

CHAPTER 5

JOB EVALUATION

5.1 CONSULTANTS' PROPOSALS

Job Factors

5.1.1 The method of job evaluation proposed by Hay did not involve job-matching or the identification of analogues, but entailed an evaluation of common factors within each job. These factors were as follows :

- (a) KNOW-HOW : the total skills required to enable the job to be carried out properly;
- (b) PROBLEM-SOLVING : the original, "self-starting" thinking required by the job for analysing, evaluating, creating, reasoning, arriving at and making conclusions; and
- (c) ACCOUNTABILITY : the answerability for action and for the consequences thereof.

In any particular job, the importance of each of these three factors would be assessed and a value assigned to it, using the Hay Guide Chart. The total number of points for each job could then be calculated by using the evaluation process.

Evaluation Committee

5.1.2 The evaluation process would be carried out by a committee of experienced consultants. The data collected from the civil service and private sector companies for each job under consideration would be presented by the consultant who conducted the interview with the job holder. The committee would discuss the data provided for each job and members would then prepare their evaluations independently of each other. The independent evaluations would be displayed and the results discussed until a consensus was reached, which would then be recorded. Staff of the Pay Survey and Research Unit would be present as observers at these evaluation meetings.

Correlation of Job Scores

5.1.3 The job scores thus obtained would then be correlated with job scores for similar industries and sectors held in the Hay database, in order to ensure that the same standard of evaluation had prevailed throughout the study. The consultant who led the evaluation committee for the evaluation of civil service jobs would present the evaluation results to a correlator experienced in public sector evaluations. The correlator would compare all the evaluations against a databank of evaluations for several thousand public sector positions and the consultant would be required to explain any apparent discrepancies in standards, until the correlator was satisfied that the same standard of evaluation had been maintained throughout. The process would then be repeated for private sector position evaluations. When the job scores for positions in both the civil service and the private sector were found to be satisfactory, data analysis could commence.

5.1.4 A full description of Hay's method of job evaluation is in Chapter 3 of their report, which can be found at Annex C to Appendix IX of this Report.

5.2 VIEWS EXPRESSED AT PAY LEVEL SURVEY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

5.2.1 (a) Senior Non-Expatriate Officers' Association

The Senior Non-Expatriate Officers' Association felt that findings concerning job sizes should be disclosed to PLSAC members. This suggestion was supported by the Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association.

(b) Association of Expatriate Civil Servants

The Association of Expatriate Civil Servants considered that, in the absence of equal representation, only Hay should decide on the points for each job and the evaluation process must be seen to be completely independent.

(c) Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association

The Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association considered that the use of the three common job factors in all cases would be unfair to non-managerial staff. They felt that no account

had been taken of factors such as hardship, danger, obnoxious working environments or unsocial working hours.

(d) Model Scale 1 Staff Consultative Council

(i) The Model Scale 1 Staff Consultative Council felt that representatives from staff associations should be present as observers at the job evaluation sessions, in order to put forward their views before the evaluation results were finally submitted to the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee. This suggestion was supported by the Association of Expatriate Civil Servants and the Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association; and

(ii) They also expressed doubts about the validity and accuracy of the evaluation results in view of the short time available. This view was shared by the Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association.

(e) Employers' Federation of Hong Kong

The Employers' Federation of Hong Kong felt that the sample of civil service jobs might be too small when compared with that for the private sector. (The sample of civil service jobs has subsequently been increased to about 400).

(f) Hong Kong Institute of Personnel Management

The Hong Kong Institute of Personnel Management emphasized that it would be inappropriate for the job evaluation scores to be revealed to the Pay Level Survey Advisory Committee.

(g) The Administration

The Administration supported the Hay methodology.

5.3 STANDING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS

5.3.1 Many useful and noteworthy points were discussed in the course of considering Hay's proposals. We have given careful thought to these and recommend as follows :

- (a) Since job evaluation should be carried out independently by Hay, neither staff association nor management representatives should be allowed to attend the evaluation sessions as observers;
- (b) We feel that to disclose the job evaluation results, as requested by the Staff Side, would be a breach of confidentiality and the proposal to reveal the results has been vigorously opposed by representatives from the private sector on this basis. These findings should therefore not be disclosed; and
- (c) We are satisfied that the three job factors described by Hay are present, in varying degrees, in all jobs. Indeed, Hay have found this to be the case throughout their long experience of pay surveys worldwide. Job evaluation should accordingly proceed on the basis of these job factors.