Estate Management review - NSWTG response to PSA feedback and questions

NSWTG response to member feedback submitted by PSA

PSA question/ member feedback	NSWTG response
Consolidation of member feedback in relation to role descriptions	*Feedback from Christine Edmondson to Nalini Sharma – significant changes to RD's, Inconsistencies in RDs* The feedback provided by Christine Edmondson on behalf of PSA members was very valuable and highlighted some issues that we addressed. A meeting was held with Christine Edmondson, PSA delegate, Nalini Sharma, Senior Manager, People & Performance and Lianne Carter, Manager, Talent & Learning to go through the feedback provided in further detail and to seek clarity on certain matters. The draft role descriptions provided for consultation were designed to reflect the new functional streams (e.g. Foundation, independence, private management, proactive and CSC) and therefore are slightly more specific than the current generic versions in terms of describing mostly key accountabilities. We have been very upfront in highlighting that these role descriptions were draft, and we were willing to receive constructive feedback that we could take on board. In saying this, from the feedback provided about role descriptions, these are some of the key changes we have adopted: • Updated focus and complementary capabilities and levels. For example, we have increased the finance capability level for the Managers (grade 9/10), and reduced act with integrity and finance capabilities for the PCSO (grade 7/8) across foundation, independence and proactive streams. • Reviewed and updated all essential requirements to ensure consistency in relation to reference to qualifications and experience requirements from grade 5/6 roles and above.

	• Generally reviewed and updated majority of role descriptions to ensure consistency in language against the following areas where relevant: primary purpose, key accountabilities, key relationships, decision making and essential requirements. • Added a key accountability to the PSCO CSC to supervising financial transactions of the CSC team • Added a key challenge highlighting working with customers of a high risk profile to the CSC role descriptions grades 3/4 to 9/10
1	*How many people will be impacted by the talent pools and can this information be made available to the PSA to consider impacts upon the members?* We have not done an assessment of people impacted by the decision not to activate talent pools. There can be a range of reasons that talent pools are activated or not; for example, some talent pools may be relatively out of date and don't necessarily reflect current capability needs. Talent pools are not automatically activated once there is a vacancy. This in line with the Government Sector Employment (Rules) 2014, Section 19(2) which states "A talent pool may be used for recruitment to ongoing employment or for temporary or term employment." This means there is no mandatory requirement for an agency or department to activate a talent pool. As talent pools exist now for up to 18 months, under s 19(4) of the Government Sector Employment (Rules) 2014, this also means that some talent pools can be quite old. We have made the decision to not activate talent pools on this basis and also to ensure that our approach is an equitable for everyone. The talent pools that currently exist are also based on current role descriptions, not the new and updated ones being used for the operating model.
2(i)	*It would appear that it is the 7/8s and Senior Managers with the most changes – the Managers roles have actually been downgraded because the capabilities in their current RD are more than prescribed by the Public Service Commission.*

	As part of the review, all current role descriptions in Estate Management have been updated to reflect revised focus of the roles in the new operating model and structure. Using this approach ensures the role descriptions accurately reflect the skills and capabilities a role requires. The extent of changes varied across role descriptions depending on how much update was required to the current role description to better reflect the work that people are already doing, such as adding a technology focus capability, changes to key accountabilities, challenges, relationships, essential criteria and/or focus capabilities. Additional changes may have been made to meet the Public Service Commission guidelines for the number of focus capabilities and levels for each grade. If and where a current role description met the above operational and compliance requirements, it may not have needed significant updates resulting in minimal changes. Copies of all current and proposed role descriptions has been provided to the PSA and members. Staff have submitted feedback on proposed role descriptions, and this will be taken into consideration as part of reviewing all feedback received. Based on the feedback provided we have revised the Principal Client Service Officer (PCSO) foundation, independence, proactive and CSC grade 7/8 role descriptions. There are now seven focus capabilities in total, the level of act with integrity and finance capabilities have been reduced to intermediate, and plan and prioritise is now a complementary capability. We have increased people management capabilities from the intermediate to adept level, given the organisation's greater focus on leading and managing people effectively. This level would be more in line with what PCSOs are currently doing. The Manager roles were not downgraded, the number of focus capabilities increased, and some levels changed to ensure compliance with the NSW Public Sector Capability Framework. There were two additional changes made resulting from staff feedback to the Manager foundation, independence, proactive and CSC grade 9/10 role descriptions. The finance and inspire direction and purpose focus capabilities levels were increased to adept.
2(ii)	*Why have the current RDs been removed by the Executive and can they be restored to Sharepoint?'* Some of the role descriptions that were published on the old SharePoint were out of date, inconsistent, and incorrect. Hence, as part of data cleansing for the IT transition project in September 2021, the old Role Descriptions did not transfer to the new SharePoint.

	All current role descriptions were made available to staff and PSA on 6 October 2021.
3	**Grade 3/4 roles** – *‘The early recruitment of three ‘establishment’ grade 3/4 roles (will become Foundation in the new structure), and using this recruitment as a talent pool really is quite problematic for NSWTG for the following reasons:* *(i) Recruiting against a current role description should mean, according to the FAQs, that any talent pool created will not be used. Using the changes as a reason to assess the entire workforce becomes redundant if you follow the reasoning of this recruitment* *(ii) If the role description changes prior to the selection process then surely this brings into question the validity of the applications – if current 3/4s need to be assessed and placed due to the changes then how would this work for people in the middle of recruitment?* *(iii) As the resulting staff have been recruited against an old role description, if they are employed prior to the new structure commencing, they will also have to be placed with all other permanent employees as per the CMP.* *(iv) NSWTG is actually recruiting for roles that will likely no longer exist by the time the recruitment process is finished – is this lawful?* (v) *As each new 3/4 role description is different and not the generic 3/4 being advertised, so in reality NSWTG wants to apply the GSEs allowance for assessment of capacity at grade across different role descriptions with similar functions and capabilities for the 3/4 talent pool staff…but not for current staff or those on current talent pools’.* This issue was clarified at a meeting with the PSA Industrial Officer and delegate on 28 October 2021. Recruitment for the grade 3/4 talent pool, although advertised on the old role description has been put on hold until new role descriptions have been finalised as part of the new operating model and structure. Assessments will now commence on the new role descriptions for specific areas, such as Foundation or

	Proactive. The recruitment will not be adversely impacted by this process, as the role descriptions both current and proposed are similar. Resuming this recruitment process will assist to fill Client Service Officer roles in the new structure quickly.
4	**Change Management Plan** – The reference to '*redundancies where there may be an 'excess of staff' – doesn't this contradict the advice that there are only additional roles and therefore why would there be excess staff – it is not referring to people who cannot meet the performance criteria under their role? …how many temporary positions there are and how long the employee has been in a temp position – in PG some temp positions have been held for several years and surely that must be given weight in stage 1 recruitment – allowing for someone in a temp role less than 12 months possibly?*' Where roles have substantially changed, existing ongoing employees will be invited to submit an Expression of Interest (EOI) at step 2 of the placement process and will be required to participate in a suitability assessment as per section 8.3 of the Change Management Plan. We cannot predetermine the outcome of whether employees will be successful in securing a role at this stage. There may be excess staff declared if existing ongoing employees are unable to secure role by step 3 of the placement process. NSWTG would manage this in accordance with the NSW Government Managing Excess Employee Policy (Memorandum 2011-11). This is standard practice under the NSW Agency Change Management Guidelines. The roles in the new operating model and structure are ongoing. We have not yet confirmed how many temporary staff will be eligible to apply at step 2 and this will be done once the Placement Process begins. Existing temporary employees who meet the eligibility criteria in section 8.2 of the Change Management Plan will be invited to submit an EOI at step 2 of the placement process for available roles at grade and undergo a suitability assessment as per section 8.3 of the Change Management Plan.
5	**Client Specialist Centre (CSC)**

	• *'The RD's have been generalised to remove reference to the specialised nature of the roles and job capabilities increased - despite no changes to staff tasks/ functions being communicated in proposed operating model or in consultation sessions.* • *Staff have been refused undertakings for direct placement against positions* • *The manager's workload has been doubled - a second team of 7.5 staff has been added but no information has been provided as to the rationale for the doubling of workload or the function or operation of the new team* The Director, Estate Management, Director, Strategy, People and Governance and representatives from People & Culture teams and the CSC met on 26 October 2021 to discuss several concerns. Feedback from the CSC was adopted and role descriptions have been revised to include references in relation to cash handling and specialised clientele. **Role Descriptions** At the meeting mentioned above, it was discussed that certain elements were omitted from the draft Role Descriptions. We have now included the supervision of financial transactions for the PCSO and inserted a key challenge across the grades to acknowledge the CSC's specific customer base in the final Role Descriptions. Some of the feedback received in relation to the Principal Client Service Officer (PCSO) role descriptions has also been taken on board including reducing the number of focus capabilities (removed plan and prioritise) and capability levels (reduced act with integrity and finance). Focus capabilities across role descriptions were reviewed and changed, some increased and others decreased, some were added to reflect the organisation's greater focus on managing staff, working collaboratively, commit to customer service and integrity and were more reflective of what staff currently do. As the management capability of roles across grades 9/10 and 11/12 was increased, this had a flow on effect in some areas to the PCSO role. Based on feedback some of the proposed increased focus capabilities for the PCSO role description have reverted to the focus capabilities level in the existing role description. In relation to comments about the PCSO number of direct reports, the current PCSO (CSC) has nine direct reports which was outdated/inaccurate in the current role description, the revised role description has

	addressed this. The number of direct reports that PSCO's across the streams range from 4-11. In general, most existing PCSO's have either maintained their current number of direct reports or have less direct reports. Some of the newer functional teams such as foundation and independence are smaller in nature, hence the lower number of direct reports. **Direct assignment** The Change Management Guidelines we follow requires us to use a placement process, which means we need to follow the stepped process outlined in the Change Management Plan. The majority of staff will be matched to a role in the first phase, direct assignment to role without needing to undertake an assessment. **Manager CSC** In finalising the model and structure, we have adopted feedback and the proposed proactive team has been moved from the CSC to the Practice & Strategy team, with the Principal Client Service Officer now reporting to the Manager, Practice & Strategy instead of the Manager, CSC. The proactive team that was initially proposed to be combined with the CSC, will still support current CSC customers that don't attend the centre, as well as other customers across Proactive Customer Management. The team will be an early adopter of revised processes for the management of customers, based on the data collected and analysed for the allocation framework and work closely with staff from Practice & Strategy. The total number of roles within the CSC has remained the same, it is simply the number of direct vs indirect reports that have changed, and therefore the number of direct reports in the final Role Description will be different to the existing.
6	*'The implementation plan has caused distress and confusion at a difficult time for staff, is not consistent with the undertakings given to staff and does not represent the feedback provided to the Executive regarding (1) the need for less direct responsibility for managers; (2) lower caseloads for CSOs and (3) the provision of technical training staff from induction and ongoing.* *Given that, consideration should be given to:*

	(i) That the 'fill and spill' restructure plan is unnecessary to achieve the addition of the new positions and be abandoned. We have always been upfront with staff that things need to change as part of this review. Following negative media attention that identified issues that needed to be addressed, the former CEO committed to the Attorney General, that a review would be undertaken of Financial Management services (as it was called then). There have also been a number of own motion inquiries from the NSW Ombudsman that have identified a range of areas to focus improvements on. In addition, the organisation has moved to considering more customer focused outcomes, rather than activity based outputs. An example of this is developing and implementing the Customer Excellence Principles. Moving to a model such as the one proposed, will provide: • greater support to staff through key targeted roles on policy, practice, project and workforce coordination and the management of customer assets. • improved role clarity by moving from a generic role description, which doesn't currently capture what most staff do, to role descriptions that specifically highlight the roles, responsibilities and focus capabilities needed for each role in different streams of foundation, proactive, independence and support for customers under direct financial management. • reduced caseloads by adding the currently proposed 52.5 additional roles, including administrative support to teams, so that staff can provide greater support to customers • The Workforce Support Team will provide significant support to Managers and PCSOs. • spans of supervision, for the most part, are reduced • The technical support will continue with a change in role title. A review or organisational change management can encompass a range of matters. We are required to follow the *NSW Agency Change Management Guidelines* and relevant Government Sector Employment Rules and consult on a Change Management Plan and proposed structure. Consultation commenced on 27 September 2021 with two information sessions held on that day and 29 September 2021. The consultation period was due to close on 12 October and was extended to15 October 2021.

	The *NSW Agency Change Management Guidelines* require us to consult on a Change Management Plan, proposed structure and workplace impacts among other things. The guidelines also require us to provide information on the process adopted to validate new positions and this has been done. To develop the EM model, a functional job analysis was undertaken to develop specific roles and role descriptions. Role evaluations have also been undertaken. Extensive detail of the evidence used to develop the model was also provided in the Frequently Asked Questions. The placement process contained in the Change Management Plan is not a 'spill and fill' approach. In a 'spill and fill' approach everyone has to apply for a role in the new structure. This won't be the case as we are trying to place as many people in roles as possible. NSWTG has worked through feedback received on the proposed operating model, proposed structure and draft role descriptions. Where practical we have adopted feedback proposed and if we are unable to adopt feedback we have advised why. This is the consultation with staff required as part of the *NSW Agency Change Management Guidelines*. The length of the consultation timeframe is linked to the requirement to adopt the new operating model, and bring new staff onboard within the milestones, attached to Treasury's conditions as part of the provision of additional budget enhancement funding. As we undertake the next steps to transition to the new model, further information will be provided on team allocation and changes to work. The Project team will continue to focus on the next steps. The Project Team will, shortly, be in touch with staff to engage them in focus and working groups and other ways, to progress planning for developing processes to: • ensure engagement happens in a way that meets customer needs • allocate customers based on complexity • identify customers to move from foundation teams to proactive management • allocate customers in proactive teams and CSOs based on complexity • identify customers to move to independence Progression of elements of the transition to the revised operating model, and draft structure will occur over a period of time:

	• Now until the end of December 2021
	  ○ Engagement re the next steps above
	  ○ Steps 1-3 to fill positions (Refer Pp28-31 '*EMR Final Draft Slide Deck'* - this means we will have existing roles filled and be in recruitment for additional roles.
	  ○ Establish trials of some of the ideas such as developing an Allocation Framework based upon the complexity of the needs of our customers. This will occur in the current Client Establishment team
	  ○ A Transition Plan will be developed
	• Jan 2022 – March 2022
	  ○ Work on the next steps will continue towards, evaluation, review, and implementation
	  ○ We will welcome our new staff to Estate Management
	  ○ New staff will be onboarded and provided with 2 weeks induction, followed by a structured ongoing induction program
	  ○ The configuration of teams will be determined, and transition plan established
	• Apr – Jun 2022
	  ○ Full implementation will occur where we will transition from implementation to business as usual
	
	Both the Estate Management review and Public Guardian Ways of Working have been included in the Organisation's assurance/audit strategic plan for 2021/22. Implementation of both operating models will be independently reviewed prior to implementation to provide assurance. This will be a multiple stage assurance review and the scope will include reviewing:
	• Checkpoint review of proposed transition
	• Identification of key risks and issues with implementation and providing recommendations
	• Risk identification and management strategies to ensure sustainability
	• The operation of the PG Ways of Working and Financial Management review.
	
	(ii) That staff be provided with the usual opportunity to be directly appointed to their substantive positions in existing teams and/or to nominate for existing positions in a first round. There is no reason to suggest that experience will not be spread over the structure given the number of existing staff and number of new starters.

	The Change Management Guidelines we follow requires us to use a placement process, which means we need to follow the stepped process outlined in the Change Management Plan. It is envisaged, the majority of staff will be matched to a role in the first phase, direct assignment to role without needing to undertake an assessment. We have adopted feedback so that existing staff can provide preferences for roles in Foundation, Proactive and Private Management team. New roles in the Independence and Support area will be advertised. The direct assignment at step 1 of the placement process will provide job security by advising eligible staff that they have been matched to an ongoing role in the new structure and the grade. The letter will not include the stream allocation of the role, e.g. Foundation or Proactive. Expressions of interest will be called for at a later date so staff can provide their input on preferred roles before being placed in a stream. Noting that sometimes staff may be assigned to a role based on organisational need. *(iii) That accurate precise information be provided explaining the **changes** to the position descriptions -and why they have been made; and that the function and location of the positions in the proposed plan be identified so that staff are aware of the actual detail of the operating model and of the positions available.* Based on change management principles, the role descriptions have been developed to reflect revised or new roles in the proposed operating model and proposed structure. Using this approach to revising existing role descriptions is standard practice in organisational change management and ensures the role descriptions we use accurately reflect the skills and capabilities a role requires. This practice also ensures staff have role descriptions that accurately reflect the work they do and we can clearly communicate the skills and capabilities we are looking for when attracting and hiring new staff. We have moved away from generic role descriptions that don't accurately describe what staff do. *Our strategy 2019-2025* also includes an initiative to review staff role descriptions over time when appropriate to ensure they accurately reflect people's roles and responsibilities. This is being done on a needs basis and the Estate Management review provides a good opportunity to ensure role descriptions are current and less generic, which is feedback we have taken on board from staff. As an agency we have a continuous improvement approach and regularly reviewing role descriptions forms part of this approach.

	Once the placement process commences, staff will be advised whether they have been directly assigned in step 1 or are invited to apply for an Expression of Interest at step 2 of the placement process. This is standard practice across the public sector in organisational changes such as this. The full set of current and proposed role descriptions were provided to staff and PSA during the consultation phase. *(iv) That information be provided as to the number of matters allocated to each position or shared positions. This is a crucial issue for staff and the subject of considerable negotiation in the past. It is not acceptable to deny staff access to these calculations which should have been central to implementation planning.* At this stage the number of customer files for each role is yet to be determined. The Estate Management Review project team will continue to collect relevant data to make an informed decision, based on the draft complexity model. *(v) That an explanation be provided as to why no positions have been designated for a technical training unit when it was identified as a crucial resource for managers and staff.* The Manager, Technical Development role remains but has been retitled to Manager, Knowledge Support. The Practice Team will play a significant role in building capability of staff. Estate Management will work with Strategy, People & Governance to establish a structured induction and ongoing professional development plan that supports the ongoing learning and professional development of staff. *(vi) Why the long term team ('Low contact team') model has been abandoned when it has proven indispensable to provision of basic services and advocacy to very vulnerable clients, for over 30 years of*

	the organisation's operation, and when 95% of the staff who provided feedback supported the specialist team approach'. All Estate Management customers will be allocated according to the required level of experience and knowledge of staff, such as; an experienced CSO can be allocated customers that require an assessed amount of effort to meet either Low, Medium or High complexity needs. The Low Contact team is currently within the same reporting line as the Private Management function. The current model is not reflective of the manner in which we should be responding to our customer needs. There are matters where customers have not been actively supported for lengthy periods of time, hence, there is not currently a proactive approach to customer, and stakeholder, engagement to ensure the ongoing financial security of those customers. There have been two Own Motion Complaints from the NSW Ombudsman's Office for customers being managed by the Low Contact function. Substantial work has been undertaken to address concerns raised, however we need to adopt a better way to support our staff to provide improved customer service. The allocation of customer matters, in the Proactive Customer Management function, based upon the assessment of the complexity of customer need will facilitate a more proactive approach to customer management and address emerging issues. Stakeholder engagement is a principal element of the revised operating model. The type of accommodation and service provider will also inform allocation in the new model. Data analysis to identify e.g. which are the main Aged Care Providers where our customers reside, will occur to inform the allocation of customers and who will manage the relationship. So, in essence, the function of the current Low Contact team will remain, but it will be managed across the Proactive Customer Management stream.
7	Request '*to ensure that as part of the Estate Management Review:* *(i) That a 'fill and spill' at any grade is rejected.*

	Refer to response Q6(i) *(ii) That as is reasonable and usual process, that any person in an ongoing position be placed at grade in their current posts wherever possible, and if this is their preference, notwithstanding their desire to seek promotional opportunity if available.* Refer to response Q6(ii) *(iii) No position descriptions be changed until there is an opportunity to evaluate the impact of new positions and that they are appropriately consulted* Refer to response Q6(iii) *There will be more jobs than people in the proposed new structure. Yet, the organisation has indicated that 'impacted' staff would need to compete for their jobs. We have not been told who impacted staff are at this stage nor their basis for making them impacted staff. The only information available to us at this stage is what would appear to be irregular, unexplained changes to role descriptions and capabilities.* In relation to automatic re-appointment of staff to their roles, under the *NSW Agency Change Management Guidelines* we are required to develop and follow a placement process. Whilst it is envisaged the majority of ongoing staff in Estate Management will be matched to a role in step 1 of the placement process, the placement process does not allow for automatic assignment to a substantive role. As per standard practice under the NSW Agency Change Management Guidelines, staff will be advised as soon as the placement process starts whether they are eligible for direct assignment because the Role Description has changed slightly or if they must apply for Expression of Interest as the role and Role Description has changed substantially. The updates to role descriptions have not been irregular or unexplained. Generally the updates that have been made are to shift the roles descriptions from being too generalised to reflecting the work and skills

	required to deliver estate management services. There has been a focus on customer service and outcomes in place of task-based outcomes.
8	***'Concerns with Proposed Operating Model and Proposed Changes to Job Descriptions*** ***Proposed Operating Model*** *The proposed Operating Model and the functions it proposes for the 'Onboarding', 'Proactive, 'Finalisation' and 'Client Specialist' Teams' (CSC) are the functions we currently undertake. These teams have merely been re-named and reshuffled to either make them larger or smaller. Staff in the current 'Low Contact Team' also perform the same duties as those indicated in the proposed main teams. There has been no communicated change to the role or function of the Customer Specialist Centre, either in size or function, as per the proposed new Operating Model.* *The proposed Operating Model suggests the only roles with new functions being introduced are located in the Practice & Strategy Team (13 roles), Workforce Support Team (4 roles), Customer Independence Team (2 roles) and about 11.5 additional ½ grade administrative support roles.* A total of 52.5 new roles are being added to the new Estate Management structure. While some of the new roles are in the Practice & Strategy team, additional roles have been added across the structure. A summary of proposed change in number of roles per grade was included in the change management plan and final number of new roles is included below. Noting the difference between the proposed and final operating model is that we adopted feedback to change the NCAT Liaison Officer from a grade 5/6 role to a grade 7/8 role.

Grade	Current structure	New structure	Net impact
11/12	2	3	+ 1
9/10	6	10	+ 4
7/8	17	27	+ 10

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>5/6</td><td>48</td><td>62</td><td>+ 14</td></tr>
<tr><td>3/4</td><td>78</td><td>90</td><td>+ 12</td></tr>
<tr><td>1/2</td><td>2</td><td>13.5</td><td>+ 11.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL FTE</td><td>153</td><td>205.5</td><td>52.5</td></tr>
</table>
Information about potential caseload numbers in the proposed new structure has not been made available to staff yet.
Refer to response Q6(iv)
Current position descriptions for roles have not been made available to staff as part of the consultation process for comparative purposes. Locating these documents on the organisational SharePoint site is difficult.
Refer to response Q2(ii)
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>
Proposed Role Descriptions
There has been no explanation, consultation nor communication to staff (including in consultation documents – Proposed Operating Model Report dated 27 September 2021) about any significant changes to staff's duties, functions or responsibilities to warrant any significant changes to their job descriptions or capabilities required for the job.
We have not been informed about what workload or other analysis has taken place in determining the revised role descriptions.
No explanation has been given about whether the proposed changes are fair or reasonable and whether they correspond with industry standard or inter organisational capabilities or requirements such as those of the Public Guardian's, which are also currently under review and not accessible to Estate Management staff.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

	We have not been informed about which specific additional duties/responsibilities correspond with proposed upgrades to the capabilities. For instance, proposed changes to grade 7/8 roles would see an upgrade in capabilities as follows: - Act with Integrity from Intermediate to Adept - Work Collaboratively from Intermediate to Adept - Finance from Intermediate to Adept - Manage and Develop People from Intermediate to Adept - Inspire Direction and Purpose from Foundational to Intermediate *- Optimise Business Outcomes from Foundational to Intermediate* - Manage Reform and Change from Foundational to Intermediate *Inexplicably, the Manager's capabilities in the proposed role description changes have seen a decrease in their capabilities, in 6 instances, with the Finance Capability being reduced to a lower capability than their direct reports (7/8).* *No explanation has been given for instances where workload has been significantly increased.* *No explanation has been given for the omission of key accountabilities where responsibility remains delegated to that role in organisational policy.* Some of the feedback received in relation to the Principal Client Service Officer (PCSO) role descriptions has also been taken on board. Focus capabilities in role descriptions were changed, some increased and other decreased, some were added to reflect the organisation's greater focus on managing staff, working collaboratively, commit to customer service and integrity. As the management capability of higher roles, grade 9/10 and grade 11/12 was increased, this had a flow on effect to the PCSO role. Based on feedback some of the proposed increased focus capabilities for the PCSO role description have reverted to the focus capabilities level in the existing role description. The *NSW Agency Change Management Guidelines* require us to provide information on the process adopted to validate new positions and this has been done. To develop the EM model, a functional job analysis was undertaken to develop specific roles and role descriptions. Role evaluations have also been

	undertaken. Extensive detail of the evidence used to develop the model was also provided in the Frequently Asked Questions. The Talent & Learning team has ensured all final role descriptions comply with Public Service Commission requirements. The team has also considered the level of focus capabilities for both draft and final role descriptions compared with others in the organisation, particularly with Public Guardian Role Descriptions. However, a direct comparison is not practical because the operating models and the services provided across Estate Management and Public Guardian are very different.
10	***Change Management Plan: Are there any other avenues of appeal that should be noted here?*** *The only avenue for appeal for disgruntled staff members is through Senior Executive on process grounds only. What other options do staff have?'* NSWTG is following the change management guidelines and general standards from other Change Management Plans in NSW Government to manage the EM review process. If an employee is aggrieved with the outcome of the assessment process, they may request an internal review. The review is strictly limited to a process review only, not a merit review of the decision in-line with GSE legislation. As per current practice, nothing precludes someone aggrieved by a decision made by a Director, to escalate their concerns with the Chief Executive Officer or to use standard industrial processes.
11	**Client Specialist Centre (CSC)** ***'Removal of Specialist Function from Proposed Job Descriptions*** *CSC's responsibilities are reflected in the role descriptions which were reviewed recently in January 2021 for 1/2, 3/4 and 5/6 and in June 2021 for 7/8.*

	The CSC team has existed within the organisation, as a cash dispensing facility by its various names, for over 20 years, servicing our most vulnerable customers. *While there have been no communicated or consulted changes to the CSC Team, including its name, staffing, its role and function in the proposed operating model and at consultation sessions, the proposed RDs for this team have changed, removing the specialist nature of the roles. On what basis?* *Key accountabilities and functions, which currently exist have also been removed from the proposed RDs, while there has been an increase and upgrade in others, without explanation or consultation about which proposed new duties or responsibilities correspond or warrant these changes.* *In addition to the removal of the Specialist features of the CSC in the proposed role descriptions, no explanation has been given for the following:* ***Removal of the supervisory function of the cash handling operation from the CSC PCSO role****: this function has been removed from the proposed role description, despite this function continuing to exist and despite policy delegating this role to undertake this function. This function corresponds with the existing "Finance' Capability of the role description and its removal denies the current role holder of this expertise/skill.* ***An increase and/or upgrade in 7 of the Job Capabilities for the PSCO's role****: there has been a significant increase in the Job Capabilities for the PSCO role descriptions, without there being an explanation of which new duties or responsibilities warrant or correspond with these changes.* ***It is understood that the current RD capabilities at this grade comply with GSE Act requirements and the proposed capabilities are inexplicably at the extreme end of the scale.*** *We have not been given an explanation for these changes - why they are warranted or how they correspond with proposed new duties or responsibilities.* *We have not been advised what comparative analysis has been undertaken in proposing these changes and to ensure the proposed capabilities are warranted and fair, particularly at an inter-organisational level– including proposed job capability criteria for our counter-part substitute decision makers at the Public Guardian's Office?* ***An increase in direct reports for the PSCO (Client Specialist Centre) from 6 to 9,*** *whereas in other teams, direct reports are proposed to range between 4 to 6 (Customer Independence & Proactive/Foundation, respectively).*

	Given that there has been no communicated change to the role or functions of the CSC Team, can you please advise why ongoing staff within this team cannot be directly appointed to their current roles? Refer to response to Q5
Other Comments	***Low Impact Team*** *There has been considerable staff discomfort with the disbanding of the Low Impact Team, for which its retention as a specialist team was overwhelmingly supported by staff in the recent engagement sessions. For staff, the concern is that the disbanding of this specialist team will result in unmanageable workloads (an additional 2500 approx. customers) spread across the proposed 'proactive teams', without any meaningful analysis of the impact having been communicated to us.* Refer to response to Q6(vi)
	Case Load Numbers *There is considerable concern that the proposed Operating Model will result in increased caseload numbers for staff, despite the intention being for smaller teams and smaller caseloads. Given that caseload information has not been made available to staff as part of this process, it is difficult for staff to provide meaningful feedback on the proposed Operating Model and how it impacts on them.* *Additionally, we have not been informed of the details of the proposed duties and responsibilities of the proposed new role descriptions and what workload assessments have been carried out to ensure they are manageable.* Refer to response to Q6(vi)
	Request to retain people in current roles they are undertaking where there has been no significant change to their duties: - *Provides as little disruption to customers and business processes*

	Ensures that specialist knowledge is not displaced *Limits the requirement for re training and upskilling of staff at a time of significant organisational change* *Reflects the organisation's commitment to staff in their Our People strategies'.* Refer to response to Q6(ii) In addition the EM Review Team will consider how we can provide the best service and as much stability for staff and customers as possible during the transition.
12	The FAQ document: *(i) ' … mixed messages and inconsistent advice. How can you apply against the current role description and then work under the new one?'.* Refer to response to Q3 (ii) Do you have a list of the changes made to the role descriptions? – No … proposed roles … are considered new – More information was provided as requested by the PSA and delegates, however information on complex processes is provided in certain context. This means that if taken out of context the information can become more complex. The line referred to above was in the context of the process of how role descriptions are developed and evaluated, and did not refer to whether a role description was actually new or not. We understand that these matters can be complex and therefore provided many opportunities to meet and discuss these issues and answer questions, as well as clarify understanding. As mentioned previously, a high-level comparative list of the existing role descriptions compared with the revised role descriptions, as well as listing the new role descriptions, was provided to PSA and staff to assist members to compare role descriptions. A more detailed comparative list of changes made to the 48 role descriptions had not been developed at that time and therefore could not be provided.

	(iii) **The role descriptions are different for every role within the new structure (replacing the generic ones) will I need to apply for each position ie customer foundation, proactive etc** - *'This is problematic for the matching process – can staff nominate a role of preference like the PG restructure?'* *(iv)* **Will talent pools be used? - No – as the roles are now different - Except the early recruitment of grade 3/4 CSOs – this will be considered in the recruitment process** – *'this talent pool will be activated to fill roles in the new structure, because the recruitment is to a talent pool and will be based on the new role description") This is not true. The current recruitment is being done against the current role description. How could they recruit against a new role description as the recruitment finishes on 10.10.21 but consultation finishes on 15.10.21 and then there is the consideration timeframe - I take real exception to this. If a current role description is being used to fill a talent pool for one grade that will be activated for employment in the new structure then all the current talent pools should be opened. You cant have it both ways'.* Refer to response to Q3 *(v)* **Redundancy – majority of staff will be placed –** *'why not all?'* In relation to automatic re-appointment of staff to their roles, under the *NSW Agency Change Management Guidelines* we are required to develop and follow a placement process. Whilst it is envisaged the majority of ongoing staff in Estate Management will be matched to a role in step 1 of the placement process, the placement process does not allow for automatic assignment to a substantive role. NSWTG may need to manage excess employees in accordance with the *NSW Government Managing Excess Employee Policy (Memorandum 2011-11).* This is not the preferred option and we will consider other roles people can be assigned to initially. In the event that an employee is declared excess, they are given the option to accept an offer of voluntary redundancy or pursue redeployment. There is no upfront formal voluntary redundancy program associated with this organisational change and redundancies would only be considered as a last resort. Further detail is outlined in the Change Management Plan.

	(vi) **Is this a spill and fill - difference between a spill and fill approach and this process is that in a spill and fill everyone has to apply for a role in the new structure. This won't be the case as we are trying to place as many people in roles as possible** – *'I don't understand why you could not place everyone when there are 52.5 new roles?'* Refer to response 12(v)
13	*'How will I be placed in a role and who is making that decision? What say do I have and how can I appeal the decision if I do not agree with it?'* Refer to response to Q10 in relation to appeals During the consultation period the PSA and staff were provided with information about the matching process in step 1 & step 2 of the placement process. This included the following information: Once feedback has been considered and taken on board, where possible, a final operating model and structure will be released. People & Culture, which includes the Talent & Learning team and People & Performance team will commence what is known as 'matching', as per the Change Management Plan, in consultation with the Director, Estate Management. Matched staff at step 1 will receive a letter confirming they have been matched to a role; however, the date of implementation and team assignment is subject to the operating model being finalised and commencing. In the meantime you will continue to do the work you currently do until we transition to the new operating model. Roles that have substantially changed, for example, capabilities and/or key accountabilities have changed significantly, roles that are new, and/or where there are more employees than available roles, these roles will be open for recruitment to Estate Management employees only at their current grade, this is step 2. Staff identified at step 2 will be invited to submit an internal Expression of Interest (EOI) for available roles at grade before external recruitment will commence (known as step 3).

	The first part of the placement process is to determine how much a new role description has changed in comparison to the current version of a similar role in the proposed model i.e. whether the role is substantially the same/comparable or substantially changed. Where there has been a minor change to the role description, including focus capabilities in particular, People & Culture will then do a desk top assessment based on the current and revised role descriptions, as well as considering what staff currently do. In making the decision, People & Culture and managers would be satisfied that the employee has demonstrated the focus capabilities of the role at the required level. We would consider current responsibilities that show how the capabilities are already being met. For example, if a client service officer were to have commit to customer service as a focus capability, we would assess whether a staff member is already displaying this capability as part of their current role. If they are already demonstrating this requirement and show they meet the focus capability, we would not need to assess this any further and they would be matched to a role.