

TASMANIAN STATE SERVICE
EVALUATION REPORT 2008



**AGENCY WORKPLACE
DIVERSITY PROGRAMS**



CONDUCTED BY:
THE STATE SERVICE COMMISSIONER



TASMANIA

Published December 2008

Copyright – Office of the State Service Commissioner

Print: ISSN 1834-3023

Permission to copy is granted provided the source is acknowledged.

Contact: Office of the State Service Commissioner

Level 2/144 Macquarie Street

GPO Box 621, Hobart, 7001

Tasmania, Australia

Telephone: 03 6233 3637

Email: ossc@dpac.tas.gov.au

Facsimile: 03 6233 2693

CONTENTS

Commissioner’s Foreword	2
Acknowledgements	3
1. Executive Summary	3
2. Evaluation Background	10
2.1 Evaluation Objectives	11
2.2 Evaluation Methodology	11
2.3 Evaluation Outputs	12
2.4 Other Related Data	12
3. Workplace Diversity Programs - System Overview	14
3.1 Legislative Requirements	14
4. Workplace Diversity Measures	15
4.1 Elimination of Discrimination, Bullying and Harassment	15
4.2 Compliance with Anti-discrimination Legislation	17
4.3 Promotion of Equity in the Workplace	19
4.4 Reflecting the Diversity of the Community	20
4.5 Recognising and Utilising the Diversity of the Workforce	21
4.6 Equal Access to Recruitment and Development Opportunities	22
4.7 Balancing Work and Other Responsibilities	25
5. Evaluation and Assessment of the Workplace Diversity Program	26
5.1 Performance Indicators	26
5.2 Evaluating the Workplace Diversity Program	27
5.3 Reporting	28
5.4 Compliance with the Commissioner’s Requirements	29
6. Workplace Diversity Program Review	30
6.1 Review of the Program	30
6.2 Success in Achieving Outcomes	31
7. Additional Criteria	32
7.1 Stakeholder Consultation	32
7.2 Format of the Workplace Diversity Program	33
7.3 Development of an Action Plan	33
7.4 Allocation of Responsibility for the Workplace Diversity Program	34
7.5 Allocation of Resources for the Workplace Diversity Program	34
7.6 Collection and Review of Statistical Data	35
7.7 Cross Referencing with Other Agency Procedures and Processes	36
7.8 Communication of the Workplace Diversity Program	37
7.9 Use of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees	38
7.10 Ongoing Evaluation of the Workplace Diversity Program	39
7.11 Use of Performance Indicators Drawn from the Commissioner’s Guidelines	40
7.12 Capture and Use of Statistical Data	42
7.13 Benchmarking	43
7.14 Workforce Planning	44
8. Learnings in Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program	45
9. Individual Agency Evaluation Summaries – Agencies with a Workplace Diversity Program	46
10. Individual Agency Evaluation Summaries - Agencies without an endorsed Workplace Diversity Program	47
Appendix 1 - CD and CD Contents	48

COMMISSIONER'S FOREWORD

The biennial *Tasmanian State Service Employee Survey* revealed that there are some differences in the way that workplace diversity is viewed by employees. While most employees believed in the respectful treatment of others in the workplace, fewer believed that their organisation was committed to creating a diverse workforce and only half reported that their workplace was free of bullying and/or harassment. Given the importance of workplace diversity to the State Service and the existence of legislative requirements governing workplace diversity measures within Agencies, I decided to evaluate and report on the progress of implementing workplace diversity programs within State Service Agencies.

Section 34(1)(h) of the *State Service Act 2000* (the Act) requires Heads of Agency to develop and implement a Workplace Diversity Program to assist in giving effect to the State Service Principles. In addition to this section 18(h) of the Act requires the State Service Commissioner to “develop principles and standards to assist Heads of Agency in evaluating the performance of employees and provide assistance to Heads of Agency in the application of those principles and standards”. To this effect, Commissioner’s Direction No. 3, Workplace Diversity (CD No. 3) was issued, setting out the minimum principles, standards and requirements for Heads of Agency in developing and implementing a Workplace Diversity Program. CD No. 3 is supported by Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program which were issued in 2002. Whilst these Guidelines do not form part of the CD, they provide assistance to Agencies by outlining the key elements of Workplace Diversity Programs and offering suggestions about how to establish and implement an effective program.

This evaluation provides an overview of the Workplace Diversity Programs that Agencies have implemented and a breakdown of the measures and features which are in place under that banner. I believe that this report will be a useful tool for Agencies in evaluating their own practices and processes in light of what is in operation elsewhere in the State Service. It also provided an opportunity to recognise the efforts and achievements of Agencies in relation to workplace diversity.



Robert J. Watling
STATE SERVICE COMMISSIONER

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank and acknowledge the efforts and assistance of State Service Agencies in the collection and review of data for this evaluation.

In particular, I would like to acknowledge the work of the members of the Project Steering Committee, who reviewed the methodology for the project, and the Contact Officers from each Agency, who were instrumental in assisting the Office of the State Service Commissioner (OSSC) Evaluation Project Team.

Finally, I would like to thank Clio Simmons and Ian Wilcox from my office for their efforts in managing this evaluation.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Based on information gathered through my State Service Agency and Employee Surveys, and the analysis of matters brought before me as State Service Commissioner, and consistent with my statutory functions, I decided to undertake an evaluation of workplace diversity programs operating in Agencies as a major project under my 2008 Evaluation Program.

The primary objective of this evaluation was to assess the extent to which Agency workplace diversity programs comply with the *State Service Act 2000* (the Act) and, in particular, with the minimum standards of Commissioner's Direction No. 3, Workplace Diversity (CD No. 3). A secondary objective was to review the range of workplace diversity measures in place in order to highlight any innovative strategies or activities and support the review of CD No. 3. It should be noted that an assessment of the effectiveness of these programs was not part of this evaluation.

Section 34(1)(h) of the Act requires Heads of Agency to develop and implement a Workplace Diversity Program (WDP) to assist in giving effect to the State Service Principles and CD No. 3 sets out the minimum principles, standards and requirements for Heads of Agency in this area. This Commissioner's Direction is supported by Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program which do not form part of the CD. Nevertheless, they provide assistance to Agencies by outlining the key elements of workplace diversity programs and offering suggestions about how to establish and implement an effective program.

Agencies were advised during March 2008 of the evaluation process and provided with background material. During May and June of 2008, Agencies were provided with a project briefing and a questionnaire to assist with information gathering. Agencies with a WDP in place completed the data worksheet and presented appropriate documentary evidence. Where an Agency did not have a current WDP in place as at 30 June 2008, they were requested to provide background information, an outline of their current situation, and their plans regarding the development of an Agency workplace diversity program.

Following is a chart presenting the Overall Summary of Outcomes for the evaluation. This is followed by a written summary of the Key Positive Findings, Key Opportunities for Improvement and comments related to Additional Workplace Diversity Criteria, as drawn from the Workplace Diversity Program Guidelines accompanying CD No. 3.

Agency names have been abbreviated throughout this report as follows:

DEDT	Department of Economic Development and Tourism
DOE	Department of Education
DEPHA	Department of Environment, Parks, Heritage and the Arts
DHHS	Department of Health and Human Services
DIER	Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources
DOJ	Department of Justice
DPEM	Department of Police and Emergency Management
DPAC	Department of Premier and Cabinet
DPIW	Department of Primary Industries and Water
DOTAF	Department of Treasury and Finance
PAHSMA	Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority
TAFE	TAFE Tasmania
TAO	Tasmanian Audit Office
TPT	The Public Trustee

STATE SERVICE AGENCY WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAMS

Overall Summary of Outcomes – Compliance Criteria

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place
- NA Not Assessable

System Overview	DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
A Workplace Diversity Program has been fully developed, and either fully or partly implemented, as at 30 June 2008	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Workplace Diversity Measures														
The Head of Agency has put in place measures to help provide a workplace free from all forms of discrimination, bullying and harassment	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Head of Agency has put in place measures to ensure that all Tasmanian and Commonwealth anti-discrimination laws are complied with in the Agency’s activities	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Head of Agency has put in place measures to promote equity in the workplace	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Head of Agency has put in place measures to ensure that employment decisions within the Agency take into account the diversity of the community, while allowing for the Agency’s skill requirements and organisational and business goals	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Agency’s Workplace Diversity Program recognises and utilises the diverse backgrounds of employees in the workforce	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Head of Agency has put in place measures to ensure that people from diverse groups have access to recruitment, promotion, career development and mobility opportunities	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Agency has supported employees and officers in achieving a balance between their work, family and other caring responsibilities	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Evaluation and Assessment of the WDP														
The Agency’s Workplace Diversity Program includes a set of performance indicators	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Head of Agency has put in place measures to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the Workplace Diversity Program	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Agency reports on employment policies, practices and statistics concerning the Workplace Diversity Program	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The latest version of the Workplace Diversity Program has been lodged with the Commissioner	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Head of Agency has provided the Commissioner with the required information to evaluate the Workplace Diversity Program	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The Head of Agency has provided the Commissioner with the required Workplace Diversity Program information for the Commissioner’s Annual Report	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Review of the Workplace Diversity Program														
The Head of Agency has reviewed the Workplace Diversity Program in the past 4 years	NA	●	NA	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA	●	●	●	●
The Workplace Diversity Program is achieving the outcomes determined by the Agency	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Note: Agencies were assessed as ‘NA’ (Not Assessable) in cases where their endorsed Workplace Diversity Programs had been implemented for less than 4 years (the maximum timeframe for formal program review, as required by CD No. 3).

1.3 KEY POSITIVE FINDINGS

Most State Service Agencies have workplace diversity programs in place that meet the minimum requirements of the Act and CD No. 3. In summary:

Workplace Diversity Program Overview

- Twelve of the fourteen State Service Agencies had an endorsed WDP in place as at 30 June 2008.
- The remaining two Agencies, DOE and DPAC, reported that, as of the same date, they were in the final stages of consultation and development, prior to formal endorsement of the WDP. This was expected to be completed by the time of publication of this report.
- Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place are at different stages of the implementation lifecycle. Six Agencies had recently completed a review of their existing WDP and are now in the process of implementing a revised WDP and 3 were currently undertaking a formal program review. The remaining 3 Agencies were, respectively, continuing to implement the program within the prescribed operational timeframes, commencing implementation of a brand new WDP, or fully implemented and due for review.

A full explanation of each Agency's progress is contained in sections 9 and 10 of this report.

Workplace Diversity Measures

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirements to implement measures addressing the elimination of workplace discrimination, bullying and harassment, compliance with Tasmanian and Commonwealth anti-discrimination laws, promotion of equity, accounting for the diversity of the community, recognising and utilising the diversity of existing employees, ensuring equal access to employment opportunities and balancing work, family and other caring responsibilities.
- Training proved to be the key measure used by all Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place, followed by the implementation of formal Agency processes and procedures in this area, and the development of support materials such as guidelines and information resources on the Agency intranet.

A full explanation of the workplace diversity measures implemented by Agencies is contained in section 4 of this report.

Evaluation and Assessment of Agency Workplace Diversity Programs

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirements to report on employment policies, practices and statistics concerning the WDP.
- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place also met the requirement to provide information to the State Service Commissioner in relation to both the annual Agency survey and this evaluation of Workplace Diversity Programs.
- Eleven of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirement to implement measures to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of their program. The same Agencies met the requirement to include a set of performance indicators as one of these measures.

A full explanation of the measures in place to evaluate and assess Agency WDPs is contained in section 5 of this report.

Review of the Workplace Diversity Program

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place reported that their Program is achieving the outcomes determined by the Agency.
- There was less compliance, however, with the requirement to review the WDP after four years of operation. Seven of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met this criterion, with a further three Agencies not being assessed, due to the immaturity of their WDP.

A full explanation of Agency review processes is contained in section 6 of this report.

1.4 KEY OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

The evaluation identified that the key area for improvement was to ensure that those State Service Agencies without a workplace diversity program in place take action to meet the legislative requirement, by completing, endorsing and implementing their programs. The evaluation also identified a number of areas which Agencies could address, either because they did not meet the requirements of CD No. 3 or because there are areas where potential improvements may be made.

The following compliance issues were identified as part of this evaluation:

Endorsement of the Workplace Diversity Program

- DOE and DPAC did not meet the requirement to have developed and implemented a WDP, as they did not have an endorsed WDP at 30 June 2008, the cut-off date for this evaluation.

Ongoing Evaluation and Monitoring

- Only one Agency (DHHS) did not meet the requirement to implement measures to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the WDP.
- The same Agency did not meet the requirement to include a set of performance indicators in the WDP, although it is noted that the Agency has developed performance indicators in the past which are not being used in conjunction with the current WDP.
- Many of the performance indicators being used by other Agencies are principally qualitative in nature and may prove difficult to use as the basis for meaningful evaluation. Inclusion of specific targets and timeframes tied to individual measures would address this.
- Similarly, where measures are to be implemented on an ongoing basis, it would be useful to include timeframes for review of each measure.

Reporting Processes

- While all Agencies meet the requirement to report on employment policies, practices and statistics concerning the WDP, the range of reporting mechanisms varies between Agencies. Five of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place do not report on the progress of the Program in the Agency's annual report. Such reporting may provide a means to raise awareness of the Agency's WDP and to recognise the success of individual activities and measures in place.

- Many Agencies do not have a system of regular progress reporting in relation to the WDP as a whole – rather they mainly report on individual workplace diversity activities, or individual statistical indicators.
- Ten of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place indicated that the human resources system is able to collect and/or provide data across the majority of statistical areas listed in this evaluation. If this information is currently being captured, Agencies should give consideration to including this additional information, where appropriate, in general reports being run from the system for monitoring purposes, as part of their Agency's reporting processes.

Review of the Workplace Diversity Program

- CD No. 3 requires that Agency WDPs are reviewed at least once every four years. It also requires that the formal review of the WDP ensures that the program assists in giving effect to the State Service Principles and achieves the outcomes set down in the CD (and used as the basis for this evaluation).
- It is suggested that the terms of reference for any formal review of the WDP include the relevant sections of the Principles, as well as the requirements set down in CD No. 3. This can easily be incorporated into the review process alongside more quantitative analysis based on performance indicators.
- Two of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place did not meet the requirement to have reviewed the WDP in the past four years. A further three Agencies did not receive an assessment against this criterion, as their WDP had been implemented less than 4 years ago. However, given that it has been a requirement for Agencies to have developed and implemented a WDP since the introduction of the Act in May 2001, these Agencies have been previously non-compliant with this and other WDP-related criteria.

1.5 ADDITIONAL WORKPLACE DIVERSITY CRITERIA

The evaluation also examined a number of other features of workplace diversity programs which are not mandatory, but were included in the Commissioner's Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program. This section of the evaluation aimed to uncover further information on how workplace diversity programs have been developed, communicated and actioned within Agencies.

Section 7 of this report provides a full breakdown of each of these additional workplace diversity criteria.

Stakeholder Consultation

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place indicated that they had undertaken some form of consultation with employees, usually via working groups or human resource project employees.

Format of the Workplace Diversity Program

- Agency WDPs vary in their organisation and level of documentation. For eight of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place, the WDP consists of a stand-alone document, often supported by a number of other guidelines and support materials. For the remaining four Agencies, the WDP consists of a series of documents which are brought together under the one program banner.

Development of an Action Plan

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have developed an action plan to implement the program. At a minimum, these outline the desired outcomes, strategies to achieve them and performance indicators to measure progress.

Allocation of Responsibility for the Workplace Diversity Program

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have allocated responsibility for the WDP. In some Agencies, designated personnel have been appointed as Workplace Diversity Coordinators, however in most Agencies this function is assumed by the Human Resources Manager or a Human Resources employee.

Allocation and Resources for the Workplace Diversity Program

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have allocated resources in the form of financial support and/or employment of Agency staff to implement the program.

Collection and Review of Statistical Data

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place indicated that they collect and review statistical data in relation to the WDP. Agencies reported that they collect and review statistical data in relation to: staff accessing training and development programs; staff attendance at diversity information sessions and other activities; numbers of reported grievances and their means of resolution; staff members accessing flexible working arrangements; employee recruitment and resignation rates; numbers of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees and their range of activities; the number of work placements/employment program participants; information to support the budget estimates process; the results of the biennial OSSC Employee Survey; and general demographics of the Agency.

Cross Referencing with other Agency Processes and Procedures

- Ten of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place made reference in their formal WDP document to workplace diversity related Agency processes and procedures.

Communication of the Workplace Diversity Program

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place indicated that they have communicated the WDP to employees. This has been achieved via: correspondence from the Head of Agency to employees; provision of diversity awareness training and information sessions; public endorsement in the Agency's newsletters; inclusion of promotional materials in employee payslips; distribution of posters and brochures; use of Human Resource Consultants; use of the Diversity Contact Employee network; use of steering committees/working groups; use of staff and management meetings (and following reports); promotion via the Agency's induction program; references in other Agency systems such as performance management; inclusion of the WDP in the employee handbook; use of the Agency intranet; and easy access to a copy of the WDP document and supporting materials on the Agency's computer system.

Use of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees

- Nine of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have appointed Workplace Diversity Contact Employees as part of their WDP. The remaining Agency with a WDP, DEPHA, reports that this role has been filled in the past and that the Agency intends to re-institute the Workplace Diversity Contact Employee network as a strategy under the new WDP.

Ongoing Evaluation of the Workplace Diversity Program

- All fourteen Agencies keep a watching brief on progress of workplace diversity activities, however some address this in a more organised way. Ten of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place indicated that the Program has been evaluated between the required 4 yearly program review. The same number of Agencies reported that they measure changes to the employment profile of the Agency.

Use of Performance Indicators Drawn from the Commissioner's Guidelines

- The Commissioner's Guidelines on Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program include a number of performance indicators as an aid for Agencies in the development of their WDP. While this list was not designed to be exhaustive and/or mandatory upon Agencies, it provides a framework to review the types of indicators Agencies are using to monitor and evaluate the WDP.
- The following performance indicators were the most commonly used by Agencies: number of grievances and incidents of workplace harassment and their resolution (10 Agencies); degree of change in the Agency's employee profile (9 Agencies); demographic composition - retention and separation rates (9 Agencies); demographic composition - returns from maternity leave (9 Agencies); demographic composition - training patterns (9 Agencies); level of satisfaction with the selection process (8 Agencies); degree of satisfaction of employees in balancing their work and personal lifestyle responsibilities; through feedback received via performance management (8 Agencies); feedback on the results of specific initiatives (8 Agencies); availability of relevant documentation to deal with incidents of workplace harassment and feedback from employees on the adequacy of the documentation (8 Agencies); demographic composition - numbers of employees in designated groups and patterns of participation, including at senior levels (8 Agencies); demographic composition - distribution of designated groups across occupation and classification/salary levels (8 Agencies); demographic composition - recruitment and promotion numbers (8 Agencies); and turnover and absenteeism statistics (8 Agencies).

Capture and Use of Statistical Data

- This evaluation sought to establish the statistical areas Agencies are currently analysing and using and/or whether Agency human resource information systems currently capture this information and therefore have the capability of producing reports if required.
- The following statistical indicators were most commonly being captured and/or analysed by Agencies: participation rates for State Service Accumulated Leave Scheme (SSALS) by male and female (12 Agencies); participation rates for SSALS over A&C level 10 or equivalent by male and female (12 Agencies); employees moving from full-time (F/T) to part-time (P/T) employment by male and female (12 Agencies); employees returning from maternity leave to P/T or F/T employment (10 Agencies); employees returning from paternity leave to P/T or F/T employment (10 Agencies); and part-time employment for employees higher than A&C level 10 or equivalent by male and female (10 Agencies).

Benchmarking

- Nine of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP indicated that they have used some form of benchmarking in evaluating their program. This has usually involved some form of comparison between Agency activity and the activities of other State Service Agencies, like organisations interstate and other published related survey and benchmarking data.

Workforce Planning

- All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place reported that the Agency undertakes some form of workforce planning. Most Agencies do not use a formal model or framework for workforce planning, but undertake these processes on a needs basis, or to gain an understanding of the business' directions as part of annual business planning processes.

1.5 LEARNINGS FROM AGENCIES

As part of this evaluation, Agencies were also asked about the key learnings in implementing a Workplace Diversity Program. The following key themes emerged from this:

- The benefits of increasing awareness of workplace diversity;
- Incorporation of workplace diversity into everyday Agency activities;
- The effect of implementing workplace diversity measures on employees; and
- The difficulties in measuring and reporting on workplace diversity outcomes.

Section 8 of this report provides further detail on each of the issues raised.

2. EVALUATION BACKGROUND

From a legislative perspective, Section 34(1)(h) of the *State Service Act 2000* (the Act) requires Heads of Agency to develop and implement workplace diversity programs to assist in giving effect to the State Service Principles. State Service Commissioner's Direction No. 3 Workplace Diversity (CD No. 3), issued in May 2002, outlines the Head of Agency's legal obligations in relation to workplace diversity, as well as the measures and standards required in the development and implementation of workplace diversity programs within the State Service. Commissioner's Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program were issued alongside the Commissioner's Direction, designed to assist Heads of Agency to meet their statutory obligation to implement a Workplace Diversity Program (WDP).

From an evaluation perspective, the State Service Commissioner's statutory function includes a responsibility to evaluate the application within Agencies of the practices, procedures and standards in relation to the management of, and employment within, the State Service. As part of this function, my Office has undertaken a range of evaluation projects, falling into three different categories:

- *The State Service Agency Survey*
This annual survey is designed to ascertain what actions have been taken, and what practices, procedures and standards are in place to ensure compliance with the State Service Principles, Code of Conduct, Commissioner's Directions and Ministerial Directions. I report on the results of the State Service Agency Survey in my annual report.
- *The State Service Employee Survey*
This biennial survey is conducted to contextualise and complement the information obtained through the State Service Agency Survey by providing information about employee confidence in the application of the State Service Principles and Code of Conduct in their workplace. This survey has been undertaken twice to date, in 2005 and 2007, and I expect this pattern of surveying to continue.
- *Independent Evaluation Projects*
In addition to the Agency and Employee surveys, my Office has undertaken evaluations of specific employment-related areas within Agencies. This commenced in 2006 with my evaluation of Agency performance management systems, followed by a 2007 review of Agency internal grievance resolution systems. The evaluation of workplace diversity programs is the next in this series of evaluations, which are closely aligned with the requirements of Commissioner's Directions that have been issued.

The 2005 and 2007 State Service Employee Surveys revealed that there are some differences in the way that workplace diversity is viewed by employees. While the great majority of employees surveyed in 2005 and 2007 believed that people in their workplace were expected to treat other employees respectfully, a significantly smaller proportion believed that their organisation was committed to creating a diverse workforce and only half reported that their workplace was free of bullying and/or harassment. Based on information gathered through these surveys and the analysis of matters brought before me as State Service Commissioner, and consistent with my statutory functions, I decided to undertake an evaluation of Agency Workplace Diversity Programs (WDPs) as a major project under my 2008 evaluation program.

2.1 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the evaluation project were to:

- Assess the extent to which Agencies' WDPs comply with the Act, *State Service Regulations 2001*, and in particular, with the minimum requirements of CD No. 3;
- Examine the range of workplace diversity measures in place within Agencies, and highlight any particularly innovative strategies or activities;
- Assess each Agency's progress in fully implementing their WDP;
- Measure the extent to which Agencies evaluate and report on their WDP practices and procedures, and
- Obtain sufficient data and information to review CD No. 3 and the associated Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program.

2.2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation project was essentially built around a 'compliance audit' of the performance of State Service Agencies against CD No. 3. It had four major phases:

- Development of the project plan, evaluation methodology and survey tools, overseen by a Methodology Reference Group comprised of selected Agency representatives;
- Trialling and revision of the methodology through an Agency pilot;
- The conduct of individual Agency evaluations, and
- The analysis and reporting of individual Agency and whole-of-service outcomes.

All Agencies were advised during March 2008 of the evaluation process and provided with background material. This correspondence also sought the nomination of a Liaison Officer to facilitate data collection and requested a copy of the Agency's current WDP documentation.

The methodology for the evaluation was piloted in the Department of Justice during April and May 2008. Following this, during May 2008, Consultants from OSSC provided all other Agencies with a project briefing and questionnaire to assist with information gathering. Agencies with a WDP in place completed the data worksheet and presented appropriate documentary evidence through a process facilitated by OSSC Consultants. Where an Agency did not have a WDP in place, they were requested to provide background information, an outline of their current situation, and their plans regarding the development of a WDP for their Agency. In order to designate a cut-off date for the evaluation, OSSC determined that an Agency's WDP should have been developed and either fully or partly implemented as at 30 June 2008. This gave those Agencies which were undertaking a review of their WDP a period of three months to obtain formal endorsement of the new program prior to its inclusion in the evaluation project.

In addition to this information, Agencies were asked to respond to a number of questions examining a set of additional criteria, drawn from the Commissioner's Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program. This data was primarily collected with a view to contextualising the Agency's WDP and to assist the process of reviewing CD No. 3 and the associated Guidelines.

Where there had been recent restructuring of Agencies, as in the case of the Department of Economic Development and Tourism and the Department of Environment, Parks, Heritage and the Arts, contacts were asked to make allowances for data to reflect the new Agencies.

2.3 EVALUATION OUTPUTS

Consolidated Agency data and evaluation findings for the State Service as a whole are presented in sections 3 to 7 of this report.

Data from each Agency was used to produce an individual Agency Assessment Sheet, comparing and assessing the information in the worksheet document, together with other information and explanations provided by the respective Agency, against the minimum requirements of CD No. 3. The narrative components of these individual Agency assessments have been included on the CD appendix (Refer to section 9 of this report).

Where an Agency did not have a current WDP in place, a written explanation was requested regarding the background, current arrangements and progress towards the development of a program. These individual Agency summaries have also been included in the CD Appendix (Refer to section 10 of this report).

2.4 OTHER RELATED DATA

This section reviews the range of data on Agency WDP that has been collected by OSSC as part of its evaluation program. The OSSC Agency and Employee surveys provide a 'snapshot' of workplace diversity as it has been promoted and supported within Agencies, and as it is viewed by State Service employees.

The State Service Agency Survey

The annual OSSC Agency Survey includes questions relating to the activities being undertaken by Agencies in implementing their WDPs, as well as reporting on diversity statistics relating to the State Service population. The following overviews are principally based on data drawn from the 2007-08 Agency Survey.

The State Service employs a diverse range of employees, from a wide variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The State Service also aims to address diversity issues such as gender balance, the employment of youth, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

Gender balance

- There are significantly more females than males employed in the State Service. As at 30 June 2008, the workforce was 31% male (9,095 employees) and 69% female (19,865 employees).

Age distribution

- Comparison of age profiles for the past 3 years shows an ageing trend in the State Service workforce.

- As at 30 June 2008 the largest proportion of employees was aged between 45 and 54 years of age, and this is consistent with data from the previous three years.
- 21% of all employees were aged 55 years or over at 30 June 2008.

Employment of young people under 25 years of age

- As of 30 June 2008, 4.01% of all State Service employees were under 25 years of age. This percentage has continued to decline since June 2005, when 4.5% of all employees were aged under 25 years.
- For obvious reasons the majority of young people are employed in the larger Agencies, however there were also signs of increases in 2007-08 in youth recruitment figures in Agencies such as DPAC, DPIW, DEPHA, DOTAF, PAHMA and TAO.

Employment of people with a disability

- 7% of the State Service workforce identified as having a disability as part of the 2007 State Service Employee survey.

Employment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders

- As at 30 June 2008 there were 71 'Identified' and 14 'Tagged' positions across the State Service.
- Identified positions are those for which the Aboriginal community is the major client group; therefore Aboriginality is an essential requirement. An essential requirement for 'tagged positions' is an ability to communicate effectively and sensitively with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and a knowledge and understanding of contemporary Aboriginal culture and society. Aboriginality is therefore not an essential requirement for 'tagged positions'.

Delivery of workplace diversity training

- State Service Agencies deliver workplace diversity training in order to raise awareness of the principles and to address specific issues such as workplace bullying and harassment. The 2007-08 Agency survey provided an overview of the numbers of employees, managers and supervisors undertaking such training. It revealed that a total of 240 managers and supervisors attended workplace discrimination training and 236 workplace conflict training sessions within the reporting period. In addition to these figures, one Agency had 324 attendees to a combined workplace discrimination and workplace conflict course.
- Other training included managing workplace issues and behaviour, with 51 attending and 113 attending a general leadership development program.

- Anti-bullying and harassment training for managers/supervisors and employees continues to be a key area for training delivery in Agencies.
- Most agencies are making steady progress towards the training of managers/supervisors and Workplace Diversity Contact Employees, although progress towards training employees is much slower.
- Several Agencies undertook their first workplace diversity training sessions during 2007-08.

Flexible working arrangements

All State Service Agencies indicated that they have implemented some form of flexible working arrangement for employees to access. The 2008 Agency Survey revealed the following:

- A total of 1,457 part-time work opportunities were advertised in 2007-08 with the flexibility to be undertaken either in a full-time or part-time capacity. 602 of these were permanent vacancies and the remaining 855 were fixed-term vacancies;
- A total of 845 permanent employees and 234 fixed-term employees changed their employment arrangement from full-time to part-time during 2007-08;
- 104 employees in 2007-08 applied and were successful in their application for the State Service Accumulated Leave Scheme (SSALS)¹;
- 13 of the 14 Agencies reported that they allow their employees to work from home on occasion, with 7 of these Agencies having developed a working from home policy;
- 10 of the 14 Agencies allow all employees access to flexible working hours; and
- During 2007-08, 559 State Service employees accessed paid maternity leave, 7 accessed paid adoption leave and 269 accessed unpaid maternity or parental leave.

The State Service Employee Survey

The State Service Employee Survey covers workplace diversity as it relates to a number of areas, including equal employment opportunities, employment based on merit, equity in employment and recognition of workplace diversity and elimination of workplace discrimination, bullying and harassment. The 2005 and 2007 surveys revealed that there are some differences in the way that employees believe aspects of workplace diversity are managed in their workplace:

- A large majority of employees (88% of employees in 2007, 90% in 2005) believed that people in their workplace were expected to treat others respectfully. This number reduced when relating to managers and supervisors treating employees with dignity and respect (73% in 2005 and 2007).
- While 81% of employees believe that their workplace is free from sexual harassment (2005 and 2007), only 51% of employees (56% in 2005) believe that their workplace is free from bullying and harassment. In 2007 28% of all employees indicated that they had been bullied and/or harassed in their workplace over the previous 12 months (26% in 2005).
- The large majority of employees believe that application for employment in the State Service is open to all, with 85% of employees confident that most job vacancies are advertised publicly (2005 and 2007) and 75% believing that people outside the State Service have a reasonable opportunity to apply for vacancies in their area (73% in 2005). A smaller number of employees, though still the majority, believe that employment decisions are based on merit (54% of employees in 2005, 53% in 2007).
- Agencies' commitment to equity in employment was recognised by 70% of employees in 2007 (68% in 2005). Employees strongly agreed that cultural background, sexual orientation, gender and age were not barriers to success (82%, 81%, 80% and 77% in 2007 respectively). A slightly smaller majority of employees believed that family responsibilities and having a disability did not constitute barriers to success (72% and 64% respectively). These findings are consistent with the 2005 survey results.
- In the area of equity in employment the lowest scoring area of the OSSC Employee survey relates to accessing flexible working arrangements being a barrier to success. 61% of employees in 2007 and 60% of employees in 2005 indicated that working part-time or using other flexible work options is not a barrier to success in their workplace, including career progression.
- A similar proportion of employees (62% in 2007, 61% in 2005) believe that the State Service provides a flexible workplace for employees. 59% believe that the workplace culture encourages the achievement of a good work/life balance (57% in 2005), and 64% indicate that part-time work opportunities are available

Overall, 62% of State Service employees indicated in 2007 that they believe that their organisation is committed to creating a diverse workforce (65% in 2005).

¹ The SSALS scheme allows employees to in effect 'buy' extra leave over an agreed period of time by working their normal hours at a reduced rate. This allows employees to 'bank' or 'buy' extra days of leave, which are then taken at an agreed time.

3. WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAMS - SYSTEM OVERVIEW

This section provides an overview of the progress of Tasmanian State Service Agencies towards developing and implementing a Workplace Diversity Program (WDP), as required by the *State Service Act 2000* (the Act).

3.1 LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Section 34(1)(h) of the Act requires a Head of Agency to “develop and implement a workplace diversity program to assist in giving effect to the State Service Principles.”

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of the Act
- Does not comply with requirements of the Act
- Assessment Criteria met
- Assessment Criteria not met

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
3.1	A Workplace Diversity Program has been fully developed, and either fully or partly implemented, as at 30 June 2008	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
3.1.1	A Workplace Diversity Program has been fully developed and implemented	●			●		●				●		●		●
3.1.2	A Workplace Diversity Program has been fully developed and partly implemented			●		●		●		●		●		●	

Comments

Twelve of the fourteen Agencies comply with the legislative requirement to have a WDP in place that has been endorsed by the Head of Agency. Of these twelve Agencies, half indicated that their program has been fully developed and implemented, with the remaining half indicating that their program has been fully developed, but only partly implemented.

This evaluation found that even with this in mind, Agencies were at significantly different stages of the implementation lifecycle. As at 30 June 2008:

- DEPHA has only recently formally endorsed a WDP, following the need to revise the program in line with the change in composition of the Agency in early 2008;
- DIER, DPEM, DPIW, PAHSMA, TPT and TAFE have recently completed a review of their existing WDPs and are now in the process of implementing a revised WDP;
- DOJ, DEDT and DOTAF are currently undertaking a formal review of their WDPs;
- DHHS has a WDP in place that has been fully implemented and is now due for review; and
- TAO is continuing to implement workplace diversity activities under the current WDP.

Two Agencies, DOE and DPAC, did not comply with the legislative requirement, as they did not have an endorsed WDP in place by the cut-off date for this evaluation in June 2008. However, both Agencies have advised that substantial progress has been made towards the development and implementation of a WDP which will meet the legislative requirements of the Act and Commissioner’s Direction No. 3.

DOE has a draft WDP which has been distributed throughout the Agency for consultation. A proposal to senior management for approval and endorsement was expected by August 2008. It should be noted, however, that certain workplace diversity activities have been, and continue to be, in place in the Agency prior to the development of this program, and that a formal WDP has been in operation in the past.

DPAC advised in September 2008 that a proposal for endorsement of the Agency’s draft WDP by senior management would be submitted in the imminent future and that implementation would then commence. Like DOE, DPAC has a number of long-running workplace diversity processes and procedures that have been included in the draft WDP, with a number of the workplace diversity strategies already under way.

A full explanation of the progress of these Agencies towards implementing a WDP is contained in sections 9 and 10 of this report.

4. WORKPLACE DIVERSITY MEASURES

This section provides an overview of the measures that State Service Agencies have implemented under their Workplace Diversity Programs (WDP) to meet the requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3 (CD No. 3). The information has been organised according to the specific requirements of the CD.

4.1 ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION, BULLYING AND HARASSMENT

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place
- Assessment Criteria met
- Assessment Criteria not met
- NA Not Assessable

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
4.1	The Head of Agency has put in place measures to help provide a workplace free from all forms of discrimination, bullying and harassment (s 1(a)(i) CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
4.1.1	Processes and procedures have been put in place within the Agency to assist in providing a workplace free from discrimination, bullying and harassment	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
4.1.2	Employee and manager training have been provided on the issue of anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
4.1.3	The Head of Agency keeps a record of formal grievances relating to discrimination, bullying and harassment	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP met the requirement to implement measures aimed at providing a workplace free from all forms of discrimination, bullying and harassment. Training proved to be the key measure used by all Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place, followed by the implementation of formal Agency processes and procedures in this area, and the development of support materials such as guidelines and information resources on the Agency intranet.

Several Agencies have determined that anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment training is mandatory for all employees, underpinned by attendance targets. This has led to extremely high participation rates for some Agencies – as an example, DPEM has reported that 98% of employees have completed the Agency’s diversity awareness sessions. Other Agencies have made training in this area compulsory for employees at A&C level 10 and above.

All twelve Agencies keep records of formal grievances relating to discrimination, bullying and harassment.

The following provides an overview of the categories of training and other measures relating to anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment reported as part of this evaluation:

Employee and Manager/Supervisor Training

- Inclusion of anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment as topics in whole of Agency workplace diversity training programs and refresher courses.
- Inclusion of anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment as part of workplace diversity modules in Agency leadership training programs.
- Delivery of individual short courses focusing on the prevention of discrimination, bullying and harassment (e.g. STOP! Bullying and Harassment).
- Delivery of training which builds upon the core anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment training, such as training in workplace communication and conflict resolution, workplace values, the State Service Principles and Code of Conduct etc.
- Development of a pool of internal Diversity Awareness trainers.

Induction Programs and Exit Interviews

- Inclusion of anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment as topics in Agency induction (and re-induction) programs.
- Development of take-home materials such as brochures outlining Agency policies and procedures in this area, Agency values etc.
- Inclusion of anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment information in an employee information manual/kit.
- Inclusion of workplace diversity related questions in the Agency's exit interview process.

Processes and Procedures

- Development of Agency policies on anti-discrimination, bullying, harassment and victimisation, and other related areas e.g. email and internet usage policy, merit-based employment.
- Development of guidelines to support Managers in the application of Agency policies in this area.
- Availability of information relating to the Agency's internal grievance resolution system and related processes, such as dealing with Breaches of the Code of Conduct.

Agency Values

- Incorporation of the elimination of discrimination, bullying and harassment in Agency values and expected behaviours (e.g. Agency Values, Leadership Behaviours).
- Inclusion of workplace diversity goals relating to anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment in the Agency's Corporate or Strategic Plan.
- Role modelling by Heads of Agency, executive management, managers and supervisors to ensure a workplace culture is free from discrimination, bullying and harassment and promotes effective use of Agency policies in this area.

Workplace Diversity Contact Employees

- Availability of trained Workplace Diversity Contact Employees to act as a source of information and support for employees with issues relating to discrimination, bullying and harassment, and to promote an inclusive working environment among employees more widely.
- Availability of a confidential phone line to report incidents of discrimination, bullying or harassment, or other access and equity issues.
- Availability of the Agency's Employee Assistance Program as an alternative and/or complementary source of assistance to employees in this area.

Recruitment and Selection

- Inclusion in all Statements of Duty of an expectation of providing a workplace free from discrimination, bullying and harassment.
- Inclusion of a voluntary Employee Diversity Questionnaire with all applications on the Tasmanian Government jobs website, accompanied by questions about special needs in relation to the recruitment process.

Performance Management Systems

- Coverage of workplace discrimination, bullying and harassment issues in performance management discussions.
- Measurement of management commitment to the elimination of workplace discrimination, bullying and harassment as part of performance management systems.

Disability Action Plan

- Development of an Agency Disability Action Plan to prevent workplace discrimination on the basis of disability.

Support Materials

- Availability of information on discrimination, bullying and harassment on the Agency intranet.
- Inclusion of references and links to related Agency policies and procedures.
- Development of Fact Sheets on selected topics, including discrimination, bullying and harassment, and use of Agency Workplace Diversity Contact Employees etc.
- Distribution of Access and Equity newsletters to employees, or specific articles on discrimination, bullying and harassment in general Agency newsletters.
- Distribution of external materials such as the newsletter of the Anti-Discrimination Commission (ADC).
- Availability of promotional materials which encourage an inclusive work environment, including posters and brochures.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Regular review of information relating to discrimination, bullying and harassment in the workplace, including training attendance statistics, resolution of grievances, contact with Workplace Diversity Contact Employees.
- Survey of all employees in relation to workplace bullying, to support the implementation of an anti-bullying campaign.
- Inclusion of anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment questions in employee attitudinal surveys.

- Reporting of statistics relating to discrimination, bullying and harassment activities as part of broader workplace diversity reporting processes.

Some Agencies have adopted innovative approaches to the prevention of workplace discrimination, bullying and harassment. DOTAF is one Agency that has focused on incorporating workplace diversity values into the Agency’s own values and behaviours.

Embedding Workplace Diversity Values into Agency Culture

Since 2005 DOTAF has worked to implement a set of values and associated behaviours to provide the Agency with a common frame of reference. The Agency reported that the development and embedding of these values has had a very positive impact on a range of workplace behaviours. The values of integrity and respect, and the associated behaviours that DOTAF has developed to promote these behaviours, have lifted employee’s awareness in these areas in a demonstrable way.

DOTAF’s commitment to implementing a values-based culture has also had a significant positive effect on the way people behave and interact at work. The values implementation has been a bottom-up process, which has led to the generation of ideas and innovative solutions. The passion of the values team has been a key success factor in this, most notably the activities developed for celebrating good values behaviour (‘values stamps and postcards’) and the anniversary of the implementation of the values system (Values Week).

4.2 COMPLIANCE WITH ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Assessment Criteria met
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Assessment Criteria not met
- No endorsed WDP in place
- NA Not Assessable

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
4.2	The Head of Agency has put in place measures to ensure that all Tasmanian and Commonwealth anti-discrimination laws are complied with in the Agency’s activities (s 2(a) CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
4.2.1	The Workplace Diversity Program has references to appropriate Tasmanian and Commonwealth anti-discrimination legislation	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP met the requirement to implement measures ensuring that all Tasmanian and Commonwealth anti-discrimination laws are complied with in the Agency’s activities. For ten of the twelve Agencies, these measures included making a formal reference to appropriate Tasmanian and Commonwealth anti-discrimination legislation in WDP documentation.

However, it is recognised that formal reference to the legislation is only one of many possible means of ensuring compliance with relevant legislation. The following measures are also in place in a number of Agencies to address compliance:

- Delivery of workplace diversity training outlining the responsibilities of Agencies in this area;
- Inclusion of references to relevant legislation in training and induction program documentation and other documents relating to the WDP, such as the employee handbook and Agency intranet;
- Development of specific Agency processes and procedures to ensure that the Agency’s activities are compliant with anti-discrimination laws (anti-discrimination, bullying and harassment, work and family, breastfeeding guidelines, disability action plans, email and internet access and usage, grievance and disciplinary procedures etc);

- Quality assurance of Agency deliverables to ensure compliance with appropriate legislation (e.g. selection reports, general Agency processes and procedures);
- Referral of employees to relevant anti-discrimination legislation by Workplace Contact Diversity Contact Employees or Human Resources employees, where appropriate; and
- Request for all employees to sign an annual declaration that they will comply with the State Service Code of Conduct, and for employees with delegations to sign a compliance statement.

The range of legislation referred to in Agency WDP documentation includes:

- *State Service Act 2000* (Tas)
- *Anti-Discrimination Act 1998* (Tas)
- *State Service Regulations 2001* (Tas)
- *Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission Act 1986* (Cth)
- *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth)
- *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth)
- *Age Discrimination Act 1998* (Cth)
- *Disability Discrimination Act 1993* (Cth)
- *Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995* (Cth)
- *Workplace Health and Safety Regulations 1998* (Tas)
- *Relationships Act 2003* (Tas)
- *Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Act 1999* (Cth)
- *Police Service Act 2003* (Tas)

Other references included:

- Ministerial Directions
- Ministerial Determinations
- State Service Commissioner's Directions (CD No. 3, Workplace Diversity)

4.3 PROMOTION OF EQUITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
4.3	The Head of Agency has put in place measures to promote equity in the workplace (s 1(a)(iii) CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place comply with the requirement to implement measures promoting equity in the workplace. Equity is a key component of the workplace diversity principles underpinning each Agency WDP and, for many Agencies, is written into corporate values and behaviours. Given the broad goals of promoting equity, there is some overlap between those measures promoting equity and those designed to eliminate workplace discrimination, bullying and harassment.

The principal measures used to promote equity within Agencies include:

- Inclusion of workplace equity as a goal in Agency corporate/strategic/human resource plans;
- Inclusion of equity as a topic in workplace diversity and management training programs and induction sessions;
- Inclusion of reference to the Agency’s commitment to equity in employment in all Statements of Duty;
- Development and implementation of an Agency Disability Action Plan to support people with disability in the workplace;
- Promotion of the Disability Employment Register run through the Public Sector Management Office (PSMO);
- Development of strategies to address employment related disadvantage e.g. an Aboriginal Employment Strategy;
- Distribution of posters and brochures throughout the Agency promoting workplace equity, and information on the Agency intranet;
- Review of processes and procedures, and their support materials, to ensure that the principle of equity is upheld e.g. recruitment and selection processes, performance management systems;
- Promotion of initiatives such as Disability Day, Stress Day and NAIDOC (indigenous culture), to encourage employees to address unconscious biases and raise awareness of the diverse nature of the working population and the issues they face;
- Promotion of equity and understanding of other employees through social activities outside the usual working environment;
- Use of rewards schemes to recognise inclusive and values-based behaviour with prizes (e.g. ‘values stamps’ and ‘values postcards’, equity awards);
- Provision of assistance and advice to selection panels on upholding the principle of merit for individual selection processes;
- Promotion of the principle of equity in daily operations e.g. drawing of working hours or leave rosters in an equitable fashion; and
- Focus on equal opportunity through the promotion of Agency processes and procedures making this possible e.g. balancing family and work guidelines, provision of breastfeeding facilities, financial information and counselling, health and wellbeing promotion seminars, access to ESL courses, rehabilitation and workplace adjustment guidelines etc.

TAFE’s Equity Awards

TAFE runs annual Equity Awards as a means of recognising the efforts of employees in promoting diversity awareness and equity in the workplace. The Awards are designed to highlight the achievement of an individual employee or a group of employees. The Awards scheme receives a high degree of promotional support from the CEO and is highly accepted and valued among Agency employees.

4.4 REFLECTING THE DIVERSITY OF THE COMMUNITY

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
4.4	The Head of Agency has put in place measures to ensure that employment decisions within the Agency take into account the diversity of the community, while allowing for the Agency’s skill requirements and organisational and business goals (s2(b) CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirement to consider the diversity of the community in any employment decisions. CD No. 3 recognises, however, that there is a need for Agencies to balance this with consideration of organisational and business goals and the skill requirements for any job vacancy. This requirement must also coexist with the principle of merit-based selection which is enshrined in the Act.

The range of measures in place across Agencies aimed at addressing the diversity of the community in employment decisions includes:

- Inclusion in the WDP of a commitment to value diversity in the workplace and aim for a workforce that reflects and understands the Tasmanian community;
- Use of training courses available through the Tasmanian Training Consortium (TTC), particularly Working with Merit for Successful Selection,
- Focus on job design that emphasises only the essential requirements of the job and broader statements of duty to encourage greater diversity in applicants for job vacancies;
- Implementation of recruitment and selection processes and procedures, which outlines the principles and benefits of having a diverse workforce and selection based on merit;
- Development of recruitment and selection tools such as checklists, workbooks, template reports etc, which prompt issues for consideration and outline areas to avoid;
- Provision of support and advice to members of selection panels from human resources personnel;
- Provision of support and information to potential applicants from human resources staff;
- Use of the fixed-term employment register for recruitment of people with a disability;
- Development and implementation of a Disability Action Plan;
- Implementation of targeted employment programs, such as trainee and graduate programs, Aboriginal trainee/ employment programs, local community employment programs;
- Facilitation of fixed-term employment opportunities for retired employees, where appropriate;
- Use of the Agency newsletter to promote use of Agency employment programs (fixed-term register or trainee programs);
- Use of a diversity questionnaire alongside job vacancy applications; and
- Encouragement of diversity in selection panel membership, where appropriate.

Supporting the local community: PAHSMA

PAHSMA recognises the value of the local community, being the major employer within the locality and employing generations of families from the region. The Agency has therefore focused heavily on providing support to the community in terms of opportunities for employment and work experience in the State Service.

The Agency has implemented a number of local strategies to assist potential employees in applying for PAHSMA vacancies, as part of the merit selection process. These strategies include:

- Work experience programs from the local high school and VET training centre;
- Information provided to local students on the State Service selection process, training and assistance provided in completing job applications and mock interviews conducted;
- Local advertising strategies to ensure that information reaches the community;
- Promotion of a fixed-term employment register focused on the local community;
- Provision of one-on-one assistance to local people with writing job applications;
- Facilitation of flexible working arrangements for employees returning from sick leave or maternity leave; and, most notably
- Delivery of an Employment Skills Training Program in conjunction with the Drysdale Institute of TAFE, aimed at members of the local community who were seeking employment in the tourism/hospitality industry, but lacked skills, were unemployed or were re-entering the workforce. The program provides participants with accredited tourism and hospitality training, including certificates of competency. The program has a very high success rate: 100% (13) participants in 2007 were offered employment at PAHSMA or elsewhere at the conclusion of the training program.

4.5 RECOGNISING AND UTILISING THE DIVERSITY OF THE WORKFORCE

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
4.5	The Agency’s Workplace Diversity Program recognises and utilises the diverse backgrounds of employees in the workforce (s 2 (c) CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirement to recognise and utilise the diverse backgrounds of employees. This area can present some challenges given that disclosure by employees is not compulsory and can be an extremely sensitive matter. In addition to this, the diverse characteristics of employees may or may not relate to the duties they are carrying out and/or it may not be appropriate for the Agency to utilise them in any way. The benefits of using the extra skills of employees would need to be balanced with potential issues in relation to taking employees out of their direct line of work, and other practical human resources implications. As an example, a number of DHHS employees have language skills, however the Agency has a policy of using qualified interpreters where formal services are required.

Despite these challenges, State Service Agencies are recognising and utilising the diverse skills and backgrounds of employees in numerous ways:

- Promotion of the benefits of diversity through social and workplace activities;
- Raising awareness of customs, religions and other diversity characteristics through training and other activities such as a diversity quiz;
- Development and display of promotional materials raising awareness of workplace diversity e.g. posters, signs;
- Encouragement of employees to become involved in steering committees and working groups in their area of expertise;
- Wide consultation processes in relation to workplace programs, projects and activities, to ensure feedback is based on diversity of opinion and experience;
- Involvement of employees in projects which acknowledge and match their skills and expertise;
- Use of employees with an understanding of Aboriginal culture to provide information to others e.g. employees of Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania, Curator of Indigenous Cultures at the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery;
- Delivery of programs aimed at recognising the diversity of, and increasing understanding of, the needs of clients e.g. an Aboriginal Cultural Competence training program;
- Development of support resources such as a Tasmanian Multilingual Phrasebook, interpreter service, website for the legally blind etc;
- Access to training where required e.g. English courses for employees with non-English speaking backgrounds;
- Encouragement of recognition of people with a disability under each Agency's Disability Action Framework;
- Nomination of staff members as Multicultural Liaison Officers, Gay and Lesbian Officers and Disability Liaison Officers;
- Development of specific working groups to address issues associated with specific target groups e.g. TAFE's Aboriginal Education Team;
- Involvement in informal mentoring and/or the pilot mentoring program run through the Public Sector Management Office;
- Facilitation of flexible working arrangements and job/workplace adjustments to meet the needs of the individual employee;
- Ongoing employment of semi-retired employees to facilitate knowledge transfer and mentoring; and
- Seeking wherever possible to share knowledge and skills between Agency Divisions.

4.6 EQUAL ACCESS TO RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place
- Assessment Criteria met
- Assessment Criteria not met
- NA Not Assessable

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
4.6	The Head of Agency has put in place measures to ensure that people from diverse groups have access to recruitment, promotion, career development and mobility opportunities (s 2(d) CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
4.6.1	The Agency has an employment program(s) or work experience opportunities for specific target groups	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
4.6.2	The Agency offers a mentoring program for new and existing employees, including those from diverse backgrounds	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
4.6.3	The Agency has reviewed its recruitment, selection and professional development processes to identify potential barriers or gaps for employees from diverse backgrounds	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All twelve of the Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirement to implement measures ensuring that people from diverse groups have access to recruitment, promotion, career development and mobility opportunities. For all of these Agencies these measures included the development of employment programs or work experience opportunities for specific target groups, such as humanitarian entrants, youth, and Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. Eight agencies reported participation in the Humanitarian Work Placement Program run through Multicultural Tasmania. Almost all Agencies reported some form of youth employment program such as the Corporate Internship Program, State Service Internship Program, VET in Schools work placements, school-based traineeships, graduate employment programs, cadetships and traineeships. DEPHA runs a number of other programs supporting people from diverse groups in gaining work skills and experience, including a custodial work program for prisoners at the Royal Tasmanian Botanical Gardens and an education program for migrants on fruit and vegetable growing. Selected Divisions within Agencies have had particular success with programs for target groups: In 2007 the Launceston General Hospital Food Services team won a national Diversity@Work Award for its program supporting migrant work placements.

Eleven of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have implemented a formal or informal mentoring program for employees, organised internally to the Agency or externally via the Public Sector Management Office's (PSMO) pilot mentoring program. PAHSMA, the remaining Agency, reported that one-on-one employee assistance in relation to recruitment and career development is available on a needs basis, though this does not qualify as a mentoring program.

A smaller proportion of Agencies have reviewed their recruitment, selection and professional development processes to identify any potential barriers or gaps for employees from diverse backgrounds. Nine of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP have undertaken a formal review of Agency processes and practices in this area. DHHS is in the process of developing a recruitment and selection toolkit as a pilot to assist all Agencies in employing the most appropriate person for the job. In some cases reviews have simply led to the refinement of existing processes and procedures: DPIW's recruitment guidelines were recently formally reviewed and rewritten in plain English, with a strong emphasis on open access and opportunity.

Several Agencies reported that such reviews have been undertaken on an ad hoc basis, often in relation to other

activities such as the development of Agency Disability Action Plans and Aboriginal employment strategies. Agencies such as TPT and DOTAF have implemented a rolling cycle of review of all internal policies and procedures, providing a regular opportunity to review these for potential barriers and gaps.

Other measures in place to address the elimination of recruitment and professional development barriers for diverse groups include:

- Development of a careers website to provide more information on employment opportunities in the Agency to the general public;
- Broad advertising of all permanent job vacancies in the Gazette, newspaper/s and websites, and of short-term vacancies within the Agency as expressions of interest;
- Raising diversity-related issues as part of performance management discussions, including formal prompts for managers to address;
- Development of individual performance management plans addressing each employee's specific circumstances;
- Inclusion of 360 degree feedback mechanisms in performance management systems and coaching support for managers in how to manage employee career development;
- Development of mentoring guidelines to support formal and informal mentoring processes;
- Support for flexible working arrangements for employees, where business operational needs can still be met;
- Provision of one-on-one coaching in verbal and written communication for employees with written and verbal communication barriers, and support for attendance at professional development training;
- Implementation of a phased-in retirement program;
- Focus on equity and merit in recruitment and selection processes and associated support materials (guidelines, employee manuals, information included in Statements of Duty and Information for Job Applicants etc);
- Consideration and actioning of feedback received via voluntary diversity questionnaires;
- Consideration of access and equity issues in the development of any Agency policies, procedures or programs;
- Encouragement of employees to tap into cross-Agency and cross-workforce development programs such as the Women's Springboard Program (facilitated through the TTC) and The Leadership Voice Forum (Workplace Training Advisory Australia);

- Sponsorship of employees from diverse groups to attend events e.g. Women in Firefighting and Diversity in Emergency Services conferences;
- Ensuring that selection criteria and standards accurately reflect the requirements of any jobs being advertised e.g. the Tasmanian Fire Service's joint research with the University of Tasmania into physical fitness standards and assessments for female firefighters;
- Delivery of annual pre-employment training targeted at the long-term unemployed, parents returning to the workforce and people with few skills in tourism and hospitality; and
- Review of the working environment to ensure that it is accessible to all employees and provision of specialist equipment where required (e.g. audio equipment for a hearing impaired employee, re-allocation of work car parking and individually-assessed workplace furniture).

Celebrating diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds – The Tasmanian Government Work Placement Program

The Tasmanian Government Work Placement Program was established in 2003 as a joint project between PSMO and Multicultural Tasmania (within DPAC). The aim of the program is to support improved settlement and employment outcomes by helping recent arrivals become job ready by providing them with opportunities to improve their skills and confidence and develop important networks within State and Local Government agencies and organisations. DOE, DHHS, DIER, DPAC, DPIW, DEPHA (formerly DTAE), DOTAF and TAFE participated in the program in 2007.

A closer look at 'Right Person, Right Job'

DHHS is in the process of developing a recruitment and selection resource as a pilot project under the umbrella of PSMO strategic human resource framework, People – Directions for the Future. Right Person, Right Job aims to ensure that the most appropriate person is employed based on the principle of merit and evidence-based selection. The resource will be a toolkit for managers, following a project management approach that builds a range of considerations into the process, including diversity. One component of this involves examining the current characteristics of the work team, such as working styles, behaviours and current diversity characteristics.

Attracting young workers – The Audit Office's Cadetship Program

TAO's annual Cadetship Program has been highly successful as a recruitment aid for the Agency, ensuring that there has been a steady flow of new employees. In the main the program attracts younger applicants, which is desirable given the ageing profile of the Agency and assists the Agency to address identified skill shortages. For employees, the cadetship program represents the start of a career pathway in audit services: in 2007 three of the five cadets who completed their cadetship remained in the Agency in auditor positions, and four were still in the process of completing their cadetship.

4.7 BALANCING WORK AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
4.7	The Agency has supported employees and officers in achieving a balance between their work, family and other caring responsibilities (s 2(d), CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have shown a clear commitment to supporting employees in balancing their work and family responsibilities. Several Agencies (DIER, DPIW and TPT) consider the implementation of a flexible working policy to be the Agency’s most successful workplace diversity strategy, with regular positive feedback received from employees. DOE and DPAC have also written flexible work practices into their draft WDPs.

Agencies are supporting employees in maintaining a balance between work and other responsibilities through:

- Development and promotion of a flexible working arrangements policy and associated guidelines, covering areas such as access to personal leave, carer’s leave and leave without pay, general hours of attendance, part-time employment, working from home arrangements, work and breastfeeding guidelines, phased-in retirement, SSALS, flexible working hours and flex-time, employee-initiated shift swapping, non-rostered shiftwork opportunities, study assistance program etc;
- Provision of information on the Agency intranet or via support resources such as employee handbooks,
- Implementation of the newly revised General Conditions of Employment Award;
- Provision of one-on-one information and advice to employees in relation to their individual circumstances;
- Provision of additional assistance to employees in areas such as financial management and via Agency health and wellbeing programs;
- Encouragement of employees to make use of the Employee Assistance Program and to attend training courses such as the TTC’s ‘Achieving a Work/Life Balance’;
- Delivery of information sessions on flexible working arrangements by Human Resources staff;
- Requirement that work/life balance be discussed as part of each employee’s performance management review; and
- Offer of additional flexibility in selected policy areas e.g. allowing access to maternity leave on a pro-rata basis with no time limits for service.

Some innovative approaches to flexible work arrangements

DIER is one Agency that has facilitated a range of very flexible working arrangements for employees. These include part-time work and regular leave without pay for some employees, to enable them to balance work and personal/family responsibilities. This has proven to be a successful retention strategy for the Agency.

The negotiations around the development of DIER’s Engineer’s Industrial Agreement also had a focus on managing for diversity in that the particular needs of engineers at different life stages were considered and an attempt was made to create provisions to meet these needs.

DEDT has adopted an approach which provides for greater freedom for employees in terms of seeking flexible working arrangements. The onus in this Agency has been placed on Agency management to justify why flexible working arrangements should not be granted, rather than falling to employees.

5. EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT OF THE WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

This section provides an overview of the measures Agencies have implemented to monitor and report on the progress of Workplace Diversity Programs (WDPs) and their associated activities.

5.1 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place
- Assessment Criteria met
- Assessment Criteria not met
- NA Not Assessable

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
5.1	The Agency’s Workplace Diversity Program includes a set of performance indicators (s 4(a)(i), CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
5.1.1	The Agency’s performance indicators have been used to evaluate the Workplace Diversity Program	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

Commissioner’s Direction No. 3 (CD No. 3) requires that a Head of Agency develop performance indicators to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the WDP. Eleven out of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirement to have included a set of performance indicators in the Agency’s WDP. However, only three of these eleven Agencies have used these performance indicators to formally evaluate the WDP.

Performance indicators included in Agency WDP documents covered a range of areas, including increasing awareness of diversity in the workplace, balancing work, family, career and cultural needs and responsibilities, elimination of workplace discrimination, bullying and harassment, encouragement of cultural awareness, promotion of equity in employment, manager and team leader development, monitoring and reporting requirements, attendance at training sessions and other activities, role and performance of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees. The desired outcomes relating to each performance indicator focused on meeting targets (e.g. in terms of statistics), completion of actions, and developing and implementing processes and procedures.

The following observations have been made in relation to the development and use of performance indicators by Agencies:

- Many of the performance indicators in WDP documents were qualitative in nature, meaning that measuring performance may prove difficult;
- There are challenges associated with reporting on areas that require employee self-disclosure, given the sensitive nature of workplace diversity characteristics;
- To be useful performance indicators need to be specific, realistic, achievable, have set targets or timeframes and be updated regularly; and
- Performance indicators should also be able to be used as the basis for evaluation and assessment, whether through reports to management, or as a key element in the required four-yearly program review.

One Agency chose to include performance indicators in a complementary Human Resources Strategic Plan, in order that monitoring of WDP progress becomes an operational issue, in line with other areas of human resource management.

Section 7.11 of this report examines Agency use of the performance indicators that were included in the Commissioner’s Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program accompanying CD No. 3.

5.2 EVALUATING THE WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
5.2	The Head of Agency has put in place measures to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the Workplace Diversity Program (s 4(a)(i), CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

Eleven of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirement to have measures in place to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the Program. DHHS reported that this is an area to be addressed.

CD No. 3 requires that performance indicators be used as the means to address this, however this evaluation also sought to identify other measures that might be in place within Agencies to review the effectiveness of the WDP. The following measures were uncovered:

- Surveys of the Agency, including annual climate surveys and more regular opinion surveys;
- Participation in external surveying processes such as the annual Hewitt Best Employers in Australia and New Zealand Study;
- Development of performance indicators and/or targets for the WDP and individual workplace diversity activities;
- Review of progress against performance indicators (as outlined in the WDP);
- Annual progress reports to the Executive Management Group or equivalent on the activities of the WDP (generally on a financial year basis);
- Gathering of feedback in relation to individual workplace diversity activities (e.g. reports from the activity facilitator on participant feedback);
- Reporting on the progress of WDP activities in the Agency’s Annual Report;
- Collection and review of workplace diversity statistics as part of annual Budget Estimates;
- Review of the outcomes of grievances, Code of Conduct investigations, external review and referrals to OSSC;
- Review of ongoing employee conformity with Agency policies and guidelines;
- Review of exit interviews, separation questionnaires, performance feedback summaries in relation to workplace diversity issues;
- Statistical analysis of diversity-related demographic information;
- Review of types of information sought from Human Resources, relating to workplace diversity;
- Monitoring of activity of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees (e.g. via quarterly reports);
- Feedback from a representative focus group;
- Establishment of a Diversity Action Group to oversee implementation of the WDP and monitor progress;
- Feedback from State Service Employee Surveys;
- Involvement in benchmarking projects with other jurisdictions/offices, which include diversity-related indicators; and
- Review of the WDP as part of the regular schedule of policy and process review.

A closer look at TAFE's Diversity Advisory Group

TAFE has established a Diversity Advisory Group to oversee the implementation of the WDP and monitor progress against established program goals. The Group is composed of representative employees drawn from across the State who are supported in attending regular group meetings.

The Group was responsible for the development of the TAFE WDP and is charged with overseeing workplace diversity activities and measures, as well as initiating promotional activity and formally measuring the outcomes of the Program. The Group is probably best known in the Agency for its involvement in running annual team and individual equity awards and events such as Harmony Day, NAIDOC (indigenous culture) and refugee week.

5.3 REPORTING

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place
- Assessment Criteria met
- Assessment Criteria not met
- NA Not Assessable

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
5.3	The Agency reports on employment policies, practices and statistics concerning the Workplace Diversity Program (s 4(a)(ii), CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
5.3.1	The Head of Agency reports on the progress of the Workplace Diversity Program in the Agency's annual report	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met the requirement to report on employment policies, practices and statistics concerning the WDP. Seven of these Agencies used the annual report as a means to promote and recognise the progress of the WDP and its activities and achievements and/or to list diversity-related statistics. At a minimum the latter included a breakdown of the Agency population by gender, age, and full-time/part-time status, however Agencies also covered areas such as salary and years of service, recruitment statistics, participation in training, and the results of specific diversity group initiatives. Some Agencies, such as DIER, report on the progress of individual workplace activities such as the Disability Action Plan in the annual report, but not on the WDP in broader terms.

In addition to the Annual Report, Agencies make use of the following reporting methods:

- Production of informal reports on individual measures (e.g. the success of workplace diversity initiatives, training statistics, Workplace Diversity Contact Employee network activity);
- Production of detailed reports on the results of employee surveys;
- Production of regular reports for management groups, most often as part of more general human resource reporting;
- Production of an annual report on the progress of the WDP (independent to the Agency's annual report); and
- Production of reports for external bodies such as OSSC.

The reporting framework typically involves human resource management divisions collating and producing a report, which is then presented to higher levels of management such as the Executive Management Team or Board. This evaluation revealed that in the main, reporting on certain types of workplace diversity activities (e.g. training delivery) appears to be well organised, however general reporting across the range of WDP activities is more limited.

5.4 COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMMISSIONER'S REQUIREMENTS

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
5.4	The latest version of the Workplace Diversity Program has been lodged with the Commissioner (s 3(a)(b), CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
5.5	The Head of Agency has provided the Commissioner with the required information to evaluate the Workplace Diversity Program (s 4(b)(i), CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
5.6	The Head of Agency has provided the Commissioner with the required Workplace Diversity Program information for the Commissioner's Annual Report (s 4(b)(ii), CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

All fourteen Agencies were willing participants in the Evaluation of Agency Workplace Diversity Programs and have to date provided the necessary information to support the State Service Commissioner's annual reporting processes. The State Service Commissioner appreciates the time and effort contributed to these processes by Agency contact personnel.

Please note that for the purpose of the evaluation criteria listed above, DOE and DPAC received three ratings of 'No endorsed WDP in place' given that as at 30 June 2008, their WDP was still in draft form.

Agencies should also note that it is a requirement to lodge an updated copy of the WDP with the Commissioner as soon as practicable after establishing, altering or revising the program. Failure to do so has a potential impact on the Commissioner's capacity to access current Agency policy information in undertaking his statutory review function.

6. WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW

This section examines the requirement for Agencies to undertake a regular, formal review of the WDP and provides an overview of the means by which Agencies measure the success of the program in achieving the desired outcomes.

6.1 REVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place
- NA Not Assessable

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
6.1	The Head of Agency has reviewed the Workplace Diversity Program in the past 4 years (s 5, CD No. 3)	NA	●	NA	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA	●	●	●	●

Comments

Commissioner's Direction No. 3 (CD No. 3) requires that a Head of Agency must review the Agency's WDP at least once every four years. Seven of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place met this criterion. Three Agencies (DEDT, DEPHA and DOTAF) did not receive an assessment given that their WDP had been implemented for less than four years. However, it should be noted that it has been a requirement for Heads of Agency to have developed and implemented a WDP since the commencement of the *State Service Act 2000* in May 2001.

Two Agencies, DHHS and DOJ, have not undertaken a formal review of the WDP in the past four years and therefore did not meet this compliance criterion. DOJ has reported that the WDP is currently under review.

Table 1 provides a snapshot of the status of each Agency's WDP.

TABLE 1: Implementation and review schedules for Agency WDPs

Agency	Date current WDP implemented	Date last reviewed
DEDT	July 2005	To be reviewed by end 2008
DOE	To be implemented	N/A
DEPHA	April 2008	N/A
DHHS	2005	N/A
DIER	April 2008	April 2008
DOJ	September 2003	Currently under review
DPEM	June 2008	August 2006
DPAC	To be implemented	N/A
DPIW	June 2008	June 2008
DOTAF	October 2004	N/A
PAHSMA	October 2006	June 2008
TAFE	June 2008	June 2008
TAO	May 2007	May 2007
TPT	2004	July 2007

6.2 SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING OUTCOMES

Assessment Key:

- Complies with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- Does not comply with requirements of Commissioner’s Direction No. 3
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
6.2	The Workplace Diversity Program is achieving the outcomes determined by the Agency (s 5(a)(b), CD No. 3)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Comments

CD No. 3 requires that the four-yearly review of the WDP must ensure that the program continues to assist in giving effect to the State Service Principles and achieve the outcomes determined for workplace diversity program measures. This evaluation has shown that only a small number of Agencies have used their performance indicators to evaluate their WDP and thus this Office has some difficulty in understanding how Agencies are able to ascertain that they are achieving their desired outcomes. Nevertheless, it is accepted that Agencies are using a range of methods to assess the achievement of workplace diversity outcomes.

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP indicated that they met this requirement. The range of methods employed to measure the success of their WDP included:

- Demonstration through lack of breaches of legislation, State Service Principles and Code of Conduct and Agency policies and procedures;
- Provision of an open, supportive environment in which to raise concerns in relation to issues such as discrimination, bullying and/or harassment;
- Support of merit-based employment and access to promotion and career development opportunities for all employees;
- Incorporation of workplace diversity principles into the Agency’s values framework, behavioural standards and culture;
- Value-adding of broader perspectives that workplace diversity brings;
- Promotion and maintenance of a healthy work/life balance through access to flexible working arrangements;
- Meeting the objectives of each workplace diversity activity;
- Positive anecdotal feedback from Workplace Diversity Contact Employees and other employees;
- Review of statistical information, particularly trends e.g. average decline in the number of grievances reported, number of people entering and leaving the Agency, number of opportunities to access training and development etc;
- Development and use of performance indicators to monitor the success of the WDP; and
- Notable successes of individual workplace diversity initiatives.

7. ADDITIONAL CRITERIA

This section provides an overview of each Agency’s assessment against the additional criteria incorporated in the evaluation of Agency Workplace Diversity Programs (WDPs). These additional criteria were included in the assessment to obtain further information on the operation of WDPs within Agencies, in addition to the legislative and CD requirements outlined earlier in this report.

These criteria were principally drawn from the Commissioner’s Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program, which were released to support Commissioner’s Direction No. 3 (CD No. 3) in 2002.

Note: Where no assessment has been given for an Agency, the additional criterion is not in place.

7.1 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.1	Employees and other stakeholders were consulted in the development of the Workplace Diversity Program	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

The Commissioner’s Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program suggest that establishing an effective workplace diversity program involves undertaking consultation with employees and management. This part of the evaluation sought to examine what stakeholder consultation had been undertaken by Agencies in the development of their WDP.

Each Agency with an endorsed WDP in place indicated that it had undertaken some form of consultation with employees, usually via working group or human resource project employees. The range of methods employed included:

- Providing opportunities for all employees to give feedback on a draft WDP document;
- Requesting input from Senior Management Group, Agency Executive Committee, Divisional Heads;
- Involvement of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees in promoting the consultation process;
- Feedback sought from attendees at diversity awareness training sessions;
- Completion of a whole-of-agency diversity survey and analysis of the results;
- Production of a discussion paper for distribution;
- Development of a separate information page on the Agency intranet to support the Program development and consultation phase;
- Convening of focus groups, with sampling drawn from employees across all business units;
- Delivery of information/feedback sessions around the State;
- Request for feedback through regular employee meetings and Agency newsletters;
- Development of arrangements to collect feedback via the phone, in person or in writing;
- Appointment of a Workplace Diversity Project Officer and Project Steering Committee to oversee the development and implementation of the WDP, including managing the consultation process;
- Representation on working groups/Project Steering Committee by diversity groups (women, youth, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, people from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds);
- Involvement of union representatives; and
- Advice sought from external stakeholders e.g. other State and Territory jurisdictions, State government departments, the Anti-Discrimination Commission.

While this part of the evaluation focused on consultation processes in relation to the original development of the WDP, the approach and activities undertaken by Agencies may be useful in light of formal review processes for WDPs.

DEPHA's WDP consultation process

DEPHA is one Agency that has undertaken extensive consultation processes in the development of the Agency's WDP. The Agency has found employee consultation to be extremely beneficial – not only did it provide employees with a forum to have a say about issues important to them, but it also reinforced to management that not all workplaces face the same issues. For example, the consultation process highlighted that people working and living together in remote and isolated areas are often exposed to a different range of issues than those working in higher populated areas.

7.2 FORMAT OF THE WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.2	The Workplace Diversity Program is available to employees:														
7.2.1	In a single document, or	●	●	●		●	●		●		●	●	●		●
7.2.1	In a series of documents				●			●		●				●	

Agency WDPs vary in their organisation and level of documentation. For eight of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place, the WDP consists of a stand-alone document, often supported by a number of other guidelines and support materials. For the remaining four Agencies, the WDP consists of a series of documents which are brought together under the one program banner.

Several Agencies have separated an overarching statement of workplace diversity objectives and principles from an action plan, in order to retain the latter as an easily-updated operational document. The action plan has most often been included as an attachment to the primary WDP document.

7.3 DEVELOPMENT OF AN ACTION PLAN

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.3	The Agency's Workplace Diversity Program has defined specific activities and actions, including timetables.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have developed an action plan to implement the program. At a minimum, these outline the desired outcomes, strategies to achieve them and performance indicators to measure progress. The more comprehensive action plans include the following information:

- Program goals/outcomes;
- Workplace diversity strategies;

- Individual actions/activities;
- Action agents;
- Performance indicators (including targets for quantitative measures);
- Timeframes; and
- Progress against each action item or strategy (e.g. in the form of a checklist).

7.4 ALLOCATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

Assessment Key:

- Additional Criterion in place
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.4	The Agency has allocated responsibility for the management of workplace diversity activities and actions.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Responsibility for implementing the WDP must fall to someone and this evaluation has shown that this generally falls to Agency human resources branches. In some Agencies, designated personnel have been appointed as Workplace Diversity Coordinators, however in most Agencies this function is assumed by the Human Resources Manager or a Human Resources employee.

This evaluation has revealed the following in relation to allocation of responsibility for the WDP:

- While human resources employees have the primary responsibility for the WDP, implementation occurs in partnership with other groups, such as the Executive Management Group, Strategic Management Group and Business Unit Managers;
- Steering Committees have been retained to oversee the implementation process;
- The network of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees is generally overseen by the Human Resources Branch; and
- A number of the action plans in Agency WDPs allocate responsibility for individual activities to the Corporate Services Director/Manager, Human Resources Manager, Human Resources employees, Workplace Diversity Contact Employees or equivalent, managers/supervisors and/or all Agency employees.

7.5 ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES FOR THE WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

Assessment Key:

- Additional Criterion in place
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.5	Resources have been allocated to the Agency's Workplace Diversity Program.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have allocated resources in the form of financial support and employment of Agency personnel to implement the program. The majority of Agencies have reported that specific funding for the WDP has not been allocated, but financial resources are available under the broader human resources or corporate services budget. Application for funds is generally made in relation to individual workplace diversity activities.

The range of resources provided by Agencies includes:

- Resources to support the development of online materials on the Agency’s intranet;
- Resources to support delivery of workplace diversity training and employee information sessions, and associated materials;
- Resources to support the production of WDP promotional materials e.g. posters, brochures, printing of Fact Sheets, development of toolkits;
- Resources to support events relating to the WDP e.g. cultural days, prizes for diversity awards;
- Funding for employees to attend diversity-related events such as conferences;
- Funding for human resources personnel assigned to implement workplace diversity activities;
- Funding for the time and training of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees (drawn from across functional areas of the Agency); and
- Funding for external consultants employed at various stages of the development and implementation process.

7.6 COLLECTION AND REVIEW OF STATISTICAL DATA

Assessment Key:

- Additional Criterion in place
- No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.6	Statistical data has been collected and reviewed in relation to the Agency's Workplace Diversity Program.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place indicated that they collect and review statistical data in relation to the WDP. This section provides an overall snapshot of the types of data that are of interest to Agencies and how it is used. Section 7.12 of this report examines some of these areas in more detail.

Overall, Agencies reported that they collect and review statistical data in relation to the following:

- Employees accessing training and development programs;
- Employees attendance at diversity information sessions and other activities;
- Numbers of reported grievances and their means of resolution;
- Employees accessing flexible working arrangements;
- Employee recruitment and resignation rates;
- Numbers of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees and their range of activities;
- Number of work placements/employment program participants;
- Information to support the Budget Estimates process;
- The results of the biennial OSSC Employee Survey; and
- General demographics of the Agency.

Data is collected through Workplace Diversity Contact Employees, contact with human resource employees, information from the Agency’s Employee Assistance Program, exit interviews, employee surveys, evaluation sheets following training sessions, and external surveys such as the Hewitt Best Employers in Australia and New Zealand Study. The Budget Estimates process, OSSC Agency survey and Workforce Analysis and Comparison Analysis (WACA) data reporting require Agencies to collect and collate annual statistical breakdowns across a number of areas, including diversity indicators. Some of this information is reported in the Agency’s own Annual Report.

While Agencies collect a broad range of data, only some areas are examined and analysed given human resource restraints and lack of direct need to do so. It is also recognised that some workplace diversity related activities are occurring informally (e.g. access to flexible working arrangements) and thus are unable to be captured statistically.

Agencies have taken quite different approaches to the collection and review of statistics. DPIW indicated as part of this evaluation that the Agency has purposely moved away from a heavy reliance on statistical reporting towards a WDP that is measured more in terms of behavioural change. At the other end of the scale, PAHSMA has recognised the need to gather baseline data to use as a benchmark for annual reporting processes and to measure the operation of the WDP. Some Agencies have introduced innovative ways to review data on an ongoing basis: TAO examines diversity related statistics as part of broader, electronic balanced scorecard reporting and TPT has developed indices to measure areas such as employee engagement and capability.

7.7 CROSS REFERENCING WITH OTHER AGENCY PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.7	The Workplace Diversity Program is referenced in other Agency procedural documents	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			●	●

Workplace diversity relates closely to a range of other Agency processes and procedures. This evaluation revealed that ten of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place made reference to these in their formal WDP document.

The following areas were cross-referenced:

- Internal grievance resolution policy;
- Performance management system;
- Alcohol consumption at departmental functions policy;
- Email and internet usage guidelines;
- Work/life balance policy;
- Balancing work and caring guidelines;
- Flex-time policy;
- Induction checklist;
- Exit interview process;
- Recruitment and selection policy;
- Prevention of workplace discrimination, bullying and harassment policy;
- Workplace feedback policy;
- Roles and responsibilities of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees;
- Guidelines for Boards and Committees;
- Employee Statements of Duty;
- Corporate training programs;
- Agency Disability Action Plan;
- Employee Assistance Program;
- Agency Corporate Plans and/or Human Resource Strategic Plans;
- Agency values and behaviours program; and
- General human resources intranet materials.

7.8 COMMUNICATION OF THE WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.8	The Workplace Diversity Program has been communicated to employees	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Communicating an Agency program to employees can be achieved in a number of ways. The Commissioner’s Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program suggest that the WDP “is communicated to employees who are encouraged to discuss and respond”. All of the Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place indicated that they have communicated the WDP to employees.

This has been achieved via a number of different communication strategies:

- Correspondence from the Head of Agency to employees;
- Provision of diversity awareness training and information sessions;
- Endorsement in the Agency’s newsletters;
- Inclusion of promotional materials in employee payslips;
- Distribution of posters, brochures;
- Use of Human Resource Consultants;
- Use of the Workplace Diversity Contact Employee network;
- Use of steering committees/working groups;
- Use of staff and management meetings (and following reports);
- Promotion via the Agency’s induction program;
- References in other Agency systems such as performance management;
- Inclusion of the WDP in the employee handbook;
- Use of the Agency intranet; and
- Easy access to a copy of the WDP document and supporting materials on the Agency’s computer system.

7.9 USE OF WORKPLACE DIVERSITY CONTACT EMPLOYEES

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.9	The Workplace Diversity Program has designated personnel or Workplace Diversity Contact Employees to support the implementation of the Workforce Diversity Program	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Workplace Diversity Contact Employees within Agencies are variously referred to as Diversity Contact Officers, Contact Officers and Workplace Behaviour Contact Officers. This is terminology used by individual Agencies and given that these employees are not ‘officers’ in terms of the Act, for the purposes of this report they will be referred to as Workplace Diversity Contact Employees.

Nine of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place have Workplace Diversity Contact Employees. The remaining Agency, DEPHA, reports that this role has been filled in the past and that the Agency intends to re-institute the Contact Employee network as a strategy under the new WDP.

The role and support structures available to Workplace Diversity Contact Employees vary according to the size of the Agency. At one end of the scale Agencies such as DPEM have appointed over 80 Access and Equity employees state wide, while smaller Agencies such as TAO maintain a smaller number of ‘Legislative Responsible Officers’ with roles relevant to workplace diversity (‘Equal Employment Opportunity Officer’, ‘Grievance Officer’, and ‘Diversity Contact Officers’, which can be represented by the same personnel).

The range of Agency mechanisms in place to support Workplace Diversity Contact Employees includes:

- Selection of at least one Workplace Diversity Contact Employee from each Agency work location or region of the State;
- Provision of the list of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees and their contact details to new employees as part of the induction process;
- Posting of Workplace Diversity Contact Employee details in every workplace, subject to site inspections;
- Posting of information on the Workplace Diversity Contact Employee network on the Agency intranet;
- Management of the network by a Workplace Diversity Coordinator;
- Requirement for all Workplace Diversity Contact Employees to attend initial training (such as external training delivered through the ADC);
- Requirement for all Workplace Diversity Contact Employees to attend regular refresher training (at least once per year);
- Development of a separate Statement of Duties for Workplace Diversity Contact Employees, outlining their role and responsibilities;
- Implementation of regular network meetings (e.g. quarterly or bi-annual) with a formal Chairperson;
- Requirement for Workplace Diversity Contact Employees to report on their activity (e.g. every quarter), which is then collated and distributed to the Workplace Diversity Contact Employees network;
- Conduct of a quarterly survey to gather information and feedback from Workplace Diversity Contact Employees;
- Production of an annual report on the activities of the Workplace Diversity Contact Employees network;
- Distribution of relevant information materials to support the work of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees, e.g. the ADC newsletter;
- Requirement for Workplace Diversity Contact Employees to work alongside employees with related roles within the Agency, such as Multicultural Liaison Officers, human resource consultants and employees from organisations such as the Disability Bureau; and
- Recognition of the contribution of Workplace Diversity Contact Employees through social networking activities.

7.10 ONGOING EVALUATION OF THE WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.10	The Workplace Diversity Program is evaluated between the required 4 yearly program review	●	●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
7.10.1	The Agency measures changes to the employment profile	●		●		●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●

This question was designed to identify the activities and measures Agencies have implemented to monitor and evaluate the WDP on an ongoing basis. All Agencies keep a watching brief on progress of workplace diversity activities, however some address this in a more organised way.

Ten of the twelve Agencies indicated that the WDP has been evaluated between the required 4 yearly program review. The same number of Agencies reported that they measure changes to the employment profile of the Agency. These statistics are used as the basis for quarterly reporting to senior management, human resource sub-committees and boards.

In order to monitor and assess the ongoing effectiveness of the WDP, Agencies have employed the following:

- Collation of a detailed quarterly report on human resource practices, based on a statistical breakdown of the Agency;
- Collation of information on the WDP for the Agency’s annual report;
- Review of feedback gathered from employees in consultative groups, employee meetings, and as a result of training activities and/or the performance management system;
- Workplace Diversity Contact Employee network reports;
- Use of a nominated group to monitor progress (Steering Committee, Diversity Advisory Group);
- Collation of data to support internal processes e.g. recruitment and retention, development of internal policy;
- Internal review of data gathering for external reporting purposes (e.g. the annual OSSC Survey, WACA reporting);
- Review of information provided by external sources such as OSSC and the Hewitt Best Employer in Australia and New Zealand survey;
- Review of the WDP as part of the rolling cycle of internal policy review (generally two to three yearly); and
- Annual reviews of the WDP against the performance indicators outlined in the WDP document.

7.11 USE OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS DRAWN FROM THE COMMISSIONER'S GUIDELINES

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

	DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.11 The Agency makes use of the following performance indicators in evaluating the Workplace Diversity Program:	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
7.11.1 Recognition of workplace diversity achievements through the performance management process			●			●	●			●	●			●
7.11.2 Degree of participation of employees on steering groups, boards, working groups and committees in the development and achievement of work plans			●			●	●		●	●	●		●	
7.11.3 Extent of promotion of workplace diversity issues in the Agency	●		●			●	●			●	●			●
7.11.4 Satisfaction of management with the outcomes of the Workplace Diversity Program	●		●			●	●				●			●
7.11.5 Degree of change in the Agency's employee profile	●		●		●	●	●		●		●		●	●
7.11.6 Level of satisfaction with the selection process			●		●	●	●			●	●	●	●	
7.11.7 Degree of satisfaction of employees in balancing their work and personal lifestyle responsibilities, through feedback received via performance management			●		●	●	●			●	●		●	●
7.11.8 Extent of flexible work practices in place to balance work and performance lifestyle responsibilities			●		●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●
7.11.9 Feedback on the results of specific initiatives	●		●			●	●		●	●	●			●
7.11.10 Number of grievances and incidents of workplace harassment and their resolution	●		●		●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●
7.11.11 Availability of relevant documentation to deal with incidents of workplace harassment and feedback from employees on the adequacy of the documentation	●		●			●	●			●	●		●	●
7.11.12 Demographic composition, including:	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
1. numbers of employees in designated groups and patterns of participation, including at senior levels			●		●	●	●			●	●		●	●
2. distribution of designated groups across occupation and classification/salary levels	●		●			●	●			●	●		●	●
3. part-time/job-sharing participation	●		●		●	●	●		●	●	●		●	●
4. recruitment and promotion numbers	●		●			●	●			●	●		●	●
5. retention and separation rates	●		●		●	●	●			●	●		●	●
6. returns from maternity leave	●		●		●	●	●		●	●	●			●
7. training patterns	●		●		●	●	●			●	●		●	●
7.11.13 Grievance patterns					●	●	●				●			●
7.11.14 Attitudinal surveys/culture audits	●				●	●	●			●			●	●
7.11.15 Peer reviews to help provide an accurate and objective assessment of how well employees and managers are doing	●		●		●	●							●	●
7.11.16 Requests for review of actions	●		●		●	●	●			●				●
7.11.17 Turnover and absenteeism statistics	●		●		●	●	●			●			●	●
7.11.18 Diversity surveys that identify issues in connection with job satisfaction, career development, management, support and discrimination or harassment in the workplace	●		●		●	●				●			●	●

The Commissioner's Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program include a number of performance indicators as an aid for Agencies in the development of their WDP. While this list was not designed to be exhaustive or mandatory upon Agencies, it provides a framework to review the types of indicators Agencies are using to monitor and evaluate the WDP.

The following performance indicators, from the above list, were the most commonly used by Agencies:

- Number of grievances and incidents of workplace harassment and their resolution (10 Agencies);
- Degree of change in the Agency's employee profile (9 Agencies);
- Demographic composition - retention and separation rates (9 Agencies);
- Demographic composition - returns from maternity leave (9 Agencies);
- Demographic composition - training patterns (9 Agencies);
- Level of satisfaction with the selection process (8 Agencies);
- Degree of satisfaction of employees in balancing their work and personal lifestyle responsibilities, through feedback received via performance management (8 Agencies);
- Feedback on the results of specific initiatives (8 Agencies);
- Availability of relevant documentation to deal with incidents of workplace harassment and feedback from employees on the adequacy of the documentation (8 Agencies);
- Demographic composition - numbers of employees in designated groups and patterns of participation, including at senior levels (8 Agencies);
- Demographic composition - distribution of designated groups across occupation and classification/salary levels (8 Agencies);
- Demographic composition - recruitment and promotion numbers (8 Agencies); and
- Turnover and absenteeism statistics (8 Agencies).

It is recognised that there are difficulties in collecting data to support some of these performance indicators. For example, a number of flexible work practices occur informally and thus are unable to be captured statistically.

Performance indicators relating to employee satisfaction levels (e.g. selection processes, access to flexible work arrangements) are collected via external surveys such as the biennial OSSC Employee Survey and/or the Hewitt Best Employer in Australia and New Zealand study. This information is collected internally

in some smaller Agencies through their own employee surveys, and across the board through exit interviews.

The following indicators were less commonly used by Agencies:

- Degree of participation of employees on steering groups, boards, working groups and committees in the development and achievement of work plans (7 Agencies);
- Extent of promotion of workplace diversity issues in the Agency (7 Agencies);
- Attitudinal surveys/culture audits (7 Agencies);
- Requests for review of actions (7 Agencies);
- Diversity surveys that identify issues in connection with job satisfaction, career development, management, support and discrimination or harassment in the workplace (7 Agencies);
- Recognition of workplace diversity achievements through the performance management process (6 Agencies);
- Satisfaction of management with the outcomes of the Workplace Diversity Program (6 Agencies);
- Peer reviews to help provide an accurate and objective assessment of how well employees and managers are doing (6 Agencies); and
- Grievance patterns (5 Agencies).

Several Agencies raised an issue relating to the use of the performance management system in gathering information on employee satisfaction in relation to diversity issues and/or recognising workplace diversity achievements. While employee performance in the areas covered by the WDP are generally covered during performance management discussions, a number of Agencies do not report this centrally, as the contents of performance feedback discussions are confidential.

Similarly, there are privacy issues associated with what can be asked as part of workplace diversity surveys.

7.12 CAPTURE AND USE OF STATISTICAL DATA

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.12	The Agency captures data and/or undertakes statistical analysis in the following areas:	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
7.12.1	1. Participation rates for SSALS by male and female	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
7.12.2	2. Participation rates for SSALS over level 10 by male and female	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
7.12.3	3. Employees moving from full-time (F/T) to part-time (P/T) employment by male and female	●		●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
7.12.4	4. Employees returning from maternity leave to P/T or F/T employment			●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
7.12.5	5. Employees returning from paternity leave to P/T or F/T employment			●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
7.12.6	6. Part-time employment for employees higher than A&C level 10 by male and female			●		●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●
7.12.7	7. Job share employment numbers by male and female	●		●		●	●	●			●	●			●
7.12.8	8. Breast feeding facilities provided			●				●		●	●	●			●
7.12.9	9. Flexible work arrangements accessed by male and female			●			●	●		●	●	●			●
7.12.10	10. Access to Agency child care facilities by male and female														
7.12.11	11. Number of employees working from home by male and female			●			●			●					

A number of statistical indicators relating to workplace diversity were examined as part of this evaluation. This Office was interested in examining not only whether Agencies are analysing and reporting on any of these indices, but also whether Agency human resource information systems currently capture this information and therefore have the capability of producing reports if required.

The following statistical indicators were the most commonly being used to capture and/or analyse data by Agencies:

- Participation rates for SSALS by male and female (12 Agencies);
- Participation rates for SSALS over A&C Level 10 by male and female (12 Agencies);
- Employees moving from full-time (F/T) to part-time (P/T) employment by male and female (12 Agencies);
- Employees returning from maternity leave to P/T or F/T employment (10 Agencies);
- Employees returning from paternity leave to P/T or F/T employment (10 Agencies); and
- Part-time employment for employees higher than A&C Level 10 by male and female (10 Agencies).

The following statistical indicators were less commonly used by Agencies:

- Job share employment numbers by male and female (8 Agencies);
- Flexible work arrangements accessed by male and female (7 Agencies);
- Breast feeding facilities provided (6 Agencies); and
- Number of employees working from home by male and female (3 Agencies).

Agency feedback as part of this evaluation indicated that much of this information is not routinely captured or reported, but can be reported on if necessary. If the information is reported, often it is in relation to activities outside the WDP, such as the general statistics in the annual report, or individual Agency employee surveys. In addition to this, some of this information is available in aggregate, but not broken down by classification or gender.

7.13 BENCHMARKING

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.13	The Agency uses some form of benchmarking in evaluating the Workplace Diversity Program	●	●	●		●	●	●	●		●		●	●	●

This evaluation examined whether Agencies undertake any form of benchmarking in relation to the WDP. Nine of the twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP indicated that they have used some form of benchmarking in evaluating their program.

Informal and formal benchmarking processes have been used by Agencies as follows:

- Consideration of the workplace diversity activities of other Agencies, as detailed in their annual reports;
- Discussions with human resource employees from other Agencies and with employees from like organisations interstate;
- Involvement in the Hewitt Best Employers in Australia and New Zealand Study and the Mercer Human Resources Effectiveness Monitor Study;
- Use of the OSSC State Service Employee Survey as a whole-of-government benchmark;
- Use of *Tasmania Together* benchmarks to set targets for the WDP and for reporting purposes; and
- Use of industry benchmarks such as the Police Human Resources Benchmarking Report, fire industry national benchmarks and Public Trustee organisation benchmarks.

TAO is currently championing the development of a human resources benchmarking process with other State and Territory Audit Offices in the Council of Auditors-General. This is already undertaken in relation to auditing services and corporate services, but has not yet been undertaken in the human resources area. The benchmarking would focus on areas that impact the operation of the organisation e.g. recruitment times, amount of sick leave taken etc.

7.14 WORKFORCE PLANNING

Assessment Key:

● Additional Criterion in place ● No endorsed WDP in place

		DEDT	DOE	DEPHA	DHHS	DIER	DOJ	DPEM	DPAC	DPIW	DOTAF	PAHSMA	TAFE	TAO	TPT
7.14	The Agency undertakes some form of workplace planning	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Workplace diversity is a key component of workforce planning and thus this evaluation sought to uncover what, if any, workforce planning is being undertaken by Agencies. All twelve Agencies with an endorsed WDP in place reported that the Agency undertakes some form of workplace planning. This has principally involved:

- Organised succession planning, including the development of an Agency succession plan;
- Completion of a skills review of every managerial role in the Agency, also considering the age profile and skill gaps;
- Consideration of attraction and retention strategies, leave management, phased-in retirement, career development and employee mobility;
- Monitoring of sector, industry and labour market factors which affect supply and demand in relation to key Agency occupational groups;
- Statistical analysis of changes in the employee profile over time, population projections and forecast training demand;
- Matching skill sets to service needs and delivery models, including review of vocational education and training and other professional education opportunities;
- Research and adoption of revised recruitment and retention strategies e.g. specific strategies for advertising for some occupations, adequacy of resourcing levels, and employee engagement;
- Convening of a retention workshop based on national expertise in this area, for managers and supervisors; and
- Consideration of the representativeness of the workforce, given the community in which it operates.

Most Agencies do not use a formal model or framework for workforce planning, but undertake these processes on a needs basis, or to gain an understanding of the business' directions as part of the annual business planning process. A number of Agencies have undertaken more detailed examination of workforce planning issues as part of broader, strategic human resource planning. TPT has recently undertaken work in developing a conceptual retention cycle model, which includes detailed plans for succession and knowledge management.

8. LEARNINGS IN IMPLEMENTING A WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

As part of this evaluation, Agencies were also asked about the key lessons learnt in implementing a Workplace Diversity Program. The following key themes emerged from this:

1. The benefits of increasing awareness of workplace diversity

- A higher level of understanding of access, equity and diversity policy across the whole of the Agency;
- More willingness by employees to accommodate (and for some, to value) differences in the workplace; and
- Better employee understanding of their rights and support options available.

2. Incorporation of workplace diversity into everyday Agency activities

- Moving respect of diversity beyond a compliance framework to that of being an inclusive component within our workplace;
- Better employee understanding of expectations of the State Service and society in general;
- More employee confidence in the organisation's ability to address behavioural issues;
- The critical importance of looking after the people in the organisation, and striving for a positive culture;
- The need to address attitudes first to avoid having 'token' diverse employees; and
- The need to be really creative in engaging employees in considering the value and practical application of honouring workplace diversity.

3. Effect of implementing workplace diversity measures on employees

- Positive acknowledgement from employees who have changed their work/life balance;
- The impact on full-time employees of an increasing number of part-time employees; and
- The impact of measures such as flexible work practices on service delivery.

4. Difficulties in measuring and reporting on workplace diversity outcomes

- Previous workplace diversity programs have been too onerous and have focused too much on statistics and reporting, with little done to change behaviour and thinking;
- Difficulty in reporting on figures that require self-identification, leading to a focus on the practices that facilitate a diverse workforce; and
- Difficulty in measuring outcomes against set key performance indicators.

9. INDIVIDUAL AGENCY EVALUATION SUMMARIES - AGENCIES WITH A WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

The individual Agency Evaluation Assessment Summaries included in the CD Appendix to this report represent the documented outcomes of the OSSC evaluation of each Agency's Workplace Diversity Program against the minimum requirements of Commissioner's Direction No. 3 (CD No. 3) and additional workplace diversity criteria.

Agencies in this category were:

Department of Economic Development and Tourism
 Department of Environment, Parks, Heritage and the Arts
 Department of Health and Human Services
 Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources
 Department of Justice
 Department of Police and Emergency Management
 Department of Primary Industry and Water
 Department of Treasury and Finance
 Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority
 TAFE Tasmania
 Tasmanian Audit Office
 The Public Trustee

9.1 ASSESSMENT CONTENT

Each individual Agency Evaluation Assessment contains information under the following headings:

- **Project Overview**

This provides a brief descriptive overview of the OSSC Workplace Diversity Program Evaluation in terms of background, objectives and methodology.

- **Agency Workplace Diversity Assessment**

This section provides an overview of each Agency's Workplace Diversity Program against the requirements set out in CD No. 3 and additional criteria drawn from the Commissioner's Guidelines for Implementing Workplace Diversity Program. The assessment outlines:

- **Key Positive Findings** – these are areas in the assessment where the Agency complies with CD No. 3.
- **Key Opportunities for Improvement** – these are areas in the assessment where the Agency did not comply with CD No. 3 or where the Agency has met the minimum standard but could potentially enhance its process.
- **Additional Workplace Diversity Criteria** – These additional criteria were included in the evaluation to explore further information on the implementation and operation of Agency workplace diversity programs. The majority of these additional criteria were drawn from the Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program attached to CD No. 3.

These comments are accompanied by an Agency Evaluation Assessment Sheet, which details the Agency's assessment against each of the compliance criteria from CD No. 3 and additional evaluation criteria.

10. INDIVIDUAL AGENCY EVALUATION SUMMARIES - AGENCIES WITHOUT AN ENDORSED WORKPLACE DIVERSITY PROGRAM

The individual Agency Response Summaries included in the CD Appendix to this report represent the documented outcomes of the OSSC evaluation of those Agencies without an endorsed Workplace Diversity Program (WDP), as at 30 June 2008.

Agencies in this category were:

Department of Education
Department of Premier and Cabinet

10.1 RESPONSE CONTENT

Each individual Agency Response Summary contains information under the following headings:

- **Project Overview**

This provides a brief descriptive overview of the OSSC Workplace Diversity Program Evaluation in terms of background, objectives and methodology.

- **Agency Response Summary**

This section provides an overview of each Agency's progress towards implementing a WDP, and provides opportunities for these Agencies to outline any workplace diversity activities that are already under way.

Each individual Agency Response Summary contains information under the following headings:

- **Overview**

This provides a brief summary of the Agency's WDP situation.

- **Progress**

This section outlines the progress being made by the Agency in planning, developing and implementing a WDP.

- **Current Activities**

This provides an outline of any existing performance management arrangements that may be operating within the Agency.

**APPENDIX 1 -
CD AND CD CONTENTS**

1. State Service Workplace Diversity Program Evaluation Report 2006
2. Commissioner's Direction No. 3 – Workplace Diversity
3. Commissioner's Guidelines for Implementing a Workplace Diversity Program
4. Agency Evaluation Summaries
 - Department of Economic Development and Tourism
 - Department of Environment, Parks, Heritage and the Arts
 - Department of Health and Human Services
 - Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources
 - Department of Justice
 - Department of Police and Emergency Management
 - Department of Primary Industries and Water
 - Department of Treasury and Finance
 - Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority
 - TAFE Tasmania
 - Tasmanian Audit Office
 - The Public Trustee
5. Agency Response Summaries
 - Department of Education
 - Department of Premier and Cabinet
6. State Service Principles
7. State Service Code of Conduct
8. State Service Commissioner's Annual Report 2007-2008





TASMANIA

Office of the State Service Commissioner

Level 2/144 Macquarie Street

GPO Box 621, Hobart 7001

Tasmania, Australia

Web: www.ossctas.gov.au

Phone: 03 6233 3637

Fax: 03 6233 2693

Email: ossctas@dpac.tas.gov.au