

# Review of PSEMA

## Feedback from staff and managers in Department of Planning and Infrastructure

### Comment

- There is a lot of reference in the commentary to let managers manage, in reality there is still far too much requiring approval of the CPE.
- There is no specific reference to GBD's.
- The legislation doesn't reflect the need of Government to be more responsive in the recruitment process particularly in the current climate where there is so much difficulty in getting people. Need to be able to offer 12 month contracts.
- May be an issue for the regulations/bylaws but there needs to be a way around continual HDA in other agencies.
- Needs to be a way of preventing people who play the system with continual promotion appeals.
- The grievance process is far too long and there is no right of appeal when OCPE make their decision.

Regarding the review of PSEMA the following areas need to be considered to facilitate appropriate management of underperformance:

- Currently the Act outlines actions under inability which are largely focussed on the fact that a CEO can take action if an employee is not performing their duty appropriately, but this is at the wrong end of the situation. The Act needs to look at making provision for underperformance and management thereof. For example the Act needs to consider enabling (with appeal processes) the management of underperformance through restriction of automatic progression through increments and possibly demoting people in cases where it is warranted. The current management of underperformance is incredibly difficult and promotes mediocrity to some degree.
- It has been raised previously that the reason we can't have proper performance management in the NTPS is because there are few consequences for underperformance. Rather than letting it get to the extreme of firing someone, we should be able to have mechanisms to manage these situations so they don't get to that stage.