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This report includes:

- an overall picture of the Defence workforce which sets out demographics for the current profile (see Defence gender picture on page 15)

- summaries of the findings of various forms of consultations (see page 32) including:
  - internal and external focus groups
  - a pulse survey
  - submissions
  - interview summaries

- best practice research (see Best practice research on page 43)

- description of the vision and actions for the future (see page 49), leading into the six themes and recommendations (see pages 50 to 60)

- an implementation timeline (see Timeline on page 62)

- attachments covering External and internal consultation (see Attachment 1), Implementation toolbox (see Attachment 2), Group policies and programs – APS only (see Attachment 3) and Industry visits (see Attachment 4).
The Department of Defence (Defence) is a large and significant department in APS terms accounting for 13 per cent of the APS workforce. It operates within a distinctive environment as it is widely dispersed and consists of an integrated APS/Australian Defence Force (ADF) workforce, the latter factor unique to this department.

In terms of the progression of women, Defence has not kept pace with the gains made in the broader APS. Minor increases have been made in the representation of women into Senior Executive Service (SES) ranks, yet advances have been slow. This Review has examined why this might be so and what action may be taken to improve representation rates at all levels.

The evidence collected demonstrates that women’s representation in Defence is not reflective of the broader community and there are barriers which limit their inclusion. Some of these have historical roots—others are products of specific practices which are more evident in Defence than in other parts of the APS.

Defence is largely a male-dominated workforce with history and practice influencing this. It is also a workforce that includes significant numbers of ex-ADF who have moved into the APS. These are predominately men. To date, women have faced outdated workplace practices which are not enhancing their roles or progression. They do not see role models or action that ensures their contribution is valued.

There is a deficiency in workplace flexibility. Workers are calling for increased opportunities and support to balance work and family responsibilities. This is not just an issue of gender—getting the balance right between these responsibilities is a challenge faced by both men and women. Improvements in workplace flexibility will benefit both genders.

Women’s performance in Defence is strong. Yet this performance is not translated to greater representation in senior roles or participation in the senior decision making where they can influence strategy and outcomes. There is evidence of entrenched attitudes which are working against women and the role they can and should play in the senior ranks of the department.

Design of policy and practice accord the pressing needs of the ADF a higher priority than the APS. By way of example, the strategic attention towards ADF recruitment and the women’s action plan far outweigh any comparable focus for the APS.

The functional area within Defence (the Fairness and Resolution Branch) has many competing priorities, some of which are not naturally compatible. While having an overseeing role for gender equity and diversity, they also have a heavy workload in managing complaints which restricts their ability to support a more diverse workforce. Groups pursue local initiatives which do not support a holistic Defence solution.

The ADF defines strong cultures and identities which are very admirable and are instruments which clarify and engage employees. Similarly, non-service groups have discrete identities and values. On many levels this too can be positive, but equally it leads to duplication, is wasteful and can work against one another in the corporate or enabling functions. There was little visibility of APS values. The State of the Service Reports have borne out the weaker association with the APS as opposed to Defence or local values.

The emergence of the People Strategies and Policy Group (PSPG) and strategic directions such as People in Defence have improved the quality of the ‘people systems’ architecture. However, the strong internal group culture and structures has led to development and implementation of localised, disconnected

---

1 Each year the Public Service Commissioner provides a report to the Minister on the state of the Australian Public Service. The report draws on a range of information sources including a yearly survey sent to all APS agencies employing 20 or more staff.
practice and process. The sense of APS employees identifying and supporting the ADF, particularly in operation, is palpable and compelling. They know their jobs are important and contribute to a greater goal. They feel pride in contributing to Defence. This is a positive ingredient on which to build a committed and engaged workforce and was clearly evident in surveys and focus groups.

What is lost in this mix is the association with the broader APS. It is a dilemma—one can hardly argue that the commitment to Defence operations is unimportant, but equally the responsibilities and accountabilities as public servants is less understood. At the very least this is at odds with practice elsewhere in the APS. There was a common view in consultation that the APS does not promote its values and culture sufficiently in Defence. It is believed military personnel coming into the APS environment can struggle to adapt to APS expectations of behaviour where these are not clearly communicated. The values and behaviours required of APS employees need to be reasserted and explained in an integrated workforce.

Diversity, and in particular gender equity, is not a strong feature of Defence human resource practice, structure and culture. Diversity is an ingredient for a long-term sustainable workforce. It needs to be promoted, enhanced and supported structurally and managed at the highest levels. The People in Defence strategy and the Strategic Reform Program (SRP) reforms provide a platform for this Review’s recommendations to gain traction relatively quickly. Strategic leadership and a ‘centre of excellence’ approach that harnesses good practice for the benefit of the enterprise are vital for a cohesive approach to cut across the department. Shared services design provides the opportunity for an organisational development unit to be established in PSPG. As part of its role proactive equity and diversity programs would be key features, as well as a role for a change manager to anchor the findings from this Review.

Improvement will come through setting goals, leaders owning and driving strategies, building capability, and being held accountable for outcomes. Support strategies and ensuring women are encouraged to aspire for leadership roles will help rebuild the weak pipeline at the Executive Levels so that they can progress to SES ranks. It will be a long journey as cultural change process takes time. A timeline has been developed to ensure foundations are built and that the support indicatives will succeed (see page 62). Achieving the desired outcomes requires dedication from all, yet it is a cultural change that many are ready for. The expectation of change is high.

Our recommendations seek to embrace the emerging good practice from industry and research, and calibrate it with the intent of the employees and other stakeholders. The recommendations are framed around six themes:

- **Theme 1**—committed leadership support
- **Theme 2**—talent management and succession planning
- **Theme 3**—workplace flexibilities
- **Theme 4**—attraction, recruitment and selection
- **Theme 5**—support and development
- **Theme 6**—governance and infrastructure.

These themes are integral to achieving the vision and provide remedies to focus resource and effort. In turn they will make a significant impact on the issues which presently stall women’s progression in the department.

The engagement of Defence employees throughout the life of this Review has been very positive and momentum for change is apparent. There is an opportunity for Defence to continue to engage employees in contributing to implementation of the agreed recommendations.
On the basis of the common findings in the research, better practice successes in industry and consultation within Defence, the review projected what a ‘desired state’ might look like. If the totality of this research and the associated actions were successfully implemented, Defence could be described as:

- Leaders who walk the talk are role models—authentic and encouraging of a diverse workforce with a particular emphasis on increasing the role of women at all levels.

- Talent is nurtured and succession planned—merit rather than patronage rewarded.

- Flexibilities within the workplace are encouraged—to build a sustainable, inclusive workforce that adapts for the future.

- APS/ADF practices are mutually respected and deployed—to support an integrated workforce. This will require re-education/explanation.

- APS Defence is sought out as a career option and widely valued in the community—myths are debunked and Defence is known as an employer that values diversity, supports its people to deliver for the Australian Government and community, and contributes to the wider APS.

- Defence HR practices are exemplary—they are best practice within the APS.
To achieve the vision the following recommendations should be pursued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SUB-RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Committed leadership      | 1.1 The Secretary issues an explicit statement to senior leaders and staff to reinforce the importance of gender diversity in building a sustainable workforce. | 1.2 The Defence Committee commits to engaging in improving representation of women through:  
  - making specific commitments within performance agreements and charter letters  
  - showing active engagement as a Diversity Council responsible for overseeing implementation initiatives  
  - holding quarterly discussions at the Defence Committee on progress toward diversity outcomes  
  - appointing a Diversity Champion at the Senior Executive Service Band 3 level.  
  
  1.3 Establish a senior rotation program for senior women at SES Band 2/3 levels with the broader APS.  
  1.4 Deliver unconscious bias experiential training to the Senior Leadership Group.  
  1.5 Ensure female membership of senior decision-making bodies. |
| and support                 |                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 2. Talent management        | 2.1 Embed a focus on identifying and developing women for leadership roles, including a facilitated shadowing and coaching component, in the new talent management system. | 2.2 Implement a development program for Executive Level women that includes job rotation, as well as over-representing women in existing development programs.  
  2.3 Consolidate the various graduate programs under single management and increase the annual intake of graduates. |
| and succession planning     |                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 3. Workplace flexibilities  | 3.1 Develop a strategy to improve workplace flexibility led by the Diversity Council, which includes:  
  - developing a ‘better practice guide’ for employees and managers  
  - creating a central webpage to promote success stories and provide practical information  
  - increasing awareness of Defence Remote Electronic Access Mobility Service (DREAMS) token availability  
  - job design expertise. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 4. Attraction, Recruitment  | 4.1 The People Strategies and Policy Group to develop a branding and attraction strategy for APS recruitment that:  
  - promotes the variety of APS jobs within Defence  
  - explicitly publicises senior APS women as role models. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| and Selection               |                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>SUB-RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Attraction, Recruitment and Selection | 4.2 Implement an Executive Level 2 refresh program including:  
- holding cross-Group Executive Level 2 bulk selection rounds  
- using professional search firms  
- appointing external representatives on selection panels.  
4.3 Develop a ‘plain English’ recruitment guide that features:  
- gender balance on panels  
- explicit expectation of women in recruitment fields  
- inclusive job descriptions.  
4.4 Adopt a common induction process in Defence which educates APS employees and their managers (both ADF and APS) on their obligations and accountabilities relating to APS employment.  
4.5 Set up a central human resource unit to oversee all recruitment and selection activity for the Senior Executive Service and Executive Level 2s. |
| 5. Support and Development | 5.1 Establish women’s networks across Defence with Senior Executive Service women in sponsorship roles.  
5.2 Establish Defence-wide mentoring programs for women. |
| 6. Governance and infrastructure | 6.1 Expand the role of the Fairness and Resolution Branch to:  
- promote diversity as a positive attribute for a workforce  
- drive the actions arising from this review  
- overhaul equity and diversity training which is currently outdated and compliance focused.  
6.2 Leverage from the soon to be released, revised APS Values and educate APS/ADF managers on their staff management and workplace diversity responsibilities and obligations under the APS Act and the Defence Enterprise Collective Agreement.  
6.3 Establish a central maternity leave pool for central management of the full-time equivalent liability associated with maternity leave.  
6.4 Establish an external committee comprised of the Secretary Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, the APS Commissioner, Secretary Department of Defence, and a female departmental secretary to oversee the implementation of this Review’s recommendations and evaluation strategy. The committee would be supported by a change manager reporting to the PSPG on progress. |
Background

On 11 April 2011 the Minister for Defence announced a review into the performance of the Defence Organisation as an Employer of Women. As part of that broad review, the Secretary of the Department of Defence, Dr Ian Watt, announced a review to examine employment pathways for women in the Defence Australian Public Service (APS) workforce.

This Review’s aim is to look at cultural and/or other barriers and make recommendations to improve representation rates of women at all levels and improve women’s progression outcomes in the Defence APS that are consistent with the merit principle applying to APS employment.

Terms of reference

The terms of reference for this Review are:

With particular reference to the demographic and cultural issues present in the Defence Organisation and with regard to the (APS/ADF) integrated workforce, the Review will to enquire into and make recommendations on:

- the impact of cultural and/or other issues on the progression of women in the Defence organisation, particularly views about the nature of leadership in Defence, work/life balance, career breaks and flexible employment practices;
- attracting women, both from within the APS and outside of the APS, to work in the Defence organisation;
- supporting the greater retention of APS women in the Defence organisation;
- improving the pathways for increased representation of APS women within the Defence organisation;
- improving representation rates for APS women in leadership roles within the senior ranks and leadership of the Defence organisation: and
- any other matters that the Review lead considers appropriate that are related to the terms of reference.

Expanding women’s participation in the workforce isn’t just something that shows off a company’s commitment to diversity. It has powerful, positive and measurable results.

Ernst & Young 2009
Methodology

The Review consulted widely across the Defence organisation which included seeking the views of current and former Defence APS women. It also referenced broader APS and community attitudes and leading private industries. The Review methodology included consultation (face-to-face interviews and internal and external-to-Defence focus groups), data analysis and literature research.

Consultations

Consultation involved a range of face-to-face interviews between the Review team and current and former Defence personnel, Minister Snowdon and his staff, and external industry and public sector organisations.

Defence views, culture and issues across all levels and regions were more broadly identified using Defence focus groups (a total of 26 conducted in 17 locations regionally and in Canberra), assisted by Workplace Research Associates.

External-to-Defence focus groups were also conducted by GfK Bluemoon, which aimed to understand how women see Defence and provide recommendations on how to better encourage women to consider APS employment in Defence. Finally, submissions were invited via e-mail to the Review’s inbox.


Research

The Review’s research captured Defence data sourced from PMKeyS, HRMeS, E-recruitment, graduate databases, Fairness and Resolution Branch and workforce planning data, including the 2010 Defence Attitudes Survey and 2009 Flexible Work Practices Survey.

The external data included information from the APSC including the 2010 State of the Service Report and data on whole of APS analysis. The Directorate of Strategic Personnel Policy Research conducted a pulse survey specifically addressing some key areas that were identified as an information gap that finalised the consultation process. See Defence gender picture on page 15 for a summary of significant data used.

The Review gathered much rich information from other organisations and employers on techniques and strategies which they employed to assist with their ‘gender agendas’ (see Attachment 2). This information was generously provided and the Review team believes they provide a ready base on which to implement a number of our recommendations.
Defence is the third largest APS agency with 22,345 employees representing 13 per cent of the APS population. The newly formed Department of Human Services is the largest with 38,174 employees, followed by the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) with 24,070 employees. There is a large gap to the fourth largest agency, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship, with 7,014 employees or 4.3 per cent of the APS.

As one of the ‘big three’ agencies and with a large contingent of SES employees, Defence has an important part to play in the representation of women in the APS.

This section examines the gender profile of Defence.

Key Findings are:

- Defence has fewer women than the APS average, both overall and in leadership roles. There is a progressive drop in the proportion of women from APS5 with a particular shortage at EL2.
- The growth in women has flattened in recent years, even reducing slightly in the SES.
- Defence has a workforce that includes many technical and professional grades where women are less represented.
- Although low by broader APS standards, the APS workforce in Defence has a significantly higher representation of women than the ADF.
- Appraisals of potential and performance indicate the current cadre of SES women is performing more strongly than their male counterparts. Although women are the minority on development programs, their promotion rate on completion of the Career Development Assessment Centre is significantly higher.
- There is a very small representation of women on Defence committees.
- The gender profile of the APS workforce is affected heavily by the number of male new hires, particularly in the middle grades (APS4–6). This can be linked to the high number of predominantly male ex-ADF members that join the APS.
- The Defence graduate programs provide a strong intake of women and have good retention rates. Advancement rates for men and women are similar following completion of the graduate programs.
- The Defence part-time rate is much lower than other agencies.
- Defence has an older age profile with less experience of working in other departments.
- Defence employees are highly engaged with greater levels of pride, motivation and agency loyalty compared to other departments.
The Defence APS workforce comprises 13,319 (59.6 per cent) men and 9,026 (40.4 per cent) women (HRMeS 1 June 11). The percentage of women in Defence is considerably lower than the APS average of 57.7 per cent (SOSR 2009–10). Women’s participation rate in the Australian workforce is 58.4 per cent (at June 2010).

Defence APS women outnumber men until APS4. This is known as the ‘crossover point’. The proportion of women decreases significantly from APS5 level and above (see Figure 1). For the broader APS the crossover point occurs at EL1 with the proportion of women reducing at higher grades (see Figure 2).

**Figure 1: Gender by classification in Defence**

![Figure 1: Gender by classification in Defence](source: APSC 2010)

**Figure 2: Gender by level—APS–wide**

![Figure 2: Gender by level—APS–wide](source: APSC 2010)
The percentage of women in Defence has increased from 30.1 per cent in 2000 to 39.6 per cent in 2010. Executive Levels have increased from 14 per cent females in 2000 to 26.9 per cent in 2010. SES representation of women has increased from 10.6 per cent in 2000 to 24.8 per cent in 2010.

Growth in the proportion of women has flattened in recent years. In the four years from 2008, total growth in women increased only 1.2 per cent and the percentage of women in the SES dropped by 0.5 per cent.

**Figure 3: Percentage of women APS, EL and SES levels in Defence 1996–2011**

*Source: APSC 2011.*
Gender by group and job family

Defence has a diverse workforce comprising a large number of technical and professional occupations. The proportion of women is less in groups (see Figure 4) and job families (see Figure 5) with a higher technical workforce.

Figure 4: Gender by group

Figure 5: Gender by job family

Source: HRMeS 2011.
Gender in the Australian Defence Force

While low by APS standards, the Defence APS workforce has greater gender diversity than the ADF.

Table 1: Percentage of women by service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>TOTAL STRENGTH</th>
<th>AT COLONEL (E)/EL2 AND ABOVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airforce</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Defence Force</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Public Service</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HRMeS, 2011.

Senior Leadership Group

Defence has a lower rate of women in the SES than other departments. Twenty-three per cent of SES in Defence are women compared to 37 per cent of the APS as a whole.

Table 2: Percentage of women in the SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>DEFENCE</th>
<th>APS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES 1</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES 2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES 3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: APSC 2010.
Twenty-three per cent of SES are women compared to 4.3 per cent of star rank in the ADF. As a whole, 12.5 per cent of the Senior Leadership Group are women.

**Figure 6: Representation at the Defence Senior Leadership Group**

![Representation at the Defence Senior Leadership Group](image)

Source: APSC 2010.

**SES performance and potential**

In the 2009–10 performance ratings 71 per cent of women were rated in the top two categories (outstanding and superior) compared to 60 per cent of men. In the previous two years, men and women rated evenly.

**Table 3: SES Performance Ratings 2009–10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully effective</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not rated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DSOM data. 2010.
The talent management process for SES employees includes a rating combining performance and potential. In 2009–10, 68 per cent of women were rated in the top two categories (top and emerging top talent) compared to 32 per cent of men.

Table 4: SES potential rating 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top leadership talent high performance/exceptional potential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging top talent high performance/strong potential</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging top talent moderate performance/exceptional potential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DSOM data 2010.
### Defence Committees

At the highest level, Defence is managed through a hierarchy of senior committees with membership position-based. Table 5 shows that women take up eight out of 132 seats in the most senior committees.

**Table 5: Senior committees in Defence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defence Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Service Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Information and Communication Technology Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Capability and Investment Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Capability Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Audit and Risk Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Occupational Health and Safety Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence People Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Estate Performance and Investment Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Secretaries’ Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce and Financial Management Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership development and promotion

Defence offers a number of central leadership programs to develop high potential staff for future leadership roles. Consistent with the classification profile of the target groups, men have formed the majority of participants.

Table 6: Leadership programs, gender rates, over 2005–10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>NO. OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>NO. OF WOMEN</th>
<th>% OF WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Command and Staff College</td>
<td>APS6 &amp; EL1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies</td>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Assessment Centre</td>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PSP data 2010.

However female Career Development Assessment Centre participants have performed better having completed the course. Since 1999, 40 per cent of female participants have been promoted to the SES compared to 25 per cent of men.

Hires

The gender breakup of new hires to the department closely reflects the gender balance of the department where 41 per cent of new hires are women compared to 59 per cent for men. Figure 7 shows the classification profile by gender for new hires is also similar to the gender profile of the Defence workforce in Figure 1, with a lower crossover point at APS 4.

Figure 7: Hires by level in 2009–10

Source: HRMeS 2010.
Ex-Australian Defence Force personnel in the APS

One of the issues that affect the gender balance in Defence is the number of ex-ADF members who join the APS. As a predominantly male feeder group, this sways the gender profile towards men and is consistent with the predominance of male new hires from APS4 upwards. While data on the number of ADF hires is not available, the census data from 2007 did show the significant number of ex-ADF males in the Defence APS, peaking at 45 per cent of APS4-6.

Figure 8: Previous military experience

Australian Defence Force spouses

There is also a cohort of mainly female ADF spouses who work for Defence in the APS.

Table 7: Spouse of ADF member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPOUSE/PARTNER IS PERMANENT ADF MEMBER</th>
<th>SPOUSE/PARTNER IS NOT A PERMANENT ADF MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS 1–3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 4–6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates

Another way Defence sources talent is from its graduate programs. Women are well represented in the programs and retention is strong. The Graduate Development Program (GDP) is the generalist program and usually has a majority of women. Although the specialist programs in the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) and Defence Science and Technical Organisation (DSTO) have fewer women, their proportion of women is strong relative to both the proportion of women graduates in engineering and related technologies (which is approximately 15 per cent) and higher than the proportion of women within the respective population in Defence (15.1 per cent of science and 8.2 per cent for engineers).

Table 8: Graduate recruitment and retention rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000—2010</th>
<th>2005—2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER RECRUITED</td>
<td>FEMALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMO</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGO(^1)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD(^2)</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSTO</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 367</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | TOTAL NUMBER RECRUITED | FEMALES | MALES | RETENTION RATE |
| GDP            | 437       | 54%       | 43%   | 70%           |
| DMO            | 342       | 32%       | 68%   | 73%           |
| DIGO\(^1\)     | 128       | 29%       | 71%   | 74%           |
| DSD\(^2\)      | 302       | 46%       | 54%   | 85%           |
| DSTO           | 264       | 26%       | 74%   | 81%           |
| **TOTAL**      | **1 473** | **40%**   | **60%** | **79%**       |

Source: Graduate programs 2011.
2. DSD = Defence Signals Directorate
Part-time work

As one measure of flexible working practices, the average rate of part-time work in Defence is 4.96 per cent compared to the APS agency average of 13.66 per cent. Table 9 shows this is the lowest rate of APS agencies with over 1000 employees. Defence actually has the lowest part-time rate of all agencies apart from the Australian War Memorial with 3.86 per cent.

Table 9: Part-time rates of agencies with over 1000 employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>PART-TIME</th>
<th>FULL-TIME</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF PART-TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>1 444</td>
<td>4 738</td>
<td>6 182</td>
<td>23.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrelink</td>
<td>5 780</td>
<td>20 122</td>
<td>25 902</td>
<td>22.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Australia</td>
<td>1 205</td>
<td>4 210</td>
<td>5 415</td>
<td>22.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Fisheries &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>3 749</td>
<td>4 682</td>
<td>19.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Securities Investment Commission</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1 560</td>
<td>1 849</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>2 349</td>
<td>2 784</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health &amp; Ageing</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>4 008</td>
<td>4 699</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2 114</td>
<td>2 474</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Average</td>
<td>20 608</td>
<td>130 259</td>
<td>150 867</td>
<td>13.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Immigration &amp; Citizenship</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>5 682</td>
<td>6 558</td>
<td>13.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Customs and Border Protection Service</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>5 106</td>
<td>5 773</td>
<td>11.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Veterans’ Affairs</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1 821</td>
<td>2 058</td>
<td>11.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Taxation Office</td>
<td>2 425</td>
<td>1 876</td>
<td>21 211</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>5 131</td>
<td>5 769</td>
<td>11.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3 055</td>
<td>3 433</td>
<td>11.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Australia</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1 021</td>
<td>10.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1 093</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maternity Leave

As at June 2010, 549 Defence APS women were on paid maternity leave. While only just over 6 per cent of the total female workforce, the rate of use peaks at a little over 20.9 per cent of women aged 30–34. These figures do not include women absent to care for babies using other forms of leave.

Table 10: Paid maternity leave at June 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE PROFILE</th>
<th>NO. ON PAID MATERNITY LEAVE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF AGE PROFILE ON MATERNITY LEAVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20—24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25—29</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>13.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30—34</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35—39</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40—44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45—49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HRMeS 2011.
Promotions

Men make up the greater proportion of internal promotions (56 per cent) with the most substantial difference being at the APS6 to EL2 classifications (see Figure 9).

Figure 9: Promotions in 2009–10

Further investigation was undertaken to determine how many women applied for Defence positions and their rate of success. Unfortunately, reliable data was limited. However, in a sample of 67 EL2 jobs filled in Defence Material Organisation (DMO) since July 2010, women were more successful, with 17 per cent of applicants being women and 27 per cent of positions being won by women. In 25 (37 per cent) of the selection processes there were no women applicants. A similar story was found in 11 non-DMO SES positions filled from February 2010 where 17 per cent of applicants were women and 27 per cent of the positions were won by women. In two of the selection processes there were no women applicants.
Separations

Women separate at a higher rate (7 per cent) compared to men (5 per cent), but are still low overall. Even at the common child bearing age from 25–35 separation rates for women remain well below 10 per cent.

Figure 10: Separations by age in 2009–10

Source: HRMeS 2011.

Age profile

Defence has an older profile relative to the APS with more than half (51.2 per cent) of the workforce aged over 45 years. This is fourth highest of agencies with 1000 or more employees, after Department of Veterans’ Affairs (60.3 per cent), Bureau of Meteorology (56.4 per cent) and ATO (52.4 per cent). The APS average is 43.4 per cent.

Within Defence men have a higher age profile than women with a total of 41 per cent of men aged over 50 compared to 24 per cent of women.
Table 11: Age profile by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APS STANDARD</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE LEVEL</th>
<th>SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE</th>
<th>TOTAL DEFENCE APS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage over 50 years old</td>
<td>24.81%</td>
<td>39.67%</td>
<td>21.93%</td>
<td>43.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage over 55 years old</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>21.81%</td>
<td>9.54%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HRMeS 2011.

Almost 60 per cent of the Defence SES population are aged over 50 years compared to 50 per cent APS-wide. Thirty per cent of the Defence SES are at or above retirement age compared to 22 per cent APS-wide.

Mobility

There is less mobility between Defence and the rest of the APS than in other agencies (see Table 12).

Table 12: Number of agencies worked in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 AGENCY</th>
<th>1–3 AGENCIES</th>
<th>4 OR MORE AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: APSC 2010.

The Defence State of the Service Agency Benchmarking Report 2010 reveals Defence employees have:

- stronger levels of pride and goal clarity
- less than average satisfaction with remuneration and career progression

Figure 11 shows Defence has above average levels of motivation and loyalty to the agency.
Consistent with their greater propensity to stay in Defence compared to their counterparts in other agencies, Defence women place higher importance on:

- job security
- career options within the agency
- the opportunity to work on cutting edge projects.

**Group policies**

The human resources (HR) function within Defence is a combination of central policy (PSPG) and delivery (Defence Support Group), combined with independent policy and processes within groups. A summary of available information about relevant activity across Defence is at Attachment 3.

There are 14 groups, each with their own HR staff. Groups develop and deliver their own programs subject to the needs of their workforce. Attachment 3 shows that it is difficult to form a cohesive picture of how groups manage their workforce and whether their policies would benefit career prospects of women or could be used to do so.
To gain a broad understanding of the views towards the representation of women in Defence a range of consultations took place including internal focus groups, submissions via email to Review inbox, external focus groups, pulse survey on flexible working and interviews with present and past Defence senior leaders.

**Focus group employee perspective**

Workplace Research Associates was contracted to assist Defence in co-facilitating focus groups to evaluate the culture of the department as it impacts on the progression of career pathways for women. Culture refers to the set of norms that are endorsed by a group of people and is best understood by examining values, beliefs, behaviours, systems, processes.

All Defence employees were invited to attend focus groups. Those who could not attend the focus groups were invited to provide a submission to the Review, consistent with the terms of reference. A total of 19 submissions were received. Over a three-week period 26 focus groups were held in 16 locations, including Canberra and ten regional sites. Altogether 352 employees attended and participated in the focus groups.

To examine organisational culture in a systematic way, frameworks used in published research were applied to structure both data-gathering in the focus groups and data analysis. The focus groups were designed to capture information through Levin’s (2000)\(^2\) theoretical framework. Levin’s approach proposes using a ‘five window framework’ to examine organisational culture comprising Norms and Practices; Leadership; Symbols; Traditions and Rituals; and Stories and Legends. In examining organisational culture it is important to focus on perceptions of work practices rather than their objective occurrence.

A wide array of views was expressed throughout the focus groups. However, a number of themes emerged as salient factors that affect APS women’s leadership pathways in Defence. Discussions typically centred on:

- the strong military culture of the wider Defence Organisation
- the high prevalence of gender stereotyping
- the reluctance of managers to implement and support flexible working practices
- the role of leaders in supporting practices that undermine women’s representation in senior roles, in particular the dominance of an assertive and masculine leadership style.

Participants in regional areas also commented on specific regional issues that affect women’s ability to move into higher level positions.

Commonly, focus group participants reported feeling devalued as a group in the Defence Organisation. Participants reported a strong tendency for women to be over-represented in support or administrative roles at lower levels, with a concurrent expectation that women should fulfil traditionally ‘female’ duties, including organising morning teas and social functions and providing emotional support to colleagues. There was a strong belief that women had a ‘softer’, more emotional style than men and that this was not valued in a Defence leadership role.

---

Consultation Findings

The main themes emerging from the focus group data are discussed in more detail below. However, analysis of the results indicates that a useful framework for understanding women’s views about and responses to the Defence culture is Ryan’s (2011) construct of ‘stigmatised identity’. Ryan draws on Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner 1986) which posits our social identity as that part of our self-concept that derives from our membership of groups encompassing the value and emotional significance attached to those group memberships. When a group is devalued by others it can be seen as a stigmatised group—a social category about which others hold negative attitudes, stereotypes and beliefs.

Major General Orme’s review of ADF Personal Conduct also comments on the affect of this phenomenon which he refers to as:

... in-groups asserting their dominance over out-groups in a military culture that values masculine characteristics such as assertiveness, courage, decisiveness, strength and action. Groups that see themselves as being in will often engage in ritualised behaviour that allows them to overtly display such status toward those they perceive to be out (p20).

Ryan suggests that, when faced with a stigmatised identity, people respond in one of a number of ways. They may either attempt to affirm the identity by educating, acknowledging and disconfirming negative stereotypes, or they may try to distance themselves from the identity by concealing their group membership, avoiding situations that highlight the membership or dis-identifying with the group.

Against this background, the main themes of the focus groups and submissions were:

Military culture

One of the strongest themes identified was the influence of a (mostly) male military culture. Many of the focus group participants felt that they work in a very male-dominated environment which is heavily influenced by a military style of leadership, communication and ways of conducting work. It is difficult for women to break into the ‘boys club’ as they are not included in networks and/or are not considered suitable for leadership roles in Defence.

3 Ryan, A M 2011, Strategies for managing a stigmatised identity in the workplace. Keynote address presented to the 9th Industrial and Organisational Psychology Conference, Brisbane, Australia.
Consistent with the ‘boys club’ culture was the perception that military style attributes are those that are valued and rewarded. There was a perceived lack of emphasis on people skills, with a commensurate focus on performing tasks combined with an abrupt, tough, and assertive/aggressive communication style. Further, women felt that it was difficult to gain respect from military or ex-military managers if they only had APS experience.

Many groups commented in some way on the misalignment of the APS workforce within a military environment and vice versa. There is a lack of understanding of APS policies and processes by ADF members and ex-ADF employees. In this culture women feel that:

- Gender stereotypes and women as nurturers

Many focus group participants reported that women’s progression and representation in the Defence environment were hindered by gender stereotypes and the predominant perception of women as nurturers. As noted above, participants commented that women were generally expected to be in support or administrative roles and to perform ‘female’ tasks. It was also reported that women were viewed negatively if they refused to engage in these behaviours.

Participants commented widely on the devaluing of typically ‘feminine’ approaches to management and leadership and the belief that women were less capable of taking on leadership roles, especially in technical areas.

- Women are openly and acceptably ridiculed and talked about and gossiped about for ‘being weak’

Consultation Findings

The problem is not working with men, it is the male-dominated culture.

*APS focus groups (June 2011)*

.. to progress, (they) need to adopt ‘blokey attitudes’ and fit in to a male-dominated work environment... for example, need to be ‘one of the boys’ in terms of language and attitude.

*APS focus groups (June 2011)*
Consultation Findings

It was felt that taking maternity leave is highly likely to hinder career prospects and that the cultural norms are that women must choose between family and career. There was considerable pressure to return to work post-pregnancy and, if in a higher level role, to return to full-time work as soon as possible.

Women who chose to return part-time were less valued as employees and it was considered that women with children were not interested in furthering their careers. Even those women who worked full-time reported that, once they had children, managers did not support them to progress in their careers in the same way as their male counterparts were supported.

Further, many groups commented on the lack of facilities for women with babies or young children, in particular on bases and in regional areas. For example, participants noted that there were often no child care centres nearby, no sick rooms, entertainment rooms for older children and no breastfeeding rooms. It was noted that these types of facilities are often available in other APS agencies.

Finally, participants reported that transactional roles were seen as less important and that these roles were mainly performed by women. It was also felt that cuts in funding were more likely in areas traditionally employing more women than men such as administration, finance and human resources.

Flexible workplace practices

There was a strong feeling that flexible working practices, although part of the Defence Enterprise Collective Agreement, were not consistently applied, managed appropriately or utilised fully. There was also a very strong feeling that decisions about whether part-time or flexible work options should be allowed in a particular area or team was at the discretion of the individual supervisor. A number of issues were raised under this theme:

- Women felt that working part-time was ‘frowned upon’ and indicated a lack of commitment and interest in work. Women reported feeling ‘guilty’ for taking up this option.
- Working part-time restricted access to training and development, acting positions and, at times, led to being given ‘less interesting work’.
- Part-time hours did not necessarily mean part-time work and there was a feeling that employees working part-time were expected to fit a full-time work load into part-time hours.
- There was a strong perception that it was not acceptable to work part-time in higher level positions (EL1 and above).
- While recruitment policies exist, there was a view that clubs or networks and choosing staff in the manager’s image were common practice and exclusive of women.

Participants also felt that a culture of ‘needing to be seen’ existed very strongly in the Defence environment. It was believed that employees need to be ‘seen’ at their desks and that long hours were the expected norm. It was strongly considered that staying beyond normal working hours and being seen to be at work was rewarded by leaders and considered essential for progression.
Consultation Findings

Employees taking up flexible work options were perceived as not serious about their careers and therefore not encouraged to apply for higher level positions.

I expected that taking time off and returning to work part-time would slow my career progression and prospects; however, some of the attitudes to part-time work I faced from supervisors and managers were a bit of a shock, especially comments such as:

- ‘We’ve just assigned you all of the tasks no one else wants to do because you’re not here often enough to get bored.’
- ‘You can’t be a team leader or ‘manager’ if you’re not here full-time. It just wouldn’t work’
- ‘We just assumed you wouldn’t want any high profile work.’
- ‘Mothers with young children aren’t focused on work because they have other priorities.’
- ‘Part-timers are unreliable because they take excessive amounts of personal leave.’

*Submission to APS Women’s Review (June 2011)*

Leadership

Participants generally agreed that senior leaders in Defence adopt a traditionally masculine leadership style with traditionally masculine qualities to fit in with the male-dominated culture. For example, it was considered that leaders are expected to display an assertive, abrupt and direct style of leadership and that it was necessary to push emotions aside.

…need to be strong, assertive, have a ‘thick hide’ If a woman is ‘soft’ (that is, puts people first), they will not get ahead Women in senior leadership roles are considered to require ‘balls’—be strong, (display) masculine behaviour with no empathy.

*APS focus groups (June 2011)*
Consultation Findings

There was also a strong belief that when women did take on leadership roles and behaved in the more aggressive manner needed, they could be seen as ‘pushy’ and over-confident. Focus group participants noted that, as a woman, it would be necessary to change from a softer to a more aggressive leadership style and this was not acceptable to some women, hence they did not apply for leadership roles.

Many groups commented on the lack of visibility of women in leadership roles across Defence. In particular, women were perceived as very rare at the SES level. This meant that there was a lack of female role models and mentors for women who would otherwise wish to pursue their career into the EL and SES levels. There were a number of reasons put forward for the lower representation of women at these levels:

- Leadership positions in Defence are often filled based on technical skills rather than management skills. Technical skills are often honed in the military, a fact that results in more males (with a military background) applying for positions.

- Women tend not to apply for positions for which they feel they have less than 100 per cent of the capability required (as set out in the selection criteria). It was thought that men will apply for positions for which they believe they are not completely qualified, however they will ‘give it a go’.

- There is a perception that EL2 and above positions require minimal personal leave, long hours and travel, which means that women choose not to apply.

- The Defence unwritten cultural rule is that you must ‘do your time’ before being promoted, a legacy from the military culture of ‘time in rank’.

- People said there was a lack of leadership programs or professional development programs for APS employees in the same way as there are for ADF members.

Finally, many groups noted that while women may aspire to leadership roles, once they experience being overlooked or de-valued due to family commitments they become discouraged and make the personal decision to ‘give up the race’.

Regional issues

Many focus group participants in the regional centres/bases that were visited raised the issue of the lack of available positions at the EL2 level and above. There was a perception in regional areas—in particular away from capital city offices—that women’s career progression was influenced to a stronger degree by the military culture of the bases. It was also felt that women on bases were not considered for technical roles, only for support roles. Many of the higher level positions that were available were technical in nature and a background in the ADF was considered indispensable for these roles.

Women of ADF spouses perceived APS employment as a positive option due to the ease of transfer when their ADF partner was redeployed. Being a ‘defence family’ was generally considered to be positive. However, women in this position felt that their career progression was restricted because of the constant need to transfer with their partner.
Descriptors of culture

In an exercise where participants were asked to rate 10 adjectives in terms of how characteristic they were of the Defence culture as it affected women's career pathways, a high level of agreement was found for five descriptors. Specifically, groups consider the Defence culture to be:

- best described as ‘exclusive’ and ‘traditional’
- least described as ‘dishonest’, ‘consistent’ or ‘innovative’.

Submissions

The submissions received highlighted consistent themes with those outlined by the focus groups. Some shared their own personal experiences with examples of difficult experiences as women and mothers within Defence with work practices not supported by flexibility and being treated as less important than their colleagues.

While there were views seeking greater support and encouragement of women, there were also views expressed that women should not get preferential treatment but rather treated more fairly within merit.

Any preferential treatment is insulting, creates division, and if not suited to the position, negatively impact on the organisation.

APS focus groups (June 2011)

A strong theme of blending in or not wanting to attract attention relates to the behavioural strategies noted by Ryan (2011) in dealing with ‘stigmatised identity’.

Conclusions from employee focus groups and submissions

From examination of the focus group results and content of submissions, it is contended that women form a stigmatised group within the Defence environment and that attempts to increase women’s representation across Defence and in particular in leadership roles, should take this finding into account.

Ryan (2011) proposes that organisations should care about identity management of stigmatised groups because identity is related to individual outcomes which are, in turn, related to organisational outcomes.
Unhappy employees are more likely to be less committed, have lower work satisfaction, and engage less in organisation citizenship behaviours. In the face of an obviously stigmatised group in the workplace the organisation has a responsibility to take action. As Ryan (2011) says:

> Shifting responsibility from the organisation to the individual to work out discrimination is not okay. Structural and systemic influences should be attended to by organisations.

Organisational culture defines and influences structural and systemic aspects of organisations. To address inequities for APS women, and to increase women’s representation and participation at senior leadership levels within Defence, a significant cultural change is required.

**Suggested change initiatives**

The focus group participants were asked to suggest initiatives for changing aspects of the Defence culture that they believe were affecting women’s ability to progress in their careers or be better represented across the department. Responses have been built into the ‘themes and recommendations’ in this report (see Ideas for improvement on page 34 and Vision and actions for the future on pages 41 to 56).

**External focus groups**

To capture the perception of Defence as an employer of women, eight external focus groups were conducted by GfK Bluemoon and were held with women working in the public and private sector to see:

- what women look for in a career
- what impression they had of Defence as a potential employer.

Participants were clear that the sessions were about joining the APS in Defence, not the ADF.

The key findings from these focus groups indicated that the factors women look for in a career include job satisfaction, a positive work environment, good salary and equal opportunity for women.

**Views towards working in the APS**

The focus groups discussed that the main appeal of working in the APS is the work–life balance and flexible working conditions provided to employees. Other appealing aspects and benefits included maternity leave and superannuation, the option to move into different roles, job security and stability.
However, the focus group participants also discussed the negative aspects of working in the APS, which included disinterest towards working in a slow moving organisation, red tape and old technology. They also expressed a perception that APS employees are unmotivated and lack autonomy. Another perceived disadvantage of working in the APS was the low turnover of employees at senior levels and the lack of career opportunities.

The focus groups commented on the issues surrounding APS recruitment. There were strong beliefs that:

- writing an APS job application is an ‘art’ and a barrier to people outside the APS and Canberra
- the process takes too long and particularly not suitable for those in the private sector who need a quicker decision (by the time they get an interview, they have had to find work elsewhere)
- private sector employees don’t understand the classification structure
- the APS outside Canberra felt there was a lack of job opportunities in the states, and less development and support as a whole.

Perceptions of Defence as an employer

When questioned on Defence as an employer of APS women the focus groups discussed that the positives of working in Defence included good salary (considered higher than other departments), exciting work, and the ability to work on big, exciting, classified projects. It was expressed that due to the department’s size there would be more opportunities to move around and perhaps opportunities to travel overseas. There was a strong perception that Defence was ‘different’ to other departments and therefore more appealing.

The negative perceptions of working in Defence included the belief that it would be less flexible then other departments and a male dominated environment. The focus groups portrayed a belief that Defence is an ‘old boys club’ which has traditional views towards women and has very few women at the top.

Some perceptions of the department are tarnished by incidents of poor behaviour towards women in the ADF. The focus groups raised a perception that women aren’t welcome in the department, and that women working in the department cannot exhibit typical female traits. The focus groups indicated that there is a perception that there is a lack of female support, respect and mentors, as well as a negative view of flexible workplace practices including part-time work and maternity leave. There was a strong belief that Defence is unknown, and that the type of work is secretive and not visible to many.

Participants expressed a concern towards working in Defence because it is very hierarchical and perceived working alongside people in uniform as intimidating.

There was a lack of understanding of Defence, particularly the difference between the APS and ADF. Some of the misconception of the Defence APS included not knowing what role the APS plays and a concern that all Defence employees needed to be fit.
Ideas for improvement

The focus groups generated ideas for improvements to make Defence more attractive employer, which included:

- ‘open the doors’—improve the level of knowledge about the department and the jobs available
- communicate the range of roles including mainstream human resources and finance
- encourage female staff from Defence to network more
- address some of the negative brand perceptions
- counter negativity with positive information
- promote the softer side of Defence activity
- avoid depicting too many uniforms in communications and public relations
- minimise ‘us and them’ mentality with less use of ‘civilians’
- communicate flexibility within the department
- reinforce a more positive image with tangible changes
- hiring women into senior positions
- providing support to women at lower levels.

Pulse survey

Flexibility was an issue repeatedly raised in the focus groups. A pulse survey of Defence employees was conducted to capture perceptions of flexible workplace practices. There were 1732 employees that participated in the survey. The pulse survey went out to both males and females in Canberra and regional locations and covered all classifications up to SES Band 3.

The survey results indicated that the aspiration for Defence employees is not significantly different between men and women. The most common level that employees aspire is to EL2 (37 per cent). However, there was significant difference in factors hindering aspiration levels. Women’s willingness to apply for a promotion is effected by a lack of confidence and a desire to not lose flexible working conditions.

Sixty-five per cent of participants believed it would be very to extremely difficult to be promoted as a part-time employee. The survey indicates that there is a perception that part-time employment limits career opportunities and that flexible workplace options are not likely to be approved in Defence.

As supported by the focus groups, regional employees reported that their desire to progress is limited by lack of opportunities. They also indicated there is a lack of access to part-time work in the regions (10 per cent of respondents have had their request to work part-time denied in regional areas).

The results of this survey are a good snapshot of Defence employees’ perceptions and attitudes of flexible workplace practices. Overall, 81 per cent of males and 55 per cent of women believed there is gender equality of career opportunities in Defence. However it is evident from the survey results that there are aspects of the workplace that hinder employee opportunity to have a flexible work–life balance and successful career options.
Consultation Findings

Interviews

In addition to the focus groups interviews were conducted with current and former Defence personnel. The aims of this Review were viewed positively and many saw it as an avenue for overdue change around the representation of women in Defence.

For those who had left Defence the view of the organisation remained positive. There was great affection and continuing interest in the Department’s purpose and progress.

Common features of the department, as it relates to APS women, were raised throughout interviews including views that:

- Women needed to be robust to work and progress in Defence. They usually tolerate behaviour that is out of place elsewhere in the APS.
- The integrated workforce means ready formed networks exist. These networks have been built through strong historical ties within the services and carried over into the APS workplace. Many saw this as a ‘club’ or at least exclusive of those who hadn’t featured in those early bonding relationships. Given the historically male-dominated nature of ADF, the minority group is women.
- There was a predominant view that Defence is a busy environment. To survive women and men were required to behave in a certain way. The significance of this survival behaviour was only noticed once individuals left the organisation.
- Technical knowledge and skill were seen as holding greater value than leadership ability. The focus on technical skills limits new talent (in the form of lateral recruits) entering the Department, and as a result mobility is not a feature of the workforce.
- The Department is seen as quite traditional, hierarchical and siloed and having a strong focus on process. Because of the pyramid structure in most groups, career progression opportunities within the groups are limited.
- There is a strong ADF infusion into all areas of the APS.
- Defence could be more mobile and this would support a more diverse workforce.
- There is a need for APS to identify talent and support it. This transcends gender and distinctions were made as to the different approaches used actively by the ADF. Perhaps the APS could use Staff College opportunities more effectively.
- Women don’t apply for promotions unless asked. Sponsors are needed to support their efforts (both men and women).
- There was a traditional view by some about any potential growth of women in senior ranks. A view that women were happy with support rather than leadership roles. The converse was put equally stridently but there is a view that role models and support would be needed to change the balance.
- There were mixed views as to the level of support women wanted within Defence.
- A strong business case to articulate the imperatives for change would be required to convince those who do not think there is an issue to solve in terms of women’s representation and progression.
- Leadership is absolutely vital for success. Women and men playing roles in the ongoing strategy will be critical.
Advantages of gender parity strategies

There is an abundance of information discussing issues around women in management/leadership or the lack thereof. The two areas consistently cited as providing benefit for organisations that aim to increase the number of women in leadership are:

- increasing the number of women in executive leadership roles provides rich business advantage
- with a diminishing supply of skilled labour women provide an untapped labour source for the future.

Improved business performance

Evidence suggests that companies with more women in senior levels out-perform those with low or no female participation. This argument is put forward not as a male versus female approach to management—rather greater diversity brings a range of views and more creativity to decision making. Diversity generates deeper debate and broader analysis on key topical issues, avoiding the prospect of ‘group think’ which is inclined to occur in dominated organisational decision-making structures.

These results were found across the public and private sector. From a business perspective having a balanced gender composition is more reflective of the general community demographic. Aligning senior management and decision-making roles to correspond with this contributes to bringing the decision making closer to the source.

The need for ‘critical mass’

However, improved performance is correlated with the number of women in senior leadership roles. Research shows there is a critical mass—that critical mass is three in 10 or 30 per cent of women on boards.

Reinforcing this paradigm is evidence from YWCA of Canberra (Shannon et al. 2011) which discusses a noticeable difference in board dynamics when 30 per cent of the composition is female. They further indicate that once the representation of females is 40 per cent a state of business-as-usual is reached. This critical mass has been reinforced through personal experience of women in senior leadership roles. For example, an interview conducted with Dr Megan Clarke CSIRO noted that at 20–25 per cent there was not much difference noted in the dynamics. At 33–35 per cent there becomes a ‘feeling of normality’. Once representation was greater than 35 per cent a difference in decision making is noticed.

---

6 Desvaux, G, Devillard-Hoellinger, S & Bumgarten, P 2007, Women Matter, McKinsey and Company. This study found a correlation between gender diversity at Board level and improved business performance. Business performance was measured as both organisational excellence and financial performance.

7 Desvaux et al. 2007. The improved business performance found was only apparent when there were three in ten or 30% women on the board. Below this level of representation there was little or no improved performance.

8 Shannon, L 2011, Women on Boards, YWCA Canberra. Of note, this critical mass has been reinforced through personal experience of women in Senior Leadership roles. For example, an interview conducted with Dr Megan Clarke CSIRO noted that at 20–25 per cent there was not much difference noted in the dynamics. At 33–35 per cent there becomes a ‘feeling of normality’. Once representation was greater than 35 per cent a difference in decision making is noticed.
To attain this critical mass organisations are moving to implement targets and/or quotas. Yet setting targets/quotas is generating much debate—debate that will continue as Australian organisations move to implement recently announced Australian Institute of Company Directors Principles, Australian Stock Exchange reporting requirements and government announcements calling for disclosure and gender composition on boards.

Labour force pressures

Important to this debate is consideration of access to an additional labour source a gender strategy provides. Information available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics notes that in 2007, 13 per cent of the Australian population consisted of people aged 65 years and over. Forward projection highlights that this figure will continue to increase and may indeed reach 25 per cent by 2056.

Labour market pressure will continue to force organisations to critically plan for a shrinking labour pool. The Australian Public Service Commission (APSC) highlights the impact of this on the Public Service with 40 per cent of the ongoing workforce eligible to retire in the coming 10 years. Of this figure 48 per cent are in the Executive Levels and 71 per cent are in the Senior Executive Levels. Defence already has 30 per cent of the Senior Executive workforce at retirement age.

Barriers preventing an increase in the representation of women in leadership

Research tells us that increasing the representation of women will require organisations to rethink basic organisational policies and support structures that operate daily and are often unchallenged. We are also informed of some common barriers and myths that are prevalent in organisations that create difficulties for women progressing. These barriers/myths include:

- there are not enough women entering the workforce
- women take on a greater share of family responsibilities and as a result take more career breaks which can limit opportunities for promotion and development
- the perception that women lack the ambition for a career in leadership
- women do not have the characteristics associated with leadership
- unconscious biases work against women’s progression in the workplace.

Not enough women entering the workforce

Women comprise just over 50 per cent of the Australian population and 46.8 per cent of the Australian workforce. Comparatively these figures suggest that in today’s workforce females have reached close to equality of opportunity. However, the figures display disparity between workforce participation per se and senior and executive positions.

According to the APSC, women’s employment has been growing at a faster rate than men since 1999. Today women represent 57.7 per cent of the APS population. Within the SES female representation has grown from 5 per cent (October 1984) to 37 per cent (June 2009). Today this figure remains steady at 37 per cent.
Like the Australian public sector women’s representation at the most senior levels in the private sector remains low. Only 33.7 per cent of management roles are filled by women. There is a distinct lack of equal female representation at board and senior management levels. For the past six years female representation on boards has shown little improvement. There has been a decline of women in senior executive levels from 12 per cent in 2006 to 10.7 per cent compared today.

Women are also present in above equal numbers in higher education and comprise close to 50 per cent in vocational education.\(^9\)

The problem does not lie in the number of women entering the workforce but more so in their progression to senior leadership. Likewise, with structural impediments preventing progression many move to part-time work often only available in lower paid female dominated areas.\(^10\)

**Career breaks**

There needs to be recognition that due to caring responsibilities sitting primarily with women, their career will often take a different course. For example, there are more females than males working part-time (40 per cent of females worked a full year compared with 53 per cent of males), and females have a greater number of career breaks in any one year (38 per cent of women compared to 24 per cent of men).\(^11\)

It has also been found that periods of absence from the workplace has the potential to negatively affect careers through lost opportunities.\(^12\)

Career breaks reduce the tenure in positions which, when unwritten rules expect a certain degree of tenure, leadership roles become seemingly unattainable.

Likewise when the perception of leadership requires ongoing availability and visibility, absences from the workplace for a career break can disadvantage women. When organisations do nothing to dispel these perceptions, then capable females are not available for leadership roles.

**Belief that women lack ambition**

A common view cited in the literature is that women do not aspire to leadership positions and this is the reason there are so few in senior roles. In fact research dispels this perception in the Australian context. Women and men aspire to leadership.\(^13\) Although ambition is present this same study (Desvaux et al. 2007) found that women are less inclined than men to rate their performance higher than their co-workers.

---

9 Fox, C 2010, Mythbusters—Seven myths about women and work, Financial Services Institute of Australasia. This study notes that 64.2 per cent of graduates, 55.7 per cent of higher education students and 47.6 per cent of vocational education and training enrolments are women. In some industries, such as law, these figures are even greater were women account for 62 per cent of graduates.

10 Fox, C 2010 notes an evident pay gap in what is termed female dominated jobs such as marketing and human resources.

11 Desvaux et al. 2007. This research identified that women work an increasingly larger number of part-time hours. They also have breaks from the workplace for extended periods for family reasons. Both these aspects they do so to a larger degree than men. Women also spend a greater percentage of time on domestic tasks which was found to place additional pressures when balancing a career.

12 Desvaux et al. 2007. This study also found that 62 per cent of women perceive family or personal obligations were an obstacle to career.

13 Desvaux et al. 2007 found that seven in 10 women and eight in 10 men aspire to leadership roles. Also found was that only one in five women believed they had equal opportunity to be promoted. EOWA research also reinforces this finding with a third of women and 43 per cent of men aspiring to roles with more responsibility.
When applying for positions it has also been found that dominant groups inadvertently promote more ‘like others’.\(^\text{14}\)

Likewise, recruitment for senior leadership is often undertaken through informal networks and contacts, two areas that the dominant group generally have greater access to. When women are not in the dominant group they miss out on potentially valuable contacts which may increase opportunities for promotion.

**Women don’t have required leadership characteristics**

Studies have found women need to drive more aggressively and assertively with their career aspirations.\(^\text{15}\) However, these characteristics, often associated with men, act against typical female personality traits. Likewise, studies have found that stereotypical male characteristics are often associated with ‘effective leadership’.

When women are associated with more ‘feminine’ traits they are regarded by men as ineffective leaders regardless of their ability. This is compounded when women adopt male models of ‘masculinity’ as women perceive them to be too harsh and aggressive and lacking in femininity. Either way, by both genders, women in leadership are not given an easy time.

**Unconscious bias**

Of more prevalence is the impact of unconscious bias on women in organisations. Unconscious bias refers to the unconscious perceptions that individuals hold that affect their behaviour without their conscious knowledge. In summary, unintentional deep-lying stereotypes of women are applied to decisions such as promotion, hiring and assessment processes in such a way that they appear to be founded on reality.

With this understanding, organisations are investing in raising awareness of the concept of unconscious bias and the impact it has on decision making as it refers to all diverse groups. Large organisations such as National Australia Bank and Commonwealth Bank Australia have been investing in training senior executives to recognise their unconscious biases.

\(^\text{14}\) Ernst and Young 2010, Women in Leadership—How smart are you? found through in their research that dominant groups will generally promote similar types. When the dominant group is male, this will generally result in a male being promoted.

\(^\text{15}\) Van Keer E, Bogaert, J & Trbovic, N (2008), Could the right man for the job be a women? Hudson, found that women need to promote themselves more than their male counterparts and take an assertive and more vocal approach with their performance ambitions. This study also found typical male characteristics are associated with effective leadership.
Best practice gender strategies

Many organisations are tackling the barriers to women's progression through a combination of strategies. Research consistently highlights some key areas that may have a positive impact with focused attention.

Primarily they include:

- leadership visibly driving and reinforcing commitment to gender parity at every opportunity
- setting achievable and realistic outcomes and goals in all areas of the business
- investing in actions to overcome the obstacles and barriers to female progression.

Analysis of best practice organisations (see Attachment 4) reinforces the research findings. A list of 10 gender strategies provided by a specialist gender diversity organisation includes:16

- engaging the Executive
- establishing the core story by the Executive
- gathering data and refining strategies
- identifying ‘champions’ in the business
- planning for critical mass
- retaining female talent—recognising hidden talent
- engaging men—focus on unconscious bias
- considering the customer
- measuring progress
- setting audacious goals.

---

16 Emberin Pty Ltd is a company that focuses specifically on delivering gender strategies. The ten factors are a combination of the outcome of work in this area.
In addition, Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency criterion for recognition of Employer of Choice for Women provides a framework for organisations in considering focused commitment to gender strategies. Interestingly the six-criteria framework covers the areas discussed above with a focus also on demonstrating how the organisation has implemented such programs. In summary the six criteria include:

- **Criterion 1** — policies that support women across seven key employment areas
- **Criterion 2** — processes that are transparent and gender inclusive across seven employment areas
- **Criterion 3** — strategies supporting commitment to fully utilising and developing all staff, removing barriers to women
- **Criterion 4** — employee education on rights and obligations regarding sex-based harassment
- **Criterion 5** — gender inclusive culture championed by the CEO, driven by senior managers and holding line managers accountable
- **Criterion 6** — improved outcomes delivered for women and the business.

A high level analysis of each of these criteria has been undertaken as part of this Review. The outcome of this analysis would suggest that Defence would perform well in most aspects of Criterion 1 and Criterion 4. However, further work would be required in the remaining criteria specifically in demonstrating actions that had been implemented. Some of this work is already under way.
There is an opportunity for Defence to make substantial improvement through realising a vision that focuses on increasing participation of women at all levels. If endorsed and implemented a future state would encompass these elements:

Leaders who walk the talk are role models—authentic and encouraging of a diverse workforce with a particular emphasis on increasing the role of women at all levels.

Talent is nurtured and succession planned—merit rather than patronage rewarded.

Flexibilities within the workplace are encouraged—to build a sustainable, inclusive workforce that adapts for the future.

APS/ADF practices are mutually respected and deployed—to support an integrated workforce. This will require re-education/explanation.

APS Defence is sought out as a career option and widely valued in the community—myths are debunked and Defence is known as an employer that values diversity, supports its people to deliver for the Australian Government and community, and contributes to the wider APS.

Defence HR practices are exemplary—they are best practice within the APS.

This vision is consistent with the People in Defence strategy, particularly the focus on diversity, attraction and career management. The Strategic Reform Program, including shared services, will assist to deliver the vision though more effective and cohesive human resource practices.

Defence is a large APS employer with a strong regional presence. There is considerable scope for increasing women’s representation to ensure a sustainable workforce for the future. It will take time. Cultural change of this magnitude requires a multi-year program. For an indicative timeline for implementation of the recommendations in this Review, see page 62.

Literature and industry practice indicates there are several actions which organisations can take to improve their representation of women at all levels. The Review has categorised them under six key themes. These also resonate with the findings from the internal focus groups.

When looked at holistically six key themes emerge as areas for focus to make sustainable impact and improve underlying negative perceptions that exist. At the centre is the need to gain true leadership commitment for diversity at all levels. This requirement is paramount. Likewise, without investing in governance and infrastructure, supporting recommendations will be short-lived and fail to have longer term impact. Support programs for female talent and succession, attracting and recruiting more women, improving flexibility and providing ongoing development all contribute to increasing representation.

With this in mind the six themes, along with supporting recommendations, are provided following in-depth analysis of the Defence environment relating to women’s progression.
The change programme must be set up as a company transformation initiative in its own right and driven by top management. Practices will not develop unless top management is convinced that diversity brings a competitive advantage and commits to implementing change, under the leadership of the CEO.

Desvaux et al. 2007

Key to any organisational change strategy is the importance of senior leadership owning and driving the reform. In driving for gender parity this requirement is even greater. There needs to be measureable accountability for the most senior leadership levels in Defence in improving female representation.

Where companies in the public and private sector publicly demonstrate leadership commitment to gender parity, Defence lags behind. These companies report on the representation of women in senior leadership and set targets for increased participation. Their performance is supported through the establishment of teams whose prime objective is to focus on diversity outcomes.

The scope of diversity teams range from diversity boards to diversity councils. However, all have a senior credible diversity champion—often a male. Although structured to have gender as their immediate outcome, such teams can expand their focus to integrate other diverse groups at a later stage.

The absence of women in Defence leadership is noticeable. When compared to the broader APS, where women represent 37 per cent of the SES, Defence has 23 per cent female participation.

Female participation on Defence committees is even sparser. The largest female presence is evident in the Occupational Health and Safety Committee with two females (13 per cent), with the majority of committees having no female participation. Of note the Defence Committee as the prime decision-making body has no female presence.

Defence needs to take immediate and systemic action to remedy the representation of women particularly in the senior leadership roles and on committees. This increased performance comes with a critical mass of women. This critical mass is imperative to making sustainable systemic change. It should be at least three in 10 or 30 per cent female representation. Below this there is little or no change. Indeed, it is this result that is driving current debate around the introduction of quotas and targets for corporate boards and executive management positions.

Commitment needs to be visible and authentic throughout the senior leadership ranks and supported by a diversity council which will engage actively in developing and implementing initiatives to increase women’s representation and value their contribution to the organisation.

17 Companies including Deloitte, KPMG, Australian Federal Police and CBA all have a CEO as the diversity champion, manage diversity councils and have senior leadership targets in place.
18 Ralph Norris, CBA and Giam Sweigers, Deloitte are referred to as ‘champions’ for increasing gender participation in their respective organisations by EOWA.
19 Data supplied by the Defence HR system show that there are 28 per cent females at SES Band 1, 19 per cent at SES Band 2 and 0 per cent at SES Band 3 levels. This compares to the broader APS with 39 per cent females at SES Band 1, 35 per cent at SES Band 2 and 27 per cent at SES Band 3 levels.
20 Desvaux et al. 2007, p12.
An explicit statement issued by the Secretary would reinforce leadership commitment on gender equality and provide the mandate for the Review recommendations.

Equally women need to be part of Defence’s decision-making bodies both in terms of their contribution and as a critical mass in the senior leadership team. We know that stronger business performance can be correlated with increased female representation at the board level. These results are founded on diversity bringing a range of views and more creativity to decision making at the highest levels.

While investment in the pipeline will take time, immediate intervention is necessary to build the senior cadre over the short term. To do this and improve the mobility of the SES a rotation program for senior women across the APS into Defence can be developed with the assistance of the APSC and other departments. A necessary adjunct to this arrangement will be the identification of men from SES in Defence to rotate into the broader APS—a double bonus of gaining wider APS experience for them as well as the benefit of experienced APS women contributing to the work of Defence until the internal pipeline is strengthened.

Changing the mix of the leadership team alone will not support the changes necessary. Corresponding changes in workplace culture and attitude are required. Internal focus groups persisted with stories of Defence practice and policy that unintentionally excluded women. Although often applied in an unconscious context, senior leaders need to be aware of any unconscious bias so they can manage behaviour and drive improvement. Large enterprises that are facing similar issues have invested in cultural awareness activities for their senior leaders to understand the impact of unconscious bias. Defence needs to do the same.

**Recommendation 1—Committed leadership support**

Encompassing leadership support as a key gender strategy it is recommended that Defence:

1. Reinforces the importance of gender diversity by the Secretary issuing an explicit statement to senior leaders and staff on gender diversity being essential to build a sustainable workforce.

1.2 The Defence Committee commits to engaging in improvements to representation of women through:

- making specific commitments within performance agreements and charter letters
- showing active engagement as a Diversity Council responsible for overseeing implementation initiatives
- holding quarterly discussions at the Defence Committee on progress toward diversity outcomes
- appointing a Diversity Champion at the SES Band 3 level.

1.3 Establishes a senior rotation program for senior women at Band 2/3 levels with the broader APS

1.4 Delivers unconscious bias experiential training to the Senior Leadership Group

1.5 Ensures female membership in senior decision-making bodies.

---

21 Large organisations such as NAB and CBA report positive leadership behavioural changes through programs focused on understanding the impacts of unconscious bias.
Targeting and over-representing women for high potential programs and succession opportunities is consistently used as a strategy by organisations to increase female participation in leadership. Evidence shows that women have the potential and perform well in senior roles. However, they need to be encouraged and identified for succession. Defence needs to use this grounding to over-represent women in high potential programs to achieve gender parity in senior leadership.

Analysis shows that Defence has a particular problem given the weakness of the ‘pipeline’ in the EL ranks, where women represent 30 per cent at EL1 and 18.5 per cent at EL2 levels. This appears to stem from the diminishing number of women from the APS5 level upwards. To be proactive Defence needs to understand this latent talent, identify women for leadership early, and develop them for future key positions.

As one of the priorities identified in People in Defence, the People Strategies and Policy Group (PSPG) is building strong capacity and infrastructure around talent management. The progression of this work is timely as it provides an opportunity to ensure that the program accommodates an even or disproportionately greater number of women particularly in the initial stages, to overcome whatever practices/processes has led to their exclusion to date. Interjecting early will help to ensure there are no unconscious biases present in or built into application processes that exclude any particular cohort of the workforce.

Building the existing feeder group pipeline is also complemented by investing in longer-term supply. Organisations with strategies for progressing female talent and succession also invest in graduate intake programs as an approach to building longer-term capability. Given that the proportion of women joining the graduate ranks is relatively strong, there is an opportunity to increase the intake of graduates to build strength and capability more broadly for Defence and work assiduously on retention so that women share equally in leadership roles for the future.

Defence has critical job families including science and engineering and use effective graduate programs. To optimise the ratio of women in these male-dominated fields, increased emphasis on encouraging women graduates will continue to be a necessary component of the graduate programs.

Yet increasing the number of female graduates as a stand-alone strategy would provide a minor, albeit ongoing, supply of females for senior levels. This alone will not provide an early gain—we know this from linear trends in best practice research. A balance of long-term and short-term supply needs to be approached to deliver on a rich talent pipeline.

The importance of investing in the growth pipeline is heightened by APSC statistics that notes 48 per cent of the entire APS Executive Level and 71 per cent of SES level incumbents are eligible to retire in the coming 10 years. With 30 per cent of Defence SES already at retirement age there is a need to invest in future leadership succession.

---

22 Organisations that have demonstrated gains in female representation in senior leadership such as NAB, General Motors and Deloitte all have fast track develop programs targeting women.

23 APSC 2008.
Defence women perform well in the SES appraisals with 68 per cent of women rated in the top two categories, compared to 31 per cent of men. Yet they are under-represented in the development programs to prepare future leaders. If this imbalance is not addressed gains in gender parity within the senior leadership cadre will not occur.

To complement the talent management system under design within PSPG a specific intervention for Executive Level women is needed to prepare them for the future leadership opportunities. Building a specific program for Executive Level women, including rotation opportunities is an important approach to developing a long-term sustainable supply of suitably qualified women for future leadership. Internal focus groups reinforced the need for a rotation program within Defence to build these on-the-job opportunities.

As part of the Strategic Reform Program learning and development for Defence will be consolidated within the Vice Chief of the Defence Force's responsibilities. Care needs to be taken to ensure that design principles and practices essential to progress APS women are not eroded by an emphasis on unique Australian Defence Force requirements.

Recommendation 2—Talent management and succession planning

As part of a focused talent management and succession planning strategy it is recommended that Defence:

2.1 Embeds a focus on identifying and developing women for leadership roles, including a facilitated shadowing and coaching component, in the new talent management system.

2.2 Implements a development program for Executive Level women that includes job rotation, as well as over-representing women in existing development programs.

2.3 Consolidates the various graduate programs under single management and increase the annual intake of graduates.
To be competitive in today and tomorrow’s labour market Defence will need to adopt more flexible working arrangements. Workplace flexibility is a strategy that supports both genders in the workplace. Best practice organisations all provide flexible work options that support women’s careers.\textsuperscript{24}

Defence has a range of flexible working options provided within the Defence Enterprise Collective Agreement. As a ready source a framework of flexible options is available for Defence employees.

Yet it appears that access to such options is somewhat lacking. This was one of the most significant issues raised at every internal focus group. This is supported by Defence having the lowest part-time work rate in the APS. The pulse survey indicated the situation was particularly acute in regional areas. The perception raised at focus groups was that flexible arrangements are not seen as acceptable.

Focus group discussions consistently highlighted a culture of being visible in the workplace as a determinant of personal success. There was a strong perception that outcomes were determined by the number of hours one would be ‘present’ in the workplace. The scheduling of meetings outside core hours appeared to be a common practice in many parts of the department. It is acknowledged that Defence is a high paced, pressured environment, but so to are other APS departments. Defence needs to realign thinking and practice to support performance based on outcomes as opposed to hours in the office.

Taking a career break in Defence does appear to have difficulties, particularly when individuals return to the workplace. Difficulties often encountered in this area by Defence employees include being placed in non-challenging roles, diminishing opportunities, and the requirement to manage a full-time load in part-time hours. Defence needs to recognise that as long as women are the primary care givers, career breaks for family responsibility will be prominent.

Defence needs to focus on the application of flexibility. There are many facets to this be they better implementation of existing provisions, innovative approaches to job design, access to DREAMS tokens\textsuperscript{25}, reintegration of people from career breaks such as maternity leave and promotion, and explanation of the many successful flexible arrangements already in place.

\textsuperscript{24} All organisations visited in this study had flexible options for women. The take up is measured and in some instances jobs are redesigned to accommodate part-time before being advertised.
\textsuperscript{25} The Review team has been advised that Chief Information Officer Group (CIOG) has just released approximately 18 000 Defence Remote Electronic Access Mobility Service (DREAMS) tokens available to Groups.
While a hot topic in the focus groups, there was also a number of examples where women and men were working successfully in flexible arrangements. These need to be supported and publicised to help overcome the inertia evident in Defence practice which is at odds with its published policies.

Therefore it is suggested that a cross-Defence working group or taskforce be convened under the auspices of the Diversity Council to develop a flexible working program. This needs to educate both APS/ADF managers and employees.

Recommendation 3—Workplace flexibilities

As part of a strategy to improve workplace flexibility it is recommended that:

3.1 The Diversity Council lead the development of a flexible working strategy which includes:

- developing ‘better practice guide’ for employees and managers
- creating a central webpage to promote success stories and provide practical information
- increasing awareness of Defence Remote Electronic Access Mobility Service (DREAMS) token availability
- job design expertise.
A compelling Employee Value Proposition is also an integral element of employment branding and the recruitment strategy. It sets out who the company is, what is expected from employees and what employees receive from working for the company. In short, it reveals what your company offers that employees value. This includes defining not just the salary or job responsibilities and opportunities, but the company’s culture and ambitions.

Hays 2006

For Defence APS and potential Defence APS employees there are inbuilt disincentives in ads and images of Defence. Additionally, Defence jobs lack an APS flavour. Images of Defence in publications and media are masculine. They create a misconception of the work and the image of the department. As well, external focus groups found negative publicity put into question the safety of Defence as an employer, and reinforced an already strong perception of a male-dominated culture. Ads become descriptors of technical and military requirement that in many cases have been found to turn people off. At the very least they become attractive only to those either already in the department or those with military experience.

The Defence contingent of male hires at all classification levels is much greater than the broader APS. In addition 30 per cent or greater of all male recruits have previous ADF experience. (Census data from 2007 reinforces this with an identified 45 per cent of APS 4–6 employees with former military experience).

When looking at female candidates who do apply a higher percentage of candidates are generally successful in obtaining an interview and are generally more successful at securing the position. The problem does not lie in their ability but in the lack of applications for senior roles. Research indicates that this can often be a lack of confidence or encouragement by senior managers and supervisors. Women are less inclined to actively and aggressively sell their skills. Ensuring women are present in the field of applicants is a major success factor for many best practice organisations.

There also needs to be a clear branding strategy to explain the positive aspects of working in Defence APS—one that attracts women from a wider pool to apply for vacancies. A feature of the branding strategy needs to include images and stories of senior APS Defence women to convince the potential pool of applicants that they can be successful and that the culture and workplace support this. There is the opportunity to leverage from the work of Defence Force Recruiting to attract women into the ADF.

There are also problems with human resource practice around selection and recruitment. Consistent with APS policy Defence requires mixed gender panels other than in exceptional circumstances. The degree to which this exception is used is the question. For instance, 65 out of 75 EL2 (or equivalent) selection panels for 2009–10 in one group were male only. When recruitment panels are predominantly male, whether consciously or unconsciously, there is a higher propensity to recruit to a dominant group model.

In response to focus group concerns this Review sampled a number of Defence job descriptions and selection criteria. It would appear some positions are advertised for a closed audience. There were examples of the use of acronyms and an implied requirement for local experience that did not appear warranted and would discourage external applicants.

26 Both CBA and NAB noted the need to have women in the field of candidates.
27 With regard to cultural diversity in organisations the focus group findings suggest that women are seen as a ‘stigmatised group’ that is others hold negative attitudes and stereotypes towards this group.
There are two initiatives which Defence could adopt to address these issues. The first is to develop and issue a whole-of-Defence ‘plain English’ recruitment guide which emphasises the importance of gender balance on panels, a requirement that panels and delegates work actively to ensure women are always in the field of candidates, and that job descriptions are easily understood. (Defence should build on the work by Standards Australia for the Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency (EOWA) on gender friendly work level standards).

The second initiative is a centrally coordinated EL2 ‘refresh’ selection round which is undertaken with the assistance of an external search firm and independent panel members. The aim of this initiative is to immediately infuse into the EL2 pipeline a more gender diverse pool of candidates and one that could redress the ageing profile of the EL and SES cohort. Given the importance of the EL2 feeder group to SES, there needs to be a central unit overseeing all SES/EL2 selection activity. This would complement the talent management and succession planning in Theme 2 of this report.

Finally, a national whole-of Defence induction program is required to get new starters on board in a consistent way regardless of their group or region. As well as providing practical advice about the workings of the department, the program should establish a common understanding and commitment to the department’s priorities and goals. The program needs to cover the APS values and the importance of supporting flexible working arrangements and equal career opportunities.

Recommendation 4—Attraction, recruitment and selection

To improve the attraction, recruitment and selection of women in Defence APS it is recommended that Defence:

4.1 Through the PSPG develops a branding and attraction strategy for APS recruitment that:
   - promotes the variety of APS jobs within Defence
   - explicitly publicises senior APS women as role models.

4.2 Implements an EL2 refresh program including:
   - holding cross-Group EL2 bulk selection rounds
   - using professional search firms
   - appointing external representatives on selection panels.

4.3 Develops a ‘plain English’ recruitment guide including:
   - a gender balance on panels
   - explicit expectation of women in recruitment fields
   - inclusive job descriptions.

4.4 Adopts a common induction process in Defence which educates APS employees and their managers (both Australian Defence Force and APS) on their obligations and accountabilities relating to APS employment.

4.5 Creates a central human resource unit to oversee all recruitment and selection activity for SES and EL2s.
To improve female representation, women will require greater support as they are less inclined to appreciate their own performance. Participants in focus groups noted that women in Defence do not apply for positions unless they feel they have 100 per cent capability. Research supports this proposition showing women are less inclined to recognise and appreciate their own performance making it difficult for them to assert their talent. The pulse survey also indicated that women had less confidence in applying for promotion.

Defence has a strong masculine culture and focus groups repeatedly identified the existence of clubs/networks that support men. This ‘mateship’ type environment resonated strongly, both regionally and in Canberra.

We know from best practice research that women have difficulty gaining access to these networks and by their mere exclusion miss valuable opportunities for development and support in their career progression. Women find it more difficult to transition to leadership primarily due to lack of role models and mentors.

Mentoring is continually cited in literature as a supportive mechanism that has aided women in progressing through to senior leadership roles. Best practice organisations have tackled this by offering formal mentoring programs for women. The EOWA Employer of Choice organisations visited all had some form of female mentoring in place. Programs involved both structured and unstructured approaches and included men as mentors.

Improving participation of women in leadership in Defence will require access to mentoring. Mentoring was one of the most commonly cited strategies to support women throughout the focus groups.

Within Defence groups, and indeed professional associations, a number of mentor programs exist. It would be beneficial to bring these together within Defence as part of shared services arrangement under the strategic direction of PSPG.

Like mentoring, the benefits of female role models in senior executive positions has been shown to correlate with increased female representation at other leadership and line management levels within an organisation. Networks and role models remain a central premise for increasing female participation at the most senior levels.

Desvaux et al., 2010
Networks for women provide a support base for shared experiences and ideas. Best practice organisations invest in women’s networks as a way to support women in their transition to leadership and also as an opportunity for sharing common experiences and ideas. Establishing a women’s network in Defence sponsored by SES women will promote a greater support base for shared interests.

SES women in Defence have a role to play in progressing the recommendations of this Review. Men also play a significant role as mentors and champions. It is pleasing to note the support many Defence SES have offered to this Review and beyond. It is not their role alone, but as role models SES women need to be visible.

**Recommendation 5—Support and development**

As part of a focused support and development strategy it is recommended that Defence:

1. Establishes women’s networks across Defence with SES women in sponsorship roles.
2. Establishes Defence-wide mentoring programs for women.
This Review has run the ruler over how Defence has managed the challenges of a changing workforce with a specific emphasis on the role of women. While the recommendations cover a number of themes it is important that this is not just a one-off isolated review. Defence is one of the largest employers of Australian public servants and should be a leader in practices that promote the employment of women. A sustained effort to modernise practice needs to be hardwired into the fabric of the Defence culture—hence the need to address governance and infrastructure.

The emergence of PSPG and subsequently the People in Defence strategy have improved the quality of the people systems architecture. However, the strong internal group culture and structures have led to the development and implementation of localised, disconnected practice and process.

The establishment of local values also supports the notion of discrete identities within Defence and the association with a group or service ahead of Defence more broadly. There was little visibility of APS values and State of the Service Reports have borne out the weaker association with the APS as opposed to Defence or local values.

Duplication of effort is obvious. There are five Graduate programs that operate independently and many more leadership and development programs. Depending on a combination of Group and geography, line managers and staff are supported by different networks of human resource advice and processes. Naturally, the quality of outcome and alignment with Defence and wider-APS policies is inconsistent.

This is a more fragmented human resource system than exists in most other departments. The strong group identity actually works against creating pathways for women and men. Career exposure and opportunities are often restricted to within groups. In many places, particularly regional areas, middle-level APS jobs are in very short supply and stove-piping within groups only worsens this. More attention to promote Defence-wide pathways, if not APS-wide, would create healthier circulation and expand opportunities.

There is also a strong emphasis on financial accountability which, obviously important, overshadows equally important people management responsibilities. Consistent with this, focus groups identified a general lack of understanding and application of the APS Act and indeed the Defence Enterprise Collective Agreement (DECA).

There is considerable evidence from the focus groups that military approaches pervade the application of APS conditions to the detriment of APS women. For example, part-time work is hard to obtain and stigmatised, and ‘time at level’ and misunderstandings around civilian full-time equivalents (FTEs) constrain the career prospects of women with career breaks. There were also many examples given of decisions which did not accord with expectations and practice under the APS Act or the DECA.

A particular area of concern raised in focus groups was the perceived hindrance of FTE management practices towards women who take maternity leave. This could be overcome by adopting common approaches in other departments including a central management approach to maternity leave that relieved business units of the FTE liability.

There is a need to re-explain expectations and responsibilities which both APS and ADF managers and supervisors need to observe in relation to the APS Act and the DECA. The soon to be released revised APS values, which are simpler and easier to understand, will give Defence a good opportunity to re-educate Defence APS and ADF managers about their responsibilities and obligations.

The Fairness and Resolution Branch in PSPG is responsible for diversity policy. Current policy for the APS is old and out of date—that is, the Departmental Personnel Instruction 1/2001 Equity and Diversity in the Department of Defence (issued January 2001). The last Equity and Diversity Plan expired in 2009.
Over the years the focus has centred on ADF women with numerous high profile reviews. In contrast there has been little focus on Defence APS gender diversity. To best knowledge the last department-level review of APS women was a statistical study commissioned in 1995.

There is a need to expand the scope and the direction of the Fairness and Resolution Branch so that it leads the department’s diversity policy implementation and acts as a centre of excellence with an immediate focus on driving improved practice and better outcomes for Defence APS women. The shared services design affords the opportunity for proactive equity and diversity policy and practice to be developed.

The centre of excellence design needs to be integrated into the broader human resource model consistent with the shared services reform. However, caution needs to be exercised in harvesting the savings from corporate or administrative support areas which employ the greatest proportion of women and other diversity target groups, including employees with disabilities.

It is clear from Defence’s current gender position and lessons from industry that improving representation of women requires sustained actions backed by strong leadership. To provide this leadership and strategic oversight, and to evaluate progress, it is proposed an external committee comprising the Secretary Prime Minister and Cabinet, Australian Public Service Commissioner, Secretary of Department of Defence and a female departmental secretary oversees implementation. This committee would be supported by PSPG.

**Recommendation 6—Governance and infrastructure**

As part of a focused governance and infrastructure strategy it is recommended that Defence:

6.1 Expands the role of the Fairness and Resolution Branch to:
   - promote diversity as a positive attribute for a workforce
   - drive the actions arising from this Review
   - overhauling the equity and diversity training which is currently outdated and compliance focused.

6.2 Leverages from the soon to be released, revised APS Values and educate APS/ADF managers on their staff management and workplace diversity responsibilities and obligations under both the APS Act and the Defence Enterprise Collective Agreement.

6.3 Establishes a central maternity leave pool for central management of the full-time equivalent liability associated with maternity leave.

6.4 Establishes an external committee comprised of the Secretary Department Prime Minister and Cabinet, the APS Commissioner, Secretary Department of Defence and a female departmental secretary to oversee the implementation of this Review’s recommendations and evaluation strategy. The committee would be supported by a change manager reporting into People Strategies and Policy Group on progress.
The following indicative timeline will assist with implementation of this Review’s recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Establishment &amp; Design</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Timeline

#### 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0 Focused Leadership Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Explicit statement by Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Senior rotation program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Female membership in decision making bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 DC commitment, Diversity champion &amp; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Unconscious bias awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Talent Management &amp; Succession Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Shadowing &amp; coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 EL development program &amp; over-representation of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Consolidate &amp; increase graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Workplace Flexibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Diversity council to lead flexible working strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 “Better Practice Guide”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Central website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Dreams availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Job design expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Attraction, Recruitment &amp; Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 APS branding &amp; attraction strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 EL2 Refresh Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Plain English recruitment guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Common Induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Central oversight of SES &amp; EL2 recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Support &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Establish women’s networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Establish Defence wide mentoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Governance &amp; Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Refocus the role of the Fairness &amp; Resolution Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Leverage the revised APS values &amp; educate managers of their responsibilities &amp; obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Central maternity leave pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 External committee to oversee recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implementation Toolbox

The review has gathered much rich information from other organisations and employers on techniques and strategies which they have employed to assist with their “gender agendas”. These have been generously provided and the review team believes they provide a ready base on which to implement a number of the recommendations made which are listed below and available in the Review Implementation Toolbox:

Mentoring and Networks
- DSA Mentor Program
- Queensland Police Women’s Network Induction Kit
- Queensland Police Women’s Network Action Plan 2010-2013
- Queensland Police Women’s Network Brochure

Attraction and Retention
- Employer of Choice for Women (EOWA) Application
- Employer of Choice for Women (EOWA) Citation Report 2010
- Employer of Choice for Women (EOWA) Criteria
- Employer of Choice for Women (EOWA) – Women Moving Forward Program
- Gender bias in Job Applications
- I&S Attraction and Retention of Women
- VCDF Actions on Retention & Attraction of Women
- APSC - Voluntary gender equity standard in job evaluation

Flexible Work Practices
- Queensland Government Office for Women, Smart Women – Smart State Taskforce, Flexible Work arrangements in science, engineering and technology – information for employers.
- Queensland Government Office for Women, Smart Women – Smart State Taskforce, Taking a career break – A resource for Queensland women in science, engineering and technology.
- Tasmania Government: Better Workplaces – Employer Resource Kit
Implementation Toolbox

Improving Representation of Women

- Advancing Women E-Guide – high impact ways for your organisation to become more competitive through advancing women
- Queensland Government Office for Women, Women’s leadership in Science, Engineering and Technology (SET), The Smart Women – Smart State Taskforce’s Board Shadowing Program.
- Navy Women’s Strategy 2011-2015
- Navy’s Commander’s Intent for Navy Women’s Strategic Adviser
- Women in Innovation & Technology Website: http://www.wit-sa.org/
Group Policies and Programs
- APS only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PEOPLE PLAN</th>
<th>DIVERSITY POLICY AND PLANS</th>
<th>DIVERSITY NETWORK</th>
<th>FLEXIBILITY/RETENTION PROGRAMS</th>
<th>MENTORING/COACHING</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS</th>
<th>GRADUATE PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>Annual People Plan 2010-11 Strategic Workforce Plan 2010-20</td>
<td>Public Service Act Defence Personnel Instruction 1/2001 - Equity &amp; Diversity DECA - commitment to career pathways for women Workplace Equity &amp; Diversity Plan 07-09 (WEDP) expired draft replacement</td>
<td>Equity Advisors - focus on behaviour</td>
<td>DECA APS critical trades New Job Family construct</td>
<td>Graduates SES Officers</td>
<td>ACSC/SSSC CDAC Capstone Draft New Supervisors and Managers Training Programs</td>
<td>Graduate Development Program (GDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two small programs; APS6-EL1 and EDS(EL2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing in Navy program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing in Navy program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal leadership development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCDF</td>
<td>Workforce plan</td>
<td>Diversity Policy draft in progress VCDF Attraction and Retention of Women Action Plan</td>
<td>VCDF Woman’s Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not yet, but in action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Odyssey and Junior Managers Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMO</td>
<td>Workforce plan, HR strategy in progress</td>
<td>No specific diversity plan. CEO’s Professionalisation Agenda is good for the attraction of women</td>
<td>Building Defence Capability Premium (BDCP), casual intermittent non-ongoing for retirees</td>
<td>Yes. Only for project managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exec Leadership Compass for EL1&amp;2, Exec Masters program</td>
<td>DMO Material Graduate Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSTO</td>
<td>Draft people strategy</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior leadership development &amp; a Middle leadership development program</td>
<td>DSTO Graduate Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;S</td>
<td>People Plan &amp; Principles and Workforce Plan</td>
<td>Yes, but 2008 under old WEDP</td>
<td>Retention Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Management Development Program (MMDP) and Executive Leadership Development Program (ELDP)</td>
<td>CDSO Intelligence Development Program Altitude@CDSO Graduate Recruitment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOG</td>
<td>Workforce Plan, includes gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching available as requested</td>
<td>CIO Training Continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>The Defence People Plan is considered as the Group plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching available as requested</td>
<td>CDSO Dev Program (for whole group) informal gender angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Finance graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCDF</td>
<td>Not yet, in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching available as requested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISATIONAL BACKGROUND (DRIVING FACTORS)</td>
<td>INDUSTRY</td>
<td>QUICK FACTS</td>
<td>BARRIERS IDENTIFIED</td>
<td>INITIATIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Australia Bank</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>Increase the number of women in executive management, the top three layers of the organisation, from 23% to 33% by 2015</td>
<td>Talent pipeline 50/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A leadership program focused on Unconscious Bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment practices aimed at balancing males and females short-listed for senior roles. Both males and females on hiring panels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of flexible options available with 50% of staff believing that flexibility is available at NAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profiles of mentors and mentees are placed on Facebook to match interest and join up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise-wide Diversity Forum which meets six times a year. Chaired by the Deputy Group CEO and consists of senior mgmt as representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A program that keeps employees on extended leave in touch with the business and helps them transition back into the workplace - reConnect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity &amp; Inclusion team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Australia Bank is a publicly listed company which operates across Australia, New Zealand, Asia, United Kingdom and United States. The bank has approximately 1,800 branches and service centres. National Australia Bank is publicly committed to a Diversity program, reflective of their customer and community base, as a good business strategy. Currently, National Australia Bank’s diversity focus is on gender and age.
Industry Visits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>GENDER SPILT OVERALL</th>
<th>GENDER SPILT LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>QUOTA/TARGETS</th>
<th>TALENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>RECRUITMENT</th>
<th>FLEXIBILITY</th>
<th>MENTORING</th>
<th>COACHING</th>
<th>ROLE MODELLING</th>
<th>NETWORKING</th>
<th>SUPPORT GROUPS</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION &amp; OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>4,500 &amp; 445 Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial stages of the Inspiring Women program faced an education requirement for the need to increase female representation rates across the firm</td>
<td>Deloitte Business Women of the Year program to identify talent</td>
<td>Fast track programs in place for identified talent including high value assignments</td>
<td>Commitment to recruitment of women</td>
<td>Create part-time opportunities for Partners</td>
<td>Mentoring program in place</td>
<td>Coaching for top talent with senior Partners</td>
<td>Profile role models through internal communications</td>
<td>Networking program in place</td>
<td>Mothers Group</td>
<td>Maternity leave staying in touch program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deloitte**

Deloitte operates across 150 countries and has 170,000 employees. Within Australia there is CEO commitment to delivering an online program focused on developing women. Called Inspiring Women the program focuses on the identification, development and retention of high potential women. Senior leaders are also involved in education and support of gender diversity. With regard to gender diversity, at the most senior levels Deloitte has been primarily male dominated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL BACKGROUND (DRIVING FACTORS)</th>
<th>QUICK FACTS</th>
<th>BARRIERS IDENTIFIED</th>
<th>QUOTAS OR TARGETS</th>
<th>TALENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>RECRUITMENT</th>
<th>FLEXIBILITY</th>
<th>MENTORING</th>
<th>COACHING</th>
<th>ROLE MODELLING</th>
<th>NETWORKING</th>
<th>SUPPORT GROUPS</th>
<th>COMMS BRANDING &amp; OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Motors Holden</strong></td>
<td>Automotive manufacturer with a predominately male-dominated workforce. In 1999 launched Diversity at Holden policy aimed at attracting more women to non-traditional roles. Main non-traditional role being engineering.</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Approx. 7,829 (2006)</td>
<td>10.7% women, 89.3% men</td>
<td>25% women in Executive roles</td>
<td>Attracting and retaining women in non-traditional roles such as engineering</td>
<td>In 2005 and 2006 all Executive Director's had a KPI for gender hire outlining that 30% of all new hires are to be women</td>
<td>Engineering division has a graduate program which includes senior female engineers talking with graduates</td>
<td>All recruitment suppliers attend GMH's induction workshop which discusses GMH diversity program. This is reinforced through supplier contracts</td>
<td>All managers involved in hiring undertake a recruitment and selection program before they are allowed to be involved in recruitment</td>
<td>Part-time, job-sharing, working from home, lactation break policy</td>
<td>GM Holden Women’s Council - meet bi-monthly. Discussions include strategies for attracting women, self-development, mentoring and career planning</td>
<td>Advertising materials including company website now feature images of both men and women working in a variety of roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENT 4**
**KPMG**

KPMG is a global professional services firm with approximately 135,000 employees across 140 countries. KPMG has an established People Strategy covering their approach and outcomes for diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEE</th>
<th>GENDER SPILT OVERALL</th>
<th>GENDER SPILT LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>QUICK FACTS</th>
<th>BARRIERS IDENTIFIED</th>
<th>INITIATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Services</td>
<td>4,800 &amp; 350 Partners across 13 Offices</td>
<td>approx. 50%</td>
<td>50% graduate intake; 50% Managers; 33% senior managers; 12% executive</td>
<td>Diversity inclusive action plan for each Division</td>
<td>The decreasing numbers of females at senior levels</td>
<td>Career resiliency programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly reporting on key performance indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible work discussion groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Women’s Development Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals set for Partners</td>
<td>Talent Day program - one day program on gender equality in context of developing succession - focus on dealing with equitable selection and unconscious bias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility strategy in place - winner of Victorian Government’s Working Families Council annual Fair and Flexible Employer Award (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal mentoring/ coaching as informal mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal coaching combined with mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Networking events held</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Return to work forums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Targeted communication plan aimed at informing staff on initiatives and programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting workshops and parental leave courses for women and spouses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 4

Industry Visits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ORGANISATIONAL BACKGROUND (DRIVING FACTORS)</strong></th>
<th><strong>QUICK FACTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>BARRIERS IDENTIFIED</strong></th>
<th><strong>INITIATIVES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry of Defence UK</strong></td>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brisbane City Council</strong></td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>6,919</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian Federal Police</strong></td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>6,919</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Defence
- **Industry:** Defence
- **Number of Employee:** 70,000
- **Gender Split Overall:** 38.7% women
- **Gender Split Leadership:** Senior Civil Service 21% woman
- **Quick Facts:** A diverse workforce including a large number of Industrial and technical grades
- **Barriers Identified:** 40% for the total workforce by 2013, 30% for the SCS by 2013
- **Initiatives:** Flexible approach to working from home, An online process of matching mentors and mantonees

### Brisbane City Council
- **Industry:** Services
- **Number of Employee:** 6,919
- **Gender Split Overall:** 32.7% women
- **Quick Facts:** 4% of total employees in the band 9 and above cohort as at 30 June 2010
- **Barriers Identified:** No targets for women
- **Initiatives:** Shadowing

### Australian Federal Police
- **Industry:** Law Enforcement
- **Number of Employee:** 6,919
- **Gender Split Overall:** 32.7% women
- **Quick Facts:** 4% of total employees in the band 9 and above cohort as at 30 June 2010
- **Barriers Identified:** No targets for women
- **Initiatives:** Targeted recruitment strategies for women, Shadowing

---

**Notes:**
- The Ministry of Defence employs approximately 70,000 civil servants, with an organisation and classification structures similar to the Australian Defence Department.
- Defence employs approximately 70,000 civil servants, with an organisation and classification structures similar to the Australian Defence Department.
- The Defence Permanent Secretary is the Diversity Champion for the whole civil service.

---

**The Review of Employment Pathways for APS Women in the Department of Defence**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL BACKGROUND (DRIVING FACTORS)</th>
<th>QUICK FACTS</th>
<th>BARRIERS IDENTIFIED</th>
<th>INITIATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commonwealth Bank of Australia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry: Financial Services</td>
<td>Industry: Financial Services</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>29% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 38,000</td>
<td>Employees: 38,000</td>
<td>29% female</td>
<td>29% female mid-management; 19% upper mgt; 1 female direct report to CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Split Overall</td>
<td>Gender: Split Overall</td>
<td>29% female</td>
<td>29% female mid-management; 19% upper mgt; 1 female direct report to CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Split Leadership</td>
<td>Gender: Split Leadership</td>
<td>29% female</td>
<td>29% female mid-management; 19% upper mgt; 1 female direct report to CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QLD Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry: Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Industry: Law Enforcement</td>
<td>25,000 civilian and uniformed</td>
<td>52% female uniformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees: 25,000</td>
<td>Employees: 25,000</td>
<td>52% female uniformed</td>
<td>52% female uniformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Split Overall</td>
<td>Gender: Split Overall</td>
<td>52% female uniformed</td>
<td>52% female uniformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Split Leadership</td>
<td>Gender: Split Leadership</td>
<td>52% female uniformed</td>
<td>52% female uniformed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Diversity council established with heads of business which meets every 3 months

---

The Commonwealth Bank sees diversity in leadership as an asset linked to better economic performance. CBA have a key diversity focus aimed at increasing the representation of women in senior leadership roles. CBA’s approach includes creating greater transparency in appointment to roles, updating business processes and policies, and building female talent pipeline. Strategies range from talent initiatives, mentoring, career resiliency and high potential development programs and a range of flexible working, parental and carers support options. CBA CEO Ralph Norris has led the reform and emphasis on gender and diversity.

- Financial Services 38,000
- Employees: 38,000
- Gender: Split Overall 29% female
- Gender: Split Leadership 29% female mid-management; 19% upper mgt; 1 female direct report to CEO

Commonwealth Bank of Australia

QLD Police

- QLD Chief of Police is a very strong advocate for women which has been seen as an imperative. QLD Police diversity strategy also focuses on older workers and indigenous.

- Law Enforcement 25,000 civilian and uniformed
- Employees: 25,000
- Gender: Split Overall 52% female uniformed
- Gender: Split Leadership 52% female uniformed

QLD Police
Industry Visits
### ORGANISATIONAL BACKGROUND (DRIVING FACTORS)

**BAE Systems**

BAE design, integrate and maintaining systems for the ADF. Globally BAE has over 100,000. With over 6,000 employees working across Australia in urban, regional and remote locations, BAE core skill sets are generally non-traditional female roles. Recognising the need for tapping into a shrinking labour pool and the innovative thinking that diversity brings, BAE developed a diversity and inclusion strategy in 2008. BAE Australia links into a global working group for diversity and inclusion.

### QUICK FACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>NO. EMPLOYEE</th>
<th>GENDER SPLIT OVERALL</th>
<th>GENDER SPLIT LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defence and Security supplier</td>
<td>6,000 employees</td>
<td>15.27% women: 84.73% male</td>
<td>11% women: 89% male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BARRIERS IDENTIFIED

- Limited numbers of females in the company and in particular in executive roles. Added to this the BAE operates in an environment where the skill requirements are non-traditional female roles.
- A 10% part-time target has been set.

### QUICK FACTS

- No specific targets or quotas.
- Diversity & inclusion balanced scorecard to report status against key measures. Reviewed and reported on monthly.

### INITIATIVES

**DEVELOPMENT**

- Managers attend training on managing flexibility.
- Succession planning in place for high potential women.

**RECRUITMENT**

- Recruitment Policy notes part-time and job-share opportunities.
- Focused on increasing more female graduates in intakes for non-traditional roles.

**FLEXIBILITY**

- Creating genuine part-time and job-share roles, flexible start and finish times, working at home for all levels in the company. All areas of BAE were required to identify roles that could be done part-time.
- Encourage all Executives to work more flexibly - particularly part-time.

**MENTORING**

- Mentoring scheme already in existence - now targets women and includes mentors external to BAE.

**COACHING**

- Executive women have targeted development plan.

**ROLE MODELLING**

- Women in the executive roles.

**NETWORKING**

- Networking opportunities for women internally and externally.

**SUPPORT GROUPS**

- Diversity & Inclusion team with Champion (member of the management Board).

**COMMS BRAND & OTHER**

- Variety of tools used to communicate including, Inclusion & Diversity website that is two-way.