

## **Attachment H**

**A statement by Mr Meadows re Dr Williams**

**23 March 2007**



**RESPONSE OF MR GEOFF MEADOWS TO ALLEGATIONS OF  
HARASSMENT MADE BY DR PAUL WILLIAMS – SENATE STANDING  
COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT COMMUNICATIONS  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND THE ARTS**

**The allegations**

Dr Williams alleges that:

- (i) he was informed that his annual work program needed changing in early October 2006, although it was approved until June 2007;
- (ii) during a recent unsuccessful interview for promotion to replace a previous long-serving supervisor of the technical support unit, one of the questions asked was “where there is a conflict between the environment and this agency, where does your loyalty lie?” When he asked for clarification, Dr Williams was told that he was there to answer questions not ask them. Dr Williams believes this question is a clear reference to his input into the Senate inquiry, which the managers consider to be disloyalty;
- (iii) at the time of the Cairns hearing of the Senate inquiry, he was removed from an interview panel; and
- (iv) he was the subject of continued accusations of having a history of criticising the department.

**Response**

In respect of (i), concerning an amendment to Dr Williams’ professional performance review agreement (“PPR”), it is part of my normal functions and duties to manage 70 staff in the Northern Region. Dr Williams is one of those officers. Each officer has a PPR to measure outcomes and performance. A PPR can be, and was in relation to Dr Williams, amended during its term. There is nothing unusual in such an amendment being made.

In this case, the amendment of Dr Williams' PPR was related to his performance as a State employee. It was not related to the circumstance of his having given evidence to the Senate Standing Committee on the Environment Communications Information Technology and the Arts ("the Committee") in June 2006.

In respect of (ii) concerning a question asked of Dr Williams during a staff selection interview, that same question was asked of all other applicants for the vacant position and directly relates to a selection criterion for selection. This selection criterion requires an applicant to have "[d]emonstrated high level ability to lead and manage a team and implement systems to promote performance management, ethical behaviour/decision-making and professional development". The specific question asked was:

"Do you think an employee of the Agency should be loyal, firstly, to the environment and, secondly, to the EPA, or the other way around?"

That Dr Williams should characterise as "completely inappropriate" a general question in these terms asked of all applicants and directed at a specific selection criteria, with respect, seems to say more about Dr Williams and his understanding of selection processes than it does about anything else.

This question does not bear any relationship whatsoever to Dr Williams having given evidence to the Committee.

In respect of (iii) concerning the removal of Dr Williams from an interview panel, I have no knowledge of the circumstances surrounding this event. I would observe, however, that it is not unusual for the composition of selection panels to be altered from time to time for reasons of administrative policy, fairness and equity.

In respect of (iv) concerning accusations to the effect that Dr Williams had a history of criticising the department, as one of Dr Williams' supervisors, I was obliged to raise with him several issues relating to his conduct.

This conduct concerned the transmission of correspondence highly critical of another officer without first having observed appropriate protocols, and the forwarding of such correspondence to other junior staff within the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service ("QPWS"); the inappropriate behaviour of Dr Williams with respect to the Minister for the Environment on 28 September 2006; and a failure to seek and obtain appropriate approvals before a person external to the QPWS was engaged to facilitate a departmental workshop.

At no stage have I "continued accusations" that Dr Williams had a history of criticising the QPWS.

No substantive evidence exists to support this allegation.

#### Summation

No substantive evidence supports the allegations made against me by Dr Williams. I reject those allegations in their entirety, notwithstanding that Dr Williams may, for his own reasons, perceive the situation differently.

Kimberley Doolop



on behalf of Geoff Meadows

Manager, Park Services  
QPWS Northern Region

