

## Proposal 2 Secretaries Board driving outcomes across government and APS performance: comments.

The APS Review invites people to “visit our [website](#), challenge our assumptions, test our thinking, and have your say.” This invitation is severely qualified by the structure of the website which channels comments into five (5) categories (Box 1),

Box 1. Screenshot < <https://www.apsreview.gov.au/>> as at 19<sup>th</sup> April 2019.

# INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC SERVICE

## YOUR IDEAS

### BUILD A FLEXIBLE OPERATING MODEL

"Design thinking needs to be integrated into all APS work. A 'head of design' is not a bad idea..."

ENGAGE NOW >

### CULTURE, GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP MODEL

"I wonder whether it would be good for the APS as a whole to have a more explicit and qualitative governance framework..."

ENGAGE NOW >

### CULTURE, GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP MODEL

"It would be beneficial to strengthen the language around measurement in the recommendation and the report..."

ENGAGE NOW >

### INVEST IN CAPABILITY AND TALENT DEVELOPMENT

"While some cultures are positive, it depends upon the senior leader..."

ENGAGE NOW >

### BUILD A FLEXIBLE OPERATING MODEL

"It would be useful to do more thinking on what collective ownership of outcomes or delivery looks like and if it works..."

ENGAGE NOW >

## LATEST NEWS

### FEATURED



## PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE

News, 19 March 2019

A trusted APS, united in serving all Australians.



### LET'S TALK ABOUT CHANGE



### BEHIND THE SCENES OF THE AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC SERVICE



### GAUGING THE MIND AND MOOD OF THE APS



### AMBITIOUS CHANGE FOR AUSTRALIA'S PUBLIC SERVICE

## KEY FIGURES

**552**

comments & counting

**536**

workshops attendees

**102**

roundtable attendees

**719**

submissions

Comment on Proposal 2, APS Review ***Priorities for change*** by Ken Coghill.

Our comments will go to broader, over-arching issues which do not fit neatly into these proposals but are fundamental to ensuring that “**the Australian Public Service is fit-for-purpose in the decades ahead**”<sup>1</sup> and answering the three (3) questions:

- How can we strengthen each proposal?
- What are we missing?
- How do we ensure lasting change?<sup>2</sup>

Somewhat confusingly each webpage opens to a proposal with a title different from that of the webpage. Further adding to confusion is the incomplete correspondence between the four (4) Priorities listed in the text:

- ❖ ***Strengthen the culture, governance and leadership model***
- ❖ ***Build a flexible APS operating model***
- ❖ ***Invest in capability and talent development***
- ❖ ***Develop stronger internal and external partnerships***

and five (5) proposals:

- **Build a flexible operating model** (Networked enabling systems and common processes across the service)
- **Secretaries Board driving outcomes across government and APS performance** (Culture, governance and leadership model)
- **Genuine transparency and accountability for delivering outcomes for Australians** (Culture, governance and leadership model)
- **Empowered managers accountable for developing people and teams** (Invest in capability and talent development)
- **Dynamic ways of working and structures to empower individuals and teams – making collaboration the norm** (Build a flexible operating model)

These comments are submitted to each of the proposals but should be accepted as relating to broader, over-arching issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> Message from the chair, *Priorities for change* p. ii.

<sup>2</sup> *Priorities for change* p. 23

Comment on Proposal 2, APS Review **Priorities for change** by Ken Coghill.

**Comments on proposal: Secretaries Board driving outcomes across government and APS performance** (Culture, governance and leadership model)

The responses in respect of the second Proposal are summarised in Box 2 and discussed in the following narrative.

Box 2. Summary of responses to questions

Question	Response
How can this proposal be strengthened?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rigorous process for senior appointments to the APS, including boards, should be spelled out and recommended</li> </ul>
What is missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rigorous process for senior appointments to the APS, including boards,</li> <li>• Recommendations for the structure and operation of the process.</li> </ul>
How can lasting change be ensured?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rigorous process should be entrenched in legislation, with a requirements to report to parliament annually and on breaches of the provisions,</li> <li>• Mandatory reporting of suspected breaches to ACLEI (or the proposed Commonwealth/National Integrity Commission).</li> </ul>

**Appointments of agency heads**

It is in the interests of good governance that members of the political executive receive short-lists of candidates for appointment from among applicants who have been found to have the best knowledge, skills and abilities relevant to the requirements of each position.

Such shortlists should be prepared by one or more appointments commission(s) acting under the authority of an Appointments Commissioner.

The Prime Minister’s legislated role to make recommendations to the Governor-General should be retained.

This model would both protect the integrity of the APS and shield ministers from risks of making ill-informed and/or misguided appointments.

This suggests a model similar to the UK model but having regard to other models such as the New Zealand model, to which **Priorities for Change** referred.

....

**Implications for Proposal: Secretaries Board driving outcomes across government and APS performance** (Culture, governance and leadership model)

Question	Response
How can this proposal be strengthened?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rigorous process for senior appointments to the APS, including boards, should be spelled out and recommended</li> </ul>
What is missing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rigorous process for senior appointments to the APS, including boards,</li> <li>• Recommendations for the structure and operation of the process.</li> </ul>
How can lasting change be ensured?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rigorous process should be entrenched in legislation, with requirements to report to parliament annually and on breaches of the provisions,</li> <li>• Mandatory reporting of suspected breaches to ACLEI (or the proposed Commonwealth/National Integrity Commission).</li> </ul>