focus has now shifted to how to apply the theories in order to effectively pursue
and implement a just culture approach. A terrific example is found in the publication by Dekker and Nyce (2013) *Just culture: “Evidence”, power and algorithms.*

**A more realistic and practical approach**

I believe that the pursuit of a strongly supportive safety culture should be intrinsic to the efforts of every safety and health professional. However, I recognise that sometimes the forest can get in the way of the trees, and it is difficult to separate elements of a good culture that can be readily identified from the overall big picture. This is also complicated by the fact that so much of the research in culture has been completed by western nations, with Australians contributing only a very small amount to the knowledge bank.

One significant contribution was made in 2003 by Hull and Read (University of Sydney) in their publication *Simply the Best Workplaces in Australia.* This research, which should be mandatory reading for all safety and health professionals in Australia, found that foremost in “excellent” workplaces in this country was the need to embed quality working relationships across the organisation in which people relate to each other as friends, colleagues and co-workers who support each other to help get a job done. While this concept may seem a little esoteric, nonetheless the researchers found that this element was the defining factor that differentiated excellent workplaces from good ones.

The issue of trust was a constant in the research, and excellent workplaces used it as an indicator of how things had changed. When asked to explore what made the difference, most people tracked it back to a change in attitude to sharing information and communicating regularly.

The research cites Leaders in Australia, a 1996 study undertaken by Cultural Imprints, which provides a foundation for understanding that Australian workers want their workplace leaders to:

- support their followers
- be consistent and stick to principles; and
- think of others

In addition, Hull and Read cite the Leadership Employment and Direction Survey (Leadership Management Australia), which found the top five factors that will positively influence improvements in performance among employees as:

- Being entrusted with responsibility/independence
- Interesting and challenging work
- A good relationship
- Receiving feedback and good communication
- Good relationships with other staff.

I contend that enormous opportunities exist for those leaders who take the time to build relationships, to listen, and to ensure that employees’ increased responsibilities are matched by appropriate skill development and learning. Safety and health professionals with organisational culture change as part of their remit could do well to consider the lessons from Hull and Read’s research.

---

**Implications for safety professionals**

I confess to being concerned by the emphasis being placed on organisational culture as a result of the drive towards nationally harmonised workplace health and safety laws, and the concepts upon which they are founded.

I applaud the integration of due diligence into the model laws. But similarly I caution against getting swept up by a revolution in corporate culture that some have prophesised will follow.

One of the underpinning principles of due diligence is that organisations must establish a “culture of compliance”, which requires officers of a company to demonstrate (amongst other things) that they have done all things reasonably practicable to ensure the health and safety of their workers and others in the workplace. But while it is a great start, a “culture of compliance” is a far cry from a just culture, based upon a foundation of trust and quality working relationships.

Earlier I mentioned Hudson’s seminal 1999 paper. He also defined a “natural and evolutionary progression of cultures” which he described as a 5-stage “journey” from “pathological” to “reactive” to “calculative” to “proactive” and finally to the best practice level, “generative”. Each stage of the “journey” has identifiable characteristics, which can be evaluated in order to provide the organisations’ leaders an insight into where they are on the pathway to best practice.

I contend that a “culture of compliance” can take an organisation up to meeting the requirements of Hudson’s “calculative” stage (which is described by other authors as “bureaucratic” *). At this stage of development, the safety culture is focussed upon systems implementation, enforcement of rules and procedures, investigation of accidents based upon their potential and planned audits of performance. Hudson himself indicates that a compliance mindset is indicative of the “calculative” stage, and that real cultural improvements can only be made beyond this point in the journey.

If the above sounds familiar to the reader then, the good news is that while there is nothing wrong with being at the “calculative” stage of organisational culture development, there is still plenty left to achieve ... and while a culture of compliance may be envied by many, no amount of regulation can enforce the building of quality working relationships with trust as their cornerstone.

* For example see Fleming “Developing safety culture measurement tools and techniques based on site audits rather than questionnaires” (Saint Mary’s University, 2007)
Tackling workplace drug and alcohol use

Drug and alcohol use in the workplace is a thorny issue for many employers. As such, many employers are implementing policies and programs to minimise associated risks, writes Craig Donaldson

There are a number of important trends in workplace alcohol and drug testing, and one of the latest and most obvious trends in the industry has become the need to test for synthetic drugs – in particular, synthetic marijuana/cannabis, which is the only synthetic drug that can be detected using an onsite urine device at this stage, according to Kara Lane, national sales manager, LaneWorkSafe. “In recent years, synthetic marijuana – aka “kronic” – has substantially increased its presence here in Australia, and due to this, safety officers are being made aware it should be tested for in the workplace,” she says.

“Synthetic marijuana is certainly an interesting substance to discuss due to the fact it is so undetermined; indeed, while it may be similar to marijuana in its ‘mimic-like’ effects, it is very different in composition and make-up. It is known that manufacturers of this banned substance continually change and alter the contents, consequently making it difficult to accurately detect. Adding to this, it should be noted that it is not listed or covered by Australian Standard AS4308 like marijuana, opiates, amphetamine, methamphetamine, cocaine and benzodiazepines.”

Steve Korkoneas, national operations & technical manager, Medvet, says there is a general trend in Australia towards oral fluid drug testing, particularly in heavily unionised environments. This has primarily come about due to the Endeavour Energy Fair Work Commission (see box) decision and other hearings where the findings have been found in favour of oral fluid over urine testing for new drug and alcohol programs.

“While there is a trend toward onsite oral fluid testing, the majority of companies are still drug testing their staff using urine, in some cases because it’s legislated, but also because the onsite urine screening process is a fully NATA-accredited process,” he says.

Successful program hallmarks
Successful workplace alcohol and drug testing policies and programs should include a holistic approach including education on the effects of drugs and alcohol to all staff, training to managers and supervisors in assisting them to identify employees at risk, as well as having a robust policy and procedure, Korkoneas says.

“As mentioned above, education and training of employees is crucial in a successful program, and ideally this should be performed prior to any alcohol and drug testing program. Make sure the education and training packages are delivered by appropriately qualified providers – Registered Training

Education and training of employees is crucial in a successful program, and ideally this should be performed prior to any alcohol and drug testing program”
Organisations (RTOs) are your best option."

Whether a company performs their own testing or outsources the program, he says it’s important the devices used are compliant (ask for a certificate) with Australian Standards. If using a third party provider, ensure they are NATA accredited for the relevant sections of the Standard (visit nata.com.au to check the scope of your supplier).

"Access to a qualified toxicologist for drug result interpretation and a medical review officer (MRO) for clinical assistance is crucial so companies can make informed choices about how to manage someone with a confirmed positive drug test from the laboratory," says Korkoneas. "These days many businesses work around the clock, so if using a third party supplier, make sure they have 24/7 service for reasonable cause and post-incident testing."

Lane says one of the most important hallmarks is that a program must meet the lawful requirements for both employee and employer. "That is, ensuring both parties have understood and of course agreed to the specific guidelines and steps that are outlined and expected," she says.

"In conjunction with this, a policy and program should be clear and simple to understand. This will ensure a better opportunity of acceptance for all parties involved; failure to make this clear from the outset can, in some cases, cause delay and dislocation in acceptance of the policy and subsequent programs."

Another important hallmark is keeping up to date with recent findings and ensuring the policy and programs reflect these potential changes. "This ties in with my earlier point on synthetic marijuana and also recently can be seen with the increase of oxycodone prescriptions. Recent studies have shown a 152 per cent increase in issuing oxycodone prescriptions; what a recent ABC article found as a trend that is being ‘diverted from medication use to illicit use’. Like synthetic drugs, oxycodone is not covered by an Australian Standard, however, options for its detection are available."

Common challenges
There are a number of common challenges and pitfalls that organisations face in implementing workplace drug and alcohol testing programs. These include a lack of understanding and/or awareness on recent...
Review your approach.
A checklist for a self-managed drug testing program.

In industries where the majority of workers are engaged in safety-critical work, a robust drug and alcohol testing regime is no doubt a key component of an organisation’s OH&S program. And there are many options available to safety professionals working in these sectors. From in-house to outsourced testing, to the saliva testing vs urine testing conversation and through to various devices with different features – it can be confusing and, at times, difficult to get right.

If you already manage your drug testing program in-house or are considering making a change to self-managed testing, the checklist below may help you in doing a quick program health-check or in starting to think about your new self-managed approach.

An in-house drug testing program.
Are you clear on the following?

1. Is your objective to identify drug use history or to ensure fitness for work?

The answer to this question will govern which testing method will best suit the needs of your workplace. If you are looking to identify the drug use history of your employees, and therefore their lifestyle choices, then urine testing will provide you with the answer.

If however you are only interested in ensuring that all of your staff and contractors are fit for work when they are onsite, then saliva testing is the best solution. Saliva testing identifies only recent / current drug use and hence helps to determine who is capable to work that particular shift.

2. How many? How often?

It may be useful to establish a set of targets to help govern your testing schedule. For example, how many people (or what % of your workforce) will you be screening for drugs on an annual, quarterly or monthly basis?

It is also important to consider frequency of testing. Many organisations prefer random testing as the lack of a schedule itself can act as a drug use deterrent. Even in this scenario however, setting testing goals can be useful.

3. Who will manage the testing?

Once you have clarity on the testing targets you can resource accordingly. To manage the process in-house, the Australian standard stipulates that your staff need to undergo the appropriate testing officer training with a registered training organisation. The course is usually one-day in duration, with online options available.

4. Do your employees know what to expect when being tested?

A clearly communicated company position statement on drug and alcohol testing helps to minimise employee objections and concerns around the testing program. This statement may cover information on who may be tested, the means of testing [saliva vs urine], as well as the company’s stance on drug use in the workplace.

5. What if the result is positive?

It is best-practice for any non-negative result to be confirmed as a positive by a secondary test. This can take place externally, or by a second sample being taken on-site and sent straight to an external lab for confirmation.

It is important that all employees are clear on the consequences of a failed drug screen. The results of the confirmation test may take a few days and a common immediate consequence for a non-negative initial drug screen is for the employee to be sent home, however this does vary greatly from policy to policy. If the confirmation test comes back as positive, the subsequent steps should also be clearly documented.

---

Do your testing devices support your testing policy?

Pathtech is helping employers eliminate drug and alcohol abuse in the workplace with the very latest in testing devices – including the DrugWipe, Australia’s number one selling saliva drug testing device. The Pathtech team works with many organisations who manage their drug testing process in-house, as well as a number of testing service providers.

To speak to Pathtech about solutions that support your drug and alcohol testing policy call the team on 1800 069 161.

Please note: This checklist was put together based on Pathtech’s experience working with organisations who undertake workplace drug and alcohol testing. It should be used as a guide which may assist in internal discussions.
Simplify your workplace drug testing process. Single wipe drug test. Results in 8 minutes.

The DrugWipe from Pathtech is the leading saliva drug detection device in Australia. It is used by all Australian Police for roadside drug screening in every State and Territory, and many workplaces around the country as part of their internal drug testing programs.

DrugWipe from Pathtech:
- Smallest amount of saliva, just a wipe down the tongue
- Reliable results in 8 minutes
- Fast detection of up to 6 drug groups: Cannabis, Opiates, Cocaine, Amphetamine, Methamphetamine (MDMA, Ecstasy) and Benzodiazepines
- No handling of saliva required
- Less invasive than urine testing

FREE Sample
Try the Securetec DrugWipe
Contact the Pathtech Team and mention ‘OH&S Professional’ for your free sample. Available until the 31st of July 2014.

As used by all Australian Police jurisdictions for roadside drug screening.

Securetec DrugWipe
An easy to use, reliable test for the detection of drugs in saliva. Provides rapid results – within 8 minutes. No handling of saliva required.

Contact the Pathtech team
Phone 1800 069 161 | Email drugwipe@pathtech.com.au
pathtech.com.au
drug & alcohol testing

**“The biggest pitfall companies face is lack of or no consultation with employees when introducing a drug and alcohol testing program”**

The policy and procedure right at the start, and alcohol program, it’s imperative to get company has decided to include a drug takes a lot of energy and time, if the those who test positive to a drug or it’s about managing people, particularly which of course it is, at the end of the day, primarily can be seen as a ‘safety issue’, he says. “Although this takes time at the front end, it will pay off at the back end.” The policy and procedure should contain clear guidelines for confirmed positive drug and/or alcohol results, available counselling and other support options as well as guidelines for disciplinary action. It’s crucial the policy and procedure is written in a way that all employees are able to understand the content, including the outcomes of a positive drug or alcohol test, he says.

Lane adds that it is important to stay up to date with industry knowledge and work before testing begins, for the best chance of success.

Korkoneas says another common pitfall is not having access to an MRO to help human resources in managing the affected employee. “Australia generally has a ‘zero harm’ versus a ‘zero tolerance’ approach, and most companies offer counselling initiatives when a drug or alcohol issue is identified. Having easy access to an MRO can facilitate decision making in employee management,” he says.

**Steps for companies**

It’s important the key stakeholders, particularly HR which drives the drug and alcohol policy and procedure, with the assistance of other key stakeholders, remember: “consult, consult, consult”, says Korkoneas. “Although this takes time at the front end, it will pay off at the back end.”

The policy and procedure should contain clear guidelines for confirmed positive drug and/or alcohol results, available counselling and other support options as well as guidelines for disciplinary action. It’s crucial the policy and procedure is written in a way that all employees are able to understand the content, including the outcomes of a positive drug or alcohol test, he says.

Lane adds that it is important to stay up to date with industry knowledge and work with their supplier in doing so. “Indeed, partnering with a reputable supplier will ensure that ongoing support and questions can be covered throughout the process.”

**The role of OHS**

Quite often, OHS professionals are put in charge of the program once it has been established and are responsible for the management of it, including scheduling of random testing and identifying employees eligible for post-incident and for cause, says Korkoneas. “The OHS professional needs to have a very good understanding of the policy, program and how to manage a non-negative on-site drug test result,” he says.

“The OHS professional needs to continue to work in combination with HR, however, needs to take a step back in the management of the employee who has tested positive. This is a people issue and is best managed by the human resource professional.”

Lane says choosing an accurate and reliable on-site drug and alcohol testing device is a key factor. “Indeed, this is arguably the most important aspect of any workplace drug and alcohol policy; OHS professionals should ensure the device they are using is Australian Standard Certified to avoid any costly or stressful legal proceedings,” she says.

“Secondly, have a short- and long-term plan. Ensure it covers what drugs will be tested for; how often employers will be tested; will there be random or blanket tests conducted; and what method of testing will be used.”

---

**Endeavour Energy loses urine testing legal battle**

NSW Government-owned electricity network company Endeavour Energy lost a third legal attempt to force staff to undergo urine tests for drug and alcohol use in a legal battle that will have major implications for a range of industries including mining, transport and aviation, according to unions.

The decision confirmed two previous court rulings, including a full bench of Fair Work Australia ruling that the use of a urine test was “unjust and unreasonable” because it could detect drug use from days earlier, rather than more recent use that could lead to impairment at work, the Electrical Trades Union said.

Endeavour Energy launched the latest legal action in October last year, with the matter heard in the Fair Work Commission in December, as the company was attempting to vary the original decision, which required the use of oral testing, with urine-based testing.
Vendor news

**Medvet Oral**
The Medvet Oral7 is an oral fluid drug screen device independently validated by a NATA-accredited laboratory confirming the device complies with manufacturer’s cut-off levels. This means the device is fit for purpose under AS 4760:2006 (Australian Standard for oral fluid). By using a reliable device compliant with the Australian Standard, you are ensuring the most accurate results giving you confidence when managing an employee who tests non-negative on-site. The Medvet Oral7 is easy to use with results available within 10 minutes for opiates, cocaine, methamphetamines, MDMA, THC (marijuana), benzodiazepines and amphetamines.

Call Medvet on 1800 633 838 or visit medvet.com.au for more information.

**Pathtech**
The DrugWipe from Pathtech is the leading saliva drug detection device in Australia. It is used by all Australian Police jurisdictions for roadside drug screening, and by many workplaces around the country as part of their internal drug testing programs. Securetec DrugWipe from Pathtech requires the smallest amount of saliva (just a wipe down the tongue); offers reliable results in eight minutes; fast detection of up to six drug groups: cannabis, opiates, cocaine, amphetamine, methamphetamines (MDMA, ecstasy) and benzodiazepines; is less invasive than urine testing; and no handling of saliva is required.


**LaneWorkSafe**
The LaneWorkSafe Synthetic Marijuana Test is one of the most accurate devices on the market, as it tests for the two main ingredients JWH-018 and JWH-073 (which are the primary synthetic cannabinoids) found in the substance. It has been designed to be used in conjunction with our LaneWorkSafe Split Specimen Cup and provides a result in 5-6 minutes onsite. The Urine Split Specimen Cup has also been issued a Compliance Certificate by a NATA Accredited Laboratory to demonstrate it meets the requirements as per AS4308:2008 standards and therefore effectively meet the requirement of a drug program.


**Drugs and Alcohol. Is Your Workplace At Risk?**
Reduce your company’s risk of alcohol and drug related harm in the workplace by incorporating a holistic approach including:

- Robust and easy to understand workplace drug and alcohol policy and procedure
- Education and training of your employees including health promotion
- Access to counselling and treatment services, often through an Employee Assistance Program
- Regular (but not routine) workplace drug and alcohol testing
- Timely evaluation of your policy to ensure your company goals are met

**Medvet can help you implement a complete drug and alcohol program incorporating:**

- Drug and Alcohol Policy Review and/or Development
- Employee Training and Education
- On-site and Laboratory Based Drug and Alcohol Testing
- Drug Test Kit Sales

Medvet is a Registered Training Organisation and NATA accredited (Section 2 AS 4760 & AS/NZS 4308 including Appendix A) drug and alcohol testing company using Australian Standard compliant urine and oral fluid drug test devices and assessed and certified Collectors nationally.

Call us on 1800 633 838 or visit medvet.com.au to find out more about how Medvet can tailor a solution for your business.
Safety in the transport industry has been a hot topic of late, with a number of significant incidents, increased scrutiny and action from regulators as well as tougher standards being imposed upon transport operators. However, work-related road safety is a complex issue requiring a range of strategies and interventions, according to Darren Wishart, Research Fellow – Fleet Safety at the Queensland University of Technology’s Centre for Accident Research & Road Safety (CARRS-Q). “Unfortunately, many industries are still looking for a silver bullet and this does not exist. To improve work-related road safety requires a multi-pronged approach and organisational and employee commitment.”

Wishart, a co-chair on the organising committee for the OSIT2014 Conference, which will be held at the Gold Coast in September, says there are a number of OHS challenges facing the transport industry. He recommended using research-informed strategies as a basis for work-related road safety programs, “in contrast to what seems like a good idea at the time”. A comprehensive approach is also important, as is a program that is continuous and sustainable, said Wishart. “Unfortunately, work-related road safety is often the first ball dropped in budget cuts or when something ‘more important’ comes along,” he says.

Defence, logistics and safety

A keynote speaker at the OSIT2014 Conference will be Commander of the stt Joint Movements Group, Colonel Simon Tuckerman, who will speak about the Australian Defence Force’s use of transport on operations and exercises. “Obviously, the ADF is not exempt from meeting our moral and legal requirements for WHS, and this poses many challenges, particularly when we are operating in an austere environment and/or a war zone. In Afghanistan, for example, the ADF goes to significant efforts to keep our people safe – or to express it in military terms: the protection of our own force is paramount,” he says.

Soldiers, including those involved in transport and logistics, are equipped with world-leading body armour, their armoured vehicles are among the best and regularly enhanced with the latest improvements in ballistics and counter measure protection, which are constantly under analysis and evolving. “But the equipment is only one facet of meeting our WHS responsibilities, because as it evolves to meet the threat, so too do our tactics, techniques and procedures and the associated training that ensures we retain the edge with highly skilled individuals, teams and commanders who need to be able to respond quickly to environmental changes, making decisions that meet the critical logistics needs of a fighting force,” says Colonel Tuckerman.

“While in the main we have been very successful, these lengths have not always been enough, and we still unfortunately have operational and training casualties and injuries in the course of our military transport and logistics duties.” Regardless of the operation or exercise, he says there is considerable overlap between WHS responsibilities and the achievement of military objectives. As a result, Defence is constantly evaluating the risks, through detailed and complex risk analysis measures and implementing mitigation strategies into various supporting movements, transport and distribution plans. “The air, sea and road transportation assets that the ADF utilises are vast and include a wide range of our own assets, as well as those of our military coalition partners, and a myriad different commercial and/or contractor-operated assets,” he says.

“As such, we are often presented with unique and dynamic risk profiles that require ongoing...
Managing DIDO safety

Also speaking at the conference is dean of the School of Business & Law at Central Queensland University, Professor Lee Di Milia, expert in OHS and drive-in drive-out (DIDO) workforces in Queensland. “Sleepy and tired drivers on roads have safety implications for the individual and broader community,” he said.

“At the hard end we could estimate there are several deaths a year in the Bowen Basin, but proving the crash was due to falling asleep at the wheel is impossible to state with absolute precision. We cannot interview the deceased to ever really know. We can get a good insight into the crash by reviewing work history in the preceding week. It’s also the case that most people are genuinely unaware of having a micro sleep or falling asleep. We are good at recognising the symptoms of drowsy driving, but we seldom act upon these, trusting our ability to ‘push through’.”

Many companies provide their workforce with education, and Di Milia says this empowers workers to better understand the factors that affect their safety. Some insist on bussing employees to ensure employee safety, and he says there is also a lot of interest in employees developing a “journey plan” that is approved by a manager.

“I have seen many of these plans, and they range from being overly simplistic to several pages. The journey plans basically ask the employee to identify the risks involved in the commute and how the employee plans to mitigate the risks. It’s a very subjective exercise for both the employee and the manager. The real issue is whether anyone’s journey plan has been rejected, and this data is not in the public domain.”

Journey plans could be useful, however, Di Milia said there are powerful psychological forces acting on a driver. “First, not seeing your family is a powerful motivator to get home, and this leads to underestimating the risk of getting home. Second, having completed similar journeys in the past is a powerful reinforcer for getting home. Third, we each feel overly confident about our ability to drive despite how we actually feel – there is a lot of research showing our optimism to drive despite the objective evidence. Basically, we discount all indicators because we think we will be alright,” he says.

“One solution that will have a major impact is to bus employees. Decreasing the number of drowsy drivers reduces the exposure risk, but there is resistance to being bussed. Some employees want their right to drive. The issue is balancing individual rights and community safety, and sorting this political hot potato is not easy.”

The OSIT2014 Conference on Occupational Safety in Transport will be held at the Crowne Plaza Surfers Paradise, Gold Coast, Queensland, 18 & 19 September 2014. For more information visit ositconference.com.
Are we fooling ourselves regarding worker involvement in OHS? This is one of the key questions that I drew from this very rich text book that documents the history and evolution of workplace relations in general and delves into various aspects of WHS that are obviously inextricably linked.

On first pass I was not convinced that I would draw a huge amount from the book, given its natural focus and depth of interest in the political history of Australia, the exploration of the international scene and detailed case studies explaining workplace relations in action. However, once I decided to treat it more as a textbook and selfishly delve into the chapters and sections that were of interest to me, I found insightful and useful discussion.

Admittedly, I did find the conclusion of the third chapter on trade unions and international labour movements a little trite in the statement that if they “are to retain their representative voice, and not be perceived as merely sectional interest groups, they need to focus their attention on retaining existing members and attracting new members while also challenging the capitalist paradigm that widens the gap between rich and the poor.” However, it probably needs to be said to lay the foundations for later discussions.

Much of the discussion naturally focuses on employee voice and how it is increasingly non-union and direct. The authors argue that these should not be a substitute for union voice but an additional channel. Given the degree to which employee involvement is enshrined in WHS legislation, these discussions are of great interest to the professional. Of course, the growth in precarious employment and job insecurity jeopardise worker voice and involvement, and the authors argue that there is in fact a “demise”. The evidence for the benefits of worker involvement is powerfully delivered, not only in terms of reduced LTIFR in workplaces with effective consultative structures but also more generally regarding the overall health benefits of having some say in decision-making in one’s life.

In addition to these focus areas that pricked my interest, I also found the examination of increased work surveillance very interesting. Naturally, drug and alcohol testing are discussed and the full treatment provides great food for thought for any of us involved in either developing or managing these programs. The book goes further into growing issues of video surveillance, genetic testing and internet and social media use. Given the emerging nature of these issues, strong conclusions could be premature, but the discussion clearly points us towards the paradox that these matters present and urge us to consider the effects on employee relations and the loss of mutual respect. The links between social media and bullying are increasingly of concern to all of us.

Australian Workplace Relations offers an excellent grounding for any student of WHS and a useful and thought-provoking reference book for those of us facing the challenges of managing safety in the rapidly changing globalised workplace.

Reviewed by Steve Cowley FSIA
The Safety Institute of Australia Ltd (SIA) is the peak national association representing health and safety professionals and practitioners in Australasia. The SIA sets and maintains standards and drives the development of the profession and practice through supporting research and supporting and assisting with OHS policy and implementation. With more than 4000 members across Australia and internationally, the SIA's role is to ensure the quality of practice and reputation of the health and safety profession.

The Opportunity
The SIA is currently seeking to engage:

1. A Chief Executive Officer (On a 1+2 year contract)
2. Two Non-Executive Directors (Voluntary roles)

Chief Executive Officer
The SIA is seeking a “hands on” CEO on full-time contract (1+2 year term) to provide strategic leadership, implement key initiatives and shape the SIA's direction as the peak member association of health and safety professionals and practitioners. You will provide high level policy advice and contribute to SIA's professional standing, influence, growth and service excellence. You will lead and manage a small team to deliver the National Strategy and the key organisational initiatives while working cohesively with volunteers and others supporting the organisation.

Non-Executive Directors
The SIA is also currently seeking to engage two independent Non-Executive Directors. You will join the existing Board of ten Executive Directors and one Company Secretary to oversee the implementation of its 2011 – 2016 National Strategy.

You must have experience in Board roles for member organisation/s. You must also be able to engage with large employers and industry bodies as well as have experience in sales, marketing, public relations, advertising OR knowledge and experience in working within the research sector.

How to Apply
Please provide your current resume and a detailed covering letter addressing the criteria and/or questions below.

Chief Executive Officer
To be successful the candidate will need to demonstrate their experience in being hands on in approach to deliver results, through collaborative working with both staff and volunteers to grow a member based organisation or similar with the follow skills:

• Appropriate tertiary qualifications
• Superior leadership and management skills.
• A knowledge and understanding of the workings of an Industry Association and/or Not-for-profit sector
• A successful background in managing and leading a dynamic team of staff and volunteers.
• Strong financial management skills.
• A track record in implementing strategic plans within a diverse organisational environment and delivering results.
• Demonstrated high level of interpersonal skills.

Non-Executive Directors
1. Please tell us briefly about your executive / board experience and qualifications.
2. Where have you provided strategic leadership and influence? Please provide one brief example.
3. Please describe your experience working with industry as well as providing professional member services.

Contact
For a confidential discussion and to request a copy of the relevant Position Description please call Patrick Murphy, Board Chair, on 0429 009 587 or Tony Mitchell, Deputy Board Chair, on 0427 306 333. No agencies please.

Applications
All applications will be treated with the strictest confidentiality and are to be submitted by email to: recruitment@sia.org.au

Applications close: Friday 11 July 2014 at 5.00pm
“This is without a doubt the **best course** I have attended in my time.

The **facilitator was one of the best** I have come across.”

**MARCUS RADER**
Department of Mines and Petroleum

SAI GLOBAL is Australia’s leading provider of **Work Health & Safety (WHS) management systems training**. Our qualifications such as the **BSB60612 Advanced Diploma of WHS & BSB51607 Diploma of Quality Auditing** are nationally recognised and can help to accelerate your career, and create health and safety management systems that are best-practice.

“The facilitator was absolutely **fantastic**.

His **knowledge and expertise** in the Health & Safety realm, **by far extended any other Subject Matter Expert** I have encountered.

His ability to **engage the classroom, maintaining focus & interaction** during the training was uncanny. **Top class!”**

**JOSHUA GRUBB**
AMS

www.saiglobal.com/ohs  1300 727 444

Excellence. Assured.