

SKODEL PSYCHOSOCIAL RISK ASSESSMENT REPORT

Example Organisation

Workforce Psychosocial Risk Assessment - Organisation-Wide Analysis - November 2025

WORKFORCE UNDER STRAIN

14%

↓ from 16% prior period

119 staff members meeting all three strain indicators

POSITIVITY RATE

78%

↑ from 74% prior period

Staff reporting a positive mood at time of check-in

RESPONDENTS

847

73% response rate

Organisation-wide

847 of 1160 eligible staff - 73% response rate

TOP PROTECTIVE FACTOR

Manager Trust

56% of positive respondents - strongest buffer

Skodel Psychosocial Risk Assessment | Example Organisation - Organisation Wide | November 2025 | Example Report for Illustration Only

01 | RISK OVERVIEW

Executive Risk Snapshot

WORKFORCE STRAIN - HOW IT IS MEASURED

A staff member is counted as under strain when all three leading indicators are present: **negative emotion at work** the majority of the time (such as burnout or stress), that is **ongoing** (not a recent or temporary response), and is **impairing their functioning** (impacting ability to perform daily tasks effectively). All three conditions must be met.

WORKFORCE UNDER STRAIN

14%

↓ from 16% prior period

119 staff members meeting all three strain indicators

POSITIVITY RATE

78%

↑ from 74% prior period

Staff reporting a positive mood at time of check-in

RESPONDENTS

847

73% response rate

Organisation-wide

847 of 1160 eligible staff - 73% response rate

STRAIN RANGE

ACROSS WORKFORCE GROUPS

9% - 23%

Strain varies by group and role. Highest at 23%, lowest at 9%.

TOP RISK DRIVERS - SELECTED WHEN REPORTING NEGATIVE MOOD

Lack of recognition for extra effort	7%
Prolonged excessive job demands	6%
Poorly planned or communicated changes	5%
Infrequent communication from leadership	4%
Excessive administrative workload	4%

METHODOLOGY Percentages shown as proportion of total respondents. Drivers selected when respondents reported negative mood at check-in. Skodel's Strain Index uses three dimensions: exposure, duration, and severity.

TOP PROTECTIVE FACTORS - SELECTED BY POSITIVE-MOOD RESPONDENTS

Trusted and supported by my manager	56%
Supportive work environment	54%
Connecting well with the team	52%
Good workplace culture	50%
Meaningful work	47%

NOTE Protective factors act as buffers against psychosocial risk. These should be preserved and reinforced through any intervention design. Full detail in Section 06.

02 | RISK DRIVERS

Top Workplace Risks

The following drivers were most frequently selected by staff when they reported a negative mood. Each reflects a psychosocial hazard with measurable presence across the organisation.

STRAIN-LINKED RISK DRIVERS - RANKED BY FREQUENCY

Lack of recognition for extra effort	7.0%
Prolonged excessive job demands	5.6%
Poorly planned or communicated changes	5.2%
Infrequent communication from leadership	4.3%
Excessive administrative workload	3.9%
Unclear or delayed information to do my job	3.9%
Inefficient processes	3.5%
Lack of input in decision making	3.5%

03 | RISK REGISTER

Hazard Overview

PSYCHOSOCIAL HAZARD RADAR

Expanding shape = increasing hazard exposure. Contracting = improvement.

PSYCHOSOCIAL HAZARD	CURRENT RISK	PREVIOUS RISK	MOVEMENT
Inadequate Reward and Recognition	MODERATE	HIGH	↓ Improving
Job Demands	MODERATE	HIGH	↓ Improving
Poor Organisational Change Management	MODERATE	HIGH	↓ Improving
Poor Communication and Information	MODERATE	HIGH	↓ Improving
Lack of Role Clarity	MODERATE	MODERATE	→ Stable
Poor Organisational Justice	MODERATE	MODERATE	→ Stable

METHODOLOGY Risk levels assigned using Skodel's Strain Index across exposure, duration, and severity dimensions. Aligned to Safe Work Australia Model Code of Practice. Four hazards reduced from High to Moderate since the prior assessment, reflecting the 16% to 14% improvement in workforce strain.

04 | COHORT ANALYSIS

Group Breakdown

Workforce strain and positivity rates broken down by staff group. Group-level data identifies where risk is concentrated and informs targeted intervention.

Frontline Staff
n = 521 respondents

STRAIN 19%
POSITIVE 73%

TOP RISK DRIVERS

- Lack of recognition for extra effort
- Prolonged excessive job demands
- Insufficient resourcing and time

Corporate / Support
n = 176 respondents

STRAIN 9%
POSITIVE 84%

TOP RISK DRIVERS

- Unclear job responsibilities
- Inefficient processes
- Lack of input in decision making

Division A
n = 246 respondents

STRAIN 11%
POSITIVE 81%

TOP RISK DRIVERS

- High client-facing demands
- Poorly planned or communicated changes
- Excessive admin work

Division B
n = 271 respondents

STRAIN 23%
POSITIVE 71%

TOP RISK DRIVERS

- Lack of recognition for extra effort
- Prolonged excessive job demands
- Infrequent senior leadership communication

STRAIN RATE COMPARISON ACROSS GROUPS

Division B	23%
Frontline Staff	19%
Organisation Average	14%
Division A	11%
Corporate / Support	9%

NOTE Division B and Frontline Staff sit above the organisation average. The gap between Division B (23%) and Corporate Support (9%) indicates strain is not evenly distributed. Targeted intervention for these two groups is the priority action.

05 | SURVEY INDICATORS

Additional Questions

Additional questions are mapped to psychosocial hazard categories. Results show the proportion of staff who agreed or disagreed with each statement.

Work Demands & Work-Life Balance | **JOB DEMANDS**

STATEMENT	AGREE	DISAGREE
I am generally able to maintain a healthy work-life balance across the year	71%	14%
The demands of my role are manageable	67%	11%
There is sufficient time in my working day to complete all responsibilities	22%	49%

Role Clarity & Participation | **LACK OF ROLE CLARITY** | **POOR ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT**

STATEMENT	AGREE	DISAGREE
I have a clear understanding of what is expected of me in my role	90%	2%

Team Relationships & Belonging | **POOR SUPPORT** | **POOR ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE**

STATEMENT	AGREE	DISAGREE
I feel a sense of belonging within my team	88%	3%
I can be my authentic self at work and feel my identity is respected	86%	2%
I feel that my contributions are valued	84%	3%

Communication & Information Flow | **POOR COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION** | **POOR ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT**

STATEMENT	AGREE	DISAGREE
I receive timely and clear updates about organisation-wide priorities and decisions	75%	4%
I receive timely and clear updates from my line manager	82%	7%
I know where to access key information relevant to my role	85%	3%

Psychological Safety & Fairness | **POOR ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE** | **POOR SUPPORT**

STATEMENT	AGREE	DISAGREE
I feel comfortable to raise concerns and I know who to raise those concerns with	74%	7%
I feel confident that issues will be heard and addressed fairly	69%	7%
I have access to resources that help me deal with difficult situations	77%	4%

Diversity, Inclusion & Wellbeing Resources | **POOR SUPPORT**

STATEMENT	AGREE	DISAGREE
I am aware of the range of initiatives offered by the organisation which support my wellbeing	77%	3%
I feel that the organisation's approach to Diversity & Inclusion improves my overall experience at work	77%	4%

06 | POSITIVE DRIVERS

Protective Factors

Tags most frequently selected by staff when they reported a positive mood. These factors act as buffers against psychosocial risk and should be preserved and reinforced through any intervention.

TOP PROTECTIVE FACTORS - SELECTED BY POSITIVE-MOOD RESPONDENTS

Trusted and supported by my manager	56%
Supportive work environment	54%
Connecting well with the team	52%
Good workplace culture	50%
Meaningful work	47%
Positive team dynamics	47%
Positive work environment	46%
A diverse and inclusive environment	38%
My role is clearly defined	28%

NOTE Protective factors reflect genuine buffers against psychosocial risk. Managerial trust, team connection, and meaningful work are among the most powerful. These assets should be sustained as controls are implemented against the identified hazards.

07 | ANALYSIS

Interpretation

STRUCTURAL RISK SIGNALS

- Recognition and workload co-occur.** Lack of recognition (7%) and prolonged job demands (5.6%) are the two highest drivers and frequently appear together among the same strained respondents. High workload without acknowledgement is more psychosocially damaging than either factor in isolation.
- Communication from leadership is a gap.** Organisation-wide updates and leadership communication both feature as risk drivers. 26% of staff lack confidence in timely updates, suggesting a gap between leadership intent and staff experience.
- Time to complete all responsibilities is critically low.** Only 22% of staff agree they have sufficient time in the working day. 49% actively disagree. This is the largest single gap across all additional questions and directly fuels the workload driver.

CULTURAL BUFFER SIGNALS

- Manager trust is a significant asset.** 56% of positive-mood respondents cited being trusted and supported by their manager. Line manager relationships are functioning as a genuine buffer and should be preserved and reinforced in any intervention design.
- Team culture is strong across the board.** Connecting well with the team (52%), positive team dynamics (47%), and good workplace culture (50%) are consistently cited. Belonging within teams (88% agree) is a clear strength. Strain is not driven by interpersonal breakdown.
- Meaningful work remains a strong anchor.** 47% of positive-mood respondents cited meaningful work. Staff remain connected to purpose, a critical protective factor in high-demand environments.

OVERALL POSITION

14%

Workforce under strain, improved from prior period (16%) and tracking toward 12%

Strong foundations

Team culture, manager trust, and meaningful work are genuine protective factors

Structural risks

Recognition, workload, and leadership communication require targeted intervention

This organisation has strong cultural foundations that are protecting the majority of staff. The strain being experienced is not a product of broken team relationships. It is being driven by structural factors: workload volume, recognition gaps, and communication clarity from senior leadership. These are controllable and addressable. Intervention should prioritise recognition frameworks, workload governance, and strengthening organisation-wide communication channels before the next assessment cycle.

NEXT ASSESSMENT Biannual review recommended. A follow-up cycle in 3-6 months would allow measurement of whether interventions are having a measurable impact on the 14% strain rate, with a target trajectory toward 12%.