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# Executive Summary

The vision of the Public Service Commission (PSC) is to be an “employer of choice by 2015”. The 2009 Vanuatu Public Sector Survey was undertaken to provide the PSC with important data and feedback to help it achieve this vision. The PSC will use the survey findings and feedback to help focus its future support with the aim of strengthening management and performance across the Vanuatu Public Service.

The PSC recognises that its most important asset is its employees – the public servants who work everyday to serve the people of Vanuatu and the nation. This survey was an opportunity to hear from public servants – for you to share your experiences on life in the public sector and your suggestions for improvement.

The survey represents a major step towards improved transparency in decision making. Accordingly, the results of the survey are being published and shared with public servants. The PSC has identified a number of priority actions in response to survey findings, with implementation progress to be reported to the Chair of the Public Service Commission.

**Key findings**

***Overview***

The survey found that most respondents are satisfied with overall leadership and management and overall conditions of service. However, the survey findings also suggest that there is room for substantial improvement in a number of areas. Key challenges in the road ahead include the need to strengthen human resources support, foster a culture of performance management, and ensure fairness and equity for all employees, particularly with respect to conditions of service, recruitment and training opportunities.

***Demographic profile***

The survey findings suggest that public servants are generally well educated, with the majority of respondents (68%) having completed some form of further training after high school. Men make up 60% of public servant numbers and also tend to occupy a higher proportion of senior management positions. The median age of public servants is 40 years old.

The survey findings suggest that public servants tend to choose the public service as a long term career, with almost two thirds of respondents (64%) having served for at least 5 years and 44% for more than 10 years. Around one out of every five respondents (19%) is currently engaged on a temporary, contract or daily rated basis. Many contracted, temporary and daily staff have served for extended periods without job security or comparable conditions of service to permanent employees.

***Leadership and Management***

While most respondents are generally satisfied with leadership and management, they also identified a need for managers to have the right skills, training and leadership qualities. Many respondents felt that management skills could be further strengthened, and that managers should focus on management and not get so involved in the technical side of things. Respondents also expressed a strong desire for more regular staff meetings and better sharing of information and communication within their departments.

Human resources support emerged as one of the most significant areas for improvement - only around 40% of respondents are satisfied with the level of HR support they currently receive. Those from provincial areas were particularly dissatisfied, with many calling for an HR officer to be based in their province in order to improve the level of service.

The need for qualified HR personnel and more timely and responsive support for HR processes (particularly around recruitment, promotions, grievances and performance pay) were consistent themes. Many respondents also felt that cooperation between HR officers and managers could be further improved, as well as improved HR support in terms of identifying and meeting staff training needs.

A significant number of respondents identified the need for recruitment and selection processes to be fair, transparent and merit-based. Female respondents, in particular, tended to perceive recruitment to be less fair and transparent than their male counterparts.

***Performance management***

Survey respondents expressed a clear desire for more performance feedback. Only around 12% of respondents indicated that they receive regular performance feedback from their supervisor, while over a third (36%) never receive any feedback. Survey findings also suggest there is a need for improved guidance on work priorities, with fewer than half (48%) of all respondents indicating that they had a clear list of performance goals.

There was a general consensus amongst respondents that there is a need for a robust and fair Performance Management System which recognises, rewards and encourages good performance. Respondents also suggested that performance assessments should allow for a two-way dialogue, be undertaken regularly and have consistent follow up. The absence of effective performance management was identified as a key constraint in terms of improving staff morale and addressing issues such as absenteeism and disciplinary action.

Many respondents also felt that disciplinary action needed to be strengthened, together with timely resolution of staff grievances. Improving teamwork was another common suggestion to improve performance.

***Learning and Development***

Training was repeatedly highlighted by respondents as one of the most important issues. A significant number of respondents would like to receive more training, with the most frequent request being for more specialised technical training, followed by leadership and management training. Survey findings also suggest that there is a need for further staff training in key government policies, such as the Public Service Act, Code of Conduct and Public Financial Management Act (with fewer than half of respondents aware of their obligations and entitlements under these key government policies). A significant number of respondents also thought that learning and development opportunities needed to be more equitable, and not just provided to those in senior positions.

While the majority of respondents indicated that they had the necessary tools and equipment to perform their job, respondents in the provinces tended to identify this as more of a problem. Respondents from provincial areas were also generally less satisfied with access to training opportunities, with many expressing the view that more training should be offered in the provinces.

***Planning and Budgeting***

The majority of respondents indicated that corporate and section level work planning was being undertaken and that, for the most part, policy making processes are evidence-based and consultative.

One of the most important issues raised by respondents was the need to improve consultation processes and input to the budget. Many respondents expressed frustration that they little input to the budget process, that budgeting was too centralised, and that it was often done in isolation of planning.

Respondents also identified a general need for more regular information on their budgets to help them better manage their programs (eg. how much money they have, as well as regular updates on expenditure). The need for better spending controls (i.e. ensuring spending is in line with budgets and budgets are aligned with plans), together with reduced political and corporate interference in the budget were also frequently raised suggestions.

**Pay and conditions**

Most respondents are generally satisfied with overall conditions of service and believe that pay is competitive when compared to the private sector. Even so, a significant number of respondents raised concerns over the high cost of living, with a substantial number calling for a review or increase of salary.

Housing allowances, in particular, emerged as a significant cause for concern. Many respondents felt that the housing allowance is not sufficient, while others voiced concerns over equity (eg. housing allowance increased for senior managers but not officers; some people not able to access government housing despite being eligible).

A substantial number of respondents raised concerns about contracted, temporary and daily rated staff being employed for long periods without adequate job security and under less favorable conditions of service than permanent staff. The survey found that a significant number of contracted and daily rated respondents have been employed without any job security for more than 5 years, raising concerns about staff equity and workforce planning within the public service.

**Priority actions for the PSC**

Based on survey findings, the Public Service Commission is examining a range of options to improve performance. It will also be essential for senior managers provide ongoing leadership in the workplace to help take many of these reforms forward.

Priority actions for the year ahead include:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Issue** | **Priority Actions** | **Estimated Time Frame** |
| **Leadership & Management** | Restructure / review OPSC | December 2009 |
| Strengthen Executive Development Program | 2010 |
| Strengthen coordination of HRDU with Aid Donors & HRO (Overseas training). | January 2010 |
| Restructure of Ministries | End of 2010 |
| Chairman quarterly meetings with DG/Directors | Beginning January 2010 |
| Chairman visits with Ministers | Beginning January 2010 |
| Annual Retreat for DG/ Directors | June 2010 |
| Ministry HRO visits to provinces (2x annual) | Program done before December 2010 |
| Strengthen HRO Group | Beginning Jan 2010 |
| Strengthen PSC visits to Province | Program done before Jan 2010 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Issue** | **Priority Actions** | **Estimated Time Frame** |
| **Leadership & Management (continued)** | Review recruitment process for Temp, Daily rated, Contract staff. | June 2010 |
| Review selection panel process | June 2010 |
| **Performance Management** | Simplify & strengthen Performance Management System | December 2010 |
| Directors, HRO & Head of sections capacity building (discipline, etc) | March 2010 |
| **Learning & Development** | Induction & Orientation training (PSC Act, PFEM Act, Code of Conduct) | December 2009 |
| HRD / Succession Plan for each Ministry | June 2010 |
| **Planning & Budget** | Issue instruction / circular for all Heads of Departments to include provincial heads in consultation | March 2010 |
| **Pay & Conditions** | Review of housing allowance | April 2010 |
| PSC to develop Housing Scheme | Long term |
| Enforcement & review of current policies regarding Temp, Daily rated, Contract status | Present |
| Review of traveling allowance & policies | March 2010 |
| Review working hours | June 2010 |

# Main Report

# 1.0 Introduction

The Public Service Commission conducted a survey of public servants in August 2009. This landmark survey represented the first time public servants had been provided with the opportunity to provide direct and confidential feedback to their employer – the Public Service Commission – one of the largest employers in Vanuatu.

The survey sought feedback from public servants on a range of issues, including: leadership and management, human resources support, performance management, learning and development, planning and budgeting, and pay and conditions. This report presents the main findings from the survey.

One of the core values of the PSC is to be “transparent and accountable for its decisions within the government framework and within the Vanuatu constitution”. This survey represents a major step by the PSC towards greater transparency and accountability. The results of the survey will be shared with public servants, and implementation of priority actions will be closely monitored by the PSC.

While the primary aim of the survey was to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement to help guide the future directions and support provided by the Public Service Commission, it is hoped that the survey findings will be also useful to a wide range of stakeholders throughout government. For example, survey data could be drawn on to assist with issues such as workforce planning, staff development and training needs.

# 2.0 Methodology

**Summary**

The 2009 Public Sector Survey was officially launched by the Chairman of the Public Service Commission on 6th July 2009 and was conducted over a three week period (6th - 25th July 2009).

The survey was open to all Public Servants who fall under the mandate of the Vanuatu Public Service Commission (estimated total population of 1999 public servants).[[2]](#footnote-2)

### 2.1 Methodological approach

As the first survey of its kind, the Public Service Commission wanted to seek the views of as many public servants as possible. Another important consideration was using a survey format that would provide respondents with a high level of confidentiality and encourage candid responses. For these reasons, the Public Service Commission elected to conduct a confidential survey which was open to all public servants, rather than target a random sample.

**Survey distribution**

The survey was distributed via email and in hard copy. Respondents were provided with three different options to take the survey:

* over the internet (via a direct web link)
* filling out and returning a word document (attached to email)
* hard copy (distributed to all provinces and departments)

The survey was distributed to 1358 public servants via email and a further 405 hard copies were also distributed (240 copies to the provinces and 165 copies to government departments in Port Vila).

**Focus groups**

In addition to the formal survey, three focus groups were held with a selection of public servants in Port Vila and in two of the provinces. Focus groups enabled the research team to explore a number of issues in more detail and added to the richness of survey data. Focus group participants in Port Vila were selected randomly from across departments, while participants in the provinces were invited from across government departments.

Table 1. Focus group statistics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Location** | **Date** | **Participants** |
| Port Vila (Efate) | 9 July 2009 | 15 participants: 5 male, 10 female |
| Malakula (Malampa) | 14 July 2009 | 11 participants: 10 male, 1 female |
| Santo (Sanma) | 15 July 2009 | 15 participants: 8 male, 7 female |
| **TOTAL** | | **41 participants: 23 male, 18 female** |

### 2.2 Sample size and response rates

It is estimated that the survey was distributed to at least 80% of all public servants.[[3]](#footnote-3)

A total of 536 responses were received.[[4]](#footnote-4) Approximately one out of every four public servants responded, with an overall response rate of around 29%. This response rate is slightly above average when compared to other surveys of this nature.[[5]](#footnote-5)

### 2.3 Methodological constraints

While the PSC aimed to conduct a census of public servants, it is estimated that the survey only reached around 80% of the target population. As a result, there is a degree of selection bias in the sample which needs to be taken into consideration when reviewing results.

The demographic profile of respondents was compared to known population statistics to test for selection bias and assess the extent to which survey respondents are representative of the broader population of public servants. This analysis found that the sample of respondents is broadly representative, with some minor exceptions.

Refer to Annex A for more detailed discussion of the methodology, methodological constraints and selection bias.

# 3.0 Key Findings

### 3.1 Demographic profile

**Summary**

This section outlines basic demographic data such as gender, age, education, employment status, position level and work location, together with more detailed analysis of key data (eg. position and education levels by gender).[[6]](#footnote-6)

**Gender**

Men make up 60% of total public servant numbers, with women making up the balance (40%). Survey respondents are representative in terms of gender when compared to the population.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Chart 1. Survey respondents by gender



n=502

**Age**

The average age of public servants is 40 and the median age is also 40.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The PSC identified succession planning as an issue of concern. Population data indicates that around 30% of public servants are due to reach retirement age within the next 10 years (i.e. those aged older than 45 years), however the next age cohort of public servants appears to be sufficient in number to fill this gap (i.e. those aged 36 - 45).

Chart 2. Public Servants by Age Group**[[9]](#footnote-9)**
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There is a small degree of age bias in survey findings, with younger respondents slightly over represented amongst survey respondents. This needs to be taken into consideration when reviewing survey results.[[10]](#footnote-10)

**Language**

All respondents indicated that they spoke Bislama either “well” or “very well”, as compared to English (94%) and French (36%).[[11]](#footnote-11)

Chart 3. Self assessment of spoken language skills
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**Education**

Survey respondents are generally well educated with at least 68% having completed some form of tertiary training beyond high school. (Refer to Chart 4)

Chart 4. Highest level of education completed by number of respondents
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**Highest level of education by gender**

A greater proportion of male respondents have completed higher level degree qualifications (29.4% of male respondents compared to only 18.6% of female respondents).[[12]](#footnote-12)

**Table 2. Highest level of education by gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Female** | | **Male** | | **Total** | |
| **HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION** | **Number** | **Percent** | **Number** | **Percent** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| Primary School | 16 | 8.1% | 12 | 4.0% | **28** | **5.6%** |
| High School | 42 | 21.2% | 62 | 20.5% | **104** | **20.8%** |
| Technical College Certificate | 41 | 20.7% | 53 | 17.5% | **94** | **18.8%** |
| Diploma | 52 | 26.3% | 70 | 23.2% | **122** | **24.4%** |
| Undergraduate degree | 29 | 14.6% | 59 | 19.5% | **88** | **17.6%** |
| Masters Degree | 8 | 4.0% | 29 | 9.6% | **37** | **7.4%** |
| Doctorate (PhD) | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% | **1** | **0.2%** |
| Other | 10 | 5.1% | 16 | 5.3% | **26** | **5.2%** |
| **TOTAL** | **198** | **100.0%** | **302** | **100.0%** | **500** | **100.0%** |
| ***Missing*** |  |  |  |  | ***3*** |  |

**Position level**

The survey attracted responses from across all position levels and Government departments.[[13]](#footnote-13)

**Chart 5. Respondents by job level[[14]](#footnote-14)**
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**Position level by gender**

Amongst respondents, women are generally under represented in higher level job classifications (i.e. Principal Officer and above) and over represented at more junior levels, as shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Respondents by Job Level and Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of respondents** | |  | **Percentage of respondents** | | **Weighted No.**  **(for comparison)[[15]](#footnote-15)** | | **Difference from weighted** |
| **JOB LEVEL** | **Male** | **Female** | **Total** | **Male** | **Female** | **Male** | **Female** | **Female** |
| Director General | 2 | 0 | **2** | 100.0% | 0.0% | 1 | 1 | -39.6% |
| Director | 16 | 1 | **17** | 94.1% | 5.9% | 10 | 7 | -33.7% |
| Manager | 31 | 9 | **40** | 77.5% | 22.5% | 24 | 16 | -17.1% |
| Principal Officer | 25 | 6 | **31** | 80.6% | 19.4% | 19 | 12 | -20.2% |
| Senior Officer | 83 | 49 | **132** | 62.9% | 37.1% | 80 | 52 | -2.4% |
| Officer | 119 | 101 | **220** | 54.1% | 45.9% | 133 | 87 | 6.3% |
| Other | 25 | 29 | **54** | 46.3% | 53.7% | 33 | 21 | 14.1% |
| **TOTAL** | **301** | **195** | **496** | **60.7%** | **39.3%** |  |  |  |

**Employment status and length of service**

The survey findings suggest that respondents tend to choose the public service as long term career. Almost two thirds of respondents (64%) have served for more than 5 years, while around 44% have served for more than 10 years (refer to Chart 6).

**Chart 6. Respondents by length of service**
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Around four out of every five respondents are permanent employees (79%), with the remainder engaged on a temporary, contract or daily rate basis (21%).[[16]](#footnote-16)

**Chart 7. Respondents by employment status**
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A frequently raised concern amongst temporary and contract staff was the length of time they had been engaged without any job security and under less favourable conditions of service than permanent employees. For example:

*“I think the HR unit in my department must used the probation system (six months probation), then recruitment......I have been working as a Contract officer for two years now and the PSC have noticed and urged our HR unit (in my department) to propose my permanent appointment to PSC, but to no avail...” (R319) “…the PSC needs to permanently recruit officers who have been in contract for more than 1 year.” (R148)*

*“As… contract staff we are not entitle to all other allowances except our basic salary and we feel that it is not fair as we are punctual with our work as in most occasions the permanent staffs do not turn up to work and leave us with no choice to run the office ourselves…” (R340)*

*“We have too many officers working on contract basis. I am requesting PSC to respect all the legal procedures of work employment so that we do not have within our Services, staffs that are continuously demoralised for being on contract basis for more than one year” (R315)*

*“My contract is taking a complete year on the 31st July 2009, without salary, my question is: When will I receive my salary and will the 12 previous months be back paid?” (R452)*

Survey data supports these concerns: around 42% of respondents engaged on a temporary, contract or daily rated basis have served more than 2 years, while almost a quarter of (24.8%) have served for more than 5 years. This suggests a need to review these appointments to determine whether some temporary and contract positions should be made permanent (refer to Table 4).

**Table 4. Length of service (temporary, contract, daily rated respondents)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Length of Service** | | | | | |
| **Employment Status** | **1 year or less** | **> 1 year up to 2 years** | **> 2 years up to 5 years** | **> 5 years up to 10 years** | **>10 years up to 20 years** | **More than 20 years** | **TOTAL** |
| Temporary | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | **18** |
| Daily rate | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | **13** |
| On contract | 29 | 17 | 14 | 4 | 7 | 3 | **74** |
| **TOTAL** | **35** | **26** | **18** | **8** | **14** | **4** | **105** |
| **Percent** | **33.3%** | **24.8%** | **17.1%** | **7.6%** | **13.3%** | **3.8%** |  |

n=105

**Respondents by work location**

Provincial areas account for around 28% of total respondents, however not all provinces responded.[[17]](#footnote-17) Nonetheless, feedback from those provinces which did respond provides an indication of some of the challenges and issues faced by employees located outside of Port Vila (discussed in more detail throughout the report).

**Chart 8. Respondents by usual work location**
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### 3.2 Leadership and Management

**Summary**

This section outlines survey feedback on leadership and management issues, including satisfaction with leadership, human resources support, supervision and recruitment processes.[[18]](#footnote-18)

***Leadership and Management***

While the majority of respondents were positive overall about leadership and management, the findings suggest there is still room for improvement:

* Just over half of respondents (55%) were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the overall leadership and management skills of managers within their department.
* More than two thirds of respondents (68.7%) “agree” or “strongly agree” that their manager treats staff with respect.
* Around 60% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” that their manager considers the input of team members when making decisions.

***Human Resources Support***

Survey feedback suggests there is a need for substantial improvement in Human Resources support:

* Only 40% of respondents are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the level of Human Resources support they currently receive, while over a third (35.9%) are either “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied”.
* respondents from provincial areas were generally less satisfied with the level of HR support than those in urban areas.
* a significant number of respondents are so dissatisfied with the current level of HR support that they requested that their HR officer be replaced.
* Only around half of the respondents (50.6%) indicated they knew who their HR officer was and felt they could get help when they needed it.

***Recruitment***

* Over half of respondents (56.5%) “agree” or “strongly agree” that recruitment is fair and transparent.

**What you told us about leadership, management and human resources support…**

This section provides more detailed analysis of survey feedback on leadership, management and human resources support.

**Table 5. Most frequent leadership and management issues raised**[[19]](#footnote-19)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ISSUE / CONCERN** | **Number of comments** |
| 1. Human resource management | 117 |
| 2. Leadership and management | 90 |
| 3. Meetings, communication and team work | 65 |
| 4. Recruitment | 30 |
| 5. Performance management and assessment | 27 |

**1. Human resources support needs substantial improvement**

Survey feedback clearly indicates a high level of dissatisfaction with the current level of HR support. The most frequently identified concern amongst respondents was ensuring that HR officers have the appropriate skills and qualifications to perform their duties. The need for HROs to work cooperatively with managers; improve the timeliness and transparency of recruitment and selection process; and the need to improve HRD planning and progress departmental restructures were other common concerns.

“the PSC need people who are qualified in human resource management to do their jobs and are smart enough to ensure that the roles of HR in ministries are carried out effectively…” (R277)

“I strongly believe and trust that our leadership and human resources management should cooperate more in order to erase all the differences so as to improve the Department” (R254)

“There shouldn't be vacant positions within the approved structure” (R490)

Respondents from provincial areas were generally less satisfied with the level of HR support than those in urban areas (refer Table 6).

“Have a human resources management unit based in Santo so that our needs will be… realised. It is too hard to communicate by phone back to Port Vila to express our needs.” (R354)

“Each province should have one HRO in order to help out in some of the works being undertaken by our high office (HRO)… Many times we have to send 2-4 times the documents being already received by the other end (HRO) and thus delaying or slowing down the process.” (R523)

We “need regular visits to areas where an officer is currently based (eg. Luganville or provinces)” (R467)

**Table 6. Satisfaction with Human Resources support by usual work location**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level of satisfaction**  **(% of respondents)** | | | | |
| **USUAL WORK LOCATION** | **Very satisfied** | **Satisfied** | **Neutral** | **Dissatisfied** | **Very dissatisfied** |
| Port Vila | 5.8% | 28.0% | 29.9% | 26.0% | 10.2% |
| Luganville | 7.9% | 39.7% | 27.0% | 17.5% | 7.9% |
| Other provincial area | 10.8% | 21.6% | 24.3% | 35.1% | 8.1% |

***2. Leaders and managers need to have the right skills, training and qualities***

Just over half of all respondents were satisfied with leadership and management (55%), however, survey feedback suggests there is still substantial room for improvement. The most frequently raised concern amongst respondents was the need for managers to have the right skills, training and leadership qualities, followed by the need for managers to be fair and transparent in their decisions.

"All heads of sections need to have proper and right trainings in the field of Management and Human Resource management"; (R237) “Yumi mas gat sam leadership trainning mo awareness long ol Departments.” (R410) “…there should be short courses on leadership and management for directors and managers in the department so they can coordinate and manage the department properly” (R230).

“I would suggest that PSC makes it a compulsory requirement for new entrants into [the public service] with potential or earmarked for a supervisory or managerial responsibilities to undergo supervisory to managerial level training… especially those with technical qualifications but without supervisory/managerial skills training.” (R159) “Managers should be mere managers and not technical persons… ” (R20)

“Managers need to be fair” and “transparent in decision making… and must be knowledgeable and capable to lead or manage staff, must be open to discussion and communicate with staff, be able to manage and address immediate staff needs” (R119) Leaders “should be a role model in decision making and direction” and “lead by example” (R61, R224). “Leadership is very vital role in any wan organisation, to be quality leader a leader must be a [role] model (ie. good attitude, proactive, etc. for others to live by). (R349)

***3. Need for regular meetings, improved communication and team work***

A significant number of respondents identified the need for more regular meetings as well as improved communication and team work. There was a general view that information sharing and cooperation needs to be strengthened.

“I think one of the most important things is for my managers to have monthly meetings with staff so that we are aware of what is going on and what to do next. It is very frustrating when since this year until now (mid year) there is no staff meeting.” (R317)

“Apply more team interactions in terms of meetings to discuss daily issues within a section and also to identify means in which a section can improve its services and operations.” (R17)

“Team work is very important especially with new policies. Staff need to be briefed and give inputs on new policies because they are the one to be implementing it.” (R229)

**4. Fair, transparent and merit-based recruitment**

Just over half of respondents (56.5%) “agree” or “strongly agree” that recruitment is fair and transparent, while around a quarter either “disagree” or “strongly disagree”.

The most frequently raised concern amongst respondents was for recruitment to be fair and transparent, and for appointments to be based on merit (i.e. based on qualifications and experience).

“Recruitment should be based on merit and not favouritism.” (R229) “Favouritism, nepotism, islandism should not be part of the decision-making… Recruitments should be based on merit and through the recruitment procedures set by the Public Service Commission” (R410)

“Selection Panel should be neutral from political affiliation/provincial system/family bisnis or favourisme” (R206).

“Appointments should be made based on merits and work experience” (R246).

It is important to note differences in perceptions between women and men. A much lower proportion of female respondents felt that recruitment is fair and transparent (only 39% of women “agree” or “strongly agree” compared to 49% of men).[[20]](#footnote-20)

**Chart 9. Perceptions on fairness and transparency in recruitment by gender**
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recruitment is fair and transparent by gender** | | |  |
| **Gender** | **Mean**  **(scale 1 to 5)[[21]](#footnote-21)** | **N** | **Std. Deviation** |
| Female | 2.929648 | 199 | 1.084824 |
| Male | 2.654485 | 301 | 1.092499 |
| **Total** | **2.764** | **500** | **1.096681** |

**5. Performance management**

A significant number of respondents felt that leadership and management could be improved by strengthening performance management and feedback (discussed in more detail under the next Section - Performance Management)

### 3.3 Performance Management

**Summary**

This section summarises survey feedback on performance management issues, including: performance planning and assessment, teamwork, handling of grievances, understanding of employee obligations and absenteeism.[[22]](#footnote-22)

***Performance management***

* Just under half of respondents (48%) agreed that their supervisor had worked with them to develop a clear list of performance goals, while around one in four disagreed (25%).
* Only around 12% of respondents indicated that they receive regular performance feedback from their supervisor, while over a third (36%) indicated that they never receive feedback.
* for those who did receive performance feedback, only around half (52%) agreed that the feedback was constructive and helped them to improve their work performance.
* One in four respondents (25%) felt that they did not get adequate recognition from their supervisor when they did a good job.

***Grievances***

* While the majority of respondents (59%) felt that they could raise grievances without fear, only around a third (36%) thought that grievances were dealt with in a timely manner.

***Team work and absenteeism***

* Almost two-thirds of respondents (64%) rated the teamwork in their area as above average or excellent (around 9% rated it as below average or poor).
* More than two-thirds of respondents (68%) agreed that absenteeism was affecting the ability of their team to meet its goals.

***Awareness of obligations and entitlements***

The survey data suggest there is a need for public servants to receive further training or guidance in key government policies, particularly the Public Financial Management Act.

**Table 7. Awareness of obligations and entitlements**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Awareness of obligations and entitlements** | | |
| **GOVERNMENT POLICY** | **Yes, fully understand** | **No, need more training** | **N** |
| Public Service Staff Manual | 56.4% | 43.6% | 472 |
| Code of conduct | 43.3% | 56.7% | 450 |
| Public Financial Management Act | 23.9% | 76.1% | 451 |

**What you told us about performance management…**

The following section provides a more detailed analysis of survey feedback on performance management issues.

**Table 8. Most frequent performance management issues raised**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ISSUE / CONCERN** | **Number of comments** |
| 1. Performance management | 89 |
| 2. Training | 36 |
| 3. Meetings / communication | 28 |
| 4. Leadership and management | 25 |
| 5. Reward and recognition | 20 |
| 6. Grievances and disciplinary action | 20 |
| 7. Work planning | 14 |

**1. We need more regular feedback on our performance**

The survey feedback sent a very clear message that staff and managers want more feedback on their work performance. There was also a view that the PMS needs to be simplified, consistently applied, and allow for two way dialogue between staff and managers.

*“I need feedback on my performance and I need clear direction. It seems to me that until now I hardly had feedback positive or negative from my manager. I would like to see more closer attention to my work performance.” (R317)*

*“I think that those entrusted with management/supervisory and human resource responsibilities should conduct… appraisals in such a way where the immediate manager/supervisor appraises his staff on a one to one basis rather than in isolation where the staff fills out his/her section and the rest is done by the superior in the absence of the staff… This helps to promote a sense of involvement and provides a two way feedback of information that will help a superior and subordinate alike in carrying out their duties and responsibilities effectively.”*

*“Performance management can be improved only if the Manager knows what his officer is doing and set up performance target for the officer to meet. The Manager should have regular meetings with his officers to closely monitor his officer’s performance and also, the manager should require from his office a report to justify his performance. If the Manager does not know what his officer is doing then how can he manage his officer’s performance?” (R26)*

*“Performance management could be improved if those responsible in a department make every attempt to lay out and inform officers of what is expected of them and not just wait to put off an officer concerned whenever a mistake is made. If a mistake is made for the first time, the department needs to consider it its responsibility to have informed the officer concern and warn the officer not to repeat the same mistake again.” (R138)*

*“I suggest that I receive feed back on performance management in order to improve in my area of performance as a Manager. How can I improve when I am not receiving feedback on performance management?” (R292)*

*“I really think the Public service should be more serious in implementing the PMS [performance management system] that began last year. Up until now there has been very little attempt by Dept heads to undertake or make any effort to undertake the implementation of the staff appraisal in their departments.” (R77) We need to “actually put the new PMS into practice” (R133)*

**Chart 10. Frequency of performance feedback by respondents**
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Several survey respondents also expressed a high degree of frustration that performance management issues and recommendations are not being followed through:

“By doing appraisals regularly and follow up with the papers till good results are received by the staffs. Proceeding with performances, monitoring and noting down, but then afterwards not forgetting for years sitting in the drawers.” (R455)

“The public service new PM System is being developed very slow and I think there needs to be an expert (or another qualified officer) to assist the existing officer responsible for the PMS.” (R189)

“We have filled up many Performance Assessment Forms and nothing has been done and the OPSC still asking us to fill up more forms. I don't really know what will be the benefit of these forms and our recommendation for increase in Salary was requested for more than a year… I suggest that the OPSC should filled up the forms by itself and make action it before the other Government Departments follow. (R479)”

**2. We need more training**

A significant number of respondents highlighted a general need for more training to improve their work performance, as well as specific training on the performance management system. (Note: Training is discussed in more detail under the next Section – Learning and Development).

**3. We want more regular meetings and improved communication**

A significant number of respondents felt that performance could be greatly enhanced through more regular staff meetings and improved communication (both within their department and between managers and staff).[[23]](#footnote-23)

**4. We want effective leadership**

Similarly, many respondents felt that strong and effective leadership was essential to improve performance, including a commitment by managers to address performance issues.

**5. We want to be rewarded and recognised for good performance**

A substantial number of respondents felt that good performance needs to be recognised and rewarded. Suggestions included both non-monetary rewards (i.e. feedback from supervisor, training opportunities and other incentives) and financial rewards (eg. promotions, salary increase, overtime and increments).

“PSC and HRO to make incentive for officers who performed excellent tasks.” (R218)

“We should be recognized and reward in terms of extra incentives for all the job we do outside of our normal job descriptions and also outside normal working hours.” (R269)

“To introduce or apply incentives so as to motivate staffs to perform to their utmost/maximum abilities. eg. Section staff of the month, Dept staff of the month, Ministry staff of the month etc,.etc..”(R107)

**6. We want performances issues and grievances to be dealt with effectively and in a timely manner**

A frequent issue raised survey respondents was the need to deal with performance issues in a timely and effective manner, including taking disciplinary action where necessary. Many respondents also highlighted the impact that a lack of attention to performance management is having on both work performance and staff morale.

“Staff grievances about salaries, recruitment statuses etc should be attended to quickly or in timely manner so as to boost the workers moral and commitment at the work place” (R212)

“Staff come late and go home early is not a matter nowdays compare private sector. I suggest managers for department gets authority to disipline staff, because the process [through] PSC is too long and sometimes it disappears on the way. When a staff knows that he has been watch and can be directly disipline by his manager, he will perform well (R440)

“Staff who are not performing should be dealt with immediately. I strongly recommend a performance audit to be carried out within [our] Ministry and the entire PSC.” (R325)

“Honest confidential report be made by immediate superiors of each department/section or unit on each civil servant and recommended to PSC for promotion/ re-grading/ confirmation/ retirement or early retirement/ or termination. Three (3) Warning should be given on certain number of absences and a disciplinary action shall be taken against officers absenting himself for more than 21 days a year.” (R206)

**7. We need to improve work planning and goal setting**

A number of respondents also felt that improved work planning and goal setting was needed to improve performance.

“Have a clear annual clear work plan with available budgets” (R63)

“Set Work Goals/Target for Achievement.” (R88)

“Need to set in place a good plan after consultations with stakeholders and agreed consensus of what needs to be done ! Clear goals and timelines!” (R76)

### 3.4 Learning and Development

**Summary**

This section outlines survey feedback on learning and development issues, including training (awareness of training opportunities, frequency, and future needs), mentoring, access to tools and equipment, and work related travel.[[24]](#footnote-24)

***Training***

* Just over half (54%) of respondents indicated that undertook at least one training program in the last year
* Slightly less than half 47% of respondents indicated that they received information on training opportunities.

**Chart 11. Number of training courses attended in the last year**
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**Most useful training in the last year**

For those respondents who had completed some of training in the last year, the most useful form of training identified was specialised technical training (i.e. specific training relating to their area of work, such as GIS or customs training), followed by leadership and management training, computer training, financial management training and training provided by the Public Service Commission.

**Table 9. Most useful training received in the last year**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TYPE OF TRAINING** | **Number** |
| Specialised technical training | 88 |
| *- of which overseas training* | *18* |
| Leadership and Management | 26 |
| Computer training | 23 |
| Financial management | 15 |
| Public Service Commission training | 15 |
| Human resource management | 13 |
| Bachelors / Masters | 12 |
| Administration training | 7 |
| Australian Leadership Awards | 6 |
| Work attachment | 6 |

***Future training needs***

When asked about future training needs, the form of training most frequently identified by respondents was leadership and management, followed by specialised technical training, financial management and computer training.

**Table 10. Training that would be most useful in future**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TYPE OF TRAINING** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| Leadership and management | 234 | 46.5% |
| Specialised technical training | 224 | 44.5% |
| Financial management | 199 | 39.6% |
| Computer training (word, excel etc) | 183 | 36.4% |
| Human resource management | 138 | 27.4% |

***Access to necessary tools and equipment***

Overall, around three quarters of respondents (76%) agreed that they have the necessary tools and equipment to do their job. However, there were clear differences between provincial and urban areas, with a greater proportion of respondents from other provincial areas concerned about access to tools and equipment.

**Table 11. Have the necessary tools and equipment to perform job by location**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **USUAL WORK LOCATION** | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neutral** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **ALL AREAS of which:** | **39.3%** | **36.4%** | **9.7%** | **11.5%** | **3.1%** |
| *- Port Vila* | *43.5%* | *38.9%* | *9.8%* | *5.8%* | *2.0%* |
| *- Luganville* | *42.9%* | *25.4%* | *7.9%* | *23.8%* | *0.0%* |
| *- Other provincial area* | *17.1%* | *34.2%* | *10.5%* | *27.6%* | *10.5%* |

***Mentoring and support from external consultants***

Around 17% of respondents indicated that they receive some form of mentoring or guidance from an external consultant (includes both international and local consultants).

* of those respondents who receive assistance from an external consultant, the overwhelming majority (82%) rated the quality of advice and support as very good or excellent (only 4% of respondents felt that it was below average or poor).

**Chart 12. Quality of advice and support received from external consultants**
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**Official travel**

Around half of those who responded (51%) had undertaken at least one official trip to a provincial area, while 30% had undertaken at least one official trip overseas in the last year.

Travel (both overseas and provincial) was more frequent amongst respondents in more senior positions (i.e. senior officer level and above) when compared to junior officers.

**Chart 13. Official work related travel by respondents (provincial and overseas)**
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**Table 12. Overseas travel by job level**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **JOB LEVEL** | **Number of Respondents** | **Number of respondents (at least one trip)** | **% respondents** | **% trips** | **Difference** |
| Director General | 2 | 1 | 0.4% | 0.83% | 0.43% |
| Director | 17 | 11 | 3.4% | 9.17% | 5.75% |
| Manager | 40 | 12 | 8.0% | 10.00% | 1.95% |
| Principal Officer | 31 | 15 | 6.2% | 12.50% | 6.26% |
| Senior Officer | 132 | 43 | 26.6% | 35.83% | 9.27% |
| Officer | 220 | 34 | 44.3% | 28.33% | -15.93% |
| Other | 55 | 4 | 11.1% | 3.33% | -7.73% |
| **TOTAL** | **497** | **120** | **100.00%** | **100.00%** |  |

**Table 13. Provincial travel by job level**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **JOB LEVEL** | **Number of Respondents** | **Number of respondents (at least one trip)** | **% respondents** | **% trips** | **Difference** |
| Director General | 2 | 2 | 0.4% | 0.85% | 0.45% |
| Director | 17 | 16 | 3.4% | 6.81% | 3.39% |
| Manager | 40 | 25 | 8.0% | 10.64% | 2.59% |
| Principal Officer | 31 | 22 | 6.2% | 9.36% | 3.12% |
| Senior Officer | 132 | 72 | 26.6% | 30.64% | 4.08% |
| Officer | 220 | 80 | 44.3% | 34.04% | -10.22% |
| Other | 55 | 18 | 11.1% | 7.66% | -3.41% |
| **TOTAL** | **497** | **235** | **100.00%** | **100.00%** |  |

**What you told us about learning and development…**

The following section provides a more detailed analysis of survey feedback on learning and development issues.

**Table 14. Most frequent learning and development issues raised**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **KEY ISSUES / CONCERNS** | **Number of Comments** |
| Training opportunities need to be fair including: | 59 |
| *- more training in provinces* | *28* |
| Need more training | 57 |
| Improved HRD support (eg. workforce planning, succession planning) | 41 |
| More on the job / in house training | 31 |
| Training needs assessments | 29 |
| Specialised technical training | 23 |
| Overseas training | 22 |
| Attachments | 20 |
| More short term training courses | 16 |
| Budget | 9 |
| Mentoring | 9 |
| Refresher training | 8 |
| Better information on training | 8 |
| In-country training | 6 |

**1. We want more training**

Respondents consistently identified the need for more training as one of the most important issues. There were mixed views of the types of training that should be offered. The most frequent request was for more in-house and on the job training, followed by specialised technical training, overseas training, attachments, short term training courses and mentoring.

*“It would be definitively cheaper to run training courses in-country and then tailor-made some study tours to offer opportunity to participants to maximise their learning by comparing with what others in the same fields of work are doing !” (R76)*

*“If only the office can organise more in-house training were all staff could attend to help improve their skills and other important thing is for all the senior staff to transfer skills to the junior staff” (R99)*

**2. We want training opportunities to be fair**

A significant issue raised by many respondents was the need for training opportunities to be fair. The most frequently identified concerns were for training to be provided at all levels (and not just managers) and for more training to be provided in provincial areas. Contracted officers also felt they were disadvantaged in terms of access to training opportunities.

More detailed analysis of the data supports these concerns, revealing that amongst respondents, senior officers and managers tend to enjoy more training opportunities than junior officers. Respondents from other provincial areas were also less likely to have undertaken any training than those in Port Vila (refer to Tables 15 and 16).

“Allocate trainings opportunities to all staffs equally. Not only senior officers or those with degrees etc. At least give some opportunities for the ones below to have access to such trainings to boost their morals.. etc” (R22)

*“Plante officers i karemaot work long field mo long ol offices under their Director, Managers or Supervisors. Taem i gat trainning need then ol officers i no save attendem but ol Senior Managers now i save go long training.” (R239)*

*“Learning and development could be improved if opportunities for attendance of trainnings is done fairly and not given to the same person every time.” (R460)*

*“To provide more opportunities to younger officer in order for them to develop and learn more and new skills and ideas in order for them to feel confident to carry out certain responsibilities given to them” (R519)*

*“Operational managers and staffs should attend to technical training/workshops and not director or members of executive. (R355)*

*“As in my case I have been a contract staff for more that three years and they are opportunities that I feel that I should attend to, to help me in my work environment and up to date I have not attended any training or workshops that are coordinated by PSC and I feel that as a contract staff we tend to miss out on opportunities as we are unable to attend any trainings or workshops overseas or provinces as we are not entitle to”. (R340)*

*“Trainning opportunities given at Port Vila should be also conducted in other provinces. (R361)*

*“Trainning opportunities i mas kam daon lo provincial level.” (R415)*

**Table 15. More than one training course by job level**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **JOB LEVEL** | **Number of respondents** | **No. respondents (attend more than one training)** | **% of respondents** | **(% attending more than one training)** | **Difference** |
| Director General | 2 | 2 | 0.40% | 0.74% | 0.34% |
| Director | 17 | 10 | 3.42% | 3.69% | 0.27% |
| Manager | 40 | 23 | 8.05% | 8.49% | 0.44% |
| Principal Officer | 31 | 23 | 6.24% | 8.49% | 2.25% |
| Senior Officer | 132 | 80 | 26.56% | 29.52% | 2.96% |
| Officer | 220 | 105 | 44.27% | 38.75% | -5.52% |
| Other | 55 | 28 | 11.07% | 10.33% | -0.73% |
| **TOTAL** | **497** | **271** | **100.00%** | **100.00%** |  |

**Table 16. More than one training course by usual location**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Usual Work Location** | **Number of Respondents** | **% of respondents** | **More than one training** | **% more than one training** | **Difference** |
| Port Vila | 364 | 72% | 204 | 75% | 2% |
| Luganville | 63 | 13% | 38 | 14% | 1% |
| Other provincial area | 76 | 15% | 31 | 11% | -4% |
| **TOTAL** | **503** | **100%** | **273** | **100%** |  |

**3. We need better HRD support**

A significant number of respondents thought that learning and development could be improved through better HR support, including undertaking training needs assessments, and improving workforce planning and monitoring. The need for better information on training opportunities was also highlighted.

*“HR section should contact a survey to identify the weakness of staff and look for training opportunities either locally or abroad to improve the skills and knowledge of staff. A successive plan should also be applicable to develop and train young staff to ensure the department or government as a whole continue to function and meeting its objectives.” (R18)*

*“Could do a survey inside the ministry to indicate training needs and then work on finding appropriate training institutes or on the trainers to suit the needs” (R63)*

*“The PSC should monitor who is going for the trainning of learning and development each time. Opportunities should be given to all level within the Department so that information will get across the board where people take work seriously and also became aware of the importance of their performance. In some Departments there is only one person who attends trainnings regularly but keeps information to him/herself without marketing it to people within the lower position of work and this is unfair.” (R385)*

*“Do regular staff performance appraisal assessments which would identify specific gaps in knowledge and skills. Training opportunities would then be sought to address these gaps.” (R187)*

*“Appointment and recruitment of HR officers, strengthen the role of Human Resource Office to address both the training and development of staff.” (R119)*

### 3.5 Planning and Budgeting

**Summary**

This section outlines survey feedback on issues relating to planning and budgeting including: corporate planning, work planning, policy development, and budgeting.[[25]](#footnote-25)

***Corporate planning***

* Just over two thirds (69%) of respondents indicated that their department had a current corporate plan (around a quarter were not sure)
* Just over half of respondents (53%) agreed that their manager effectively communicated the Ministry’s vision and priorities.
* Around three quarters of respondents (76%) indicated that their section has a current work plan, with the majority (70%) agreeing that their responsibilities within the work plan were clear.

***Policy development***

* Around a quarter of respondents (25%) indicated that they had been involved in developing some form of new policy in the last year.
* Of those respondents who had been involved in policy development, most indicated that the bulk of consultation to develop the policy had taken place within their department. Consultation with the provinces and general public was less consistent (although was still undertaken to some extent in the majority of cases).
* Respondents indicated that most new policies were also informed by some degree of analysis or data (63.8%).

**Table 17. Extent to which policy development is informed by consultation and analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Percentage of Responses** | | | |  |
| **Policy informed by:** | **Significant amount** | **Reasonable amount** | **A little bit** | **Not at all** | **Total** |
| Consultation within Dept | 53.8% | 33.0% | 11.3% | 1.9% | **106** |
| Analysis or data | 38.8% | 35.0% | 20.4% | 5.8% | **103** |
| Consultation with other Government Depts. | 28.6% | 39.8% | 21.4% | 10.2% | **98** |
| Consultation with general public | 26.3% | 33.3% | 16.2% | 24.2% | **99** |
| Consultation at provincial level | 24.0% | 37.5% | 19.2% | 19.2% | **104** |

***Budgeting***

* Less than half of respondents knew the budget for their section (47%)
* Of those respondents who knew their budget, around 30% indicated that they did not receive their full budget.[[26]](#footnote-26)
* The most frequently cited reason for not receiving the full budget allocation was a Ministerial decision to use the money for another purpose, followed by the budget being used by another area.
* Several respondents also indicated that the Department of Finance had not released the money, or that there been significant delays in releasing the money (refer to Table 18)
* Views on budget alignment with priorities were mixed, with around 36% of respondents indicating that their budget was “reasonably” or “extremely well” aligned with priorities in their sector, while around 30% thought it was “not well aligned” or “extremely poorly aligned”.[[27]](#footnote-27)
* Several focus group participants suggested the government budget should have a greater focus on Vanuatu’s productive sectors (eg. agriculture, forestry)

**Table 18. Main reason indicated for not receiving full budget**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MAIN REASON FOR NOT RECEIVING FULL BUDGET** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| We couldn't spend the money in time | 2 | 2.9% |
| Ministerial decision to use the money for other purpose | 23 | 33.3% |
| Budget was used by another area to meet other priorities | 18 | 26.1% |
| Department of Finance did not release the money to our Dept / delays in releasing funding | 7 | 10.1% |
| Inadequate consultation around budget process | 3 | 4.3% |
| \*Other | 3 | 4.3% |
| Don't know / Not sure | 13 | 18.8% |
| **Total** | **69** | **100.0%** |

**What you told us about planning and budgeting …**

The following section provides a more detailed analysis of qualitative survey feedback on planning and budgeting issues.

**Table 19. Most frequent issues planning and budgeting issues raised[[28]](#footnote-28)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **KEY ISSUES / CONCERNS** | **Number of comments** |
| Greater input and consultation on budget | 67 |
| Improved planning, prioritisation and alignment of budget with plans | 56 |
| Devolve budget management to program managers / provinces | 32 |
| Better information sharing on budget | 30 |
| Increase budget | 19 |
| More training | 14 |
| Qualified finance personnel | 9 |
| No ceiling / zero budgeting | 7 |
| Timely process / release of funds | 7 |
| Transparency | 7 |

**1. We think the budget process would benefit from wider consultation and input**

The suggestion most frequently identified by respondents was to improve consultation and involvement of staff in setting the budget. There was also a general view that budgets are determined with little consultation or reference to existing plans and needs, which made it difficult to meet priorities. Respondents from provincial areas were particularly concerned that they do not have adequate input to the budget process.

*“More consultation between the Officer in charge, finance Officer and the various sections within the Department identifying planning and budget allocation is needed and follow up is necessary and vital in achieving the work plans. Submitting a work plan and not being able to access the budget allocation for such needs is pointless and frustrating!” (R180)*

*“The involvement of all staff (particularly senior/technical staff) in the budgeting and planning process is crucial. It provides staff with a better understanding and appreciation of the level of resources available to undertake planned activities and or programmes. Once the budget is appropriated staff need to be briefed on the resources allocated and changes instituted to ensure that activities undertaken are within the approved budget. Regular staff meetings should be convened to inform staff on any issues affecting the department’s budget and the implementation of activities.” (R476)*

*“My opinion is that as an Officer in charge of the [Provincial] Office I recommend that I be present for when our budget is to be made.” (R372)*

*“To include my section on [the] retreat organised by corporate service when considering budgeting and planning processes. Cause when they do not include us in their meeting and retreats then how will they know my operating and planning… costs of a year?” (R470)*

**2. We need better planning, with budgets aligned to plans**

A significant number of respondents also highlighted the need for improved planning, including the need for realistic goals, greater involvement of provinces and better alignment between budgets and plans.

*“Excellent service delivery will only occur if the Department has a budget plan in place in order to ensure all offices based in the six provinces access funds to implement their activities. Otherwise for the last 28 years our stationed Officers can't do anything much but rather lodging complaints instead, due to no funds!’ (R283)*

*“Managers plan their budget according to their work plans. Every time their submission is never considered due to budget ceiling… [Our department] budget has been the same for some years now despite the increasing population.” (R325)*

*“Ministries and Department must ensure that budgets are set according to what they can deliver over a period of time. Budgets must align with Ministries corporate and business plan. Only then will budget make more sense and is adequate. If we plan for more than what we can achieve than we will exhaust our financial resources. Resources might be spread too thinly and no outcomes or output can be seen evident. Objectives or goal set in our plans must be measurable and achievable and be those that address a real need in a community or nationally. Unplanned Expenditures must be discouraged within the whole Government. Virements and supplementary budgets be discourage.” (R269)*

*“Planning should take both a top down and bottom up approach to ensure that the services we are providing meets the needs and situations of the people in the provinces or islands. The budget/money should be made available in the provinces for easy access and implementation or activities in a timely manner and in accordance with the plan. The process of budgeting should involve superiors working in the provinces because this is where most of the actions and services take place. Most of the time the budget is made at the central level without the provincial input.” (R287)*

**3. We think budget responsibility should be devolved and decentralised**

A significant number of respondents identified the need for greater devolution of responsibility for both budgeting and expenditure (this was a particular concern for managers and those from provincial areas). The need for greater control and certainty over budget resources was a key theme.

*“Decentralism finance i kam daon long province.” (R442)*

*“If all budgets approved are put through the Provincial Government Account and I can just commit work in the Province instead of contacting Port Vila as communication is a major obstacle at present.” (R295)*

*“In the provinces (Torba) there are many activities to be undertaken with insufficient funding support from Government. For Vanuatu Government to deposit all finance for all department into provincial Government to coordinate and manage all sent to carry out work. Decentralise finance from Port Vila to province.” (R294)*

*“Each section should have their own budget and that money should not be used by other sections. This will help achieve what is plan for.” (R104)*

*“Budget allocated for each Department/Section is managed by the Director or Manager of that particular Department/Section according to the business plan developed.” (R392)*

*“budget should be release to specific sections.. and sections/units should directly control their budget to avoid diversion of unnecessary expenses ... so much concentrate in corporate service is making service delivery slower and unrealistic” (R121)*

**4. We need more regular information sharing on budget**

A number of respondents (including many managers) indicated that they are not getting sufficient information on their budget. They highlighted the difficulties of managing their programs when they weren’t advised of the overall budget available to them and without regular updates on expenditure information.

*“As a Manager I should get monthly updates on my budget and expenditure so that I can well plan my operations. At the moment this is not the case that I don't know how much fund my section has to be able to plan my operations effectively.” (R23)*

*“Managers are never aware and not consulted on how their budget is being expended. They must have access to smartstream so that they can monitor their budget very closely.” (R325)*

*“Regular record and information of Budgeting and Planning Statistics distributed to staffs in different sections or units.” (R308)*

*“Budgeting and planning should be delivered to the staffs so that everyone knows what to do and what is happening.” (R266)*

**5. We need better control of spending (in accordance with budget)**

Many respondents also highlighted the need for better spending controls, to help ensure that budgeted resources were being spent as planned and not being diverted for other uses. A number of respondents also highlighted the need for greater transparency around the use of funds.

*“If you (finance dept) can lock the budget allocated to each department so that there is no borrowing or stealing of funds by other unorganised departments. Let managers who fail to manage his department be accountable…” (R44)*

*“Budget is not clearly and evenly distributed. As such allocated budget should be ONLY be used for its purpose. I suggested that when fund is made available for a particular activity the head of the department or the ministry should not use their position to divert the fund for another activity.” (R98)*

*“Budgets should not be lumped into a pool. In this way many people tap into it and once they overuse their budget they automatically use other section's budget. The financial system should be in a way that only the rightful sections to use their budget and can have access to their budget but not others like the system of pooling budget. Pooling budget at most times results in many plans not been achieved due to no money available as others have used it up.” (R406)*

*“The budget allocated to a Section should be split into proper heads by province for Officers to exactly know his/her working budget in year but not to be kept under one basket in Port Vila. Ministers should not use the Department's allocated budget as it always affects our planning and performance. I never know exactly how much funds is available to me for executing my plan every year.” (R359)*

*“Do away with "Ministerial Virement Business" because it drains out money budgeted for activities and affects service delivery to the community.” (R292)*

*“To be informed and handled with transparency (budget).” (R376)*

*“Transparent in all level of employees in the department.” (R240)*

**6. We would like more training, as well as dedicated and qualified personnel**

Several respondents identified the need for more training around budgeting and planning processes, together with qualified personnel to help support the process.

*“Prior to budget preparation, Finance units and Planning units could run trainings on how they want individual units to do their budgets....... this will really help in the preparation of budgets...”(R63)*

*“Each office or organization like my office should have it's own finance and HR officer based within the office rather than base with the ministry itself. Also budgeting should be done accordingly upon the managers discretion in a timely fashion.” (R474)*

*“[We] need qualified people not those who have been transferred for the accountant positions and do never intend to upgrade their knowledge and skills in Finance and Budget in order to understand the real meaning of the nature of their job.” (R277)*

### 3.6 Pay and Conditions

**Summary**

This section outlines feedback on issues relating to pay and conditions of service.[[29]](#footnote-29)

* Around half of all respondents (51%) agreed that public service pay was competitive with the private sector (around 22% disagreed).
* A significant majority of respondents (72%) thought that conditions of service in the public service are either “very good” or “excellent.”
* Around 10% of respondents indicated that they receive supplementary income from a source other than their public service salary.
* Just over one fifth of respondents (22%) indicated that they can always complete their assigned work during normal work hours, with a further 45% indicating “most of the time”. Around a third of respondents indicated they “never” (4%) or can only “sometimes” (29%) complete their assigned work during normal work hours.

**Chart 14. Percentage of respondents who are able to complete their assigned work during normal work hours.**



n=461

**Which issues are most important to you?**

Respondents consistently identified training opportunities as one of the most important issues, followed by promotion opportunities, performance pay, salary and recognition from their supervisor. This suggests that many staff are keen to further develop their skills, and want to be recognised for their work performance through promotion opportunities and performance pay.

**Chart 15. Issues which are most important to respondents**



**Table 20. Most important issues by number of respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Training opportunities | 331 | 65.8% |
| Promotion opportunities | 220 | 43.7% |
| Performance pay | 212 | 42.1% |
| Salary | 195 | 38.8% |
| Recognition from supervisor | 170 | 33.8% |
| Paid allowances | 82 | 16.3% |
| Medical benefits | 78 | 15.5% |
| Leave entitlements | 64 | 12.7% |

**What you told us about pay and conditions …**

The following section provides a more detailed analysis of qualitative survey feedback on pay and conditions.

**Table 21. Most frequently raised issues on pay and conditions[[30]](#footnote-30)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **KEY ISSUES / CONCERNS** | **Number** |
| Salary (of which) | 129 |
| *- Increase salary* | *61* |
| *- Review salary scale* | *15* |
| *- Fair pay (in accordance with job requirements,*  *qualifications, experience)* | *53* |
| Increments / performance pay | 47 |
| Allowances (of which): | 68 |
| *- Housing allowance* | *33* |
| *- Responsibility allowance* | *8* |
| *- Travel allowance* | *8* |
| *- Child allowance* | *5* |
| *- Safety allowance* | *2* |
| Contract issues | 21 |
| Fairness | 19 |
| Cost of living / inflation | 16 |
| Severance pay / Long service leave | 14 |
| Promotion opportunities | 11 |
| Timely payment | 9 |
| Insurance | 7 |
| Working hours | 7 |
| Equipment | 6 |
| Dept structure | 5 |
| Sick leave | 4 |

**1. We would like to see an increase in pay and for pay to be fair**

The most frequent request amongst respondents was for an increase in salary, with many respondents raising concerns about the high cost of living and inflation. There was also a general view that pay should be fair and take into account job responsibilities, qualifications and experience. A number of respondents thought that salary scales should be reviewed, raising concerns over discrepancies in pay between different departments, job classifications and qualifications. Several respondents were also concerned about the pay gap between junior officers and those in management.

*“Salary scales for some managers are not consistent with other Departments like Finance and Public Service in comparison with [our department]. All senior managers do same or more then some but get small scale. We raise a lot of money for the Government but nothing in return” (R41)*

*“I think to some degree, grading in the PS is not consistent between and across line departments and ministries” (R77)*

*“Managers are getting paid big sums of money while the people who do most or of the important work get less pay. There should not be a big "gap" between the pay of managers and officers because officers do more work than the managers.” (R3)*

*”Degree holders in the department are paid lower than Certificate holders. This is not fair as more training is provided to Certificate officers from us with degree qualifications. Need to correct our salary scale in correspondence to our qualification and experiences.” (R105)*

*“PSC needs to look at the salary scale… and readjust as there’s a gap difference between field officers and senior or supervisors. There’s a big margin and as a field officers I feel what I earn is not enough for my family especially with the current high cost of living.”*

**2. We want to be rewarded for good performance**

As highlighted under Section 3.4, a significant number of respondents identified a desire to see form of reward or recognition for good performance, such as performance pay or promotion opportunities. Many respondents also lamented that they had never received any pay increments or salary review despite many years of service.

*“I've been giving my service to the government for more than 10 years but never been given any recognition…” (R52)*

*“…this is a long time issue that was overlooked by the current Manager. I worked for almost 13 years now without any promotions neither receiving any performance pay (increments). Even though being overloaded with work but never been recognised and praised for the good works. There is no big change/increase in my pay after GRT…” (R283)*

*“Most times, I feel that I have worked above my salary scale and that I deserve an increase in salary. Unfortunately, getting an increase in salary takes such a long process or does not exist. My concern is that PSC should have a faster way of identifying hard working public servants and reward them immediately. (R23)*

*“…we never have increments (for those that work long enough to be recognised), hardly any promotions yet more intakes of new officers under posts which can be taken up by promotions of permanent officers.” (R22)*

*“**Salary increments have been overlooked for the past years and I think the respective Department and Human Resource Officer concerned should seriously look into this especially with the rising cost of living, salary increments assist in one way or another. It is not the fault of the Staff if the previous Officers in charge have failed in producing appraisals for the staff. The HRO should take into consideration this fact when determining adjustment of salary increments.” (R180)*

*“If PSC could look into staff performance quickly so that all Public servants could be rewarded accordingly.” (R317)*

**3. We want allowances to be reviewed and applied fairly**

The most frequently cited concern amongst respondents was in relation to housing allowances. Many respondents felt that the housing allowance should be increased to account for the high cost of rent. There was also a general view that allowances needed to be applied fairly, with many respondents concerned that political appointees and senior managers generally received better conditions.

*“All entitle officers eligible for housing allowances for own housing should be paid at the same rate as subscribed in the GRT determination.” (R59)*

*“It's not fair making the directors, DG, managers housing allowances increasing first… and the bottom level / low paid officers as us, receiving low housing allowance. Life this days in Port Vila town is very hard, high cost of living and everything, every where is money. So please treat every one with respect and fair.” (R109)*

*“About housing allowance, why DG, Directors and Principal their housing allowance is increase and what about officers? It's not fair. They take more salary then us.” (R320)*

*“Housing allowance is too small, where in Vila can you find a house for less than 15,000VT I guess it would be in the squatters, even in the squatter settlements rents are 15000VT - 20,000VT. Why do politicians get better housing allowance than us civil servants. IT IS NOT FAIR !! Please compensate us hard working civil servants by increasing the housing allowance to 25,000VT or 30,000 VT per month... The GRT did not have great impact on all Vanuatu Governments civil servant's hierarchy. It only have great impact on the higher levels DG, Director, Managers, Supervisors but the hardworking ones they only got the last slice of the cake, this is very selfish.” (R130)*

*“Political appointee’s allowances are much higher than civil servants and this is wrong and should be changed.” (R58)*

Other issues raised in relation to allowances included:

* Providing an “extra responsibility allowance” where people are required to do more than is normally required under their job description.
* Reviewing and decreasing the “travel allowance” (several people were concerned that the current travel allowance is too high and is therefore limiting the capacity of officers to travel to the provinces and engage in service delivery.
* Providing some form of “safety allowance” or insurance to protect workers who are injured on the job.

*“Reduce Vt 10,000 night traveling allowance to VT 5,000 or Vt 2,500 per night so that we can cater for more… visits to schools and provinces.” (R42)*

*“Doing field work is harder as one has to work in really dangerous and risky environments. Sometimes, your life is on the line doing the job, however, there is no life insurance to cover you in the job.” (R488)*

*“The PSC should have insurance benefits for Public Servants. (R150)”*

**4. We want fair treatment for contract officers**

A significant number of respondents once again raised concerns about unfair treatment of those employed on a contract or daily rated basis.

*“Staff on contracts are at a disadvantage than their counterparts because at the end of the day we are doing the same work-load as any permanent staff (if not better), yet we are denied any allowances and other entitlements that is only applicable to permanent staff.Being a contracted staff I am denied my permanency way beyond 6 months to a year after being initially offered my contract. I am constantly dished out with the "same crap of a response" that there is no permanent position available due to shortage of funds when clearly at my department there is distinctively shortage of man-power. How long I will remain as a contracted employee within my department is unbeknown… to me.” (R25)*

*“Also why some staff are on contract for so many years without being permanent. Who is responsible for this problem solving??? Is it the PSC or our department?????. Some contract staff have committed themselves and weight the same responsibilities like other permanent staff, but at the end of the day the contract staff don't have the right to allowance & others etc!! Because he/she is still a contract staff and I have seen this as not fair. I’m urging the PSC to seriously consider this very carefully.” (R91)*

*“How long should it take for an officer on daily rated to become permanent? If an officer works for more than 10 years on a daily rated bases and then becomes permanent, will he or she be paid severance for those years on daily rated bases when he or she retires or severance pay will only be for the years that he or she became permanent???” (R322)*

**Severance pay / long service leave**

*“Yes, thank you for the opportunity given to share my view in relation to 'severance pay. All public servants have spent most of their working lives with the government of the republic of Vanuatu & the attempt to reduce a two (2) months severance pay would only jeopardize their livelihood in the end. This is especially true when you take a moment to compare a public servant to a political appointee who normally receive a calculated annual gratitude where as a public servant would only receive his or her severance pay on retirement. This comes only once in his or her working life. Thank you for considering my honest input to this important exercise. (R61)*

# 4.0 Issues for PSC Consideration

Survey findings point to a need for action in a number of key areas. As one respondent pointed out, the survey will only be useful if the findings can be translated into positive change in the years ahead.

*“Is PSC really going to do something about the results from the survey or you just want to know? I think a lot of people will comment on a lot of things and how will PSC deal with each case?...Fulap taem lo ol Work Performance report blo ol staff ol Appraiser I stap recommendem samsamting be I neva happen… Mi no wantem suggestem samting we bae i neva happen. PSC bae i mas lukluk gud ol staff blo hem bageken. Firem olgeta we oli stap mekem flower nomo mo karem ol gud wan i kam blo mekem sam productive work blo helpem ol public servants. Fulap concern oli stap kam fas lo PSC office nomo, tekem manis before you karem wan response. PSC yu organisem u blo speedimap sam process lelebet.” (R177)*

The PSC acknowledges the many concerns and suggestions of its employees, and will use the findings of the survey to help guide its future support. With this in mind, the following issues and priority actions are put forward for consideration by the PSC.

**Suggested Priority Actions**

***Leadership and management***

1. Continue to invest in leadership and management training to further develop the skills of managers.

***Performance management***

1. Simplify the existing Performance Management System and link it to an affordable and transparent system of reward and recognition and / or disciplinary action (as required)
   1. PSC to provide training on the new performance management system to all staff and managers, together with clear written guidance in the Public Service Staff Manual.
   2. Ensure the new, simplified PMS enables staff to contribute to goal setting and facilitates two-way dialogue between supervisors and staff so that performance expectations are clear
   3. Consider introducing both monetary and non-monetary rewards to encourage good performance (eg. performance increments, annual bonuses, extra leave days, certificates of recognition, Public Service Medal etc)
   4. PSC to conduct annual audits of Departments to check level of compliance with the PMS and equity in its application
   5. Incorporate departmental compliance with the PMS into the performance agreements for Director Generals and Directors (eg. at least 95% of all employees complete annual performance planning and appraisal)

***Human Resource Management***

1. Within six months, review appointments for all staff engaged on contract, temporary or daily rated basis for more than 2 years.
   1. Determine which positions should be made permanent
   2. Provide existing temporary / contracted / daily rated employees engaged for continuous periods longer than two years with comparable conditions of service to permanent staff (eg. severance pay, annual leave), or equivalent financial compensation going forward.
   3. Establish clear and transparent government-wide policies on the future use of contract / temporary / daily rated appointments.
2. Establish service standards or benchmarks to ensure the timely resolution of HR processes, such as recruitment, handling of grievances etc.
   1. Review key HR processes to identify bottlenecks and streamline processes
   2. Consider appointing an HR officer in each of the provinces to improve HR service provision.
   3. Consider devolving responsibility for some HR processes to Director Generals, with PSC to provide a quality assurance role.

***Learning and development***

1. Ensure individual staff learning and development (training) needs are identified and monitored through the new Performance Management System.
   1. HR officers to keep employees advised of relevant training opportunities and identify common Department training needs are identified and met.
2. PSC to provide refresher training in staff responsibilities and entitlements under Public Service Manual, Code of Conduct.
   1. Ensure induction for new employees also includes the above training

***Conditions of service***

1. Review current allowances and ensure equitable application of allowances for employees, in particular:
   1. Review current housing allowance / policy on provision of government housing with a view to ensuring equitable access and appropriate level
   2. Consider reducing the current travel allowance
2. Consider introducing more flexible working hours (i.e. flex-time) to provide employees with a degree of flexibility to meet family or other needs (provided that employees meet minimum work requirements of 40 hours per week)
3. Consider introducing a provision for long service leave after 10 years of service, (in lieu of the existing arrangements where provisions are only made upon retirement).
4. Consider expanding SmartStream database records to incorporate other important demographic information, such as geographic location, job level (to better facilitate monitoring and review of departmental restructures, staffing profiles and HRD planning).

# 5.0 Lessons Learned

For the benefit of future surveys of this nature, several lessons emerged

* In future, consider targeting a random representative sample of public servants rather than conduct a census. While it is recognized that this will require additional effort in data collection, it would further strengthen the validity of results.
* Engage more closely with the Vanuatu Statistics Department in the design and testing of the draft survey.
* Conduct wider consultation within the PSC on the survey questionnaire to ensure all relevant issues are incorporated.
* Email and paper based formats generally yielded better response rates. The use of the web based survey format was limited due to current bandwidth and web access constraints. Future surveys should take this into account.

# ANNEX A - Detailed Methodology

**Survey population**

The survey was open to all Public Servants who fall under the mandate of the Vanuatu Public Service Commission. The total population was estimated to be 1999 public servants.[[31]](#footnote-31)

**Dates of survey**

The survey was officially launched by the Chairman of the Public Service Commission on 6th July 2009 and was open for a three week period (i.e. 6th - 25th July 2009).

**Methodological approach**

A draft survey questionnaire was developed and piloted with a random sample of 15 public servants in January 2009.[[32]](#footnote-32) The questionnaire was subsequently revised based on feedback from the pilot.

As the first survey of its kind, the Public Service Commission was keen to seek the views of as many public servants as possible. Another key consideration was using a survey format that would provide respondents with a high level of confidentiality, thereby giving respondents the opportunity to provide candid responses. For these reasons, the Public Service Commission elected to conduct a confidential survey which was open to all public servants rather than target a representative random sample. Given time, resource and logistical constraints, the survey was not able to reach all public servants. However, it is estimated that at least 80% of the target population received a copy of the survey.

**Survey distribution**

The survey was distributed via email and in hard copy. The survey was distributed to 1358 public servants via email and a further 405 hard copies were distributed to the provinces and government departments in Port Vila.

***Email distribution:***

The government email list was used to obtain contact email addresses for public servants who are employed under the Public Service Commission. The email distribution list required significant manual cleansing, which was achieved by cross referencing the list with the Government’s payroll system (SmartStream) in order to validate recipients.

Public servants who were sent the survey via email (1358) represent approximately 68% of the total population (N=1999).

Email recipients were provided with two options to respond:

Option 1: A direct html link to an internet based survey (anonymous)

Option 2: An attached word document which could be filled out and returned to a private email address which was specifically set up to ensure confidentiality of responses.[[33]](#footnote-33)

**Hard copy distribution:**

In addition to email distribution, a total of 405 supplementary hard copies were distributed by mail to the provinces (240) and government departments (165).

Hard copies were sent to the Secretary General of all Provincial Headquarters with instructions for distribution, collection and return of surveys. Reply paid envelopes were provided to facilitate the return of surveys to the PSC.

Hard copies were also provided to Human Resource Officers in government departments within Port Vila to encourage responses from people without access to the government email system.

The PSC followed up with Provincial Headquarters by telephone and email to confirm receipt of the surveys, explain the survey process, and follow up returns. Follow-ups were also conducted with all government departments in Port Vila to collect hard copy returns.

**Focus groups**

In addition to the formal survey, three focus groups were held with a selection of public servants.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Location** | **Date** | **Representation** |
| Port Vila | 9 July 2009 | 15 participants: 5 male, 10 female |
| Malakula | 14 July 2009 | 11 participants: 10 male, 1 female |
| Santo | 15 July 2009 | 15 participants: 8 male, 7 female |
|  | **TOTAL** | **41 participants: 23 male, 18 female** |

Focus groups enabled the research team to explore a number of issues in more detail and added to the richness of the data. Participants for the focus group in Port Vila were selected randomly from across departments. Participants in the provinces were invited from across all departments (there was generally good attendance, with participants from across a number of different departments and position levels).

**Sample size and response rates**

It is estimated that the survey was distributed to at least 80% of all public servants.[[34]](#footnote-34)

Approximately one out of every four public servants responded, with an overall response rate of around 29%.[[35]](#footnote-35)

This response rate is considered comparable to other surveys of this nature (and slightly above the median). For example, “the median survey response rate for 199 online surveys conducted in the US with a total of 523,790 invitations sent to potential respondents was 26.45%... while response rates for mail out surveys are typically between 10% - 30%.”[[36]](#footnote-36)

The total number of responses received was 536. Of these, 24 responses were determined to be invalid.[[37]](#footnote-37) The total number of valid returns included in data analysis is therefore 503.

**Methodological Constraints**

*Selection bias*

While the PSC aimed to conduct a census of public servants, it is estimated that the survey only reached around 80% of the target population. As a result, there is a degree of selection bias in the sample which needs to be taken into account when considering the results. For this reason, confidence intervals are not calculated.

Because the methodological approach was to conduct a census, rather than a random sample, it is important to try and show the group of respondents closely resembles the large group of non-respondents, in order to provide some basis (but not a conclusive one) for generalizing the results to the larger group.

Analysis was conducted of the demographic profile of respondents and compared to the population assess response rates and test for selection bias. This analysis found that the sample of respondents is broadly representative of the population, with some exceptions (see below)

**Demographic analysis of respondents compared to known population**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Age:*** | Younger respondents are slightly over represented (i.e. those younger than 25 years up to 35 years). |
| ***Gender:*** | Broadly representative |
| ***Position level:*** | Unable to determine (population statistics cannot be compared) |
| ***Employment status:*** | Daily rated and temporary workers are under represented in the sample |
| ***Location (urban / rural):*** | Unable to determine (population statistics unknown). There was good response from three provinces. |
| ***Language***: | Unable to determine (population statistics unknown) |

**Table A1. Comparison of known population with respondents by gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **POPULATION** | | **RESPONDENTS** | |
| **GENDER** | **Number** | **Percent** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| Women | 802 | 40.1% | 199 | 39.6% |
| Men | 1197 | 59.9% | 303 | 60.4% |
| ***Sub-total*** | ***1999*** | ***100%*** | ***502*** | ***100%*** |
| Not specified |  |  | 1 |  |
| **TOTAL** | **1999** |  | **503** |  |

This table shows that the sample of respondents by gender is broadly representative when compared to known population statistics.

**Table A2. Comparison of known population with respondents by age cohort**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **POPULATION[[38]](#footnote-38)** | | **RESPONDENTS** | |  |
| **Age group** | **Number** | **%** | **Number** | **%** | **Difference** |
| 25 years or younger | 147 | 7.7% | 49 | 9.7% | 2.1% |
| > 25 -35 years | 550 | 28.8% | 166 | 33.0% | 4.2% |
| > 35 - 45 years | 638 | 33.4% | 171 | 34.0% | 0.6% |
| > 45 - 55 years | 466 | 24.4% | 110 | 21.9% | -2.5% |
| Older than 55 years | 111 | 5.8% | 7 | 1.4% | -4.4% |
| **Sub-Total** | **1909** | **100%** | **503** | **100%** |  |
| Not specified | 80 |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | **1999** |  |  |  |  |

This table shows that younger respondents (<25 years to 35 years) are slightly over-represented when compared to known population statistics.

**Mixed methodology**

The mixed methodology also presented constraints. Internet and hard copy responses were completely anonymous, whereas email responses were only confidential. The data entry process ensured that no responses could be attributed to a particular individual. The lack of anonymity for email responses does not appear to have impacted on the candidacy of responses.

Slow internet access resulted in a high drop-out rate for those completing the survey over the internet. As a result, all responses needed to be screened to check for duplicates.

# ANNEX B - Feedback on the survey

**Sample of unsolicited comments received:**

“This is a good initiative taken by PSC. Thank you PSC.”

“Thank you for giving us the opportunity to be able to provide feedback to our employer !  Well done your unit should be congratulated for this initiative ! Et bonjour la confidentialité!!!!!!!!!!!!!”

“Fully support.”

“Very supportive of initiative taken by PSC for this survey.  It is about time !!!”

“Congratulations PSC! We all welcome the PSC Survey and look forward for everyone's contributions for a more productive service to all of us! I am pleased!  May God enlarge all your visions to our nation's growth and wealth for a fruitful service for all! God bless you all!”

“Emi stret me really appreciatem chance ia thats why me reply quik from janis blong traem lukluk back long wanem ol stap finis mo how blong improvem or changem depends long ol issues raised.”

“An excellent approach taken by PSC. Thanks a lot.”

“I wish PSC all the best with this survey and pray for a better PSC for tomorrow.”

“Thanks for a given opportunity to provide some feedback. Good going.”

 “Thank for giving the opportunity to express myself for the first time ever in this survey to improve PSC and my Department.”

# ANNEX C - Statistical Annex

**Table C1. Hard copy survey distribution to provinces**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Province** | **Number** | **Responses** |
| Torba | 30 | 0 |
| Sanma | 60 | 41 |
| Malampa | 60 | 42 |
| Penama | 30 | 0 |
| Tafea | 40 | 12 |
| Shefa | 20 | 1 |
| **TOTAL** | **240** | **96** |

**Table C2. Hard copy survey distribution to Government departments in Port Vila**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ministry / Department** | **Number** |
| Ni van business | 10 |
| Tourism | 10 |
| Trade | 10 |
| Public Works | 10 |
| Lands | 20 |
| Women’s Affairs | 9 |
| Meteorological | 10 |
| Agriculture | 20 |
| Forestry | 15 |
| Quarantine | 10 |
| Fisheries | 8 |
| Immigration | 3 |
| Education | 10 |
| Finance | 20 |
| **TOTAL** | **165** |

**Table C3. Survey respondents by Government department**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Government Department** | **Number of respondents** |
| Judiciary | 1 |
| Agriculture, Fisheries & Forestry | 43 |
| Education, Youth and Sport | 55 |
| Finance and Economic Management | 110 |
| Foreign Affairs | 6 |
| Health | 89 |
| Internal Affairs | 24 |
| Infrastructure and Public Utilities | 65 |
| Justice and Social Welfare | 12 |
| Lands, Geology and Mines | 35 |
| Ni Vanuatu Business | 6 |
| Trade, Tourism and Business Development | 15 |
| National Audit Office | 3 |
| Office of the Ombudsman | 7 |
| Prime Minister's Office | 11 |
| Public Service Commission | 12 |
| Public Prosecutor | 1 |
| Public Solicitor | 3 |
| Sub-Total | 498 |
| *Missing* | 5 |
| **TOTAL** | **503** |

**Table C4. Official work trips to the provinces by job level**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of official work trip to provinces** | | | | |  |
| **JOB LEVEL** | **Not at all** | **1-2 trips** | **3-5 trips** | **6-10 trips** | **More than 10 trips** | **Total** |
| Director General | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Director | 1 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Manager | 12 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 37 |
| Principal Officer | 6 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 28 |
| Senior Officer | 51 | 45 | 20 | 4 | 3 | 123 |
| Officer | 125 | 56 | 13 | 7 | 4 | 205 |
| Other | 29 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 47 |
| **TOTAL** | **224** | **149** | **62** | **14** | **10** | **459** |

**Table C5. Official work trips overseas by job level**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of official work trips overseas** | | | | |  |
| **JOB LEVEL** | **Not at all** | **1-2 trips** | **3-5 trips** | **6-10 trips** | **More than 10 trips** | **Total** |
| Director General | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Director | 5 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Manager | 21 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Principal Officer | 11 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Senior Officer | 69 | 38 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 112 |
| Officer | 148 | 30 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 182 |
| Other | 35 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 39 |
| **TOTAL** | **289** | **103** | **14** | **3** | **0** | **409** |

# ANNEX D - Survey timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Activity** |
| 2006 | Public Sector Survey discussed with the Government of Vanuatu as part of the design for Governance for Growth (GfG). Proposed purpose was to assess effectiveness of service delivery. Included in the GfG design, with proposal to conduct annually |
| August 2008 | Survey requested by former Secretary of Public Service Commission, Mr Mark Bebe. |
| August 2008 | Working level meeting between PSC and GfG to discuss survey and desired focus |
| October 2008 | Draft survey tool developed by Public Service Commission, with technical assistance from GfG. |
| 22nd – 23rd January 2009 | Pilot of draft survey tool conducted by PSC with random sample of 15 Public Servants in Port Vila. Survey tool further refined following the pilot.  Survey modified to reflect feedback from pilot |
| June 2009 | PSC sent letter to all departments advising of proposed Public Sector survey (addressed to all Director Generals, Directors and HROs)  Staff notice on government email. |
| 25th June – 6 July 2009 | Final web, email and hard copy versions of survey tool developed and endorsed by the PSC. Email distribution list developed.  Testing of different survey formats (word, internet, hard copy) |
| 7th July 2009 | Survey officially launched by new Chairman of the Public Service Commission, with media coverage. |
| 9th July 2009 | Focus group discussion in Port Vila (15 participants) |
| 14th July 2009 | Focus group discussion in Malakula (11 participants) |
| 15th July 2009 | Focus group discussion in Santo (15 participants) |
| 24th July 2009 | Survey closes |
| 21st July – 15th August | Follow up outstanding survey returns  Data entry of survey responses (with assistance from two Youth Challenge Volunteers) |
| 15th August – 30th September 2009 | Analysis of data and preparation of draft report for PSC and Government of Vanuatu, with technical support from GfG. |
| October 2009 | Final report prepared. PSC to present findings |

# ANNEX E - Focus group feedback

**Focus Group Discussion Questions**

1. What do you like best about working in the public service? What attracted you to working for the public service?

2. What do you like least about working in the public service? What would you most like to change?

3. How can the PSC best serve you? Do you feel that you are getting the level of support from PSC that you need? Are there any areas for suggested improvement?

4. Working hours. Public service recently changed official working hours.

OLD TIMES 7.30am – 11.30am and 1:15pm – 4.30pm

NEW TIMES 7:30am – 12pm and 1pm – 4:30

What have been the advantages and disadvantages of the new working hours?

**FOCUS GROUP 1**

**Location: Port Vila, Thursday, 9th July 2009**

**Participants: 10 women and 5 men**

**1. What do you like about working in the public service? What attracted you to the public service?**

* Enjoy public contact / like helping people / providing service to people
* Job straight after school / no choice
* Long time in job / job security
* Like job conditions (eg. sick leave etc) / better than private sector
* Enjoy visiting other islands
* Right job, service to people
* Easy to go for training

**2. What do you like least about working in the Public Service? What would you most like to change?**

* Need to have right person for the right job
* Change of government = need consistency in the work at Ministry level
* Need better monitoring and evaluation system
* Need better performance management
* Slow recruitment processes
* Need common understanding of vision and goal amongst staff
* Recruitment needs to be fair / Don’t want PSC deferring recruitment submission
* Disciplinary process is too long. Managers don’t deal with issues / resolve issues. Need to change disciplinary culture
* Favoritism – not following right channels / processes for recruitment (particularly an issue for political staff).
* Bosses not resolving issues / boss contract / not empowered to resolve
* Morale drop when bosses hold up issues
* Need staff to appraise bosses
* Director too long in a position is not good / leads to stagnation
* Bosses needs managerial skills

**3. How can PSC serve you better?**

* Provide feedback to public servants and follow through
* Review the matrix system (salary scale)
* Increments – we have never had them, need to follow up
* Director and DG’s housing allowance has gone up, but what about everyone else? Should be fair
* Pay at higher levels also increased, but not for more junior staff
* Pay and allowances need to be fair
* Need better link between pay and responsibility
* More training, which is linked to career progression
* Progression currently linked to immediate vacancies above you
* Retirement package every 10 years (shouldn’t have to wait until 55)
* Retirement under exceptional circumstances at an earlier age (i.e. 45)
* Participation in private sector (need to share knowledge between public sector and private sector). Life after the public service
* Housing allowance needs to be reviewed
* Five days sick leave is not enough
* Request for carers leave and paternity leave (to look after children)
* Training needs follow up
* Francophone – training

**4. Working hours**

* Old Hours: 7:30am to 11:30am and 1:15pm to 4.40pm
* New hours 7:30am to 12pm and 1pm to 4:30pm
* Positive: More working hours, can get more work done
* Negative: Not enough time at lunch / can’t go home
* Still feel sleepy after lunch
* Salary wasn’t increased to reflect extra hours
* Not everyone following the new hours
* Private sector still finishing at 11:30am, so for half an hour there is no interaction with government
* Some kids finish school at 11:30am = problem for picking them up
* Still dark when people go to work
* As long as working 8 hours a day, should be more flexibility in working hour (flex-time)

**FOCUS GROUP 2**

**Location: Malakula, Tuesday 14th July 2009**

**Participants: 10 men, 1 woman**

**1. What do you like about working in the public service? What attracted you to the public service?**

* Providing service to the people and country. Especially for helping people so that they can stay healthy and continue development
* Men and women share work together – be vocal on behalf of women
* Provide infrastructure service to people to improve standard of living
* Help improve services contribute to business development
* PSC manual – be comparison is better than private sector (better benefits) eg. retirement package is good. PSC grade for salary is good but better in comparison with private sector
* Not too strict
* Manual indicates available of training but in provinces we don’t always have access but good that its still there. Need more opportunity for training and going further
* Work in something I am interested in and I can help people at the same time doing what I like
* Public services you have vested interest in providing a services and you can see the development of people as a result of your service. Private sector only money making.

**2. What do you like least about working in the Public Service? What would you most like to change?**

* System of HR – we need to speed up the processes (particularly recruitment). Is very slow for HR services to come to us and very frustrating. It takes longer for things to go from province to Vila but longer for department to PSC.
* Personnel management – there should be more follow up and strengthening and keep people alert to make sure services keep going out
* We are entitled to training but often not able to access the training. It seems training only benefits the people in Vila. Need to give opportunity to the people in provinces as well who serve the majority. Some of those people get training and don’t use it. Some people go for training for the wrong tasks (wrong person to the training therefore ineffective)
* Management often deters people from access to training
* Our senior managers (DGs, Director etc) never come out to the provinces and we are left doing whatever we wan with not much contact. They need to come down and visit, appreciate our work what’s happening in field (since TA increases, lots of Directors DGs travel)
* We do not get together department wide for planning of work etc and there not a lot of team work / interdepartmental communication
* Structures of department / Ministries can cause some of these failures – means there’s confusion in the chain of command / reporting etc. Doesn’t usually filter down to the people it needs to serves. Lack of alignment and allocation of resources / funds.
* Financial resources that reach provinces fro government. There is too slow process for imprest to reach areas that need it the most. Can take months (and people are having to pay for things from their own pocket).
* Funds are centralised and takes longer. But provinces depend on DoF in Vila and we have to wait.
* Downsizing productive sectors (eg. Agriculture) through the CRP has been detrimental to the public because they no longer have access to those services. Perhaps some sectors should be downsized but others not. Transfers from Vila to province is very difficult. Often people don’t want to come.

**3. How can PSC serve you better?**

* HRD planning is very weak. By each department and PSC must strengthen. Lack of planning leads to recall of retired officers who return for the sake of services – no salary change.
* Claims turn around time too long
* Severance pay after 10 years. Can invest while you’re still young
* Resources that we need to deliver services in the provinces are very lacking and these will help us deliver the services eg. vehicles – tumas long Vila be nogat lo island
* No appraisal happen from the top down

**4. Working Hours:**

* Work longer hours and not enough time at lunchtime
* Pay still the same through longer hours – feel cheated
* Physical strength depends on whether you eat or not. If you don’t get breaks you leave early. Not practical because after 11:30 you’re too hungry to concentrate or do any work
* Must live where they work so we need to serve the people at any time

**FOCUS GROUP 3**

**Location: Santo, Wednesday 15th July 2009**

**Participants: 7 women, 8 men**

**1. What do you like about working in the public service? What attracted you to the public service?**

* Allows us to work with people in different communities
* Want to build up the nation and make sure service is delivered everywhere in Vanuatu
* You meet people who have needs and you know you can help them with your services
* Work for the biggest employer – job security – not sensitive to political change
* There are procedures and ways of working that are already in place and makes us confident
* Something I wanted to do from a young age. Helped me develop my career, HR, Finances and like knowing that we work all over the country to develop the nation. Nation wide work
* Opportunities for career development / growth
* Productive sector creates many other opportunities to people from town to rural (eg. Agriculture dept) Create jobs, give skills
* Incentives available through PSC eg. GRT
* Safeguard interests of employees

**2. What do you like least about working in the Public Service? What would you most like to change? 3. How can PSC best serve you (combined)**

* How complaints are handled from the public to the politicians. Hard for those to be resolved. Managers needs to adjust the organization to safeguard the needs of the public.
* Organisational structures need to be stronger and need to be aligned to making services go down to the grass roots level.
* There is too much central control of access to finance. Needs to be decentralised.
* A lot of policies in PSC but these are often not disseminated throughout the PS. Managers and Directors to officers…. Weak top down communication and contributes to down up community and creates confusion. Need to encourage better communication and listening
* Need everyone to be a part of the budget and planning process, especially through consultation down to provincial level.
* Change budget ceiling as it limits our ability to provide services
* Return of quarterly budgeting to be released quarterly
* Work force planning – if this can be disseminated down through the departments right down to individual planning
* There needs to be a focus on Vila offices as well otherwise devolution into the provinces won’t work. They need to also be involved.
* Lack of coordination between departments to PSC. HRO needs to be supported because sometimes issues do not reach the places its intended for.
* Want to see a better mechanism in place between PSC down to depts, provinces. Make sure that information can pass quickly between PSC and everyone else. Can PSC set up some kind of system?
* HR is very weak within departments. The process are very delayed and often not aligned to what they PSC manual says. Also performance assessment. It’s not done at all. Perhaps there needs to be an HR officer in the provinces. Also needs a reporting system in place so that information is always available to all officers.
* Need to change focus around Job descriptions so that all the people who do the same job across the board get the same remuneration. Needs to be fair.
* Condition of housing needs to be standardised and upgraded. Access also an issue: a lot of officers eligible for housing, but not enough housing to go around. Should be able to get some sort of housing allowance to compensate.
* Need change in structure of delegation of responsibility from DG down to managers at provincial level.
* Productive sector needs to be prioritised again (need change of government policy)
* Who is responsible for maintenance of government assets (housing)? Clarity needed.
* Gender equity, code of conduct and consideration of family welfare needs to be more strongly enforced.
* Can government be a guarantee for officers to get a house loan from VNPF?
* Change attitudes about people views about their jobs. That we are doing the government’s business, not your own business.
* Suggestion: Leave retirement fund with finance department control and not at Ministry level.

**4. Working Hours:**

* Too short to go home and eat / rest. Also if we depend on buses is too hard.
* As a mother, 7:30am is too early because of children. Can we change from 8am – 5pm?
* PSC to ask government about reinstating daylight savings
* Most people agree that flexibility in working hours would be better. i.e. as long as you work 8 hours, should be able to come in later or earlier etc. Control issue – should abide by code of ethics for your job. Need a system in place to implement.

*Photo: Focus group discussion in Port Vila*



*Photo: Youth Challenge Volunteers assisting with data entry*



# ANNEX F - Survey questionnaire

**Vanuatu Public Sector Survey 2009**

Welcome to the Vanuatu Public Sector Survey.

This survey is your opportunity to share your views on the issues you face daily in the job and the services provided by the Public Service Commission. We will use your feedback to help improve management practices, human resources support and future training across the Vanuatu Public Service.

Your feedback is important to us, so please take the time to complete all the questions.

Please note that survey responses are anonymous and confidential. We therefore encourage you to answer questions as honestly as possible.

The survey takes approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The survey is printed on BOTH sides of the paper, so please check you haven’t missed any questions.

[pscsurvey@vanuatu.gov.vu](mailto:pscsurvey@vanuatu.gov.vu)

Completed surveys should be returned to your Provincial Headquarters by

**20th of July 2009**.

We look forward to receiving your views and working together to build a better public service.

If you have questions regarding the survey, please contact Webster Alilee at the Public Service Commission. Email: [walilee@vanuatu.gov.vu](mailto:walilee@vanuatu.gov.vu) or Telephone: 25090

Thank you for your participation.

Public Service Commission

**Part 1. Demographic information**

**1. What is your sex?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Female** |
| 🞏 | **Male** |

**2. What is your age?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **25 years or younger** |
| 🞏 | **26 to 35 years old** |
| 🞏 | **36 to 45 years old** |
| 🞏 | **46 to 55 years old** |
| 🞏 | **Older than 55 years** |

**3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Primary School** |
| 🞏 | **High School** |
| 🞏 | **Technical College Certificate** |
| 🞏 | **Diploma** |
| 🞏 | **Undergraduate Degree** |
| 🞏 | **Masters Degree** |
| 🞏 | **Doctorate (PhD)** |
| 🞏 | **If other, please specify ……………………………………………………** |

**4. How well do you speak each of the following languages?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very well** | **Well** | **Not well** | **Not at all** |
| **Bislama** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **French** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **English** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |

**5. What is your current job level?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Director General** |
| 🞏 | **Director** |
| 🞏 | **Manager** |
| 🞏 | **Principal Officer** |
| 🞏 | **Senior Officer** |
| 🞏 | **Officer** |
| 🞏 | **If other, please specify ……………………………………………………** |

**6. What is your current job status?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Permanent appointment** |
| 🞏 | **Temporary** |
| 🞏 | **Daily rate** |
| 🞏 | **On contract** |

**7. How long have you worked in the Vanuatu Public Service?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Less than 1 year** |
| 🞏 | **More than 1 year up to 2 years** |
| 🞏 | **More than 2 years up to 5 years** |
| 🞏 | **More than 5 years up to 10 years** |
| 🞏 | **More than 10 years up to 20 years** |
| 🞏 | **More than 20 years** |

**8. Which area of government do you work in?  (please select one)**

🞏 **Judiciary**

🞏 **Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries**

🞏 **Ministry for Education, Youth and Sport**

🞏 **Ministry for Finance and Economic Management**

🞏 **Ministry for Foreign Affairs**

🞏 **Ministry for Health**

🞏 **Ministry for Internal Affairs**

🞏 **Ministry for Infrastructure and Public Utilities**

🞏 **Ministry for Justice and Social Welfare**

🞏 **Ministry for Lands, Geology & Mines**

🞏 **Ministry for Ni Vanuatu Business**

🞏 **Ministry for Trade, Tourism & Business Development**

🞏 **Malvatumauri Office**

🞏 **National Audit Office**

🞏 **Office of the Ombudsman**

🞏 **President of the Republic**

🞏 **Prime Minister's Office**

🞏 **Public Service Commission**

🞏 **Public Prosecutor**

🞏 **Public Solicitor**

🞏 **State Law Office**

**9. Where are you usually based for work?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Port Vila** |
| 🞏 | **Luganville** |
| 🞏 | **Other provincial area** |

**Part 2. Leadership and Management**

**10. How satisfied are you with the leadership and management skills of managers in your department?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Very satisfied** |
| 🞏 | **Satisfied** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Dissatisfied** |
| 🞏 | **Very dissatisfied** |

**11. My manager treats me and my peers with respect:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**12. My manager considers the input of team members in making decisions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**13. How satisfied are you with the level of HR (human resources) support provided in your Department?   Note: HR support includes assistance with recruitment, transfers, promotion rounds, grievances etc.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Very satisfied** |
| 🞏 | **Satisfied** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Dissatisfied** |
| 🞏 | **Very dissatisfied** |

**14. I know who my HR officer is and feel I can get their help when I need it:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |

**15. Recruitment and selection practices within my department are fair and transparent:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |

**16. Do you have any suggestions on how leadership and human resources management in your department could be improved?**

**Part 3. Performance Management**

**17. My supervisor has worked with me in creating a clear list of performance goals:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**18. My supervisor provides feedback on my job performance:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Regularly** |
| 🞏 | **Sometimes** |
| 🞏 | **Never** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**19. The feedback I receive on my performance is constructive and helps me to perform my job better:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**20. I get adequate recognition from my immediate supervisor when I do a good job:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**21. I rate the teamwork in my work area as:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Excellent** |
| 🞏 | **Above average** |
| 🞏 | **Average** |
| 🞏 | **Below average** |
| 🞏 | **Poor** |

**22. Frequent absences (people taking time off work) are affecting the ability of our team to meet its goals:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |

**23. I am aware of my obligations and entitlements under each of the following government policies:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes, fully understand** | **No, need more training** |
| **Public Service Staff Manual** | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Public Service Act** | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Code of Conduct** | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Public Financial Management Act** | 🞏 | 🞏 |

**24. I feel I can raise grievances or complaints without fear:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |

**25. Grievances in my department are dealt with in a timely manner:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**26. Do you have any suggestions for how performance management could be improved?**

**Part 4. Learning and development**

**27. I am provided with the necessary tools (computer equipment, software, stationary etc) to do my job effectively:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |

**28. In the last year, I received information on training opportunities:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Yes** |
| 🞏 | **No** |

**29. I receive adequate training to grow and be effective in my job:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |

**30. The number of training programs I participated in over the last year was:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **0 (if you did not complete any training, please go to Q32)** |
| 🞏 | **1** |
| 🞏 | **2 to 3** |
| 🞏 | **4 to 5** |
| 🞏 | **More than 5** |

**31. The most useful training I received in the last year was (please specify the type of training you received):**

**32. The areas of future training that would be most useful to me would be (tick all that apply):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Financial management** |
| 🞏 | **Human resource management** |
| 🞏 | **Leadership and management** |
| 🞏 | **Specialised technical training** |
| 🞏 | **Computer training (word, excel etc)** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |
| 🞏 | **If other, please specify ……………………………………………….** |

**33. Do you currently receive mentoring or assistance from an external consultant?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Yes** |
| 🞏 | **No** |

**34. The quality of advice & support I receive from the external consultant is:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Excellent** |
| 🞏 | **Very Good** |
| 🞏 | **Average** |
| 🞏 | **Below Average** |
| 🞏 | **Poor** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**35. Over the last year, how many times did you travel for official work related purposes?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not at all** | **1-2 trips** | **3-5 trips** | **6-10 trips** | **More than 10 trips** |
| **Number of trips to the provinces** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Number of trips overseas** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |

**36. Do you have any suggestions on how learning and development opportunities in your department could be improved?**

**Part 5. Planning and Budgeting**

**37. My Ministry has a current Corporate Plan:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Yes** |
| 🞏 | **No** |
| 🞏 | **Don't know** |

**38. My manager clearly communicates our Ministry's vision and priorities:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**39. My section has a current work plan:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Yes** |
| 🞏 | **No** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**40. My responsibilities within our section's work plan are clear:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Not applicable** |

**41. Have you been involved in developing any new policy in the last year?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Yes** |
| 🞏 | **No (if you answered NO, please go to Question 43** |

**42. How much was the most recent policy you developed informed by:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Significant amount** | **Reasonable amount** | **A little bit** | **Not at all** |
| **Analysis or data** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Consultation within my Department** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Consultation with other government departments** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Consultation with the general public** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |
| **Consultation at provincial level** | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 | 🞏 |

**43. I know what the budget is for my section:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Yes** |
| 🞏 | **No (please go to Question 46)** |

**44. My section or unit received all of the money approved in the budget last year:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Yes (go to Question 46)** |
| 🞏 | **No (please go to Question 45)** |
| 🞏 | **Don't know / not sure (go to Question 46)** |

**45. What was the main reason that you did not receive the full amount of money in your budget last year?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **We couldn't spend the money in time** |
| 🞏 | **Ministerial decision to use money for other purposes** |
| 🞏 | **Our budget was used by another area to meet more urgent priorities** |
| 🞏 | **We did not account for money provided under an imprest account** |
| 🞏 | **Department of Finance did not release the money to our Department** |
| 🞏 | **Don't know / not sure** |
| 🞏 | **If other, please specify …………………………………………..** |

**46. In your opinion, how well aligned is your department’s budget to the priorities in your sector?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Extremely well aligned** |
| 🞏 | **Reasonably aligned** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Not well aligned** |
| 🞏 | **Extremely poorly aligned** |

**47. Do you have any suggestions for how budgeting and planning processes could be improved?**

**Part 6. Pay and conditions**

**48. The Public Service offers competitive pay rates in comparison to other employers:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Agree** |
| 🞏 | **Neutral** |
| 🞏 | **Disagree** |
| 🞏 | **Strongly Disagree** |

**49. Do you receive supplementary income in addition to your public service salary from a private business?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Yes** |
| 🞏 | **No** |

**50. Overall, I think that the conditions of service (leave, maternity leave etc) within the Public Service are:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Excellent** |
| 🞏 | **Very Good** |
| 🞏 | **Average** |
| 🞏 | **Below Average** |
| 🞏 | **Poor** |

**51. I can complete my assigned workload during normal working hours:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Always** |
| 🞏 | **Most of the time** |
| 🞏 | **Sometimes** |
| 🞏 | **Never** |

**52. Which issues are MOST important to you? (select two or three)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🞏 | **Leave entitlements (holiday leave, sick leave etc)** |
| 🞏 | **Salary** |
| 🞏 | **Performance pay (increments)** |
| 🞏 | **Paid allowances (housing, child, COLA)** |
| 🞏 | **Medical benefits** |
| 🞏 | **Promotion opportunities** |
| 🞏 | **Training opportunities** |
| 🞏 | **Recognition from my supervisor** |

**53. Are there any other issues regarding pay and conditions that you would like to raise?**

1. Governance for Growth (GfG) is a joint partnership between the Vanuatu Government and the Australian Government. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The total population figure was obtained from the government’s SmartStream database (P-Scale and C-Scale employees). Note: The survey did not seek the views of employees working under other government commissions, such as the Police Commission and Teaching Commission. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. It was not possible to verify the exact sample size due to the methodology used, however around (68%) of the total population were sent the survey via email, and a further 405 hard copies were distributed across the provinces and departments (of which 231 hard copy responses were received, equivalent to around 12% of the total population). The estimate of 80% is therefore conservative – actual recipients of the survey may have been higher. Estimated response rates for the different survey approaches (i.e. email, web and paper based returns) are provided at Annex A. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Of these, 24 responses were determined to be invalid. The total number of valid returns included in data analysis is therefore 503. Refer to Annex A for more detail. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Figure based on estimated maximum sample size of 1763 (1358 email recipients and 405 hard copies) and total responses of 536. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Survey data is compared to known population statistics (where available) to test for selection bias and assess the extent to which the sample of respondents is representative of the broader population of public servants. Refer to Annex A for discussion on selection bias and representation. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Total population statistics for gender: 802 women and 1197 men. Refer to Table A1, Annex A. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Based on known population data from Smartstream: Includes all public servants for whom age data was available (n=1912). Note: Total population: N=1999. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Refer to Annex A for more discussion on methodological constraints and selection bias. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Population statistics on language were not available for comparison. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Higher level degrees include: Undergraduate degree, Masters degree and PhD [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. It was not possible to determine numbers of public servants by position level from Smartstream data due to differences in classifications between P-Scale and Health Department employees. However, the distribution of survey respondents by level is broadly in keeping with available population data for P-Scale employees. Refer to Annex C: Table C3 Respondents by department. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Note: Other mostly includes those who are acting in positions and health professionals. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Based on gender ratios for known population of public servants (i.e. 60% men, 40% women). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Population statistics for employment status were not available. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Despite repeated follow up by the PSC with all provinces, survey responses were only received from Tafea, Malampa and Santo provinces. Population data for public servants by location is not available from SmartStream. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Based on data from Questions 10 through to 16 in the Survey Questionnaire. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Note: Training was another significant issue raised (with 37 comments). To avoid repetition, feedback on training is discussed under Section 3.4 – Learning and Development. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. While it cannot be concluded that recruitment processes are gender biased, the data suggest that women perceive there to be a greater degree of bias in recruitment practices. This may be a reflection of broader gender imbalance within the public service (both in absolute staff numbers and in the relative proportions of women and men by job level). [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Where 1 is “strongly agree” and 5 is “strongly disagree”. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Data is drawn from Survey Questions 17 through to 26 [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Note: The need for regular meetings / communication (28) and effective leadership (25) are discussed in more detail under Section 3.2 – Leadership and Management). [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Data was drawn from Survey Questions 27 to 36. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Data was drawn from Survey Questions 37 to 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Half of those respondents who knew their budget (50%) indicated they received their full budget allocation, while the remaining 20% weren’t sure. n=212 [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. n=427 [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. N=269 [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Data was drawn from Survey Questions 47 to 53. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. n=284 [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. The total population figure was obtained from the government’s SmartStream database. Note: The survey did not canvass the views of employees working under other government commissions, such as the Police Commission and Teaching Commission. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. The pilot was conducted in Port Vila [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Note: The word document version was automated to make it function as close as possible to the web version. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. It is not possible to verify the exact sample size due to the methodology used, however around (68%) of the total population were sent the survey via email, and a further 405 hard copies were distributed across the provinces and departments (of which 231 hard copy responses were received, equivalent to around 12% of the total population). The figure of 80% is therefore conservative – actual recipients of the survey may have been higher. Estimated response rates for the different survey approaches (i.e. email, web and paper based returns) are provided at Annex A. Refer also to discussion on selection bias. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Figure based on estimated maximum sample size of 1763 (1358 email recipients and 405 hard copies), and total responses of 536. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. <http://www.peoplepulse.com.au/Survey-Response-Rates.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Invalid returns included those with insufficient data for analysis (partial returns), duplicate returns and nil returns. Partial responses were a particular problem with web based returns. Feedback indicated that slow internet access led to a higher drop out rate amongst web based respondents (approximately 20% of web based returns were not completed, with the majority of these invalidated as a result). [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Population statistics for age were obtained from SmartStream. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)