

7 October 1980.

His Excellency Sir Murray MacLehose, G.B.E., K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O.,
Governor of Hong Kong

Your Excellency,

Technical and Survey Officer Grades

In our First Report on Civil Service Pay (Report No. 2) we reviewed the pay scales of the Technical and Survey Officer grades and reached the conclusion that they should remain unchanged. We said, however, that we would be prepared to re-examine these grades in the light of the findings of a Working Party which we were given to understand had been established to examine the implementation of the 1977 Technical Grades Review. Earlier this year, we received a report by this Working Party on a claim by the Association of Government Technical and Survey Officers for better remuneration. We have now completed a study of this Report and have the honour to submit our further advice on the pay of the Technical and Survey Officer grades.

The existing pay scales and structure of the Technical and Survey Officer grades were established in August 1977 as a result of a review of the professional support grades in the Public Works Department, subsequently referred to as the 1977 Technical Grades Review. The review followed a Pay Investigation Unit survey of comparable jobs in the private sector. However, the pay scales were disputed by staff and, in September 1977, Professor P.G. Willoughby of Hong Kong University was appointed as a one-man Committee of Inquiry to determine whether the pay scales and structure introduced as a result of the Review were fair or otherwise, and to recommend whether the proposals should be amended. Professor Willoughby's conclusion was that the pay rates provided for in the restructuring of the professional support grades were broadly fair according to the Government's pay policy. Notwithstanding the Committee of Inquiry's findings, staff continued to dispute the results of the 1977 Technical Grades Review and in November 1978, a Joint Management/ Staff Working Party composed of representatives of Public Works Department management, the Association of Government Technical and Survey Officers and Civil Service Branch was convened to examine, among other things, the pay scales of the Technical and Survey Officer grades on the basis of

any evidence not previously considered. It is the report of this Working Party which we have considered.

The principal finding of the Working Party was that there were certain duties now performed by staff in the grades which were not included in the ranking criteria at the time of the 1977 Technical Grades Review, and that these should constitute new evidence to support a case for improving the pay scales of the grades. The Report of the Working Party contains no arguments for revised pay scales, let alone any suggestion as to what such scales might be. The Working Party bases its findings solely on a list of duties performed by staff of the Technical Officer and Survey Officer grades which they consider were not included in the ranking criteria at the time of the 1977 Technical Grades Review.

Before turning to the results of our further review of the Technical and Survey Officer grades there are two points we would wish to make which are of paramount importance in the consideration of requests by staff for improved pay scales based on changes or additions to duty lists.

First, the two principal documents relating to the job content of various civil service ranks and grades, "Guides to Appointment" (formerly Details of Post) and "Ranking Criteria", are prepared by Government for specific and limited purposes. The former are no more than check lists for the guidance of officers dealing with recruitment and promotion. The latter are used to describe those aspects of jobs at a particular rank level which help to distinguish the responsibility level of one rank from those immediately above or below it. Neither is an exhaustive duty list nor, in our opinion, is it either practicable or desirable that they should attempt to be so. In the case of ranking criteria, which only exist for a minority of ranks, their value in their present form is open to question. The duties of civil servants are bound to undergo change, just as is the work of private sector employees, as the world as a whole and Hong Kong in particular develop. Furthermore, staff must be prepared to accept and cope with the introduction of new technology and management techniques as an inevitable consequence of progress.

The second point we wish to make is that it is quality rather than quantity that establishes the appropriate pay for any job. The assignment of additional duties to a post may simply involve a re-allocation of time spent on certain jobs without any change in the level or range of responsibilities of the staff concerned. Indeed, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility for the addition of relatively simple and straightforward tasks to lower the overall responsibility of a job. Thus only if the additional duties to be performed result in a raising of the level of responsibility of a post, or if their performance introduces a new element in the factors

used for determining pay scales, are they likely to justify improved pay scales.

Staff in the Technical and Survey Officer grades are employed in several departments, with the majority in the Public Works Department, and in a number of streams or disciplines. For example, staff in the Technical Officer grade may be employed in the Architectural, Cartographic or Electrical and Mechanical streams etc. while Survey Officers may be employed in the Engineering, Land or Planning streams and so on. Their duties and the ranking criteria referring to those duties may therefore vary according to the stream in which they serve. In examining the duties of the Technical and Survey Officer grades, we have therefore had regard to the ranking criteria for the grades as a whole.

We have noted that one of the findings of the Working Party is that practically all the duties listed as not being included in ranking criteria were performed by staff of the Technical and Survey Officer grades before the 1977 Technical Grades Review. In our further study of the Technical and Survey Officer grades, we have therefore first examined the 140 items which the Working Party Report lists as not included in the 1977 ranking criteria to see to what extent they involve additional responsibilities, and secondly examined the nature of these duties to establish whether or not their inclusion in the 1977 ranking criteria could have affected the pay scales introduced as a result of the Technical Grades Review.

We have found that an overwhelming proportion of the 140 items listed as "additional" either actually appear (albeit sometimes slightly differently worded) in the ranking criteria of one or other of the disciplines of the Technical and Survey Officer grades, or are so closely related to duties already appearing in the ranking criteria that, in our opinion, they can reasonably be regarded as included. Of the few remaining items, none is such as to result in a substantial raising of levels of responsibility and all are appropriate for grades whose principal responsibilities are to provide support services to professional staff.

In the circumstances, we do not consider that the additional duties listed would have affected the outcome of the 1977 Technical Grades Review nor are they such as to warrant any adjustment to pay scales in accordance with the principles we now use in determining such scales.

In addition to the Working Party Report, we have considered representations from a group of Chief Technical Officers that there are two distinct levels of responsibility exercised by staff in this rank. We have not examined this claim in detail pending the receipt of further information which the management has undertaken to provide.

We conclude, therefore, that the evidence submitted in the Report of the Joint Management/Staff Association Working Party on a claim by the Association of Government Technical and Survey Officers for better remuneration does not justify any change in the existing pay scales and structure of the Technical and Survey Officer grades, details of which are contained in the annex to this letter. We shall however address you further on the question of the Chief Technical Officer rank when the information we have sought has been received.

We have the honour to be,
Your Excellency's obedient servants,

(S.Y. Chung)
Chairman

Pay Scales and Structure of the
Technical and Survey Officer Grades

	<u>Pay Scale</u>
<u>Technical Officer</u>	
Technical Officer Trainee	5 - 10
Technical Officer	17 - 24
Senior Technical Officer	25 - 33
Principal Technical Officer	34 - 41
Chief Technical Officer	42 - 44
<u>Survey Officer</u>	
Survey Officer Trainee	5 - 10
Survey Officer	17 - 24
Senior Survey Officer	25 - 33
Principal Survey Officer	34 - 41

4 November 1980.

His Excellency Sir Jack Cater, K.B.E., J.P.,
Acting Governor of Hong Kong.

Your Excellency,

The Housing Assistant and Housing Manager Grades

Among a number of grades identified in our First Report on Civil Service Pay (Report No. 2) as requiring further review were those of Housing Assistant and Housing Manager. Our initial review had revealed a situation with regard to the Housing Assistant grade which we considered unsatisfactory. The qualifications for entry to the grade were set at four separate educational levels, ranging from school certificate to university degree, each of which attracted different starting pay. We could find no justification for such an arrangement and advised that a further review was required before we could make firm recommendations on the pay and structure of the grade. In the case of the Housing Manager grade it had also been drawn to our attention that for many years vacancies in the grade had been filled solely by the appointment of suitably qualified Housing Assistants. It was suggested to us that Housing Assistant had in effect become the entry rank of the Housing Manager grade and that this should be recognised by combining the two grades into a single grade. We felt this suggestion to be deserving of consideration and therefore advised that the further review we proposed for the Housing Assistant grade should be extended to include the Housing Manager grade.

As a first step towards this further review, we arranged for a job survey of the Housing Assistant and Housing Manager grades. We received the results of the survey in June of this year and examined these alongside the representations we had received from staff and management. Although staff in the Housing Assistant grade have represented to us that the range

of jobs inspected was too narrow, we are satisfied that the survey, which was based on an examination of 264 completed job questionnaires and the inspection of 124 jobs, provides an adequate assessment of the duties and responsibilities of the Housing Assistant and Housing Manager grades. In addition, the survey results do not differ markedly from the description of duties and responsibilities contained in the staff's own submission.

At present Housing Assistant is a one-rank grade with a pay scale of MPS 13 - 29. Staff are employed mainly in two branches :

- (a) the Estate Management Branch which is concerned primarily with the day-to-day management of housing estates and applications for housing; and
- (b) the Operations Branch which is mainly concerned with squatter control, demolition and clearance and day-to-day management of temporary housing areas.

In the Estate Management Branch the duties of Housing Assistants include some work of a relatively routine nature such as rent collection, but we accept the view presented to us that the performance of these duties is essential if Housing Assistants are to maintain regular contact with housing estate tenants as part of their overall estate management responsibilities. Supervision and higher level responsibilities in the two branches are exercised by members of the Housing Manager grade.

As we have explained, the principal reason why we deferred making firm recommendations for the grade in Report No. 2 was the multiplicity of the educational qualifications prescribed for entry. The system we have adopted for setting pay scales has regard, among other things, to the minimum educational qualification necessary for the competent performance of the job concerned. Thus, in order to recommend a pay scale for the Housing Assistant grade it was necessary for us first to determine what the minimum qualification for entry to the grade should be.

In our Report No. 2 we said that we found it difficult to accept that a university degree should be a stipulated entry qualification for the Housing Assistant grade and we recommended that university graduates should receive the same starting pay as matriculants, i.e. MPS point 16. The recommendation

was accepted by Government and nothing in the results of the job survey of the grade or the submissions received from staff and departmental management leads us to change this position. Also while a Polytechnic Higher Diploma or Post-secondary college diploma are suitable qualifications for appointment to the grade we do not consider they should be regarded as the minimum qualifications to permit the competent performance of the job concerned. At the other end of the educational spectrum we have noted that school certificate is a relic from the days before the Resettlement Assistant grade was merged with the Housing Assistant grade and that there has been no recruitment of school certificate holders for some considerable time.

After careful consideration we recommend that the minimum entry qualification for the Housing Assistant grade should be matriculation. We have reached this conclusion for two main reasons. First is the nature of the job itself. While we do not consider a university degree essential to the performance of the duties of a Housing Assistant we do feel that if staff are to fulfil their responsibilities in the estate management and operations fields efficiently, something more than school certificate is required. Matriculation as a minimum entry requirement will have the additional advantage of ensuring greater maturity. Secondly, advancement to and within the Housing Manager grade requires passes in the examinations for the Hong Kong University Certificate in Housing and Estate Management or its equivalent and entrance to these courses requires matriculation.

Having reached the conclusion that matriculation should be the minimum educational qualification for entry to the Housing Assistant grade we propose that the pay scale of the grade should be adjusted in line with those of other comparable matriculation grades as follows :

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
Housing Assistant	MPS 13 - 29	MPS 16 - 30

A further examination of the Housing Manager grade has confirmed the information given to us earlier that appointments to the grade are made solely from suitably qualified Housing Assistants and thus in effect Housing Assistant can be regarded as the entry rank to the Housing Manager grade. We appreciate the advantage of this arrangement and therefore recommend that the situation be recognised and the two grades combined into a new Housing Manager grade. Assistant Housing Manager would then become the second rank of a

matriculation grade and the pay scale and structure of the new grade should therefore be as follows :

<u>Existing</u>		<u>Proposed</u>
<u>Housing Assistant Grade</u>		<u>Housing Manager Grade</u>
Housing Assistant	MPS 13 - 29	MPS 16 - 30
<u>Housing Manager Grade</u>		
Assistant Housing Manager	MPS 25 - 32	MPS 31 - 37
Housing Manager	MPS 33 - 47	MPS 38 - 47
Senior Housing Manager	MPS 48 - 51	MPS 48 - 51

As Housing Assistant and Housing Manager are grades on which we deferred making recommendations in our Report No. 2, we recommend that our proposals, if accepted, should be implemented with effect from 1st October 1979, i.e. the date of implementation of the other recommendations in that Report.

We have the honour to be,
Your Excellency's obedient servants,

(S.Y. Chung)
Chairman

12 November 1980.

His Excellency Sir Jack Cater, KBE, JP,
Acting Governor of Hong Kong.

Your Excellency,

The Works Supervisor Grade

In our First Report on Civil Service Pay (Report No. 2) we undertook to conduct a further review of the Technical and Survey Officer grades in the light of the findings of a joint management/staff association working party. We also said that such a review would be extended to include an examination of the Works Supervisor grade. In a letter dated 7th October 1980 we advised Your Excellency of the results of our re-examination of the Technical and Survey Officer grades and we now have the honour to submit our advice on the pay scales and structure of the Works Supervisor grade.

Until 1977 the duties of the Works Supervisor grade were performed by staff in the Foreman grade. At that time, the Foreman grade consisted of two ranks, Foreman and Senior Foreman, and staff of the grade served in a number of government departments. In most departments their work was largely concerned with the supervision of men. However, the 1977 Technical grades review found that the work of Foremen and Senior Foremen in the Public Works Department involved more technical supervision than was generally the case elsewhere in government. Foremen and Senior Foremen in this department were therefore regraded Works Supervisor II and I respectively to better reflect the nature of their duties. Subsequently, this regrading was extended to appropriate posts in the Foreman grade in other departments. The pay scales for the two Works Supervisor ranks remained the same as those for the corresponding ranks in the Foreman grade.

Works Supervisors are employed in two main categories :

- (a) in plant or site operations, mainly supervising Artisans and Labourers (and in some cases carrying out highly skilled work) with Works Supervisors I in overall charge of a plant or a whole section of a large plant and Works Supervisors II in charge of a shift or the operation of a particular sphere of work;
- (b) in the inspection of contractors' work with projects allocated to a Works Supervisor I or II according to their complexity, size and value.

The levels of responsibility of Works Supervisors in both categories are regarded as comparable.

The similarity between the appointment and training requirements of Works Supervisors and Technical and Survey Officers, to which we referred in Report No. 2, has proved to be more apparent than real. Our further examination has shown that only a very small proportion of Works Supervisors have been appointed to the grade through the Trainee rank. The great majority of posts have been filled by the promotion of suitably qualified Model Scale 1 staff or by persons who have completed a Technical Apprenticeship or obtained a Polytechnic certificate under other arrangements. At most therefore the Works Supervisor Trainee rank provides a supplementary source of recruitment to the grade. Having regard to the other sources of recruitment to the grade, the duties assigned to it and its relationship with the Technical Inspector grades, we consider that Works Supervisors are correctly placed in the Technical Inspectorate and Related Grades group and that their pay scales should be reviewed within the context of this group.

In so far as the structure of the Works Supervisor grade is concerned we have considerable doubts as to the necessity for the Trainee rank in its present form. We accordingly recommend that recruitment to the Trainee rank should be discontinued and the rank abolished. We are satisfied that there is a functional requirement for two ranks of Works Supervisor and propose no other change in the rank structure.

Our review has brought to light factors which we consider justify some improvement to the pay of the grade. In particular there are serious retention problems and on examination of the nature of the work of the grade we conclude that the maximum pay of both

ranks should be adjusted upwards. We therefore recommend that the pay scales of the Works Supervisor grade be revised as follows :

Works Supervisor Grade

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
Works Supervisor II	MPS 11 - 13	MPS 11 - 15
Works Supervisor I	MPS 14 - 17	MPS 16 - 19

We make no recommendation for the Works Supervisor Trainee rank since we have proposed that it should be discontinued. Serving Trainees should continue to be paid from their existing scale.

In making our recommendations for the Works Supervisor grade we are conscious of the fact that there are a number of other civil service grades, especially Foreman, who see their duties and responsibilities as comparable. These grades were considered in our previous Reports. But as we have already advised in our Second Report on Civil Service Pay (Report No. 5), we shall shortly be conducting a review of supervisory ranks and grades on Model Scale 1 and the Master Pay Scale.

The Works Supervisor grade is a grade on which we deferred making a recommendation in Report No. 2. We therefore propose that the revised pay scales which we propose should, if accepted, be implemented from 1st October 1979.

We have the honour to be,
Your Excellency's obedient servants,

(S.Y. Chung)
Chairman