

Optimising Workforce Structure in Public Sector : the System Dynamics of Employment Planning in Australia

Joseph YoungKon Yoon^{1*}, Kyungjoo Yoon²

¹Gaju Global Business Center

²Dept. of English Education, Global Cyber University

공공부문에서 고용구조의 최적화 : 호주 고용계획을 위한 시스템 다이내믹스

윤영곤^{1*}, 윤경주²

¹가주글로벌비즈니스지원센터, ²글로벌사이버대학교 실용영어학과

요약 본 논문은 알고리즘을 활용한 최적화를 바탕으로 한 시스템 다이내믹스 피드백 모델을 통해 고용 시뮬레이션의 특징을 제시하는 목적을 가지고 있고, 직위, 근무기간, 계급 등의 요소를 중심으로 적정한 고용 인원을 제시하는 3차원 논리적 판단구조를 제공한다.

호주 육군의 고용정책에 대해 보다 신속적인 고용시스템을 제시할 목적으로 시스템 다이내믹스 모델을 통해 국방부의 변화가 심한 정책에 대한 안정적 고용 적정선을 파악한다. 특히 생산성을 최대로 발휘할 수 있는 필요한 고용 패턴 및 외부 인력의 고용, 내부인력의 타 조직으로 이동 등 다양한 가능성을 분석한다.

키워드 : 고용, 공공분야, 시스템 다이내믹스, 노동력, 최적화

Abstract This paper illustrates key features of an enterprise employment simulation which integrates a system dynamic feedback model with a cost-effectiveness optimisation capability utilising genetic algorithms. Its core is a 3-dimensional array structure tracking staff numbers by rank, by time-in-rank, by years-of-service.

The resultant model, which could readily be adapted to non-Defence use, can identify, given user specification of any mix of employment rules, the likely patterns of employment behaviour including: resultant time-in-rank and years-of-service profiles; ability of a Unit to fill all positions to target strength; ability to fill promotional positions within normal rules for substantive promotion; need to fill promotional positions using rules for temporary promotion or transfer from outside; necessary recruitment pattern to sustain target strength.

Key Words : Employment, Public Sector, System Dynamics, Workforce, Optimisation

1. Introduction

From time to time changes are proposed to the methods of entry into and conditions of service in

the Armed Services. Whilst the impact of minor changes can be reasonably predicted by personnel experts, significant changes can result in longer term unexpected and undesirable outcomes. This is

*Corresponding Author : Joseph YoungKon Yoon(ykjoon@gmail.com)

Received November 2, 2017

Revised November 21, 2017

Accepted December 1, 2017

Published December 15, 2017

especially so in complex organisations such as the Armed Services which involve complex interactions over time between the organisational elements.

Thus a rapid turnover employment policy may result in an organisation structure in 10 years time which has a large emergency reserve, but which cannot supply trained NCO's to handle rapid mobilisation. Conversely, a low turnover employment scenario may diminish promotion opportunities which in turn impacts on morale. Policy switches between the extremes may produce totally unexpected consequences. Also, as the peace-time Army is fundamentally a training organisation, 'boom-bust' recruiting patterns result in successive peaks and troughs coursing through the training system for years after the initial event, causing considerable inefficiencies[1].

The specific catalyst for this paper was the policy decision to move the Australian Army from a 'lifetime career service' to a workforce with more flexible rules for entry and exit. Given the 'boom-bust' consequences of army recruiting policy over the previous decade there was concern to understand the implications of alternative employment scenarios. The project contract specifically requested a 'system-dynamics model' and also specified that this model was to permit identification of the 'optimum' employment strategy.

2. The Nature of the Model


The simulation system comprised the system dynamics model, built in Powersim, and an EXCEL spreadsheet where the data for the different employment scenarios was entered. The Powersim model included[2]:

- Full Time employment module
- Part Time employment module
- Army Emergency Reserve module
- Productivity performance measurement module

- Promotion and transfer rules module

2.1 Characteristics of the employment modules

The core of the model is the stock 'Workforce', which is a three dimensional array in which we maintain key attributes of personnel in each cohort. These attributes are rank, length of service and time in rank. Personnel are recruited only at the lowest level, and 'spiral up' the array incrementing each additional year of service and time in rank and each promotion through a possible six ranks[3].



[Fig.1] Full time employment module

The use of Powersim's powerful array structures results in a stock-flow diagram which is sufficiently 'simple' and uncluttered to use as a basis for validating the broad business rules with subject area experts and to use with senior managers in explaining counter-intuitive consequences of specific scenarios. At the same time it permits the capturing of critical organisational data. The 'simple' module in Figure 1 contains some 12,000 elements[4].

2.2 Scenario Building – Base Data and Employment Options

The decision was made to use spreadsheets for basic data entry and scenario specification because of the complexity of entering data directly into the array structures and also because the client's staff are very familiar with spreadsheets[5].

The first step in building an employment scenario is the specification of base characteristics of the Army unit or other aggregation. The following personnel policy parameters data items are required:

Strength targets by rank for full time and, where appropriate, part time service.

The promotion cohorts for each rank (i.e. minimum time-in-rank for substantive promotion).

The proportion of each cohort likely to be considered suitable for substantive promotion.

The proportion of each cohort likely to be considered suitable for accelerated promotion.

Separation rates by rank, by years-of-service (held constant over time in order to focus on the effect of different employment scenarios).

3. Application of Optimisation to System Dynamics Modelling

3.1 Optimisation Objectives for Modelling Employment Strategies

Notwithstanding the comments above, optimisation remains a controversial topic in the system dynamics community. We would argue that it is an invaluable tool in at least two restricted contexts.

First, we have found the optimisation process valuable in validation. We have found that the random process of selecting input variables occasionally produces results that should be impossible. Closer inspection finds a flaw in logic or in the specification of business rules. Manual testing had not picked up the problem because the input variables were not ones we would intuitively try.

More importantly, where there are potentially a very large number of decision levers, or a large number of possible 'positions' for those levers, optimisation can identify initialisation settings which

are 'pretty good', from which 'what-if' analyses and sensitivity analyses can be undertaken.

Consideration of the 'Transfer Policy' options make it apparent that the user can specify any '% transfer policy' (in the range zero to 100%) for each year of service (from years 1 to 20), for each rank. In other words there are an infinite number of combinations and permutations of policy possible for each of the employment scenarios modelled[6].

Many of these combinations will yield a structure which cannot sustain the strength targets without cannibalising other units or which cannot achieve preparedness and mobilisation targets. Even if we discard all those combinations of transfer policy which lead to failures to meet boundary constraints, there will still be an inordinate number of 'feasible' solutions. 'Optimisation' allows us to identify an initial position for our policy levers which is 'pretty good' even if an 'optimum' as such does not really exist.

3.2 Optimisation presumes that there is an objective function to optimise

It may seem axiomatic that organisations know what they are trying to optimise, especially if they ask for the 'best' option. However our question to the client "What does your employment policy aim to optimise?" was met with a blank look. Army, in fact, could not specify optimisation criteria against which to judge the different employment scenarios. This, in our experience, is not uncommon.


In the absence of guidance from the client we included a 'placeholder' that could be replaced if and when Army identified an 'optimisation' employment objective. The simulation model has a crude employment cost-effectiveness measure based on output productivity and total salary cost. This productivity module consists of two key facets[7]:

- productivity by years of service, and
- time on task (versus time on supervision and management etc)

The productivity by years of service graph in illustrates a hypothetical trades employment category. An apprentice has minimal productivity for the 3 years in training; has a productivity in the first year after graduation of around 40% of that of the master tradesman; and thereafter gradually increases in productivity with years of experience.

The time on task graph shows that, at the rank of private, the majority of the working day is spent on task (allowing about a 20% overhead for routine military activities) regardless of YOS. Higher ranks, however, spend an increasing proportion of their time on supervisory and managerial duties. Combining the two graphs for the unit gives an average productive output potential. (There is, in fact, a dynamic relationship between productivity of subordinates and supervisory time spent by managers, but this was ignored in the first instance.)

The model can thus compare alternative employment scenarios, which may otherwise seem equally satisfactory, on the basis of their respective outcome efficiencies.



[Fig.2] Productivity by Years of Service and Time-on-Task by Rank

The specification of productivity by years of service is essentially qualitative, based on the judgements of experienced NCO's and unit commanders. An ADFA research project is currently gathering estimates of this data for a variety of Army trades. The broad framework for

time-on-task has been taken from the case presented to the Remuneration Tribunal in an Army pay claim. Again this needs to be validated on an trade by trade basis, as the characteristics can be expected to vary between the administrative, technical and arms trades[8].

3.3 The Optimisation Tools


The optimisation capability was achieved by integrating the genetic algorithm optimisation software 'Evolver' with Powersim and EXCEL. 'Evolver is a set of proprietary Genetic Algorithms which can be run as an add-in for Excel, although the Evolver solving methods can be used within many other applications.' The model to be optimised is defined within an Excel spreadsheet. If the model is specified in another Windows-based application (such as Powersim), Excel acts as the medium of information exchange between that application and Evolver.

Broadly following Wolstenholme's framework[9] of the required interaction between an optimisation routine and system dynamics model, the Evolver, Excel and Powersim applications were combined in accordance with the following steps:

- Evolver selects a population and updates the values of the model variables to be optimised. The model variables are defined in cells within Excel.
- These values are sent to Powersim and a simulation is conducted.
- Once the Powersim simulation is complete, the value of the objective function is returned to Excel to enable Evolver to assess it's fitness and generate offspring accordingly.
- Evolver selects new values for the variables to be optimised (the offspring), and amends the appropriate cells in Excel.
- If the stopping criteria specified to Evolver is not met, go to Step 2.


To facilitate the interaction between the software,

the cells in Excel that contain the range variables and the objective function value must be linked by DDE to corresponding variables in Powersim.



[Fig.3] Basic optimisation strategy using Evolver, Excel and Powersim

The data flows between the packages are illustrated in Figure 4. The Powersim model had some 35,000 elements, and approximately 50 policy variables were being varied with each iteration. In addition, boundary condition tests were applied against some 20 factors. Each complete iteration took just under 1 minute on a 233MHz Pentium with 128 Mbyte of RAM. Typically the model reached stability within 2,000 to 2,500 iterations (1.2 to 2 days), although in the tests the model was typically run for 10,000 iterations[10].



[Fig.4] Optimisation data process flows

Typically the optimisation process would result in a setting of the 'levers' which gave a 15% to 20% improvement on their initial 'considered judgement' position after 2,500 iterations. Running the system for a further 7,000 rarely improved the result by more than 1%.

4. Conclusion

This paper has outlined a powerful strategic enterprise employment simulation model. The strength of the model, its ability to track staff by rank, by time-in-rank, by years-of-service, is also a limitation because it results in about 50 'decision levers', each of which can have an infinite number of positions. Also, where different scenarios with different constraints are being compared, there is no prima facie basis for assuming the same 'ideal' initialisation settings.

The combining of genetic algorithm optimisation with the system dynamics model allows the automated identification of an 'optimum' initial setting of these levers (or at least a 'pretty good' starting point) for the different sets of constraints, from which the user can do 'what-if' analyses to understand the functioning of the system.

The optimisation process had the unexpected bonus of serving as a validation tool in that it ran very large numbers of 'extreme value' tests, occasionally produced aberrant results which, on reviewing, pointed to mistakes in logic or business rules.

Setting up the integration was no mean task. We look forward to testing the new Powersim Enterprise Kit with enhanced genetic algorithm capability to see whether it is capable of handling the complexity of large array models. If so, we will dispense with the integration process described in this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] Hillson, D., (2002). Extending the risk process to manage opportunities, *International Journal of Project Management*, 20(3), 235-240.

[2] Sterman, J., (2000). *Business Dynamics: Systems Thinking and Modelling for a Complex World*. (No. HD30. 2 S7835 2000). Boston, MA, Irwin McGraw-Hill.

[3] McLucas, A.C. (2000). 'When to use qualitative or quantitative system dynamics techniques: guidelines derived from analysis of recent man-made catastrophes', in: *Proceedings of System Dynamics 2000, International System Dynamics Conference, The System Dynamics Society, Bergen, Norway*.

[4] McLucas, A.C. (2000). 'Rectifying the failure to learn in complex environments', in: *Journal of Battlefield Technology*, 3(3), 42-50.

[5] Coyle, R.G. (2015) The Use of Optimization Methods for Policy Design in a System Dynamics Model, *System Dynamics Review*, 1(1), 81-91.

[6] Sholtes, R. M. (1994). Optimising system behaviour using genetic algorithms. In *International System Dynamics Conference, Methodological and Technical Issues* (p. 246).

[7] Wolstenholme, E. F., & Al Alusi, A. S. (1987). System dynamics and heuristic optimisation in defence analysis. *System Dynamics Review*, 3(2), 102-115.

[8] Billington, J. (1997). A few things every manager ought to know about risk. *Harvard Management Update*, 2(3), 1-12.

[9] Hunter, W. C., & Smith, S. D. (2002). Risk management in the global economy: A review essay. *Journal of banking & finance*, 26(2-3), 205-221.

[10]Stevenson, R. W., Wolstenholme, E. F., & North Yorkshire, H. L. (1999). Value Chain Dynamics—Applying System Dynamics to Support Value Thinking. In 17th International Conference of the System Dynamics Society and 5th Australian & New Zealand Systems Conference.

윤영곤(Joseph YoungKon Yoon)

[정회원]



- 2001년 2월 : University of New South Wales (산업공학)
- 1999년 6월 ~ 2006년 3월 : 호주 연방정부 산업부(조정관)
- 2007년 3월 ~ 2013년 2월 : 국제통상전략연구원 (원장)
- 2013년 ~ 2016 : 호남권기업성장지원센터 (센터장)
- 2017년 ~ 현재 : 가주글로벌기업지원센터 (센터장)

- 관심분야 : 시스템 다이내믹스, 마케팅, 최적화
- E-Mail : ykjyoon@gmail.com

윤경주(Kyungjoo Yoon)

[정회원]



- 2003년 2월 : Australian National University (언어학)
- 2003년 3월 ~ 2007년 2월 : University of New England (교수)
- 2009년 3월 ~ 2012년 2월 : 공주대학교 (교수)
- 2013년 3월 ~ 현재 : 글로벌사이버대학교 실용영어학과 (교수)

- 관심분야 : 문화간 의사소통, 의미론, 호주정책
- E-Mail : kyoong@gw.global.ac.kr