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# Overview

On 6 June 2017, the Office of the Federal Safety Commissioner (OFSC) emailed 348 accredited companies inviting them to participate in an anonymous online survey regarding the operations of the Work Health and Safety Accreditation Scheme (Scheme) and the OFSC.

193 of these companies made submissions to the survey, constituting a response rate of 55.5 per cent. Questions in the survey were not compulsory and companies were also able to submit a “don’t know/not sure” response to a number of questions. For the purposes of this report “don’t know/not sure” responses have been excluded from the results.

## Results

### Section A: About your company

***How many people were directly employed by your company as at 30 June 2016 (not including contractors)?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Small (0 to 19 employees)** | 23 | 11.92% |
| **Medium (20 to 199 employees)** | 114 | 59.07% |
| **Large (200+ employees)** | 56 | 29.01% |
| **Total** | **193** | **100.00%** |

***In which State(s) and/or territory(ies) do you operate?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **% of respondents (193 responses)** |
| **ACT** | 52 | 26.94% |
| **NSW** | 117 | 60.62% |
| **NT** | 53 | 27.46% |
| **QLD** | 101 | 52.33% |
| **SA** | 62 | 32.12% |
| **TAS** | 35 | 18.13% |
| **VIC** | 91 | 47.15% |
| **WA** | 74 | 38.34% |

***What types of construction do you undertake?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **% of respondents (190 responses)** |
| **Civil** | 116 | 61.05% |
| **Commercial** | 108 | 56.84% |
| **Residential - Single dwelling** | 24 | 12.63% |
| **Residential - Other** | 51 | 26.84% |

***Has your company ever undertaken an Australian Government Building and Construction WHS Accreditation Scheme Project?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 130 | 73.45% |
| **No** | 47 | 26.55% |
| **Total** | **177** | **100.00%** |

### Section B: Scheme Accreditation

***Thinking back to before your company was accredited, do you think workplace safety in your company was…?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Very good** | 29 | 16.20% |
| **Good** | 81 | 45.25% |
| **Fair** | 61 | 34.08% |
| **Poor** | 8 | 4.47% |
| **Very Poor** | 0 | 0.00% |
| **Total** | **179** | **100.00%** |

***As a result of the Scheme accreditation, do you think workplace safety practices in your organisation have improved?[[1]](#footnote-1)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 152 | 81.28% |
| **No** | 35 | 18.72% |
| **Total** | **187** | **100.00%** |

***Has Scheme accreditation helped your company achieve a “whole of organisation” improvement to safety culture?[[2]](#footnote-2)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 137 | 74.86% |
| **No** | 46 | 25.14% |
| **Total** | **183** | **100.00%** |

***Which of the following, if any, was your company hoping to achieve by becoming accredited? Select all that apply.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **% of respondents**  **(193 responses)** |
| **Be eligible to tender for Government work** | 183 | 94.82% |
| **Better safety performance** | 102 | 52.85% |
| **Improved safety culture** | 112 | 58.03% |
| **Fewer incidents** | 68 | 35.23% |
| **Other** | 15 | 7.77% |

***Have you achieved these outcomes?***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Yes** | **%** | **No** | **%** | **Total** | **%** |
| **Be eligible to tender for Government work** | 162 | 90.00% | 18 | 10.00% | 180 | 100.00% |
| **Better safety performance** | 96 | 96.00% | 4 | 4.00% | 100 | 100.00% |
| **Improved safety culture** | 109 | 99.09% | 1 | 0.91% | 110 | 100.00% |
| **Fewer incidents** | 59 | 89.39% | 7 | 10.61% | 66 | 100.00% |
| **Other** | 15 | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 15 | 100.00% |

***Has the OFSC contributed to improving overall safety in the Building and Construction Industry?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 165 | 95.93% |
| **No** | 7 | 4.07% |
| **Total** | **172** | **100.00%** |

***All State and Territory Governments now recognise Scheme accreditation as automatically meeting the Work, Health and Safety (WHS) element of pre-qualification schemes for their construction projects. Is this recognition likely to be a benefit to accredited companies?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 165 | 93.75% |
| **No** | 11 | 6.25% |
| **Total** | **176** | **100.00%** |

***All State and Territory Governments now recognise Scheme accreditation as automatically meeting the Work, Health and Safety (WHS) element of pre-qualification schemes for their construction projects. Is this recognition likely to be a benefit to your company?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 156 | 90.70% |
| **No** | 16 | 9.30% |
| **Total** | **172** | **100.00%** |

***Would you recommend Scheme accreditation to non-accredited companies?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 124 | 87.32% |
| **No** | 18 | 12.68% |
| **Total** | **142** | **100.00%** |

### Section C: Cost of Accreditation

***Do you think Scheme accreditation represents value for money (ie. weighing up safety/commercial benefits against any extra costs directly related to the Scheme)?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 152 | 83.98% |
| **No** | 29 | 16.02% |
| **Total** | **181** | **100.00%** |

***Thinking about how often the OFSC audits your company, do you think the frequency is …?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Too much** | 32 | 17.40% |
| **About right** | 145 | 78.80% |
| **Not enough** | 7 | 3.80% |
| **Total** | **184** | **100.00%** |

***Thinking about OFSC reporting requirements, do you agree or disagree that they are…?***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Yes** | **%** | **No** | **%** | **Total** | **%** |
| **Too onerous** | 45 | 25.00% | 135 | 75.00% | 180 | 100.00% |
| **Too frequent** | 40 | 22.10% | 141 | 77.90% | 181 | 100.00% |
| **Not providing an accurate picture** | 66 | 38.37% | 106 | 61.63% | 172 | 100.00% |

### Section D: OFSC and FSO Performance

***Thinking about the contact and/or support you had with the Office of the Federal Safety Commissioner (OFSC), were they good or poor in relation to …?***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Good** | **%** | **Poor** | **%** | **Total** | **%** |
| **Having knowledgeable staff** | 183 | 97.86% | 4 | 2.14% | 187 | 100.00% |
| **Being courteous and polite** | 191 | 99.48% | 1 | 0.52% | 192 | 100.00% |
| **Responding promptly to queries** | 179 | 93.72% | 12 | 6.28% | 191 | 100.00% |
| **Being able to get hold of the right person** | 179 | 96.24% | 7 | 3.76% | 186 | 100.00% |
| **Communicating with you clearly** | 182 | 96.30% | 7 | 3.70% | 189 | 100.00% |

***Overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the service provided to you by the Office of the Federal Safety Commissioner?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Satisfied** | 184 | 97.35% |
| **Dissatisfied** | 5 | 2.65% |
| **Total** | **189** | **100.00%** |

***Thinking about your interactions with the Federal Safety Officer(s) who have conducted audits, to what extent do you agree or disagree that the officers were …?***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Yes** | **%** | **No** | **%** | **Total** | **%** |
| **Professional** | 188 | 98.43% | 3 | 1.57% | 191 | 100.00% |
| **Knowledgeable** | 184 | 98.40% | 3 | 1.60% | 187 | 100.00% |
| **Collaborative** | 165 | 88.71% | 21 | 11.29% | 186 | 100.00% |

***Thinking about any Guidance Material provided by the OFSC, such as the audit criteria guide, the reporting pack and website information etc, do you agree that they are…?***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Yes** | **%** | **No** | **%** | **Total** | **%** |
| **Readily accessible** | 190 | 98.45% | 3 | 1.55% | 193 | 100.00% |
| **Clear and easy to understand** | 159 | 84.13% | 30 | 15.87% | 189 | 100.00% |

***Is all of the information you require regarding the OFSC regulatory framework available on fsc.gov.au?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **%** |
| **Yes** | 157 | 96.91% |
| **No** | 5 | 3.09% |
| **Total** | **162** | **100.00%** |

***How would you prefer to be informed of new fact sheets, case studies and news articles on the agency website fsc.gov.au?***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **% of respondents**  **(193 responses)** |
| **Website** | 95 | 49.22% |
| **Social Media** | 6 | 3.11% |
| **Email** | 169 | 87.56% |
| **Newsletter** | 68 | 35.23% |
| **Other** | 1 | 0.52% |

***FSC Online was introduced in an effort to cut red tape and improve efficiency. To what extent do you agree or disagree that this has been achieved for…?***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Yes** | **%** | **No** | **%** | **Total** | **%** |
| **Accreditation/Reaccreditation applications** | 135 | 90.00% | 15 | 10.00% | 150 | 100.00% |
| **Accredited contractor reporting** | 154 | 92.77% | 12 | 7.23% | 166 | 100.00% |
| **Accredited contractor dashboard** | 147 | 90.18% | 16 | 9.82% | 163 | 100.00% |

1. This question measures the impact of first getting accredited. The figures represent the 2014 results for companies accredited at that time, aggregated with the 2016 results for companies that were accredited after the 2014 survey and the 2017 results for companies that were accredited after the 2016 survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This question measures the impact of first getting accredited. The figures represent the 2014 results for companies accredited at that time, aggregated with the 2016 results for companies that were accredited after the 2014 survey and the 2017 results for companies that were accredited after the 2016 survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)