Name: Maria Louise Rosenfelder

Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services

Position: Administrative Officer (AO2)

Length of employment: 17 years

Employed in this position since 5.2.1995 (start of employment in the Queensland Public Service)

Employed on a casual basis until made permanent in August 2011

Employment terminated 2.11.2012

When the job cuts were announced there was a restructure of our branch.

There were meetings about the restructure but no consultation or input accepted.

We were told that everybody would have to apply for their jobs and anyone who was unsuccessful would be offered redundancy or the option of applying for other jobs.

There were two AO2s in the branch - myself and another employee.

The outcome of the restructure was that everyone retained their positions except for the two AO2s, making the restructure somewhat pointless and certainly appearing non-genuine. I firmly believe the intention of the restructure was to get rid of the A02s.

When the restructure was announced, my manager told me (in July) that my position had been abolished and as there were no longer any AO2 positions in the branch, I would not be able to apply for a position like all the other employees.

My original plan had been to work until my 60th birthday and then retire. The redundancy meant I would be out of work for about 6 months before being able to access my Super. If I had not accepted the redundancy offer, there was a very high probability that no other position would have been found for me in the allocated time frame. The package paid at the end of this process would have left me in a far worse situation financially. I therefore felt I could not take the risk financially and accepted the redundancy offer.

As it was, I did not receive an official offer of redundancy until October and I left on 2 November. I believe that this delay was intentional, due to the heavy workload of end of year processing and management wanting to keep me in the position until processing was finalised.

When I was first told in July that my position was abolished, I was offered a job in private enterprise and if the redundancy had been processed at the time I would have had a position to go to. However, due to the long delay between the redundancy offer and the final processing, they were unable to keep this position open for me. I am now unemployed with no income and forced to live off my package. My partner has been ill and unable to work for several months and we have had very little income.

My departure forced a major rearrangement of processes within our team as well as work areas outside our branch and impacted negatively on every other team member's workload. This effect is ongoing. The reduction in the workforce and the resulting increase in other staff members' workloads are also causing issues with the provision of services to non-government organisations.

I might add here that even though I occupied an AO2 position I had been working at an AO4 level for many years. I made several unsuccessful attempts to have the position reclassified and in the end gave up. Promises were made but never kept.

I was a casual employee for 16 years. During the last few years my workload and level of work had increased substantially and I had been working full-time. When I was told my position would be made permanent, I was also told that I had to accept being cut back to four days a week to accommodate another person in the branch being employed. The workload remained the same and I was under much pressure and quite stressed. I was most surprised when told my position was to be cut.

I am aware of employees in other branches of the department and also other departments who have no or no meaningful work, who are at fairly high levels, and whose positions have not been affected.

In my opinion, this entire cost-cutting operation has been handled very poorly, has been rushed unnecessarily, and decisions on which positions to cut were not made in the best interest of either the employees or the department, and with no regard to service provision. A lot of those decisions were very unfair.

Maria Rosenfelder

11 February 2013