

**MINUTES**  
**Department of Health**  
**NWOW Steering Committee**

1.30 – 2.45, 27<sup>th</sup> March 2019  
Location: Scarborough House Level 14  
Executive Meeting Room 1

| MEMBER           | REPRESENTING   |
|------------------|--|
| Matt Yannopoulos | Chair - Chief Operating Officer (CO Group)                         |
| Tracey Duffy     | Medical Devices & Product Quality (HPR Group)                      |
| Celia Street     | Diagnostic Imaging & Pathology, Medical Benefits (HF Group)        |
| Lyndall Soper    | Population Health & Sport (PHSACQ Group)                           |
| Anthony Speed    | Compliance (A&AC Group)  |
| Charles Wann     | Financial Management (CO Group)                                    |
| Daniel McCabe    | Information Technology (CO Group)                                  |
| Rachel Balmanno  | People Communications & Parliamentary (CO Group)                   |
| Ariana King      | Senior Responsible Officer - Financial Business Support (CO Group) |
| Meredeth Taylor  | Indigenous Health (HSPPC Group) - Represented Mark Roddam          |
| <b>APOLOGIES</b> |  |
| Mark Roddam      | Indigenous Health (HSPPC Group)                                    |
| Chris Jeacle     | Rural Access, Health Workforce (CMO Group)                         |
| Tracey Duffy     | Medical Devices & Product Quality (HPR Group)                      |
| <b>OBSERVERS</b> |  |
|                  | Program Manager  |
|                  | Secretariat  |

**Agenda Item 1: Welcome**

- The Chair opened the meeting at 1:35pm
- The Chair welcomed members and briefly discussed the PM&C site visit, noting how useful the visit was and the Activity Base Working (ABW) style was not the only method that the department would use.
- Lyndall Soper thought PM&C was nicely branded.

**Agenda Item 2: Minutes and Actions of February Meeting**

- The Minutes were accepted
- The Actions Register was accepted
- The Terms of Reference was accepted

**Agenda Item 3: Risk Management – EY Facilitated Workshop**

s 47F from EY opened the discussion emphasising that the Committee should focus on managing the outcomes. From the workshop that was facilitated by EY the following changes were made to the NWOW Program Risk Review;

| Risk 1 – Appropriateness of Funding | Proposed Changes   |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Risk 6 Naming                       | Change to – Investment is insufficient to realise our vision   |
| Causes                              | No change  |
| Existing Controls                   | Add - Executive Board endorsement  |
| Treatments                          | Add on to #1 – allocate owners for all supporting activities with success linked to individual performance agreement. Change #3 – Take a whole-of-capability planning view, ensuring that ongoing arrangements are fully budgeted. Move - #4, better supporting Risks 4 & 5. Add – Determine the appropriate model to analyse financial requirements. Add – Seek |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
|              | additional funding through moderation process. Add - Conduct early estimation and financial monitoring process. |
| Risk Rating  | Severity - Drop rating to a lower level.  |
| Consequences | No change   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Risk 2 – Failure to inspire and create the vision of a new workplace environment</b> | <b>Proposed Changes</b>   |
| Risk 2 Naming   | No change   |
| Causes  | Add – MOG impacted staff (in/out)   |
| Existing Controls   | Add – Steering Committee is multi-representational from across the business. Add – Heavily engaging internal communication team that understands the department and therefore delivers good messaging. Add – Work place strategy is in development. Add – High level of staff interest in flexibility and change. Add – Experience centre   |
| Treatments  | Change #1 to – Develop an agreed and detailed Program plan and schedule. #3 Change dot point to – A comprehensive change management plan that addresses different working styles. – A stakeholder engagement plan to determine what is important to consult. – Flexible to adapt for new cohorts (i.e. triggered by MoG). Change #4 – Utilise lessons learned from other agencies / organisations in both public and private sectors. |
| Risk Rating   | Consequence & Severity – drop to lower level  |
| Consequences  | No change   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Risk 3 – Leadership behaviours will not support the change</b> | <b>Proposed Changes</b>   |
| Risk 3 Naming   | No change   |
| Causes  | No change   |
| Existing Controls   | Add – Ongoing Senior Executive Service (SES) performance measurement and leadership process.  |
| Treatments  | Take out # 4. Add – Conduct positive engagement with the First Assistant Secretaries, and up. Add - activate SES performance framework. Add – Engage the Secretary in a targeted approach, including - Learning forward to drive change - Setting leadership priorities and expectations. |
| Risk Rating   | No change   |
| Consequences  | No change   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Risk 4 – Governance arrangements are ineffective</b> | <b>Proposed Changes</b>  |
| Risk 4 Naming   | No change  |
| Causes  | No change  |
| Existing Controls                                       | Take out #2 as this is a treatment. Add - Seeking independent program advice and assurance.  |
| Treatments  | Take out 3 & 4. Add – Interdependency management with other projects and initiatives. Add – Although governance arrangements currently exist, the establishment of a more developed plan for future governance arrangements is required. |
| Risk Rating   | No change  |
| Consequences  | No change  |

| <b>Risk 5 – Department's readiness and preparedness to implement the change</b> | <b>Proposed Changes</b>  |
|---|--|
| Risk 5 Naming   | No change  |
| Causes  | No change  |
| Existing Controls   | Add – Training for all staff/L&D   |
| Treatments  | Add – Application of the SES cohort to manage change. Add – A comprehensive change management plan that addresses different working styles. Add – A positive communication plan. |
| Risk Rating   | No change  |
| Consequences  | No change  |

| <b>Risk 6 – The Department fails to embed the New Ways of Working</b> | <b>Proposed Changes</b>  |
|---|--|
| Risk 1 Naming   | No change  |
| Causes  | No change  |
| Existing Controls   | Add – Experimentation and use of Experience Centre   |
| Treatments  | Add – Identify the follow-on / champion as the Program progresses, and allocate owners for all supporting activities with success linked to individual performance agreements. Add – Articulation of benefits to enable the Department to embed the New Ways of Working Program. Add – Develop a positive communication plan. Add – be realistic with the workforce and allow time to realise benefits and conduct continuous improvement. Add – Drive experimentation and continuous improvement process. |
| Risk Rating   | No change  |
| Consequences  | No change  |

#### **Agenda Item 4: Revised Guiding Principles**

- The Program Manager discussed the revised Guiding Principles, noting that the Departments Teleworking Policy and Hours of Work & Flexibility Policy should align.
- Points from discussion regarding the first section of the Guiding Principles '*What is the 'New Ways of Working' program?*'
  - Daniel McCabe suggested getting some insights onto how they would like to work and have a caveat put in - that this is something we need to work through.
  - Lyndall Soper commented that it sounds too fluffy, it should be articulated as to why we are doing this and should have a harder edge.
  - Charles Wann commented on stating some positives such as the Sirius Building is at end of life and savings will be made by shutting down Scarborough.
  - The Chair suggested obtaining his speaking notes on the NWOW that he gave to the Secretary to help with the wording.
- It was decided to reframe '*What is the 'New Ways of Working' program?*' to become '*Why New Ways of Working?*' based on the talking points.
- The '*Principles to guide program implementation*' section was accepted by the Committee.

### **Agenda Item 5: Overview of Design Phase Plan**

- The Program Manager updated the Committee on the Formation Phase with the following;
  - The Change and Communications specialist started on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2019.
  - The EL2 Program Manager interviews were taking place on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2019.
  - The EL1 recruitment was being finalised.
- The Program Manager gave an overview of the Design Phase Plan noting that the Workplace Strategy and Design request for tender (RFT) was published on AusTender on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019 with a closing date of 16<sup>th</sup> April 2019.
- The following points from the discussion were;
  - Lyndall Soper requested that the Workplace Strategy include relevant examples of both government and private sites.
  - Charles Wann suggested that the final two respondents present to the Committee.
  - Charles Wann noted in regards to Teleworking, there is a possibility of creating a 'Government Hub' in Scarborough House to enable other government departments to come in and use the space, which will give the department an opportunity to generate revenue.
  - The Chair noted that the Executive move will be part of the standard program.
  - Charles Wann noted in regards to the budget/finance for the Program, the timing for requests are Moderation, which is due by the 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2019 and the second being in June 2019.

### **Agenda Item 6: Summary of Actions**

- Not discussed

### **Agenda Item 7: Next Meeting**

- 17<sup>th</sup> April 2019
- The Program Manager noted that Jodie Grieve will no longer present to the Committee at the April meeting in regards to the Experience Centre, this has been moved to the May 8<sup>th</sup> committee meeting.
- The Committee agreed to a discussion at the April meeting on what the committee members would like to see in future meetings.
- The Chair closed the meeting at 2.44.