

**HWSA – “Safe Steps”  
Manual Tasks, Slips and Trips in Hospitals Campaign**

**2008 Survey Results of Audit Assessment**

31 surveys were returned:

Tasmania 4

Western Australia 3

Queensland 7

Victoria 7

South Australia 6

New South Wales 4 (The format of the NSW survey was different to that of the remaining states, as such NSW results have been analysed separately. Where possible, similarities have been drawn between NSW data and that of the other states.)

The survey comprised of two sections. ‘Section A: The Audit Tool’, and ‘Section B: The Audit Process’. In each of these sections, respondents were asked to rate, using a box scale numbered 1 to 5 (where 1 = very poor, 3 = average, and 5 = excellent), their response to a range of questions about aspects of the audit process. In the NSW survey, a 10-point scale was used, where 1 = very poor, 5 = average, 10 = excellent). All respondents had the option of answering questions with NA = not applicable.

The following tables (Table 1 and 2) show the survey questions, the mean (average) response to each question, and the standard deviation of responses from the mean.

Table 1 shows the results of survey replies from Tasmania, Western Australia, Queensland, Victoria and South Australia.

Results show that, generally, respondents found the audit tool and the audit process ‘average’ to ‘good’. When calculating the mean response of individual surveys, one Queensland respondent had an overall ‘excellent’ impression of the audit tool and the audit process. A Victorian respondent had an overall ‘below average’ impression of the audit tool and process. The mean response to the survey of all other respondents was ‘average’ to ‘good’.

A larger standard deviation shows that there was greater variation in the response to that question compared to a question with a smaller standard deviation. The low standard deviation in the above table shows that there was little difference between responses to each question.

**Table 1: Results of survey replies from Tasmania, Western Australia, Queensland, Victoria and South Australia**

**Section A: The Audit Tool**

Thinking about the Audit tool itself, how would you rate it for the following components?

		Mean	Standard Deviation	Result
a	Overall length	3	1	average
b	Format/layout of the audit tool	3	1	average
c	Ease of completion	3	1	average
d	How effective were the audit prompts in assisting you to fully assess the manual task/slips/trip issues?	4	1	good
e	In instances where manual tasks/slips/trips hazards were not adequately controlled did the audit tool assist you to identify the reasons?	3	1	average
f	How well did the timing of the audits connect with the target area's busiest period?	3	1	average

**Section B: The Audit Process**

Thinking now about the Audit process and the support you received in completing the hospital audits, how would you rate the following components?

a	The effectiveness of the inspector training for conducting the audit programme	4	1	good
b	The usefulness of the Inspector Supplement provided to assist the audit process	4	1	good
c	The usefulness of the campaign support material (e.g. media releases, information provided to hospitals) prior to the audits	3	1	average
d	Workplace response - initial reception from non clinical area supervision upon commencement of the audit(s)?	4	1	good
e	Workplace response - initial reception from non clinical area workers upon commencement of the audit(s)?	4	1	good
f	Workplace response - actions resulting from advice/notices given during/following audits(s)	4	1	good
g	The Office of the ASCC survey - was the distribution of the Office of the ASCC survey timely and effective (had they seen it prior to the audit)?	3	1	average
h	From your experience with Safe Steps and similar HWSA compliance campaigns how would you rate the value of these projects to obtaining compliance in workplaces?	3	1	average

Table 2 shows the results of survey replies from New South Wales. Results show that, generally, respondents found the audit instrument and the audit process 'above average' to 'good'. The larger standard variation of this data compared to data from the other states is explained by the larger scale used to rate replies. One respondent responded quite negative about the audit instrument (their ratings ranged between 2 and 3), which has contributed to the higher standard variation of responses to Section A.

**Table 2: Results of survey replies from New South Wales**

**Section A: The Audit Instrument**

Thinking about the Audit instrument itself, how would you rate it for the following components?

		Mean	Standard Deviation	Result
a	Overall length	5	3	average
b	Coverage/scope	6	3	above average
c	Specific content	6	3	above average
d	Ease of completion	5	2	average
e	Relevance to workplace	7	3	good
f	Effectiveness in achieving outcomes	6	3	above average

**Section B: The Audit Process**

Thinking now about the Audit process and the support you received in completing the hospital audits, how would you rate the following components?

a	Training/preparation	6	3	above average
b	Information, literature provided	7	2	good
c	Administrative arrangements	7	2	good
d	Campaign support	3	1	poor
e	Workplace response - initial reception	6	2	above average
f	Workplace response - overall assistance	8	1	good
g	Workplace response - feedback provided	8	1	good

When calculating the mean response of individual NSW surveys, one respondent had an overall 'below average' impression of the audit tool and the audit process. When looking at responses to individual questions across all respondents, Section B question d returned a 'poor' response.

When comparing responses to comparable questions between the NSW survey and that provided to the other states, answers were similar.