



Justice
Corrective Services

20 Lee Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Tel 02 8346 1333 | Fax 02 8346 1205
www.justice.nsw.gov.au

Trim: D15/721985

11 December
November 2015

Ms Anne Gardiner
General Secretary
Public Service Association of New South Wales
PO Box 3356
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Attention: Damien Hennessy
Industrial Advocate

Dear Ms Gardiner

“Required Information under IRC Recommendations”

I am writing further to the recommendation issued by Commissioner Newell in the Industrial Relations Commission in matter 999 of 2015 and in response to the letter from the Association dated 9 December 2015.

The recommendations agreed to provide the Association with 2 specific statements in relation to the job analysis methodology used globally and to reiterate the terms of reference and provide any additional information about the merging of administration and stores.

In response to the 11 requests from the letter 9 December 2015, I advise:

1. **New change management plan** – The intent of consultation is for the Association to provide feedback. Please include any additions you propose in your feedback.
2. **Consultation timetable** - CSNSW is actively consulting with the Association as is confirmed in the recommendations.
3. **Proposed merging of administration and stores** - This is contained within Attachment 2.
4. **Role Allocation** – This is contained within in Attachment 1.

5. **Reporting arrangements** – Our letter dated 20 November 2015 details the reporting arrangement and how they are to be structured.
6. **Position impact tables** - The information available to staff will be updated as soon as possible with information surrounding MISE + WISE. We have included details on existing and proposed role numbers at each grade. It is immaterial for consultation concerning the structure whether a role is vacant.
7. **Email address** - hrsupport@dcs.nsw.gov.au
8. **Draft role descriptions** – The role descriptions provided some months ago do identify the focus capabilities and are enclosed.
9. **Reports** – Information on the scope and objectives of this review has been provided. CSNSW does not intend to provide its internal working documents. The final proposals have been provided for your comment.
10. **Costs savings** - As outlined in Statement 2, this review does not have an overall aim of cost savings.
11. **Safety impact statement** - We are happy to receive individual feedback on this area.

I trust the information contained in this letter and the attachments addresses what the PSA requires in order to consult its members.

Please contact Laura Molenaar, HR Advisor Industrial Relations on 8346 1712 if you have any further enquiries.

Yours sincerely



CATHRYN HELLAMS
Director, Human Resources
CSNSW

Attachment 1

Corrective Services utilised the Mercer Cullen Egan Dell (CED) system to perform its job analysis of the Administration and Stores Review personnel.

The Mercer CED System is a consistent system designed to rate similar types of jobs, it does however recognise that the complexity, scope, challenges and demands of jobs vary from job to job and seeks to measure those differences.

This system of job analysis used extensively throughout the NSW Public Sector and has been trusted by reputable clients such as:

- The Royal Australasian College of Surgeons
- University of Southern Queensland and
- Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment in the Northern Territory.

The job analysis process was commenced by undertaking a review of all the established positions in each location and their assigned grades. This analysis confirmed the conclusion that there is not a consistent model of staffing across the system with varying grades and classifications undertaking administrative support activities.

Work then commenced into what actual tasks being performed in each of the centres and in the MISE + WISE Complex. This analysis was done in full consultation with the General Managers and/or Business Managers. This resulted in list of tasks functions to be complied along with information regarding the volume of each task being performed.

With this information, and the previous role descriptions the Mercer CED Job Analysis methodology was utilised, this methodology utilises a number of factors to analyse an appropriate level of position, some of these factors include:

- **Education Requirements** – Does any of these tasks require any tertiary, professional or other qualifications to be held to perform the specific task.
- **Knowledge and Experience** – This aspect measures the education, training, skills, and knowledge and work experience requirements of a position. It is not an assessment of what the current incumbent holds in this regard, it is an assessment of the levels of each required to be held to perform the task.
- **Judgement** - Evaluates the reasoning factor involved with the task – to what degree and complexity is the person required to problem solve. This is an objective assessment, not subjective to how well the current incumbent performs in the area of problem solving, but merely an assessment of how likely and often does a particular task require the exercise of judgement.
- **Job Environment** – This elements identifies the extent, clarity and completeness of objectives, guidelines, systems and policies, it is closely tied to the Judgement element.
- **Interpersonal Skills** – Measures the task's requirement for skill in managing people and relationships. It is not a measure of the amount of interpersonal skills possessed by any incumbent but rather is concern with the people management skills required to achieve the objective.

This methodology was in no way used to assess the volume of work. It assesses the level of skills, knowledge and responsibility required to undertake the role.

This process gave insights into what capabilities and level at which positions should be graded in line with the tasks they complete.

The volume of work is used to determine the number of roles needed at each centre.

It is critical to understand that a position will not be upgraded in pay grades simply based on the volume of work.

With these two factors, the appropriate grading based on an assessment of tasks and number of positions based on volume of work, were formulated into the proposed structure we put forward to our general managers for further consultation. Those general managers had additional input based on the specific requirements of their centres and as such the figures were then revised to result in the table that was provided to the PSA on 23 November 2015.

Attachment 2

Aims and Objectives of the Administration and Stores Review

As per our letter dated 20 November 2014

“... The main objective of the review is to ensure that we developed a staffing model that is consistent across all correctional centres based on activity levels and that each correctional centre has dedicated resources.

.... There is not a consistent model across the system, with varying grades and classifications undertaking administrative support activities”

Possible Merging of Admin and Stores Functions

As all employees in affected positions under this review are employed under the *Government Sector Employment Act 2013* and its associated regulations and rules which mean that no employee under this legislation owns a position they are assigned to a role.

One of the intents of this review is to enhance the skill base amongst the support staff in each centre, so it may be possible on occasions that a worker who predominately does administration work maybe requested to perform basic stores functions.

The requests to perform work is required to be reasonable and lawful, and if an individual employees feels that an instruction is not either reasonable or lawful are required to raise that with an explanation to their immediate manager/supervisor.

It is not the intent of the reform to completely merge these functions into a hybrid structure however it is important to note, there will be no recognition of a demarcation issue between an administration focused worker and stores based worker.