

From Ray Blessing  
Company CVGT

Current Role: General Manager CVGT a Job Network/Work for the dole provider. CVGT is also a Group training Company and NAC provider. CVGT delivers services largely in regional Victoria and is a not for profit Company. CVGT is also delivering WFD in Melbourne.

**This submission is representative of my own views not that of CVGT.**

I have worked in the employment industry for over twenty years.

15 in CES and related departments

2 years in Centrelink Management

2 years in CVGT as a General Manager

I am currently a member of the NEESA board.

I manage all DEWRSB contracts and relations with DEWRTSB for CVGT.

My phone contact details are

0409196353

Email [rblessing@cvgt.com.au](mailto:rblessing@cvgt.com.au).

Sorry but I have to rush this but I am keen to make a submission as I realize the importance of this enquiry to the industry and the customer and want to share some of my immediate thoughts.

The current set up is very outcome focused particularly in IA and JST where ratings are driven by outcomes. It appears to me that the focus on outcomes provides insufficient incentive to focus on the very hard to place. Older unemployed indigenous and people with disabilities.

Of particular concern to me is that organizations that deliver services in only large regional centers are advantaged under the present star rating system in comparison to providers that deliver services across an ESA with sites in smaller communities. For example if you are based in a large regional center and focus on volume flow and the quality end of commencements you will get a better percentage of outcomes than a provider that is focused on working with people across an ESA and working in smaller centers where there is less possibility for turnover and outcomes. For example people with no transport will not easily find employment anywhere and they will always choose to use a provider in a local town than travel to the large regional center. Yet an outcome in these communities has similar value to one in a large regional center.

This could be remedied by have a factor in the star rating that recognizes ESA coverage, or given greater weighting to contract manager reports.

I am strongly of the view that the purchaser provider's model is more effective than the previous model. I can sincerely say that the outcome focus is easier to manage in non public sector environment. I noted in my time in Centrelink and then coming across to

CVGT how much easier it is to implement change and gain response in a smaller organization.

Whilst the transition to Job network and between contracts has been tortuous I think the development of partnership in recent times has been really positive. For the people working in Job network and WFD job security is often very reliant on the effectiveness of the total organization. However I see competition as a key to improving services. It would appear to me that a more effective method needs to be found to share best practice. The NEESA conferences and Work for the dole conferences have merit in this process as people are more prepared to share at the national level.

As I view the development of purchaser provider, I see significant scope with other Government services at both the state and national level. It is really matter of government preference as to which method is used and as a person that has experienced both models I'm clearly in the camp of those who see a move from public service delivering services that are best delivered in a competitive/Controlled market.

A controlled market is one that appeals more to me from a staff concern. I think that once organizations demonstrate capacity and quality of service that negotiation could be used more deliberately rather than competition. The ridiculous situation with job Network where small centers had four or five providers made no economic or market sense and did not lead to improved customer service.

Coordination will be improved when job network members are more secure in their business. This will be easier as organizations achieve continuation of contracts.

I am highly impressed with the support our company receives from DEWRSB

and the frankness of the milestones discussions with our DEWRSB regional Manager.

I note the recent move within DEWRSB to develop consistent approach to tendering across all the programs and this will be valued. As clearly the WFD tendering process was smooth and easy to work with. It also was very transparent.

I also note that DEWRSB operates more in a partnership as distinct to DETYA, which appears more contract and contractor.

In relation to sustainable employment outcomes I think the key is to provide bonuses at the 26-week and 39 week and 52 week point and less upfront.

I am also unsure how DEWRSB measures customer satisfaction and whether that should have key factor in tender assessment. The customer is often the best judge of a provider. I do realize that the breaching process may affect this test.

Ray Blessing