

Submission
No 170

**THE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS OF THE NSW
AMBULANCE SERVICE**

Name: Mr Steven Davies

Date received: 4/07/2008

Partially Confidential

Dear Committee Members.

I applied for a Rescue Officer position and was successful in finishing third on the order of merit out of a total of four Officers.

The Position stated that the successful Officers would be appointed to a permanent Rescue position.

The Officer who finished fourth on said list was appointed to a permanent Rescue role and I was delegated to a primary care Ambulance role despite the Position advertising otherwise and my position on the merit list.

As I was not performing in said Rescue role, I applied for a position as an Intensive Care paramedic. I was told by recruitment that I was four days short of having 12 months skill consolidation in my rescue role, even though I was not performing in a Rescue role and had not for some 6 months.

This is despite the fact that an Officer in my very same Rescue course was accepted in a position for Intensive care Paramedic with only two months skill consolidation.

There have been recent cases where it seems Recruitment just suits them selves as to whether an Officer completes 12 months of skill consolidation.

I contacted recruitment and put my case forward. I would have had more luck banging my head against a brick wall.

As the Ambulance Service grievance procedures had proven to be an absolute JOKE I set about to gather as much information as I could in regards to the Maladministration of Recruitment that they would have to act.

I sent the following email out via the Services intranet to the majority of addressees listed there in.

If anyone has had UNSATISFACTORY Dealings with recruitment please contact

I received quite a few complaints and letters of support.

The next day I received a hand delivered letter from then acting CEO M. Willis.

(a copy of which I have on file should you like to peruse)

The letter questioned my Ethics and I responded in writing to M. Willis.

(a copy of which is on file should you like to peruse.)

Immediately the I.T. department of the service sent an email out telling people it was inappropriate for them to respond to my email. (under whose authority did as a non ranking officer act?)

also blocked anyone using a service computer from sending email to my address. (this is clearly in breach of section 17 of the

workplace surveillance act).

(a copy of the document (computer script) showing the address being blocked is available at your request)

At this time I had also been taken off the services mailing list. Which means I received no information that was generally broadcasted to all staff including SOP updates or matters of a clinical nature.

I wrote a letter to Mr. Rochford addressing my concerns in regard to actions and it appears either lied to the CEO or the CEO is a liar.

I contacted Sharon White in the PSCU in regards to breaching the workplace surveillance act and as what has come to be expected from that department they were not willing to take any formal action. Worthy to note that approximately 1 hour after my conversation with the PSCU my address was unblocked.

Not once did the CEO or Operations Manager request copies of the complaints I received in regards to Recruitment.

I have also heard allegations that (at the time) had been caught altering the test results of an Officers application and the Service had taken no action.

can only be described in Medical terms as yet she has refused applicants from joining the service on Medical grounds.

On the 20th anniversary of women in the service it is worthy to note that a level 1 course was entirely comprised of 20 women (out of all the applicants the 20 most eligible candidates were all women! this is unheard of)

It is also worthy to note that this service has a diverse range of employees (which I encourage and support)

One of the demographics would be Officers who live an alternate lifestyle (same sex partners). Again I support this 100% and have family members who also enjoy this lifestyle free of harassment.

I have to ask the question though does the Service treat these Officers differently. It appears that some officers get special advantages due to the fact the Service does not know how to deal with these Officers effectively or are too scared of being accused of harassing gay people. Meanwhile certain Officers are getting away with things that a normal heterosexual Officer would be crucified over.

I believe these enquiries will lead to NO real effective change within the Service until a body such as ICAC gets involved.

S.Davies