

Date: 20131119

File: 566-02-7851

Citation: 2013 PSLRB 145



*Public Service  
Labour Relations Act*

Before an adjudicator

---

BETWEEN

LINDA WILCOX

Grievor

and

TREASURY BOARD  
(Department of Human Resources and Skills Development)

Employer

Indexed as

*Wilcox v. Treasury Board (Department of Human Resources and Skills Development)*

In the matter of an individual grievance referred to adjudication

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

***Before:*** Stephan J. Bertrand, adjudicator

***For the Grievor:*** Daniel Fisher, Public Service Alliance of Canada

***For the Employer:*** Lesa Brown, counsel

---

Heard at St. John's, Newfoundland,  
August 28 and 29, 2013.

## REASONS FOR DECISION

---

### **I. Individual grievance referred to adjudication**

[1] Linda Wilcox (“the grievor”) is an employee of the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development (HRSD). On September 26, 2008, she filed a grievance about the adequacy of the job description that had been prepared by the employer for her position in 2006. According to the grievor, the employer has failed to provide her with a complete and current statement of duties and responsibilities, contrary to clause 54.01 of the collective agreement between the Treasury Board (“the employer”) and the Public Service Alliance of Canada for the Program and Administrative Services Group, which expired on June 20, 2007 (“the collective agreement”). That clause reads as follows:

*54.01 Upon written request, an employee shall be provided with a complete and current statement of the duties and responsibilities of his or her position, including the classification level and, where applicable, the point rating allotted by factor to his or her position, and an organization chart depicting the position’s place in the organization.*

[2] On October 30, 2012, the employer provided its final-level grievance response, which denied the grievance on the basis that none of the grievor’s proposed changes to the job description significantly altered in any way the “Client Service Results” or the “Key Activities” of her position and that most of the proposed changes were already subsumed in her current job description. The grievance was subsequently referred to adjudication on November 27, 2012.

### **II. Summary of the evidence**

[3] The grievor testified that she held the position of Team Leader, classified PM-03, with Service Canada’s Processing and Payment Employment Insurance Branch since February 2006. She indicated that the generic job description of her position, bearing number 2NA00743, was too general and incomplete and that it fell short of capturing the depth of her responsibilities, particularly the management aspects of her duties. A complete copy of the grievor’s job description is annexed as Appendix “A” to this decision.

[4] The grievor testified that for a number of years, she reported to a virtual manager, that is, a manager who was not located at her work site and with whom she would normally communicate via telephone, email or video conference. As a result, team leaders, such as herself, would often be considered site leads, since they often

were the highest-classified employees at the work site. According to the grievor, she essentially managed her work site for a number of years, but her job description failed to reflect that reality.

[5] In cross-examination, the grievor acknowledged that other work sites with no on-site managers had lower-classified positions acting as site leads, such as PM-02, PM-01 and even CR-04 employees. She also confirmed that her authority to approve leave requests was limited to vacation and sick leave requests of five days or less, that she had once acknowledged receipt of a grievance on behalf of management, that she had once signed a separation certificate, and that she had once helped an employee fill out a disability insurance form.

[6] The grievor filed a copy of her job description and six other documents, most of which consisted of training materials she had received while attending training sessions. However no explanations were given as to how these materials established that her job description did not represent a complete and current statement of her actual duties and responsibilities.

[7] At my request, the grievor submitted a handwritten annotated copy of her job description, which indicated the changes and amendments she believed should be made to it.

[8] The changes and amendments the grievor sought were not copious and consisted of the following, in boldface for clarity:

- i) Under the “Client Service Results” section, the grievor proposed to add the word “manages” at the beginning of the sentence so that it would read as follows:

*Client Service Results*

***Manages,** [l]eads and coaches teams in multiple sites and geographic locations on the delivery of the service offerings (i.e. services and programs) of the Department and its partners, resulting in community and citizen-centred service excellence for an assigned area.*

- ii) Under the “Key Activities” section, the grievor proposed several changes. She requested that the word “**analyzes**” be placed at the beginning of the first paragraph, and that the words “**in a constantly changing environment**” be inserted in the first paragraph, after the words “programs and services”. She proposed adding the word “**manages**” at the beginning of the second paragraph, and the word “**evaluates**” at the beginning of the third paragraph. The grievor also proposed inserting what is currently found at

bullets 2 and 3 of the “General Administrative Knowledge “ section, and what is currently found at bullet 8 of the “Responsibility” section to the “Key Activities” section. The wording of these three additional bullets, moved from the “General Administrative Knowledge” and “Responsibility” sections would also include her proposed modified wording. The bullet which was originally under the Responsibility section, which the grievor proposes to move to the Key Activities section would strike out the words “**which may include**” and add the words “**in the provision of service by defining goals and objectives.**” The two bullets that she proposes to move from the “General Administrative Knowledge” section would add the words “**and application**” after the word “**knowledge**”. These proposed modifications of the “Key Activities” section would read as follows, with the additions in boldface for clarity:

Key Activities

*Analyzes, [s]upervises a work team engaged in the delivery of programs and services **in a constantly changing environment** by assigning work and monitoring the results/impacts; implements corrective action while fostering a climate of transparency, trust and respect.*

*Manages, [l]eads, coaches and trains a citizen centred work team by modeling service behavior, sharing knowledge and fostering the learning and development of the team and its individual members.*

*Evaluates, [s]upports and monitors the performance of employees on an ongoing basis and identifies successes and areas requiring improvement for individual and team development;*

....

*Knowledge **and application** of conflict resolution, problem solving, interpersonal communication and facilitation techniques to lead a team and to create a productive, quality service environment;*

*Knowledge **and application** of needs assessment, coaching, monitoring and evaluation methods for the development of learning plans to support career development of individual team members, applying competency -based management principles, to assess and reward performance or take corrective action with respect to performance gaps;*

*Ensuring a secure, healthy and safe work environment for employees. ~~which may include~~ [S]ite management of multiple sites and vehicles **in the provision of service by defining goals and objectives.***

- iii) Under the “Skill” section, the grievor proposed to add the word “**manage**” to the first bullet, just before the word “supervise a work team” and the words “**and coordinates**” to the second bullet just after the words “advise/coach”. These two modified bullets would read as follows, with the proposed changes in boldface:

Skill

### *Program and Specialized/Technical Knowledge*

*The work requires:*

- *knowledge of the Department's mandate, mission and organization structure in order to **manage**, supervise a work team engaged in the delivery of service offerings (i.e. services and programs); to lead and coach the team in achieving service excellence; to implement organizational changes; and to conduct preliminary analyses prior to recommending/implementing service improvements;*
- *knowledge of relevant policies (such as those relating to fraud prevention) and legislation (e.g.-the Employment Insurance Act, Old-Age Security Act, and other acts and regulations specific to the Department's programs) sufficient to advise/coach **and coordinates** those engaged in the delivery of related services;*

• ....

- iv) Under the Responsibility section, in addition to removing one bullet that has been discussed above and moving it into the "Key Activities" section, she has proposed adding a new bullet to the Responsibility section, **at the beginning** which reads as follows, with changes in boldface:

#### *Responsibility*

*The work involves:*

- ***Ensuring the application of HR policies and guidelines;***
- ...

- v) Under the "Working Conditions" section, the grievor proposed to add the words "and processing" to the third paragraph, just before the words "sensitive and confidential personal information", as follows:

#### *Working Conditions*

....

*While performing the daily functions, the work requires maintaining composure, impartiality, and a professional attitude in dealing with **and processing** sensitive and confidential personal information of individual team members or citizens, and employee behavioural issues, particularly when they affect the overall performance of the team.*

...

[9] Carson Littlejohn, Director of Employment Insurance Operations, testified that the grievor's job description is generic and was intended to apply to a great number of PM-03 team leaders across the country who perform work in different business lines. He added that although some work sites were managed by virtual managers, classified

PM-05 or higher, which resulted in having lower-classified employees, such as CR-04s, PM-01s and PM-02s, acting as site leads for those work sites, the managing responsibilities and ultimate accountability always rested with those virtual managers. According to Mr. Littlejohn, even though site leads could be expected to act as contact persons at their respective work sites and to liaise with their virtual managers about any work site issues, virtual managers continued to be accountable for the management of those work sites.

[10] Mr. Littlejohn testified that that is not an issue anymore as far as the grievor is concerned since the work site where she is located no longer has a virtual manager. Kelly Lingard, who also testified, has been working at the grievor's work site as a PM-05 service manager since October 2012, and the grievor has been reporting to Ms. Lingard since then.

[11] Mr. Littlejohn emphasized the valuable contributions of the team leaders. However, he clarified that those contributions did not include management duties and responsibilities and did not carry the accountability that ultimately rested with PM-05 managers, to whom they reported. Those duties and responsibilities had never been delegated to team leaders as far as Mr. Littlejohn was concerned, whether or not his managers reported to work sites. In other words, whether the site lead was a team leader, or an employee classified at the PM-02, PM-01 or CR-04 level, he or she was not tasked with being or expected to be in charge of the work site or to administer its day-to-day operations.

[12] According to Mr. Littlejohn, the words that the employer had used to describe the grievor's duties and responsibilities, including "leads," "coaches," "supervises," "trains," "assigns," "monitors," "supports," "identifies," "plans," "organizes," "reviews," "reports" and "implements," were powerful and adequately reflected the work assigned to and expected of the grievor.

[13] Ms. Lingard testified that she has been reporting to the grievor's work site as a PM-05 manager since October 2012 and that she manages a team of 75 employees and 4 team leaders, including the grievor, and that none of her duties and responsibilities or signing authority have ever been delegated to the grievor or to any other team leader. As the ultimate site lead, she indicated that she dedicates no more than 5% to 10% of her time looking after work site issues at any given time.

[14] Ms. Lingard testified that most, if not all, of the language that the grievor was attempting to add to her job description was already subsumed in it. She referred to a great number of paragraphs and bullets in the job description in support of her statement.

### **III. Summary of the arguments**

#### **A. For the grievor**

[15] The grievor argued that her job description was both inadequate and too general and that her testimony had provided numerous examples of duties she performed that fell outside her generic job description.

[16] The grievor suggested that before Ms. Lingard's arrival, and particularly when she reported to a virtual manager from essentially 2006 to 2012, she performed the duties and responsibilities normally assigned to a PM-05 manager and considered herself a front-line manager. According to the grievor, site leads and managers have the same duties and responsibilities.

[17] The grievor argued that the realities of her work duties exceeded the portrayals contained in her job description and referred me to paragraph 53 of *Public Service Alliance of Canada v. Treasury Board (Department of Human Resources and Skills Development)*, 2012 PSLRB 86, and to paragraph 34 of *Parker et al. v. Treasury Board (Department of Human Resources and Skills Development)*, 2009 PSLRB 109. The grievor's job description, in her view, did not sufficiently describe the full range of duties and responsibilities attributed to her position by the employer from 2006 to 2012.

[18] The grievor made it clear that she was seeking the addition of the proposed stronger language into her job description with the hopes of having her position reclassified.

#### **B. For the employer**

[19] The employer submitted that the burden of convincing me that the collective agreement has been breached was on the grievor and argued that she had not discharged that burden.

[20] According to the employer, nothing in the collective agreement requires it to use a specific format or precise language when it comes to job descriptions, especially when such an instrument endeavours to apply to a large number of employees who work in different regions across the country and who perform work in different business lines.

[21] The employer argued that it should not be required to list all possible activities expected to be performed under a specific duty or to describe at length the manner in which those activities ought to be accomplished. In support of that position, the employer referred me to paragraph 26 of *Hughes v. Treasury Board of Canada (Natural Resources Canada)*, 2000 PSSRB 69.

[22] The employer submitted that the grievor's job description contained sufficient information to accurately reflect what she was expected to do and that it did not neglect to include any duty or responsibility that she was required to perform. For that reason, the grievor's job description ought to be found acceptable, according to the employer. On that point, I was referred to paragraph 52 of *Jennings and Myers v. Treasury Board (Department of Fisheries and Oceans)*, 2011 PSLRB 20.

[23] The employer further argued that by providing the grievor with a job description that adequately described, in broad terms, her duties and responsibilities, it fulfilled its obligation under the collective agreement. I was referred to paragraph 24 of *Jaremy et al. v. Treasury Board (Revenu [sic] Canada - Customs, Excise & Taxation)*, 2000 PSSRB 59.

[24] Quoting from paragraph 48 of *Suric v. Treasury Board (Department of Human Resources and Skills Development)*, 2013 PSLRB 44, the employer suggested that the grievor's proposed changes amounted to "wordsmithing." It added that it was not my role to edit or correct its wording, used to describe the duties and responsibilities of the grievor, as long as those terms were broadly described.

#### **IV. Reasons**

[25] The grievor has alleged that the employer breached the collective agreement by failing to provide her with a complete and current statement of her duties and responsibilities. According to her, the generic job description of her position, bearing number 2NA00743, falls short of accurately reflecting the work she has been performing since 2006.



[26] For the grievor to succeed with her grievance, she had to demonstrate that her job description lacks the elements she has identified in her handwritten annotated copy, which I have summarized in paragraph 8 of this decision. If she was unable to discharge that burden through convincing evidence, her grievance must fail.

[27] Many of the principles that must be considered in deciding this type of matter are captured at paragraph 52 of *Jennings and Myers*, which states the following:

*[52] What is a complete and current statement of the duties and responsibilities of an employee? The parties and the arbitral authorities on which they rely agree that a work description must contain enough information to accurately reflect what the employee does. It must not omit a "...reference to a particular duty or responsibility which the employee is otherwise required to perform"; see Taylor v. Treasury Board (Revenue Canada — Customs & Excise), PSSRB File No. 166-02-20396 (19901221). A job description that contains broad and generic descriptions is acceptable as long as it satisfies that fundamental requirement. In Hughes v. Treasury Board of Canada (Natural Resources Canada), 2000 PSSRB 69, at para 26, the adjudicator wrote the following: "A job description need not contain a detailed listing of all activities performed under a specific duty. Nor should it necessarily list at length the manner in which those activities are accomplished." See also Currie et al. v. Canada Revenue Agency, 2008 PSLRB 69, at para 164; Jaremy et al. v. Treasury Board (Revenue Canada - Customs, Excise & Taxation), 2000 PSSRB 59, at para 24; and Barnes et al. v. Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, 2003 PSSRB 13. The employer is not required to use any particular form of wording to describe the duties and responsibilities of an employee and "...it is not the adjudicator's role to correct the wording or the expressions that are used," so long as they broadly describe the responsibilities and the duties being performed (see Jarvis et al. v. Treasury Board (Industry Canada), 2001 PSSRB 84, at para 95; and see Barnes, at para 24.*

[28] Generic job descriptions are a common instrument within the public service, especially when the duties and responsibilities they refer to are performed on a national scale and by a large number of employees. As was suggested in *Hughes*, it would not be desirable to require the employer to list each and every activity expected to be performed under each duty and to elaborate at great length on the manner in which each activity is to be accomplished. So long as the job description sufficiently describes in broad terms the full range of duties and responsibilities attributed to the position and it reflects the realities of the affected employee's work situation, all is

well. In this case, I believe it does. After carefully considering the evidence, including the exhibits filed at the hearing, I am convinced that the grievor was provided with a current and complete job description.

[29] The grievor provided very few details as to why the changes she was seeking should be allowed. The grievor's testimony covered her perceptions as to her management duties at the work site, but she provided very few details to support changes in her work description. While the grievor provided a few examples of duties she performed on singular occasions over the past seven years, for the most part, those did not fall outside her job description, and even if they did, which I do not believe to be the case, the evidence does not suggest that the grievor was regularly assigned such duties. For example, acting as a site lead for a short period of time, a duty that lower classified employees were also assigned, did not justify making the requested changes to the grievor's job description.

[30] Unfortunately, the grievor did not individually tackle each change or amendment she proposed; nor did she present convincing evidence in support of her propositions, something that could have assisted me in better understanding the reasoning behind each proposed change. For example, I was not presented with any convincing or compelling evidence that would justify removing what is currently found at bullets 2 and 3 of General Administrative Knowledge and inserting those paragraphs under Key Activities. I simply do not share the grievor's vision that one's knowledge should be considered a key activity. Similarly, no convincing or compelling evidence was presented to me that would justify removing what is currently found at bullet 8 of Responsibility and inserting that language under Key Activities. Although the word "application" has been added to the proposed description of a key activity, even with this addition, the grievor did not provide any evidence as to why the contents of those two bullet points should be included in the Key Activities, rather than where they are now under General Administrative Knowledge. Arguably, these are captured within the bullets already and the grievor has not in any way established that their addition to the key activities is justified. Knowledge of needs assessment, coaching and monitoring are applied in order to accomplish the key bullets, and in particular the first two noted in the key activities. Likewise, knowledge of conflict resolution and problem solving to lead are applied to accomplish the first three bullets of the Key Activities.

[31] With respect to adding the word “manages” or “manage” under the Client Service Results, Key Activities and Skill sections, the grievor failed to demonstrate why the proposed language was justified in the circumstances. While her examples of some of the duties she performed during the past seven years certainly validated the language currently used in her job description (i.e., “leads,” “coaches,” “supervises,” “trains,” “assigns,” “monitors,” “supports,” “identifies,” “plans,” “organizes,” “reviews,” “reports” and “implements”), the grievor did not provide any evidence that the use of stronger language was warranted. I agree with the employer’s position that those words, mentioned in the grievor’s job description, are powerful and that they adequately reflected the duties and responsibilities assigned to and expected of the grievor. In addition, the evidence clearly established that the grievor always reported to a PM-05 manager, whether that manager was virtual or at the work site, and that managerial authority and accountability always rested with those managers. No evidence was led to suggest that virtual managers refused or were unable to exercise their managerial authority or accountability and that that resulted in the grievor having to take on such authority or accountability in their stead.

[32] The other changes that the grievor wants added to her job description either are already subsumed in her current job description or have simply not been established as duties that she has performed. For example, one of the key activities listed in the grievor’s job description provides that she will be expected to support and monitor the performance of employees on an ongoing basis and to identify successes and areas requiring improvement for individual and team development. The grievor feels that the word “evaluates” should be added to that paragraph. I disagree as to that need. The same reasoning applies to my unwillingness to add the word “analyses” to the first paragraph of Key Activities or the words “and processing” to the third paragraph of Working Conditions. The Key Activities already note that the grievor “supports and monitors the performance of employees on an ongoing basis”. It goes without saying that supporting and monitoring the performance of employees requires some form of evaluation and communication. The grievor has not provided any evidence to me to suggest that her functions in evaluation went beyond that, for example that she was ultimately accountable for the evaluation of her team members.

[33] Based on the evidence before me, the grievor’s submission on the inclusion of the term “evaluates”, along with other terms that she wanted to include are at best “wordsmithing” and seem to have been advanced to support her argument that the

management aspects of her duties have not been captured in the work description. Based on the evidence before me, I cannot find that her job description fell short of capturing the depth of her responsibilities, including those aspects of her duties that she might consider to be management.

[34] The thrust of the grievor's argument appears to be the fact that for many years she was the site lead, and for many years she was the highest classified employee at the work site. As the respondent's evidence demonstrated, team leaders make valuable contributions but those do not include the accountabilities of PM-05 managers, to whom they reported. The grievor has not provided any evidence that disputes that there was always a manager - whether virtual or on site - and that this person ultimately carried the accountability for management of the team. In addition, she has not provided evidence that demonstrates that her work description should be corrected or changed for any other reasons.

[35] As for the grievor's proposal to strike out the words "which may include" and add the words "in the provision of service by defining goals and objectives" to bullet 8 of Responsibility and to add a new bullet that reads "ensuring the application of HR policies and guidelines," she simply failed to provide compelling evidence or a rationale justifying such changes.

[36] The grievor has failed to discharge her burden of proving on the balance of probabilities that her job description does not provide a current and complete statement of her duties and responsibilities. I am simply unable to conclude that, based on the evidence before me, the grievor's job description leaves out any of her duties and responsibilities or that some of her duties or responsibilities are listed under the wrong section or subsection.

[37] For all of the above reasons, I make the following order:

*(The Order appears on the next page)*

**V. Order**

[38] The grievance is denied. I order the file closed.

November 19, 2013.

**Stephan J. Bertrand,  
Adjudicator**

## APPENDIX A

---



Government of Canada / Gouvernement du Canada

Position Number	Position Title Team Leader	
Position Classification PM-03	National Occupation Code	
Department/Agency Service Canada	Effective Date September 14, 2006	
Organizational Component Service Management		
Geographic Location Various	Job/Generic Number 2NA00743	
Supervisor Position Number	Supervisor Position Title	
Supervisor Position Classification		
Language Requirements	Linguistic Profile	
Communication Requirements		
Office Code	Security Requirements	

### **Client Service Results**

Leads and coaches teams in multiple sites and geographic locations on the delivery of the service offerings (i.e. services and programs) of the Department and its partners, resulting in community and citizen-centred service excellence for an assigned area.

### **Key Activities**

Supervises a work team engaged in the delivery of programs and services by assigning work and monitoring the results/impacts; implements corrective action while fostering a climate of transparency, trust and respect.

Leads, coaches and trains a citizen centred work team by modeling service behaviour, sharing knowledge and fostering the learning and development of the team and its individual members.

Supports and monitors the performance of employees on an ongoing basis and identifies successes and areas requiring improvement for individual and team development;

Plans, organizes, implements, and ensures quality of service offerings; delegates duties in an appropriate manner; and achieves departmental performance standards and team performance goals/objectives.

APPENDIX A



Leads local committees/working groups or participates in local, regional, national committees/working groups to test or analyze procedures, tools, systems, to assess impact on service delivery e.g. implementation of a new service product, departmental priorities, Public Service Employee Survey results.

Reviews and reports on information received from employees, citizens and stakeholders to management and senior leaders.

Implements response to local feedback.

Fosters innovation and service excellence by establishing an environment that encourages creativity and continuous learning.

Provides first-level resolution on citizen issues or complaints not resolved at front-line point of contact.

Establishes and maintains relationships with internal/external clients and stakeholders.

Administers oaths, as well as takes and receives affidavits, declarations and affirmations.

Employee's Statement	
I have been given the opportunity to read and comment on the content of this work description.	
Name of Employee	Signature _____ Date _____
Supervisor's Statement	
This work description accurately describes the work assigned to this position.	
Name of Supervisor	Supervisor's Signature _____ Date _____
Authorization	
Name of Manager	Manager's Signature _____ Date _____

**Skill**

**Program and Specialized/Technical Knowledge**

The work requires:

- knowledge of the Department's mandate, mission and organization structure in order to supervise a work team engaged in the delivery of service offerings (i.e. services and programs); to lead and coach the team in achieving service excellence; to implement organizational changes; and to conduct preliminary analyses prior to recommending/implementing service improvements;



- knowledge of relevant policies (such as those relating to fraud prevention) and legislation (e.g.- the Employment Insurance Act, Old-Age Security Act, and other acts and regulations specific to the Department's programs) sufficient to advise/coach those engaged in the delivery of related services;
- knowledge of program delivery methods, techniques and practices, including: service excellence techniques and practices (customer service skills) to implement improvements to service offerings; monitor and analyze performance results; identify areas requiring improvement; implement service delivery enhancements and organizational performance standards to develop individual/team performance goals/objectives;

#### **General Administrative Knowledge**

- knowledge of human resource (HR) management techniques and practices, team motivation, team building, team empowerment, collective agreements, labour relations and other aspects of HR management;
- knowledge of conflict resolution, problem solving, interpersonal communication and facilitation techniques to lead a team and to create a productive, quality service environment;
- knowledge of needs assessment, coaching, monitoring and evaluation methods for the development of learning plans to support career development of individual team members, applying competency-based management principles, to assess and reward performance or take corrective action with respect to performance gaps;
- knowledge of financial management practices and techniques to make recommendations and provide input to the budgetary process, including forecasting and resource allocation;
- knowledge of office production software and organizational systems in order to use departmental databases, electronic mail, Intranet, work and data processing applications and to alert the technology support as required to ensure that these systems are operating for employees to provide services.
- knowledge of change management techniques to assist employees to adjust to ongoing transformation of the work environment, including service delivery and other organizational expectations/issues; fostering a positive working environment (examining service delivery changes against employee competencies and determining the need to develop or enhance those competencies to meet new service requirements);

#### **Contacts (Difficulty and Importance of External and Internal Contacts)**

- promoting the Department's vision, mandate and values internally and externally; interfacing with employees; consulting with and advising managers on issues relating to the delivery of programs in their business line; consulting with and advising citizens on service offerings; participating in committees and meetings





with citizens and stakeholders; building relationships with local union representatives in support of a healthy work environment;

- supervising a virtual team (across distance and using telephones/technology);
- writing documents, presentations and reports for management;
- delivering presentations to colleagues, citizens, and stakeholders; and
- explaining and/or resolving complex issues on behalf of clients, Members of Parliament, and Ministers.

### Effort

#### **Decision Making (Scope and Impact)**

- supervises entry level employees who are usually on probation. Can work in an area with a high turnover of staff.
- deals with organizing and allocating work of staff, monitoring work, work performance standards, compiling and analysing performance standards, acceptable work behaviour, development of individuals, professional learning and development, performance issues, and conflict resolution and teaches employees how to work with each other.
- representing the management team on special initiatives (e.g. national working group introducing a new service offering, or working with non-government organizations and community partners to develop Memorandums of Understanding and define partner roles); and
- advising management on operational issues (such as workload pressures and staffing issues) and decision making related to service delivery.

Often the position is the only contact with the community. The position can be the senior representative on site for the Department. The position is the first contact for complaint resolution and first line contact for resolution of complaints from clients.

Decision making involves management of the work of the team, resolution of issues and disputes between citizens and employees (e.g. concerning non-approval of benefit eligibility). Decisions and recommendations impact on citizen satisfaction and on standards of performance for the Department in meeting its objectives to the Canadian public. Decisions often need to be made under short time constraints while dealing with competing priorities.

#### **Physical Effort**

Physical effort is required when carrying out day-to-day activities such as working at a computer, sitting at a desk or in meetings, and making presentations. These activities vary throughout the day.



**Responsibility**

The work involves:

- providing a service experience of the highest quality ensuring consistency and that all actions and decisions could withstand public and the Department's scrutiny in terms of the integrity of those services;
- leading and coaching a team, possibly virtual, in delivering the Department's offerings through the assignment of work, monitoring to ensure that the performance standards and operational targets are met, providing training and formal and informal feedback to employees throughout the review process; and promoting a safe and healthy work environment ensuring employees are aware of and comply with related measures and procedures;
- providing information to management on budget needs and HR requirements for the effective and efficient operation of team activities;
- addressing more complex cases (such as a citizen disputing a decision on benefit eligibility or an enquiry from a Member of Parliament) requiring review, interpretation and decision;
- administering oaths, as well as takes and receives affidavits, declarations and affirmations;
- implementing recommendations from quality management programs and ensuring standards and commitments made in this regard are understood and enforced by staff;
- providing creative, innovative opportunities for the professional development of staff with a focus on the service culture transformation and organizational vision to achieve service excellence;
- ensuring a secure, healthy and safe work environment for employees, which may include site management of multiple sites and vehicles.
- connecting internal and external contacts to provide information concerning the Department's service offerings and programs, including interfacing with citizens or their representatives, to resolve contentious issues (e.g. challenges relating to use of, or non-receipt of, program funding).

**Operational Responsibility**

The position leads and coaches teams in the delivery of the service offerings (i.e. services and programs) of the Department and its partners' resulting in citizen-centred service excellence for an assigned area. The position supports the implementation of the transformation of service delivery within the organization, in a spirit of cooperation amongst colleagues, in a constantly changing/evolving environment. As well the position supervises a work team engaged in the delivery of programs and services by assigning



work and monitoring the results/impacts and implements corrective action while fostering a climate of transparency, trust and respect.

**Working Conditions**

The work is done in an open office environment, which lends itself to noise and lack of privacy. Some travel may be required.

Operational standards require immediate response to fluctuating citizen requirements.

While performing the daily functions, the work requires maintaining composure, impartiality, and a professional attitude in dealing with sensitive and confidential personal information of individual team members or citizens, and employee behavioural issues, particularly when they affect the overall performance of the team.

Occasional disagreeable interactions with citizens/stakeholders.

**Additional Information**

Service Offerings are services or benefits designed to meet specific client needs and achieve a particular societal outcome.

Programs include foundational programs such as Employment Insurance (EI), Canada Pension Plan (CPP) and Old Age Security (OAS) as well as a wide range of other programs and initiatives such as National Homelessness, Youth Employment, Aboriginal HR Development, etc.

Partners can include federal, provincial and municipal governments and other community organizations.

Assigned area may include responsibility for multiple sites and virtual supervision (e.g. facilities, security, business continuity plans and human resources).

Size of a team varies depending on a range of facts such as type of work (e.g. single or similar focus versus multi-disciplinary) and physical/geographic location/dispersion. In general, the ratio of employees to Team Leader will be higher in situations where there is a physically concentrated group of employees or single/similarly focused team in terms of the work assigned. Conversely, the ratio will be lower in situations where employees are physically dispersed (e.g. multiple sites in rural/northern areas) or where the work involved is of a complex or multi-disciplinary nature.

Team Leaders may be required to provide training on tools or systems that are not covered by more formal training (e.g. training new staff to use e-mail, client tracking system, inter/intranet, etc.).