

Good evening Vicki,

The PSA sought feedback from members via a PSA Brief and that feedback is outlined below. The PSA also note that some feedback has been cc'd to the PSA and therefore won't reiterate that here. Other feedback may have also been sent to you by employees as well as to the PSA so there may be some repetition of that here.

1. Members describe current workload issues, and it is noted that no workload assessment was provided to the PSA or employees for consultation.

Clause 15.2 of the *South Australian Modern Public Sector Enterprise Agreement: Salaried 2017* ('Agreement') states that "Any proposed review or proposed workplace change must include as part of consultation, an assessment of the potential impact on workloads for individual employees or a work group in a workplace and measures proposed to manage such impacts. The intent of managing impacts must be to minimise the risk of unreasonable workloads." The PSA request your confirmation that this has been undertaken and seek evidence of this workplace assessment outlining the matters discussed in Clause 15.2.

Concerns around workload impacts include:

- PSA members describe that with every new CEO/Chief Financial Officer (CFO) that is appointed, the expectations of the Business Consultants (BCs) is continuously increasing as is the day to day workload. Whilst BCs continue to take additional work there does not appear to be a review of practices or cease doing other tasks.
- A lot of the workload issues relate to lower level transactional duties which are time consuming. These duties were historically performed by the Assistant BCs, but these positions were centralised to improve efficiencies for NALHN and renamed Business Support Officers (BSOs), with the amount of assistance provided to BCs diminished significantly. In addition the full FTE for these positions and the professional development officer for NALHN have never been fully filled.
- The BC is a stand-alone position that has no ability to delegate work and reports to a number of directors. With some BCs having multiple reports, the workload generated by having so many day to day reporting lines is not manageable. In addition, 0.2 FTE was built into a new service for additional BC time but has never been filled. It is common for BCs to have further areas/Divisions added to their portfolio with no assessment of workloads or consultation undertaken.
- The PSA understand that previously, another senior role was also abolished. It is also noted by members that the previous incumbent was offered a TVSP without consideration for the impact this would have on BC's day to day management and the coordination of their role and function.

2. Relating to workloads but also in relation to other matters, it is not clear how the proposals will assist with the need to improve BC line management in relation to succession planning, leave management, backfill and additional resources to support the current workload and future activities expected from BCs.

Leave coverage is a concern to members. They note that the proposed Finance Divisional Manager (FDM) role is proposed to provide "BC backfill on occasion" and members wonder how will this be addressed given the BC is pivotal to the functioning of the business' operations and require backfill on

all leave, not just "on occasion". However if the FDM was to cover all leave (which the PSA understand would be approx. 28 weeks in total), they would not be able to undertake their own work as well as the critical work of the BCs. This must be resolved, as members report that issues around succession planning and backfill arrangements for BCs have been raised on a number of occasions, with BCs having to source their own backfill and cover for their critical functions.

3. In terms of the Organisational Charts, the PSA and members note that there are no classifications included, nor other roles such as BSO despite being proposed to report to the FDM as per that role's proposed Job and Person Specification (J&PS). The PSA are aware of other inconsistencies also being reported around some titles etc.

In addition, the PSA understands from members that this will be a reporting line change for the BSOs and seek confirmation that they have been therefore included in this consultation process.

4. The PSA had queried whether whether there would be proposals forwarded regarding the wider finance review, as feedback to this proposal may then be out of context. Your response was that there was nothing currently, but this may change in the future. Members are concerned regarding this, given that little to no input was sought into the proposed structure / models after being told a review was in progress and then being apparently on hold for a number of months. Members feel that this proposal appears to have "come from nowhere" and been written in a rush as evidenced by the conflicting details between the J&PS' and the discussion paper, as discussed above. The BCs are very cognisant of the issues with their roles, the current structure and what the Network / Divisions need to run their business, but they advise that no-one has sought input into this proposal. In addition, members state that there does not appear to be any input from the Divisional Directors who are responsible for their Division's operational performance and achieving outcomes with the support of the BCs.

5. It is also noted that although not explicitly stated in the papers, it appears that another very senior, experienced and valuable position within NALHN – the Principal Project Officer's role - is being abolished. This is a concern to members as they have experienced the loss of a significant amount of corporate knowledge from NALHN in recent years, and this role is highly regarded by the BCs. Members believe that this role is being abolished presumably to create a manager for a team of ASO6's and just to provide leadership and "backfill on occasion" (noting the role is a combination of existing managers positions who will remain under the new structure.) It is unclear as to how this position will improve leadership to the BCs, other than reducing the number of direct line reports from the CFO from 12 to 4 staff.

Members don't believe that they need a 1 FTE manager given they have worked for over twelve months without one, and given the current reporting lines through to the Clinical Divisions and linkages with FBAS in regards to reporting and budgeting practices. They do believe however that they need someone who is accessible and understands, and is empathetic to, the BCs issues / needs. The proposal appears to focus on the needs of the CFO rather than that of the Divisions & Business Consultants. There is no discussion as to whether consideration for the current role, function and expectation placed on BCs will change to reflect the new focus of the FDM. In addition there is no mention of the role partnering with clinicians or having a patient focus.

4. The PSA is aware that some members have submitted alternative proposals. The PSA seek that all feedback, including those proposals, are considered and response provided to employees and the PSA. It is also suggested that any alternatives are released to the PSA and all staff, including those with connection such as BSOs and Divisional Directors, for consultation, also taking into account the feedback received.

The PSA will await NALHN's consideration of, and response to, the above feedback.

Regards, Rosie.