

CHAPTER 6

MODEL SCALE 1

Introduction

6.1 Our first review of Model Scale 1 in Report No. 2 was largely confined to adjusting the value of the pay points of the scale. We recommend overall improvements to the pay of Model Scale 1 employees. However, in paragraph 5.13 of that Report we listed a number of other issues concerning Model Scale 1 employees which we considered required further attention, and undertook to examine these in our current work programme. These issues are :

- (a) The relationship between Model Scale 1 and the Master Pay Scale; in particular the degree to which differences in the terms applicable to staff on the two scales should be reduced.
- (b) Criteria for ranking; the system for determining the level of pay for individual ranks on Model Scale 1.
- (c) Possible abolition of sub-segments; the system whereby many Model Scale 1 employees receive only part of the normal segment scale.
- (d) Transfer to the Master Pay Scale; the possible transfer of individual Model Scale 1 ranks to the Master Pay Scale.
- (e) Amalgamation of ranks; a possible reduction in the number of Model Scale 1 ranks.
- (f) Supervisory ranks; the question of whether the number of supervisory ranks on Model Scale 1 could be reduced.

The review of these issues has also involved an examination of each individual Model Scale 1 grade.

6.2 We had already received some representations on the above issues in the course of conducting our first review. On 18th December 1979 we issued a circular letter (which we asked should be brought to the attention of all Model Scale 1 staff) seeking further views from both staff and management. In response to the letter we received 41 submissions. Staff of the Commission also met a number of groups of Model Scale 1 employees and visited some of them at their place of work. A list of staff groups and associations from whom written representations were received is in Appendix IX, and those who were met by staff of the Commission are listed in Appendix IV.

Relationship between Model Scale 1 and the Master Pay Scale

6.3 In the Consultative Document issued prior to the preparation of our First Report on Principles and Practices we raised the question whether the long-term objective should be to eliminate the differences between Model Scale 1 and Master Pay Scale employees altogether, or whether the circumstances of the employment of Model Scale 1 employees were such as to justify their remaining a separate group within the civil service. With few exceptions the replies to this question were that the aim should be to eliminate differences between Model Scale 1 and Master Pay Scale employees altogether. The majority of representations received in reply to our circular letter of 18th December 1979 also expressed the view that these differences should be eliminated. However, many of both the earlier submissions and the representations received in response to the circular letter recognised the complexity of such an exercise and that to grant the same terms to Model Scale 1 and Master Pay Scale employees could only be a long-term objective.

6.4 There are a number of major problems involved in eliminating the differences between Model Scale 1 and Master Pay Scale employees. Firstly, comparability with the private sector remains an important factor in determining civil service pay, and particularly so for this group of employees where a comparison can be readily drawn. The pay and conditions of Model Scale 1 employees should therefore have some regard to private sector practice. Secondly, both the nature and structure of Model Scale 1 grades are such that any changes can only be introduced gradually and after taking due account of existing relationships between Model Scale 1 staff and those on the Master Pay Scale. Thirdly, this type of employee forms the greater part of the Hong Kong work force, and the present Model Scale 1 terms have the advantage of permitting flexibility of movement between Government and the private sector.

6.5 Taking these factors into account we believe that Model Scale 1 employees should remain as a separate group within the civil service for the time being. However, we consider the differences between the pay and conditions of Model Scale 1 and Master Pay Scale employees should be reduced. As a first step we have examined the differences between the pay structure of Model Scale 1 and that of the Master Pay Scale.

Model Scale 1 Pay

6.6 The principal difference between the pay scale of Model Scale 1 employees and the pay scale of staff on the Master Pay Scale lies in the size of increments. In addition, Model Scale 1 is divided into four segments categorised by the titles : Workman II, Workman I, Artisan and Senior Artisan. In a move towards reducing differences between the pay scales of Model Scale 1 and Master Pay Scale employees, we therefore propose that Model Scale 1 should be restructured as a numbered scale, in the manner of the Master Pay Scale

and that more realistic increments should be provided. One unsatisfactory aspect of the existing scale is the arrangement whereby employees on the bottom segment of the scale only receive increments once every five years. Our proposals provide for annual increments for these employees.

6.7 We therefore recommend that the existing Model Scale 1 be replaced by a completely new scale of 20 pay points. Our proposed scale is set out in Table E at the end of this Chapter. The benefit of the new scale is in the size of increments and for most ranks it will reduce the number of steps necessary to reach the maximum pay point.

6.8 As our proposed new scale involves a major restructuring of Model Scale 1 and has fewer pay points than the existing scale, special conversion arrangements will be necessary. Details should be provided by the Administration but Table E sets out the basic conversion we consider appropriate. We have used the prefix MOD in referring to points in the new scale. If accepted, our proposed scale should be introduced from a current date.

Other Issues affecting Model Scale 1 Employees

6.9 We have dealt with the other issues listed in paragraph 6.1 in the context of our review of individual Model Scale 1 grades. In referring to criteria for ranking our concern was that in some cases employees doing the same work in different departments were receiving different levels of pay. In our proposals for individual grades we have rectified this situation wherever practicable. We have also with a few exceptions abolished sub-segments by broadbanding ranks within four groups. This principle is outlined in paragraphs 6.15 and 6.16 below. The exceptions relate to certain cases where we have undertaken to conduct a further review. We have also amalgamated a number of Model Scale 1 ranks where we consider it appropriate to do so, and we have reduced the number of supervisory ranks from five to three.

Representations

6.10 We have given due weight to the representations received from staff and management in our consideration of individual Model Scale 1 grades. We have, however, found it impracticable to refer to these recommendations on an individual basis since the nature of Model Scale 1 is such that representations have been received from a number of groups of staff or associations representing employees in the same Model Scale 1 grade. These may come from groups within different departments or from different unions whose membership includes Model Scale 1 employees in the same grade. Since the representations sometimes contain divergent views our approach has been to take all points made into consideration in arriving at our recommendation for each individual grade.

6.11 Understandably, the representations concentrated on seeking improvements in pay and conditions of service. In so far as the latter are concerned many staff sought improvements to allowances, a reduction in hours of work and better arrangements for rewarding overtime.

6.12 As far as conditions of service are concerned we must draw attention to our Terms of Reference which preclude our considering such matters until they are formally referred to us. However, we have the following comments :

- (a) We consider conditions of service for Model Scale 1 staff should take account of better practice in the private sector. We would therefore suggest that Government monitor changes in private sector practice in order that any improvements introduced can be applied to its own employees;
- (b) In paragraph 38 of Report No. 1 we suggested that the arrangements for the payment of Obnoxious Duty Allowance should be rationalised. We are aware that the Government has already taken action in this respect but one or two cases continue to be referred to us which indicate that some anomalies may still exist;
- (c) In paragraph 59 of Report No. 1 we stated that we would investigate the possibility of introducing a provident fund or some other form of superannuation for Model Scale 1 employees. However, we have since found that the scheme of retirement allowances already in existence for Model Scale 1 staff provides better benefits than those provided under a provident fund or any similar scheme for the same class of workers in the private sector. We would suggest however that consideration be given to preparing a pamphlet on the retirement allowances scheme for distribution to Model Scale 1 employees, many of whom appear to be unaware of its existence.

Review of Individual Grades

6.13 At the same time as representations were called for, a study was undertaken of individual Model Scale 1 grades. Departments were requested to submit representative job descriptions for each rank in their charge and, on the basis of these, 450 representative posts were selected and individually inspected. As a result a composite description for each rank (or more than one description where significant differences between posts in the same rank were detected) was compiled. In addition, account was taken of some 580 job descriptions prepared during an earlier Pay Investigation Unit survey and of draft "guides to appointment" for Model Scale 1 ranks prepared by departments during 1979. In the

light of this information the value of each rank was assessed using a factor system which took account of, among other things, skill, knowledge of work, training and physical effort required. In addition, account was taken of the job content and the extent to which it might involve enforcement duties involving confrontation with the public likely to result in bodily harm.

6.14 The immediate problem encountered in conducting a review of individual Model Scale 1 grades is that there are variations in the job performed by a particular grade both between departments and within divisions of the same department. In some cases these differences are dealt with by the payment of allowances but in other cases not. Except where these differences are significant enough to justify a revised grading our approach has therefore been to consider the range of jobs performed by a particular grade in arriving at our recommended rank scales.

6.15 In Report No. 2, we mentioned that educational qualifications had little significance in determining the pay of grades paid from Model Scale 1. The "qualification method" which we have adopted for establishing the benchmark entry points for grades on the Master Pay Scale and for determining the "qualification" groups therefore does not apply here. However, because of the wide range of jobs performed by different grades, we consider that they should be broadbanded under four groups. The major departure from the system used for the Master Pay Scale grades is that instead of using the educational qualification method, we have used the method described in paragraph 6.13 in determining the appropriate group for each grade.

6.16 Thus, although our proposed Model Scale 1 no longer provides for the division of employees into Workman II, Workman I, Artisan and Senior Artisan segments, we recommend that individual grades on Model Scale 1 should continue to be broadbanded within four pay groups, MOD 1 - 4, MOD 5 - 10, MOD 11 - 17 and MOD 18 - 20. The revised rank scales also take account of the abolition of sub-segments.

Recommendations on Individual Grades

6.17 Our recommendations on individual Model Scale 1 grades are set out in paragraphs 6.19 - 6.74 . They include a number of recommendations for the regrading of ranks. In effecting these regradings the conversion rules set out in paragraph 3.17 should be applied. Since we did not review individual Model Scale 1 grades in our Report No. 2, the changes in rank scales should be implemented with effect from the 1st October 1979, wherever practicable, within the framework of the existing scale.

6.18 While in general we feel that changes in titles should best be dealt with by departments in consultation with

Civil Service Branch we have recommended in a number of instances that consideration should be given to re-titling the grades concerned so as to reflect their duties and responsibilities more accurately. In this connection we have noted that the terms "Semi-skilled Labourer" and "Labourer" are still used to designate grades falling within the current segments of Workman II and Workman I respectively. We consider this inappropriate and to be consistent with the spirit of our earlier recommendations in paragraph 5.19 of Report No. 2 we recommend the titles Workman I and Workman II should be substituted for Semi-skilled Labourer and Labourer.

6.19 Amah

2,449 posts

Amahs in the civil service can be broadly divided into two categories in terms of nature of work and job content.

The first category of staff provides a personal service to patients and to the handicapped in hospitals, clinics or rehabilitation centres of the Medical and Health Department and Social Welfare Department. It includes staff in ranks I, II and III of the grade. We have not found any significant functional differences between the three ranks and note that their duties and those of Hospital Orderlies are similar. We therefore recommend that these two grades be replaced by a new single-rank grade with an appropriate title reflecting their duties.

The second category is composed only of Amahs in rank III of the grade. These staff are employed in government schools, educational institutes and in the offices of a few government departments. Their duties are similar to those of Labourers in these or other departments. It is considered more appropriate to re-grade the Amah posts in this category as Labourer (to be retitled as Workman II) in order to standardise the ranking.

Our recommended pay scales which have regard to the differences in job content of the two categories of staff are as follows :

| <u>Existing</u> | | <u>Proposed</u> | |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|
| (First category) | | | |
| Amah III | WII 1 - 16) | New Grade | MOD 5 - 10 |
| |) | (to include | |
| Amah II | W I 1 - 3) | Hospital | |
| |) | Orderly grade) | |
| Amah I | W I 4 - 9) | | |
| (Second category) | | | |
| Amah III | W II 1 - 16 | Workman II | MOD 1 - 4 |

6.20 Animal House Attendant

13 posts

This is a departmental grade in the Medical and Health Department. Having regard to the duties of the grade which involve the caring, feeding and cleaning of laboratory animals, and to our broadbanding principle, we recommend that the pay scale should be as follows :

| | <u>Existing</u> | <u>Proposed</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Animal House Attendant | A 4 - 10 | MOD 11 - 17 |

6.21 Artisan

4,822 posts

Artisans are employed in 18 departments on a wide variety of duties which require dexterity and appropriate skills. These duties range from the installation, operation and servicing of mechanical and electrical equipment, supervision of subordinate staff, to rendering supporting services to medical personnel. It has been represented to us that generally no functional difference exists between Artisan I and Artisan II ranks. We accept this and propose that the two ranks should be combined and paid from a single pay scale in the appropriate group.

There are also ranks currently paid on the same scales as Artisans who perform skilled work at a similar level, and where the distinction is one of title only. We recommend that these ranks be merged with the Artisan grade and paid from the same scale. These include the Chargeman/Artisan, Carpenter I and II, Electrician, Fitter, Plantman I and II, and Workshop Assistant grades. We also recommend that Painter I and II should be merged with the Artisan grade.

Departmental titles e.g. Artisan (Fitter), Artisan (Electrician), may be used to reflect the operational requirements of departments. In this regard, we also suggest that Artisans in the Cargo Handling Unit and the Pollution Control Unit of the Marine Department be given new departmental titles so as to reflect their duties more accurately.

| | <u>Existing</u> | | <u>Proposed</u> |
|------------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|
| Artisan II | A 1 - 7) | | |
| |) | Artisan | MOD 11 - 17 |
| Artisan I | A 4 - 10) | | |

6.22 Barber

12 posts

Barbers are employed in the Medical and Health Department. We consider that the work of this grade is generally comparable to that of Workman I and have raised

the pay scale accordingly.

| | <u>Existing</u> | <u>Proposed</u> |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Barber | WII 5 - 16 | MOD 5 - 10 |

6.23 Car Park Attendant 27 posts

We note that the duties and responsibilities of Car Park Attendants vary significantly between locations. We therefore recommend that the pay scale of the grade should remain on the corresponding points on the new scale, pending a further review of the grade.

| | <u>Existing</u> | <u>Proposed</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Car Park Attendant | A 1 - 7 | MOD 11 - 15 |

6.24 Caretaker 79 posts

We have considered the similarities in responsibilities between this grade and those of the Watchman grade. Pending a comprehensive review of these grades, we recommend that the Caretaker grade should remain on the corresponding points on the new pay scale.

| | <u>Existing</u> | <u>Proposed</u> |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Caretaker | WII 1 - 16 | MOD 1 - 4 |

6.25 Carpenter 51 posts

Carpenters belong to a two-rank grade and are employed in a number of departments. We have already drawn attention in paragraph 6.21 to a number of grades which can properly be drawn together into the Artisan grade. Carpenter is one of these and we so recommend :

| | <u>Existing</u> | | <u>Proposed</u> |
|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|
| Carpenter II | A 1 - 7) | | |
| |) | Artisan | MOD 11 - 17 |
| Carpenter I | A 4 - 10) | | |

6.26 Chainman 450 posts

Staff in this grade are engaged in field survey work and are responsible for the supervision of Labourers in survey gangs. As there is no functional difference between the two ranks, and taking into account the nature of their

duties, we recommend that the two ranks should be amalgamated and paid at the same level as Artisans.

| <u>Existing</u> | | <u>Proposed</u> | |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|
| Chainman | WI 1 - 9) | Chainman | MOD 11 - 17 |
| Head Chainman | A 1 - 7) | | |

6.27 Chargehand 9 posts

This was a departmental grade in the Government Supplies Department until its metal workshop establishment was transferred to the Public Works Department in April 1980. Chargehands supervise teams of Artisans and Labourers in furniture and metal workshops. Their duties and responsibilities are comparable with those of Senior Artisans in the Public Works Department. We therefore recommend that this grade be merged with the Senior Artisan grade, with a pay scale revised as follows :

| <u>Existing</u> | | <u>Proposed</u> | |
|-----------------|----------|-----------------|-------------|
| Chargehand | SA 1 - 3 | Senior Artisan | MOD 18 - 20 |

6.28 Chargeman 128 posts

It has been suggested to us that there is an overlap in the duties of Chargeman and Ganger, and in those of Senior Chargeman and Amenities Assistant III. We consider that the grading of Chargeman requires a further review together with that of other minor supervisory ranks on Model Scale 1 and the Master Pay Scale. Meanwhile we recommend that the pay scales of this grade should remain on the corresponding points on the new scale.

| | <u>Existing</u> | <u>Proposed</u> |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Chargeman | A 1 - 7 | MOD 11 - 15 |
| Senior Chargeman | SA 1 - 3 | MOD 18 - 20 |

6.29 Chargeman/Artisan 737 posts

Save for a small number of posts in the Government Secretariat and the Printing Department, the majority of the staff in this grade are employed in the Urban Services Department. Their responsibilities include life-guard duties, operation of filtration plants and supervision of junior staff in the operation of recreational facilities and plant nurseries. In view of the nature of their work, we recommend

that this grade be merged with the Artisan grade. (See paragraph 6.21)

| | <u>Existing</u> | | <u>Proposed</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|
| Chargeman/Artisan | A 1 - 10 | Artisan | MOD 11 - 17 |

6.30 Chauffeur 11 posts

Chauffeurs are under the general control of the Government Land Transport Agency and are responsible for driving V.I.P. pool cars. We consider that this grade, together with the Personal Chauffeur grade which is paid from the Master Pay Scale, and the Special Driver and Motor Driver grades on Model Scale 1, should be the subject of a general review which we will undertake in our next programme of work. In the meantime we recommend that the pay scale should remain on the corresponding points on the new scale.

| | <u>Existing</u> | <u>Proposed</u> |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Chauffeur | SA 1 - 3 | MOD 18 - 20 |

6.31 Cobbler 3 posts

We consider this grade is appropriately ranked and recommend that the pay scale should remain comparable to that of the Artisan grade.

| | <u>Existing</u> | <u>Proposed</u> |
|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Cobbler | A 4 - 10 | MOD 11 - 17 |

6.32 Communications Attendant 12 posts

Staff of this grade are employed in the Marine Department. They assist Marine Inspectors on watch duties relating to ship movements in the Hong Kong waters. Our examination of this grade reveals that no functional difference exists between the two ranks. We therefore recommend combining them and, having regard to the level of responsibility and the nature of duties, adjusting the pay scale to the same level as the Artisan grade.

| | <u>Existing</u> | | <u>Proposed</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Communications Attendant II | WI 1 - 9) |) | Communications Attendant MOD 11 - 17 |
| Communications Attendant I | A 1 - 7) |) | |