

**Finance and Public Administration Legislative Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Prime Minister and Cabinet Portfolio**

**Australian Public Service Commission**

Estimates 2004-05 – Supplementary Written Questions November 2004

**Question: PM 4**

**Topic: Multicultural/Diversity Issues**

**Senator Ludwig asked:**

**General**

For all of the following questions, please answer with respect to both the Department and all agencies constituted under it.

**Question 1.** For the each of the i) 1999-00, ii) 2000-01, iii) 2001-02, iv) 2002-03, v) 2003-04 financial years, did the Department include in its annual report a report on outcomes achieved for clients from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds?

**Question 2.** If not, for the each of the i) 1999-00, ii) 2000-01, iii) 2001-02, iv) 2002-03, v) 2003-04 financial years, did the Department otherwise publish a report on outcomes achieved for clients from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds? (If yes, please supply report)

**Question 3.** For the each of the i) 1999-00, ii) 2000-01, iii) 2001-02, iv) 2002-03, v) 2003-04 financial years, did the department budget for costs associated with developing culturally responsive and accessible services?

**Question 4.** For the 2003-2004 financial year, how much did the department budget for this purpose?

**Question 5.** For the each of the i) 1999-00, ii) 2000-01, iii) 2001-02, iv) 2002-03, v) 2003-04 financial years, how many Departmental programs or services were delivered via an intermediary service provider, such as another level of government or a non-government organisation?

**Question 6.** Of these, in each financial year how many did the funding conditions in contracts specify relevant access and equity accountabilities (for example, collection and reporting of information on client characteristics)?

**Question 7.** For each of these, is the provision a standard clause? If so, can the Department please supply the clause?

**Question 8.** If there is no standard provision, is a copy of the provision available for each of these? Are the provisions subsequently audited? If yes, what were the results? (Please supply).

**Question 9.** Can the Department provide a current list of each community information publication it publishes in English as at a) the current date (2, December 2004) or if this is unavailable b) 30 June, 2004 (and take from then to 2 December 2004 On Notice) or if this is unavailable c) 1 January 2004 (and take from then to 2 December 2004 On Notice) or if this is unavailable d) the last date for which they were available (specify date and take from then to 2 December 2004 On Notice)?

**Question 10.** For the above list, what publications are translated into languages other than English and for each, what languages are they translated into?

**Question 11.** For the above list, how many copies were printed?

**Question 12.** For the above list, what was the total cost of each document in translation, publication, printing and distribution?

**Answer:**

The Commission's mission is to promote, review and evaluate a values-based public service and to foster its capability and the Public Service Act 1999 sets out the particular functions to be undertaken by the Public Service Commissioner in relation to the public service. Accordingly, the Commission's primary interactions are with public servants rather than the community or industry, although we work closely with private sector partners in delivering learning and development programs for public servants and we liaise extensively across the public administration industry (state government, academia and international).

The scope of Senator Ludwig's questions is directed at the provision of services to the community and in particular members of the community from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and, given the focus of the Commission's work is on the public service, rather than the community, it would seem that the Commission's role and work program are outside the scope of Senator Ludwig's questions. The Commission has a clear interest in encouraging a public service that is representative of the composition of the broader community, including people from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, but this work does not readily fit with the intent of Senator Ludwig's questions.

**Finance and Public Administration Legislative Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Prime Minister and Cabinet Portfolio**

**Australian Public Service Commission**

Estimates 2004-05 – Supplementary Written Questions November 2004

**Question: PM 4**

**Topic: Multicultural/Diversity Issues**

**Senator Ludwig asked:**

**General**

**Question 13. What efforts has the Department made to identify employees from a non-English Speaking background and what languages they are fluent in?**

The Commission undertakes an annual Workplace Diversity census. Participation in the census by staff is voluntary. The census identifies staff born overseas and for whom English was not their first language.

The Commission does not determine whether these staff are fluent in a language other than English.

**Question 14. What proportion of the Department's personnel have a non-English speaking background?**

The Commission's 2003-04 Annual Report shows that as at 30 June 2004 5.3% of staff indicated that English was not their first language.

**Question 15. For each language other than English that the Department has identified employees with fluency, can the Department provide how employees were fluent? For each language other than English, how many were identified as being fluent?**

The Commission does not determine whether staff are fluent in a language other than English.

**Question 16. Of these employees, what efforts has the department made to identify the language proficiency of these employees? For each language other than English, how many were identified as having proficiency?**

The Commission does not determine the language proficiency of its staff in languages other than English.

**Question 17.** Of these employees, how many has the Department identified as possessing accredited language skills to either translator or interpreter standard? For each language other than English, how many were identified as having accreditation at the a) translator and b) interpreter level?

The Commission does not determine whether staff have accredited language skills.

**Question 18.** Of these employees, how many has the Department funded in whole or in part accreditation of language skills to either a) translator and b) interpreter level?

N/A – see above

**Question 19.** How much did the department spend engaging language a) translator and b) interpreter level in each of the financial years i) 2001-02, ii) 2002-03, iii) 2003-04?

The Commission did not engage language translators or interpreters.

**Question 20.** How many times did the department engage an a) translator and b) interpreter in each of the following years i) 2001-02, ii) 2002-03, iii) 2003-04?

N/A – see above

**Question 21.** For each language in which a) a translator and b) an interpreter was engaged, how many engagements occurred in each of the following years i) 2001-02, ii) 2002-03, iii) 2003-04?

N/A – see above

**Question 22.** What was the total cost of those engagements by language for a) translators and b) interpreters in each of the following years i) 2001-02, ii) 2002-03, iii) 2003-04?

N/A – see above

**Question 23.** For each of the financial years i) 1995-96, ii) 1996-97, iii) 1997-98, iv) 1998-99, v) 1999-00, vi) 2000-01, vii) 2001-02, viii) 2002-03, ix) 2003-04 how much was spent in advertising or advertorial in the ethnic press?

The Commission has not advertised in the ethnic press.

**Question 24.** For each of the above years, could the Department please specify each title, in which advertising was bought, the language of that title and the total annual spend on advertising and advertorial in each title.

N/A – see above

**Question 25.** For each of the financial years i) 1995-96, ii) 1996-97, iii) 1997-98, iv) 1998-99, v) 1999-00, vi) 2000-01, vii) 2001-02, viii) 2002-03, ix) 2003-04 how much was spent in advertising and or advertorials on ethnic radio? For each financial year, could the Department please specify which station, broadcast language and how much was spent on each language at each station?

Nil

**Question 26 to 31.** Refer attached landscape document

**Question 32.** How many Ministerial staff does the department provide?

Nil

**Question 33.** To what Minister or Parliamentary Secretary are they assigned?

N/A – see above

**Finance and Public Administration Legislative Committee  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Prime Minister and Cabinet Portfolio

Australian Public Service Commission

Estimates 2004-05 – Supplementary Written Questions November 2004

**PM4 Questions 26 to 31**

	Year 2000-01	Year 2001-02	Year 2002-03	Year 2003-04
(26) How many break-ins were there on Departmental property in 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04? For each incident:	2	Nil	Nil	Nil
a) what was the location and the cost of damage associated with each break in?	Melbourne Office May 2001 \$385.00 (3 drawer filing cabinet) and \$148.00 (repair damage to front entrance doors) Total \$533.00 Brisbane Office May 2001 Nil Cost	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
b) What was the cost of damage conducted during each break in?	Melbourne Office: \$533.00 Brisbane Office: Nil	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
c) What was the subject of theft in each break in?	Melbourne - petty cash; tea club cash; electronic projector Brisbane - TV; DVD/VCR	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
d) What was the cost of any theft associated with each break in?	Melbourne - \$8572.00 Brisbane - \$1380.00	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
e) was anyone charged with the break in (specify if they were employed by the Department)?	Melbourne - No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
f) was anyone convicted of the break in (specify if they were employed by the Department)?	Brisbane - No Melbourne - No	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Note: Equipment values are reported at written down value(s) i.e. purchase cost less accumulated depreciation

Year  
2003-04  
2

Year  
2002-03  
2

Year  
2001-02  
2

Year  
2000-01  
3

(28) How many thefts of departmental property occurred in 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04? For each incident:

a) What was stolen in each instance?	Year 2003-04 2	Year 2002-03 2	Year 2001-02 2	Year 2000-01 3
	August 2003 - Overseas: Mobile phone from hotel room	August 2002 - Canberra Office - Cash	June 2002 - Canberra Office: Cash	September 2000 - Canberra (private residence): Mobile phone stolen from vehicle
	April 2004 - Overseas Mobile phone from hotel room	March 2003 - Canberra Office: Cash	Jul 2002 - Canberra Office: Cash	May 2001 - Melbourne Office: Cash and Electronic Projector
				June 2001 - Brisbane: TV and DVD/VCR

b) What was the value of the stolen item/s?	Equipment: \$1090.00 Cash: Nil	Equipment: Nil Cash: \$29.00	Equipment: Nil Cash: \$71.00	Equipment: \$9285.00 Cash: \$1027.00
c) Where was it stolen from?	Refer a) above	Refer a) above	Refer a) above	Refer a) above
d) Was anyone charged with the theft (specify if they were employed by the Department)?	No	No	No	No
e) Was anyone convicted of the theft (specify if they were employed by the Department)?	No	No	No	No
f) Were any of the items recovered?	No	No	No	No

Note: Equipment values are reported at written down value(s) i.e. purchase cost less accumulated depreciation

	Year 2000-01	Year 2001-02	Year 2002-03	Year 2003-04
(29) How many incidents of fraud were detected against the department in 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04? For each incident:	1	Nil	Nil	Nil
a) What was the subject of the fraud in each instance?	Misuse of Australian Government Credit Card	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
b) What was the value of the fraud?	\$38,465	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
c) Which administrative unit was the subject of the fraud?	Adelaide Office	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
d) Was anyone charged with the fraud (specify if they were employed by the Department)?	Yes, a Departmental employee was charged with the fraud.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
e) Was anyone convicted of the fraud (specify if they were employed by the Department)?	Yes, a Departmental employee was convicted of the fraud.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
f) Were any of the defrauded items or was any of the defrauded money recovered?	Yes, the Commission, with the agreement of the former employee, recovered the full amount of the fraud against accrued leave and super contributions.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable



	Year 2000-01	Year 2001-02	Year 2002-03	Year 2003-04
(30) How many incidents of loss (excluding theft, accident, breakage and vandalism) of departmental property were reported to the department in 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04? For each incident:	1	2	2	2
a) What was the loss in each instance?	<p>May 2001: Deficiencies at Commission</p> <p>Stocktake for Financial Year 2000/2001: Clerical Chairs x 4 (1994) (Canberra Office)</p> <p>Mobile phone - 1998 model (Canberra Office)</p> <p>Video/TV - 1998 model (Canberra Office)</p> <p>Digital computer - 1998 model (Sydney Office)</p> <p>Computer monitor - 1998 model (Melbourne Office)</p> <p>External tape drive - 1998 model (Perth Office)</p>	<p>Interstate Travel - Mobile phone (Melbourne Office)</p> <p>April 2002: Deficiencies at Commission</p> <p>Stocktake for Financial Year 2001/02: External Zip Drive - 1998 model (Canberra Office); Sel 2.0 Windows CD (software 1997) (Canberra Office); Licence Henya (software 1999) (Canberra Office)</p>	<p>Overseas Travel - Mobile phone, no value</p> <p>May 2003: Deficiencies at Commission</p> <p>Stocktake for Financial Year 2002/03: External Scsi CD Rom Drive (1997) (Canberra Office); Overhead Projector (1998) (Canberra Office); Shredder (1998) (Canberra Office)</p>	<p>April 2004: Deficiencies at Commission</p> <p>Stocktake for Financial Year 2003/04: Multimedia Projector Toshiba TL471 (Canberra Office); CD Writer - external and portable model (Canberra Office); Lap Top - Digital Hi Note (2000) (Melbourne Office); Modem (2001) (Melbourne Office)</p>
b) What was the value of the loss?	Nil	\$7,887.00	Nil	\$649.00
c) Which administrative unit lost the property?	Refer a) above	Refer a) above	Refer a) above	Refer a) above
d) Were any of the lost item/s recovered?	No	No	No	No
e) Was anyone disciplined over the loss?	No	No	No	No

Note: Equipment values are reported at written down value(s) i.e. purchase cost less accumulated depreciation

(31) How many vehicular accidents in which departmental vehicles (including vehicles leased by the department) were involved were reported to the department in 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04? For each incident:

	Year 2000-01 3	Year 2001-02 4	Year 2002-03 1	Year 2003-04 4
a) What was the value of the damage?	\$6,781.75	\$9,250.40	\$435.03	\$3,894.63
b) Which administrative unit was the vehicle attached to?	Canberra Office and two in Melbourne	Canberra Office	Canberra Office	Canberra Office
c) Was anyone charged over the accident (specify charges)?	No	No	No	No