

**The following represents the Public Service Association of NSW's submission on the "Draft Restructure Management Plan – Corporate Affairs."**

1. It is difficult to give informed feedback on the roles that have been changed in the proposed structure. The main reason for this is ER has not provided these materials. It is disappointing that the PSA was not furnished with copies of the current and proposed Roles Descriptions for consultation. It is requested that Employee Relations commit to furnishing the PSA with full copies of RDs at time of the release of the restructure plan. In the two-week time period given for consultation from the PSA's perspective our energies need to be on understanding the proposed structural changes and how this will affect our members, as well as obtaining member opinion and feedback, rather than chasing up RDs from the business.
2. It is disappointing that Management has not consulted with the union prior to its decision to effectively delete a large number of permanent roles within the unit.

The only justification given by the Department for its restructure plan – which aims to cut seven substantive Grade 9/10 and 7/8 roles – is to “meet the needs of a changing organisation” and “to respond to a changing communication landscape, to reduce costs and rebalance some aspects of the Corporate Affairs model”. The PSA has concerns that the proposed model that the business is relying on does not properly take into account the impacts that the loss of specialist roles (such as Grade 7/8 multicultural specialist) will have upon the delivery of services to the public.

**Qu.** How does the business intend to address the foreseeable impact from the deletion of this (and other specialist roles), especially when it comes to the delivery of public services? What operational assessment has been undertaken to determine the impact on public services by the loss of these roles?

3. The business needs to commit to directly appointing Grade 5/6s in the new structure. Existing employees at this grade have already been through the relevant assessment requirements for this role at grade, and therefore should not be required to undergo a further suitability assessment for these roles. If there are indeed some changes to the RDs and the business deems there is a change to the role, then the business must consider appropriate training for a period of up to six months to enable affected Grade 5/6 employees to become equipped with whatever new duties or skills are needed for them to perform in the role capably.

It is requested that the business confirms direct appointment for each grade 5/6 – and training where required.

4. Within BRD Fair Trading the PSA has concerns with and objects to the loss of the in-house designer. From an operational point of view, the loss of an in-house designer does not make sense nor is cost-effective. It is apparently being outsourced.

At a recent DFSI JCC Secretary Hoffman expressed his willingness to use public servants for public service roles. It is expected the Department is compliant with the Public Service Commission's guidelines around the issue, and the Audit Offices recommendations – particularly that contingent labour is used only once all other methods of recruitment have been explored. The FT in-house designer needs to be considered to be kept in-house, in line with the Audit Office recommendations. This is essentially a public service role that should not be outsourced. Will the business consider it remaining in-house?

5. We know that the NSW Government with its release of its Aboriginal Employment Strategy it indicated that it is committed to developing and achieving high levels of Indigenous employment across the Public Sector. The Strategy indicated a target of 1.8% by 2021.

The PSA is in agreement with the Strategy and wants this strategy to be employed by agencies so that attracting Indigenous employment is actively pursued. To what extent has the business considered the NSW Aboriginal Employment Strategy in its restructure plan?

6. Members are concerned that the specialising of roles within the BRD structure to streams (campaigns, partners and channels) will effectively narrow the regular employment of their diverse skills, leaving them less competitive in seeking future work roles and limiting development opportunities.

There is also concern that the specialising of duties will lead to fatigue and boredom (for example: large campaigns are extremely intensive. While people may relish the challenge and rewards of a large campaign, they look forward to employing other skills and tasks at the campaign's end - not jumping into another.

It is asked whether these role descriptions comply with the Public Service Commission's policy on role descriptions which I believe is intended to make role descriptions broad so as to allow easier transferability at grade across the sector?

We seek a comprehensive understanding of the basis for the narrowing of the skills sets – whether they comply with the PSC's policy on RDs

Also, does the business acknowledge that this effective narrowing of diverse skills will bring about perverse WHS consequences? How does it intend to address this in a future structure for concerned employees?