

CHAPTER 3

GENERAL APPROACH

3.1 CONSULTANTS' PROPOSALS

3.1.1 For the purpose of comparing jobs in the civil service and the private sector, Hay proposed to use a method of job evaluation, devised by them and known as the "Hay Points System", which had been used extensively during similar studies in various countries. This method involved selecting a representative sample of jobs in the civil service and comparing it with a similarly representative sample of jobs in the private sector. The content of these jobs would be investigated and evaluated to establish a basis for comparison. Since it was recognised that many civil service jobs did not have analogues in the private sector, Hay did not propose to resort to direct job-matching between the civil service and private sector, but would use their own job evaluation method. This was a systematic process for measuring jobs on a factor basis, thereby enabling the comparison of jobs of a completely different nature. A full description of the Hay methodology may be found at Annex C to Appendix IX of this Report.

3.2 VIEWS EXPRESSED AT PAY LEVEL SURVEY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

3.2.1 (a) Association of Expatriate Civil Servants

The Association of Expatriate Civil Servants stressed that the Pay Level Survey methodology should be readily understood by all staff. A small sample of direct job comparisons should be made as a cross-checking device. (Hay subsequently agreed to the latter suggestion and a few direct job comparisons will therefore be made).

(b) Hong Kong Institute of Personnel Management

The Hong Kong Institute of Personnel Management felt that Hay's proposed methodology was a sophisticated one and had been well tried out in other parts of the world. This should inspire confidence in Hay's work.

(c) Police Force Council

The Police Force Council* expressed the opinion that the current broadbanded structure of the disciplined services should be reviewed, taking into account the unique, dangerous and complicated nature of the work of the Police Force. The only fair way of arriving at a correct level of police pay was by evaluating the relevant factors and special features of police work in their own right, without broadbanding the police with the remainder of the disciplined services.

(d) Senior Non-Expatriate Officers' Association

The Senior Non-Expatriate Officers' Association expressed reservations about the Hay method of job comparison, which was likened to comparing apples with oranges, rather than apples with apples. This view was also shared by the Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association.

(e) Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association

(i) The Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association doubted whether the Hay methodology could evaluate accurately the content of civil service jobs and private sector jobs, since it did not compare like with like; and

(ii) The Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association also felt that the list of civil service jobs selected for pay comparison might not be representative of the civil service as a whole, since, out of a total of 992 non-Directorate ranks in the civil service, only 13% of the total and 9% of Master Pay Scale ranks had been selected, despite the fact that there was a wide variety of duties and job types on the Master Pay Scale. Jobs in the

* In this Report, Police Force Council refers to the Staff Side of the Council only.

educational, transport, marine, air traffic, trade, telecommunications, labour relations, inland revenue and data processing grades had all been ignored.

- (iii) The Senior Civil Service Council* and the Model Scale 1 Staff Consultative Council also put forward their suggestions on the list of selected jobs and these are given in paragraphs 4.2.1 (a) (iii), 4.2.1 (b) (vii), 4.2.1 (c) (i), 4.2.1 (c) (ii) and 4.2.1 (d) (iv).

(f) The Administration

The Administration supported the methodology proposed by Hay, as, in their view, did some other Committee members.

3.3 STANDING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

3.3.1 After careful consideration of the views expressed by members of the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee and Hay's proposals, we recommend as follows :

- (a) A great deal of thought has been given to the use of a survey methodology which would allow the direct comparison of total packages for jobs in the civil service with those of their private sector counterparts. This approach is sometimes referred to as job matching. However, since few civil service jobs have direct analogues in the private sector, we believe that a more viable method of comparing total packages in the two sectors must be found. We are aware that the Hay methodology has been used successfully on numerous occasions, both in the public and private sectors, in other parts of the world as well as in Hong Kong, and it should therefore be used for the purpose of this Pay Level Survey, since it seems to us to be the only viable methodology in the circumstances;
- (b) Furthermore, since the current Pay Level Survey is not intended as a review of the broadbanding system which now exists within the civil service, any

* In this Report, Senior Civil Service Council refers to the Staff Side of the Council only.

investigation into whether such a review is necessary, as suggested by the Police Force Council, should take place quite separately from this Pay Level Survey; and

- (c) The basis for comparison should be ranks, as recommended by Hay, not employees. Bearing this in mind, the proposed sample of approximately 15% of all civil service ranks should be accepted, as it is, we are advised, statistically quite adequate.