



Submission to the Independent Review of the Australian Public Service

July 2018

Professor Deborah Blackman, Associate Professor Helen Dickinson, Dr Karen Gardner,
Dr Fiona Buick, Dr Samantha Johnson and Dr Sue Olney
Public Service Research Group, School of Business, UNSW Canberra¹

About us

The Public Service Research Group at UNSW Canberra has a strong track record of research into public services in Australia and overseas, covering various aspects of public sector management, delivery of public services and the implementation of public policy.

Professor Deborah Blackman's² research interests include public sector policy implementation, systems level change, employee performance management, organisational learning, soft knowledge management, organisational effectiveness, psychological contract, and governance, and she was the lead researcher on a joint collaborative project with the Australian Public Service Commission on *Strengthening the Performance Framework*.³ Associate Professor Helen Dickinson⁴ has published widely on governance, leadership, commissioning and priority setting and decision-making in public services, is co-editor of the *Journal of Health, Organization and Management* and the *Australian Journal of Public Administration* and a Victorian Fellow of the Institute of Public Administration Australia, and has worked with all levels of government, community organisations and private organisations in Australia, UK, New Zealand and Europe on research and consultancy programmes. Dr Karen Gardner's⁵ research focuses on the implementation of continuous quality improvement programs, primary care performance measurement and commissioning processes, and the evaluation of complex health interventions. Dr Fiona Buick's⁶ research focus is the role of organisational culture, strategic human resource management and human resource management in enabling group and organisational effectiveness within the public sector, as well as the dynamics involved in structural change and intra- and inter-organisational joining-up, highlighting tensions between informal and formal institutional practices. Dr Samantha Johnson⁷ has extensive experience consulting to government on public sector management, performance and leadership and in management and leadership capability development, and her research interests include public sector performance, management and leadership capability development, and strategic organisational behaviour. Dr Sue Olney's⁸ research examines the impact of marketisation of public services on public sector managers, service providers and citizens, and practical challenges in implementing public policy.

¹ <https://www.unsw.adfa.edu.au/public-service-research-group/>

² <https://research.unsw.edu.au/people/professor-deborah-blackman>

³ http://www.apsc.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/56507/Performance_accessible.pdf

⁴ <https://www.unsw.adfa.edu.au/school-of-business/associate-professor-helen-dickinson>

⁵ <https://research.unsw.edu.au/people/dr-karen-gardner>

⁶ <https://research.unsw.edu.au/people/dr-fiona-buick>

⁷ <https://research.unsw.edu.au/people/dr-samantha-j-johnson>

⁸ <https://research.unsw.edu.au/people/dr-sue-olney>

Summary

We welcome the opportunity to contribute to this review examining the capability, culture and operating model of the APS. Under five headings – **Middle Manager Capability, Navigating the 4th Industrial Revolution, Performance Measurement, Delivering Fair Outcomes for Citizens** and **Rethinking Machinery of Government Changes** - our submission addresses the following aspects of the review:

- driving innovation and productivity in the economy
- delivering high quality policy advice, regulatory oversight, programs and services
- tackling complex, multi-sectoral challenges in collaboration with the community, business and citizens
- improving citizens' experience of government and delivering fair outcomes for them
- acquiring and maintaining the necessary skills and expertise to fulfil its responsibilities

Our recommendations in brief:

1. There is a need to rethink not only the types of skills required for middle managers from 'hard' to 'soft' skills, but also the way that such skills should be identified, developed, embedded and modelled in the APS so that they become habitual.
2. The APS should develop more effective skills and approaches to considering what the implications of new technologies might be and guard against these disadvantaging particular groups.
3. A critical appraisal of the data, motivations, rewards systems and techniques that underpin different performance measurement approaches and the system architecture and processes needed to advance implementation is needed. The APS should adopt a pragmatic approach that facilitates accountability and improvement at multiple levels.
4. The APS must find a way to ensure citizens enjoy the benefits of market approaches to delivering public services while protecting those vulnerable to market-produced inequities. Institutional architecture created to produce public value can be both a barrier to defining policy problems, and to collaborating across government departments, tiers of government and sectors and with citizens to address those problems.
5. Machinery of government changes should be implemented sparingly. However, when they are considered necessary to achieving desired outcomes, APS departments should: establish an integration team that focuses exclusively on developing and implementing integration strategies; communicate information about changes more clearly and effectively to the workforce; provide opportunities for cross-departmental interaction; focus on enhancing cultural learning across the relevant departments; and ensure that individuals and groups within combined functions / departments are formally developed, mentored and resourced to undertake intra-departmental boundary spanning roles.

Middle Manager Capability

When considering the scope of the review it is clear that, although there will be some technical issues affecting long term choices and outcomes, the factor that will make the biggest contribution is achieving high performance through the capacity, capability and skills of employees. This will be important at all levels, but we suggest that an area that needs particular consideration is the middle management cohort.

Much has been written about the need for effective senior leadership, and we would endorse this requirement. However, we suggest that a major issue for the current APS is developing a highly effective middle manager cohort and one which is able to effectively support change. Recent research by Buick, Blackman and Johnson⁹ suggests that change management could be improved through middle managers actively undertaking a change intermediary role where they make sense of the change intent, operationalise it, and provide role clarity for employees. Doing so enables employees to make sense of, reframe and implement the change. Adopting a change intermediary role would not only reduce resistance to change, but support the introduction and adoption of innovation. However, the research showed that, although the importance of middle managers is recognised, many have undertaken inadequate development, particularly prior to becoming a middle manager, to adequately prepare them for this role.

A common approach by many APS organisations is to look for superstar employees through talent management policies; these employees are then given many development opportunities. Those identified as underperforming are also targeted for development. However, in many cases, the majority of employees who are performing at level – so are neither superstars nor underperforming - are left to “muddle through”. They might be offered “acting” opportunities, but the efficacy of these is very dependent on others taking an active interest in ensuring that learning actually takes place during the acting period. For this to happen, the incumbent of the management role (who is often the person away) and the person to whom they are now reporting, albeit temporarily, must work together to ensure this is a learning activity. This relates to another issue identified in our research – that for the 70:20:10 learning and development framework, which is widely used across the APS, to be effective and enable capability development - social learning needs to act as an integrative mechanism of formal and experiential learning (see Blackman et al. 2016¹⁰). It is well established that formal training has a number of inherent limitations; while some core skills can be transferred and integrated into work relatively easily, more complex tacit knowledge – such as people management - is harder to develop and to transfer, particularly in the government sector (see Awoniyi et al., 2002; Kirwan & Birchall, 2006; McCracken, Brown, & O’Kane, 2012¹¹). Therefore, organisations need to actively support their employees in applying and implementing their new knowledge. This requires adequate development of senior managers and middle managers to act as mentors and coaches. We suggest that, as a part of the review, there needs to be a rethinking of not only the types of skills required from ‘hard’ to ‘soft’¹² but also the way that such skills should be identified, developed, embedded and role modelled so that they become habitual.

A key issue in this will be allocating and enforcing accountability for identifying (a) what skills are needed; (b) who makes sure the skills are acquired; and (c) who ensures acquired skills are embedded into everyday work practices. To date, it appears that many managers and leaders do not see employee

⁹ Buick, F., Blackman, D. and Johnson, S. (2018) Enabling Middle Managers as Change Agents: Why Organisational Support Needs to Change. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77(2): 222-235, DOI: 10.1111/1467-8500.12293.

¹⁰ Blackman, D., Johnson, S., Buick, F., Faifua, D., O'Donnell, M. and Forsythe, M. (2016) The 70:20:10 model for learning and development: an effective model for capability development? *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*. 2016 (1): <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/ambpp.2016.10745abstract>.

¹¹ Awoniyi, E.A., Griego, O.V., & Morgan, G.A. (2002) Person-environment fit and transfer of training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 6(1), 25-35. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2419.00147; Kirwan, C., & Birchall, D. (2006) Transfer of learning from management development programmes: Testing the Holton model. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 10(4), 252-268. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2419.2006.00259.x; McCracken, M., Brown, T.C., & O’Kane, P. (2012) Swimming against the current: Understanding how a positive organisational training climate can enhance training participation and transfer in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 25(4), 301-316. DOI: 10.1108/09513551211244124

¹² Dickinson, H., Sullivan, H. and Head, G. (2015) The future of the public service workforce: A dialogue. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 74, 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12143>.

capability development as a core part of their role. An over-focus on technical skills during recruitment processes serves to embed this problem, with people management seen as an add-on, rather than as a core job responsibility.

It seems to us that anything the APS is trying to achieve – i.e. driving innovation; increasing productivity; delivering high quality policy advice, regulatory oversight, programs and services; tackling complex, multi-sectoral challenges in collaboration with the community, business and citizens; and/or improving citizens' experiences of government and delivering fair outcomes for them - will require organisations to support their managers at all levels to acquire and embed suitable skills so that they feel empowered, able to make decisions and undertake their roles effectively.

Navigating the 4th Industrial Revolution

The theme of technology and how this will change the way in which the APS operates and the skills and capabilities required is a key theme of the review. There are significant developments underway in fields such as robotics, artificial intelligence, additive manufacturing (3D printing), virtual reality and blockchain that hold the potential to make a significant impact on public services and public service delivery. However, this impact will be contingent on the ability of the APS to be ready to adapt to these technologies and to have the capability to work with others in readying the public service sector to adopt these in a fair and ethical manner. For all of the positive factors that these technologies bring, they also have the potential to bring with them negative impacts.

One of the challenges in facing these new technologies is the readiness for change within the APS. The Public Service Research Group is currently undertaking research into robotics in care services (funded by the Australia and New Zealand School of Government) and the study will report later this year with data from interviews being currently analysed. The early indications of this study suggest that many parts of the APS (and public services more broadly) are ill-prepared for the changes that growing use of these technologies will bring. Many interviewees who we spoke to in the APS suggest that as yet thinking has been limited in terms of the types of changes that will be required and a lack of foresight given to the potential implications of these technologies. Interviews revealed perspectives suggesting that many areas of the APS are waiting for technologies to develop further and become more embedded before being widely used. This situation is problematic for at least two reasons.

Firstly, it is well established in the literature that the Australian public service faces a challenge in respect to policy implementation.¹³ Some of the reason for this relates to the types of assumptions that are made about implementation processes. Work needs to be done to ensure that public service organisations have the skills and capabilities to implement and adjust for technological developments. That this is a challenge already with respect to 4th industrial revolution technologies is indicated in the fact that despite being world leading in many areas of cyber-physical systems research, Australia ranks 18th in the world in application of industrial robots, with 50% fewer firms engaged in automation compared to leading countries.¹⁴

Secondly and more importantly, failing to carefully consider these technologies may mean that important factors are not considered until there is a public outcry over an issue. Many of these technologies have potential implications in terms of the ways in which services are currently regulated. For example, in relation to 3D printing, Dickinson¹⁵ argues that these technologies raise a series of dilemmas for policy makers in terms of the role of government, how regulation is operated and intellectual property is managed. If these issues are not resolved before the widespread use of these technologies, then it is likely that we will see a number of incidents emerge that focus attention on these issues. Developing the capacity and capabilities to deal with new technologies will require significant engagement with a wide range of different stakeholders.

¹³ Moon, Dickinson & Blackman (2017) Not another review about implementation? Reframing the research agenda. Issues paper no 1. Public Service Research Group: Canberra.

¹⁴ Australian Centre for Robotic Vision (2018) A robotics roadmap for Australia. QUT.

¹⁵ Dickinson (forthcoming) The next industrial revolution? The role of public administration in supporting government to oversee 3D printing technologies. *Public Administration Review*.

As outlined above, as well as bringing many positives, there is the potential for these technologies to have some negative and potentially damaging implications and it is important that these are considered in detail and before they are rolled out in a more substantive way. Many of these technologies have the potential to create new forms of data about individuals and much of this may be highly sensitive in nature. This new class of data has the potential to be used by corporations in ways that disadvantage individuals.¹⁶ Moreover, many of these technologies have the potential to exacerbate current disadvantage and inequalities.¹⁷ The APS therefore needs to develop more effective skills and approaches to considering what the implications of technologies might be and guard against these disadvantaging particular groups.

Performance Measurement

Performance measurement is a central feature of modern public administration used by governments across the world to enhance accountability for outcomes and drive improvements in service delivery¹⁸. The deployment and use of performance data together with other incentives in performance management systems enables governments to adopt arms-length regulatory approaches to managing public services as they move to more market based delivery^{19 20}. Performance management is increasingly used by governments to achieve external accountability for outcomes and internally by services to generate formative data for quality improvement²¹.

Research suggests that implementation of these systems is highly context dependent and the extent to which different approaches can be implemented by governments varies according to the pre-existing relationships and policy levers within individual systems. There is evidence that assurance approaches which use performance data together with financial incentives such as pay-for-performance are associated with unintended consequences including gaming, measurement fixation and tunnel vision in healthcare²² and may undermine professional motivations and trust²³ which inhibits collaboration needed to ensure integrated high-quality services. For these reasons, governments are moving to adopt more hybrid approaches, aligning different accountability mechanisms, both 'soft' and 'hard' to drive improvement across public services²⁴. These include continuous quality improvement networks and professional approaches that leverage provider legitimacy and authority for using data to achieve desired outcomes; and assurance approaches using public reporting, financial incentives and contractual mechanisms as the stimulus for change.

Our research in health and social care²⁵ suggests that Australia's approach has focused on the development of performance indicators without due consideration of the ways in which these can be used to achieve desired outcomes, nor to the alignment of different approaches to develop and embed a comprehensive and flexible approach to performance management. A critical appraisal of the

¹⁶ Nguyen & Solomon (2018) Consumer data and the digital economy. Consumer Policy Research Centre: Melbourne

¹⁷ Australian Human Rights Commission (2018) Human Rights and technology issues paper. Australian Human Rights Commission: Sydney.

¹⁸ Pollitt, C. Performance management in practice: A comparative study of executive agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 2006;16(1), 25–44.

¹⁹ Bouckaert G, Peters G. Performance Measurement and Management: The Achilles' Heel in Administrative Modernization. *Public Performance and Management Review* 2002;25(4).

²⁰ Henman P. Performing the state: the socio-political dimensions of performance measurement in policy and public services, *Policy Studies*, 2016: 37;6, 499-507, DOI: 10.1080/01442872.2016.1144739

²¹ . Freeman T: Using performance indicators to improve health care quality in the public sector: a review of the literature. *Health Services Management Research*. 2002, 15: 126-137.

²² Mannion R, Braithwaite J. Unintended consequences of performance measurement in healthcare: 20 salutary lessons from the English National Health Service. 2012
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1445-5994.2012.02766.x>

²³ . Harrison S, Smith C. Trust and moral motivation: redundant resources in health and social care? *Policy Polit*. 2004;32:371–386.

²⁴ Tenbensel, T. G., & Burau, V. Contrasting approaches to primary care performance governance in Denmark and New Zealand. *Health Policy*, 2017;121 (8), 853-861. DOI 10.1016/j.healthpol.2017.05.013 URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/2292/36738>

²⁵ Gardner K, Olney S, Dickinson H. Understanding tensions in the use of data in assurance and improvement oriented performance management systems to improve their implementation. Forthcoming

motivations, rewards systems and techniques that underpin different approaches, and the kind of data, system architecture and processes needed to advance implementation and increase adaptive capacity for change is needed. We recommend the APS adopt a pragmatic approach that facilitates accountability and improvement at multiple levels if government is to realise the potential of performance measurement systems, particularly as the availability and use of different types of data expands rapidly into the future.

Delivering Fair Outcomes for Citizens

The Australian government is tackling increasingly complex, multi-sectoral challenges in a constantly shifting environment. This calls for sophisticated understanding within the APS of the local, national, regional, and global factors that can impact on delivery of public policy outcomes, the strategic environment in which public sector employees and agents operate, and the relationships needed to achieve complex policy goals. In recent years, the government's default position to achieve fair outcomes for citizens in this environment has been to embrace private sector style approaches to designing and delivering public services, with the aim of being more responsive, accountable and efficient. This includes expanding public service markets, through commissioning, competitive tendering or personalised budgets, intended to promote efficacy and efficiency through competition, and to cater to citizens' diverse needs and circumstances.²⁶ Yet research shows that while some citizens benefit from these approaches, others are marginalised²⁷. Factors that drive inequalities, such as age, gender, level of education, disability, health, access to technology, socioeconomic status, residential location and household structure, emerge as clear fault lines in systems underpinned by these principles and as previously noted, digital government can exacerbate this.²⁸ The flow-on costs of this inequity ripple across government and the community.

Institutional architecture created to produce public value²⁹ can be both a barrier to defining policy problems³⁰, and to collaborating across government departments, tiers of government and sectors and with citizens to address those problems. The skill sets needed for the public service workforce to negotiate and build shared priorities and values in this environment of competing interests include technical skills, professional skills, and relational skills.³¹ They entail a shift from authority to diplomacy and pragmatism, balancing accountability with experimentation, recognising that context matters, understanding that diversity is crucial to design and implement fair policy, and clear-eyed appraisal of citizens' experience of government across a broad spectrum of needs and circumstances. To fulfil the social contract between government and citizens, the APS must find a way to ensure citizens enjoy the benefits of market models while protecting those vulnerable to market-produced inequities.³²

Rethinking machinery of government changes

The APS review aims to ensure the APS is fit-for-purpose to meet challenges of the future. Key to this is, amongst other things, the capacity and capability of the APS to meet core responsibilities and deliver functions, with a focus on efficiency, effectiveness, improving citizens' experience of government and being an 'employer of choice'. We argue, however, that a major impediment to achieving these

²⁶ Carey G, Dickinson H, Malbon E & Reeders D (2018) 'The Vexed Question of Market Stewardship in the Public Sector: Examining Equity and the Social Contract through the Australian National Disability Insurance Scheme', *Social Policy and Administration*, vol. 52, pp. 387 - 407, 10.1111/spol.12321

²⁷ Smyth P, Malbon E and Carey G (eds) (2016) *Social Service Futures and the Productivity Commission* UNSW Canberra <http://www.powertopersuade.org.au/social-services-futures/>

²⁸ Australian Human Rights Commission (2018) Human Rights and technology issues paper. Australian Human Rights Commission: Sydney.

²⁹ Moore, M (1995) *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government* Harvard University Press

³⁰ Bacchi, C (2009) *Analysing policy: what's the problem represented to be?* Pearson Education, Frenchs Forest

³¹ Dickinson H, Needham C, Mangan, C and Sullivan H (eds) (forthcoming) *Re-imagining the future public service workforce*; Needham, C and Mangan, C (2014) *The 21st Century Public Servant* University of Birmingham <https://21stcenturypublicservant.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/21-century-report-281014.pdf>

³² Carey G, Malbon E, Olney S & Reeders D (2018) 'The personalisation agenda: the case of the Australian National Disability Insurance Scheme', *International Review of Sociology*, vol. 28:1, pp. 20-34, DOI: 10.1080/03906701.2018.1425084

aspirations is the reliance on structural change as a mechanism for achieving supposed gains, such as governmental policy priorities, and improved coordination, effectiveness and efficiency.

Our research into machinery of government (MoG) changes suggests that they are frequently enacted but poorly implemented and are, therefore, unlikely to deliver on anticipated gains. Our research demonstrates that many MoG changes are highly disruptive, particularly when they involve functions / departments with fundamentally different organisational cultures and they are implemented within a short timeframe.³³ Many MoG changes are implemented in relatively short timeframes, with public servants claiming that inadequate time is devoted to planning, ensuring cultural fit between functions / departments, and implementing the change effectively.³⁴ This means that not only are functions / departments merged that are culturally incompatible, but departments are provided with inadequate time to work through critical differences and establish a plan for how to effectively integrate different cultures. As a result, they are unable to provide sufficient consideration to how to establish mechanisms to facilitate integration across disparate groups, often leading to these groups operating in isolation to one another and, therefore, not achieving the anticipated gains.³⁵ Our research also suggests that these issues are exacerbated for those working in 'support' functions, such as finance, IT and human resources, as this is where personnel are combined and departmental differences in policies, processes, cultures, managerial approaches and so on are most stark. Finally, our research also indicates that the period of disruption and dysfunction from structural change can be long-lived, due to insufficient time to develop practices to overcome dysfunction induced by structural change.³⁶ This is particularly a problem when departments undergo multiple MoG changes within a short period as they do not have sufficient time to recover from each change before embarking on a new one. Overall, our research indicates that the disruptive nature of many MoG changes undermine the capacity and capability of the APS to meet core responsibilities and deliver functions in an efficient and effective manner.

Our research supports findings from the UK that structural changes are highly disruptive.³⁷ They are often associated with high transition costs associated with staff being distracted from daily operational business as they change jobs, re-locate and develop new standard operating procedures.³⁸ These issues are often exacerbated due to the insufficient time allocated to planning and implementing the changes, with little time devoted to longer term issues such as synergy identification, corporate planning, and how to establish effective human resources, operations, and finance functions.³⁹ Finally, and most concerning, a study in the UK also found that structural changes are expensive, estimating that establishing a new department costs at least £15m in the first year alone.⁴⁰ High costs often emerge as a result of needing to cover additional resourcing (people and facilities), productivity losses and pay settlements.⁴¹ We have been unable to find comparable figures in the APS, but nonetheless cite this study to highlight the costly nature of MoG changes.

³³ Buick, F., Carey, G. and Pescud, M. (2018). 'Structural Changes to the Public Sector and Cultural Incompatibility: The Consequences of Inadequate Cultural Integration'. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77(1): 50–68 doi:10.1111/1467-8500.12262.

³⁴ *ibid*

³⁵ *ibid*

³⁶ Carey, G., Buick, F. and Malbon, E. (2017). 'The Unintended Consequences of Structural Change: When Formal and Informal Institutions Collide in Efforts to Address Wicked Problems', *International Journal of Public Administration*, DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2017.1350708.

³⁷ Andrews, R. and Boyne, G. (2012). 'Structural Change and Public Service Performance: The Impact of the Reorganization Process in English Local Government'. *Public Administration*, 90(2): 297–312. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01956.x.

³⁸ Pollitt, C. (2007). 'New Labour's Redisorganization: Hyper-Modernism and the Costs of Reform – A Cautionary Tale'. *Public Management Review*, 9(4): 529 – 543. DOI: 10.1080/14719030701726663

³⁹ White, A. and Dunleavy, P. (2010). *Making and breaking Whitehall departments: a guide to machinery of government changes*. Institute for Government; LSE Public Policy Group, London, UK. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/27949/>.

⁴⁰ *ibid*

⁴¹ Andrews, R. and Boyne, G. (2012). 'Structural Change and Public Service Performance: The Impact of the Reorganization Process in English Local Government'. *Public Administration*, 90(2): 297–312. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01956.x; White, A. and Dunleavy, P. (2010). *Making and breaking Whitehall departments: a guide to machinery of government changes*. Institute for Government; LSE Public Policy Group, London, UK. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/27949/>.

Based on our own research – and that of other academics - we recommend that the government and APS only initiate MoG changes when it is absolutely necessary for achieving desired outcomes. In doing so, we recommend that the government and the senior executive service (SES) within the APS consider if there are other mechanisms that could be pursued to achieve the desired outcomes. For example, if the aim is to enhance greater inter-departmental working, then consideration could be devoted to the likelihood of other mechanisms achieving the same objective. It is recognised that coordination and collaboration occur along a continuum of activities, ranging from informal and intermittent (cooperation), to more formalized, yet short-term (coordination) to more formalized, long-term and integrated (collaboration) arrangements (see, for example, Keast, Brown and Mandell 2007⁴²). Thus, consideration could be devoted to whether the anticipated gains could be better achieved through cooperation, coordination (i.e. inter-departmental committees and working groups, taskforces etc.) and/or collaboration (i.e. joint teams).

When it is determined that a MoG change is, in fact, necessary then we suggest more time is devoted to the planning process. Planning should include an assessment of likely complementarities and incompatibilities, highlighting potential problematic areas. Then attention should be devoted to how to enhance integration across merged entities. We outline our recommendations for APS departments in detail in Buick, Carey and Pescud (2018)⁴³, but in brief they include:

- Establishing an integration team that focuses exclusively on developing and implementing integration strategies;
- Devoting closer attention to effective communication to enable employee understanding of the rationale for the change, anticipated benefits, and the desired new organisational identity;
- Utilising performance management to support employees through the change process in order to provide role clarity;
- Providing opportunities and forums for employees from the different groups to engage in dialogue, and share ideas, learnings and knowledge; and
- Focusing on enhancing cultural learning across the organisation through being able to discuss differences and synergies, establish a better understanding of how the groups could enhance cooperation and work together.

Finally, we also recommend that the SES within APS departments ensure that individuals and groups within the combined functions / departments are adequately developed and supported to undertake intra-departmental boundary spanning roles. These activities may involve creating dedicated boundary spanning roles where individuals and groups work across structural, cultural and/or functional boundaries. We suggest these individuals and groups should be formally developed, mentored and provided with adequate resources to undertake their roles.⁴⁴

⁴² Keast, R., Brown, K. and Mandell, M. (2007). 'Getting the Right Mix: Unpacking Integration Meanings and Strategies', *International Public Management Journal*, 10(1): 9-33.

⁴³ Buick, F., Carey, G. and Pescud, M. (2018). 'Structural Changes to the Public Sector and Cultural Incompatibility: The Consequences of Inadequate Cultural Integration'. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77(1): 50–68 doi:10.1111/1467-8500.12262

⁴⁴ Carey, G., Buick, F., Pescud, E. and Malbon, E. (2017). 'Preventing Dysfunction and Improving Policy Advice: The Role of Intra-Departmental Boundary Spanners', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 76(2): 176-186. DOI:10.1111/1467-8500.12213.