

CHAPTER FIVE

PAY SCALES FOR THE GENERAL DISCIPLINED SERVICES

General

5.1 We propose that the four remaining disciplined services should be called the "general disciplined services" and we use this term to distinguish the pay scales we propose for them. Each service has its own separate functions and characteristics and is in that sense unique. Though we have examined each of them separately, we do not find it necessary to provide separate pay scales for them.

5.2 Our review of the factors identified the two groups as follows :-

Group A	Group B
Fire Services (Operational)	Immigration Service
Correctional Services	Fire Services (Ambulance)
Customs and Excise	Fire Services (Control)

We have commented on these groupings in Chapter 3.

5.3 We should comment here on one matter which might be thought likely to affect these groupings. We have received representations from both management and staff in Fire Services that the 60-hour working week is too long and should be reduced. Management consider that such a change would enable them to make better use of staff resources. We have not felt able to make a recommendation on this, though it is an important matter. The 60-hour week is closely bound up with the unique shift pattern recorded in **Annex 1.3**, Appendix II, Section III(a). In this pattern there are 35 periods of 24 hours on and 63 periods of 24 hours off in a 14-week cycle. In the period of 24 hours duty it is estimated by the department that on average just under 10 hours are spent on stand-by at the station.

5.4 We believe that a limited reduction in the number of hours in the working week in the Fire Services would necessarily be accompanied by a radical re-organisation of the shift pattern and of working arrangements. We have examined the implications of such a change for our assessments and we conclude that such a change would not alter the grouping of Fire Services (Operational) staff with CSD and C & E in our Group A. We take this view though we appreciate that even the kind of limited reduction in hours we have in mind (of the order of 4 to 6) would inevitably mean some increase in staff.

We have also borne in mind the considerable increase in workload per head there has been for operational firemen since 1979 (see **Annex 2.2**) and the increased activity and service given to the public that has flowed from the decentralisation of some fire protection work to operational stations.

5.5 In proposing new pay scales for the services in these two groups we have adopted a similar approach to that described in paragraphs 4.10 and 4.11 of Chapter 4 for the police scales. We reviewed each of the existing scales carefully in the light of all the evidence we had gathered, including details about trends in and current levels of recruitment and wastage as well as our review of the factors and we revised them in a systematic way to achieve the general increases we decided were required and introduce other changes that we consider necessary to meet specific problems.

5.6 Under the present pay scales the rank and file of Correctional Services and Customs and Excise have the same pay as the rank and file of the Fire Services Department; but recruits to the Officer and Inspector ranks begin two incremental points lower in the scale; and the Station Officer in the Fire Services Department is also, like the Inspector of Police, on a through scale, that is a scale which progresses continuously without a promotion step to the next rank above, that of Senior Station Officer. These features make assimilation of the basic Officer grade scales in Group A a complex matter.

5.7 In our first attempts to devise new scales we prepared several versions of separate all-through scales for Group A and Group B from bottom to top. The results contained too many anomalies which we were unable to remove, and we eventually decided to stick to the existing practice of having scales which embraced all the services but were separate for the rank and file, Officers and the directorate respectively. Our proposals in respect of the two groups are described in the following paragraphs.

GDS(R) pay scale

5.8 For the rank and file, we have taken particular note of the exceptionally severe premature wastage and relatively limited success in recruitment of AO IIs in CSD and wastage experienced though to a lesser degree in C & E. With this in mind, and looking also to our review of the factors we propose that the pay difference between this group of rank and file staff, together with the firemen with whom we group them, and the police should be slightly reduced.

5.9 **We recommend** that the existing DPS(R) pay scale should be abolished and replaced by a new 30-point scale called the General Disciplined Services (Rank and File) Pay Scale (GDS(R)) (details at **Annexes 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.7, 5.8, 5.10 and 5.12**). In accordance with the grouping of the six separate services mentioned in paragraph 5.2 above, we propose that the services in Group A should have a one-point lead over

those in Group B, like this :-

	Group A	Group B
First tier	GDS(R) 2-16 (17,18)	GDS(R) 1-15 (16,17)
Second tier	GDS(R) 17-25	GDS(R) 16-24
Third tier	GDS(R) 26-30	GDS(R) 25-29

(Points in brackets denote long service increments.)

5.10 One of the main results of our review of the factors was to group the Immigration Service with FSD (Ambulance) and FSD (Control). Because pay in the Immigration Service has been lower in the past, the increases in this group are therefore relatively greater for Immigration staff than for the other two groups; but in the light of our review of the factors, we still consider it right to propose substantial increases for the two FSD services in Group B.

Proposed restructuring of the Immigration Service

5.11 We understand that the rank of Assistant Immigration Officer is likely to be abolished over a period, and that it would be useful for us to propose a pay scale for a proposed new rank of Chief Immigration Assistant, together with a scale for Immigration Officer which recognises that this would become an entry rank. On this basis **we recommend** the following pay scales (see **Annex 5.14**) :

Chief Immigration Assistant - GDS(R) 25-29

Immigration Officer (new style) - GDS(O) 4-18

GDS(O) pay scale

5.12 **We recommend** that the existing DPS(O) scale should be replaced by a new 38-point scale called the General Disciplined Services (Officer) Pay Scale (GDS(O)) described below and in detail at **Annexes 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.9, 5.11 and 5.13**. We realise that even if an early decision is taken to restructure the Immigration Service it will be some time before the existing structure is totally replaced. Against that background, we have provided 38 points on the GDS(O) pay scale so that it may cater for the existing Assistant Immigration Officer and Immigration Officer ranks as well as the new style Immigration Officer mentioned in paragraph 5.11 above.

(a) Immigration

5.13 The first three points on the GDS(O) scale are therefore exclusively for the AIO rank. The pay scales **we recommend** for the Immigration Service are :-

AIO GDS(O) 1-11

IO GDS(O) 12-18

SIO GDS(O) 19-23

CIO GDS(O) 24-29

APIO GDS(O) 30-33

PIO GDS(O) 34-37

(b) Fire Services (Control)

5.14 Station Officer/Senior Station Officer (Control) in FSD is at present equivalent to the mainstream Station Officer/Senior Station Officer in the operational side of the department. In line with our review of factors, we propose to adjust their pay to a level equivalent to that of Ambulance Officer and Senior Ambulance Officer (at minimum and maximum points respectively). However, we do not wish to alter the existing practice of having a combined establishment for this group of officers. The pay scales **we recommend** are :-

Station Officer (Control) GDS(O) 4-23

Senior Station Officer (Control) GDS(O) 19-23

(c) Fire Services (Ambulance)

5.15 The pay scales **we recommend** for Officers in the Ambulance section of FSD are :-

Ambulance Officer GDS(O) 4-18

Senior Ambulance Officer GDS(O) 19-23

Superintendent (Ambulance) GDS(O) 24-29

Assistant Chief Ambulance Officer GDS(O) 30-33

(d) Fire Services (Operational)

5.16 For Group A services, **we recommend** that Officers in the entry ranks should have a two-point lead over their counterparts in Group B services. The FSD (Operational) Officers' scales **we recommend** are :-

Station Officer GDS(O) 6-23

Senior Station Officer GDS(O) 19-23

Assistant Divisional Officer GDS(O) 24-29

Divisional Officer GDS(O) 30-33

Senior Divisional Officer GDS(O) 34-37

(e) CSD and C&E

5.17 We have observed that the historic use of common nomenclatures, such as "Superintendent", by several services can be misleading. The fact that a Superintendent of Police, a Superintendent in CSD and a Superintendent of Customs & Excise have the same title and all receive the same pay tends to give rise to the belief that they are comparable ranks in all respects. We have helped reinforce this view by aligning these ranks which have identical pay scales in the tables at Annex 4.14 as well as the graphs at Annex 4.15 in our Preliminary Report. However, we did remind ourselves in paragraph 4.19 of that report that the ranks of CIP and Assistant Divisional Officer could equally be aligned with the first promotion ranks of most of the disciplined services entry ranks.

5.18 From our visits to the services and on the basis of strong representations we received, we have formed the view that a Senior Inspector of C&E is in many ways comparable to a CIP although the nature of their duties and responsibility is usually different. In the police and FSD, there is no functional distinction between IP and SIP or between Station Officer and Senior Station Officer respectively, whereas a Senior Inspector of C&E is a Unit Commander who takes charge of several Inspectors in his formation; and a Principal Officer in CSD is in a similar position. He is usually a section head in charge of three Officers and a number of Assistant Officers in a correctional institution. Such a cross-service comparison can be made all the way up the rank structure, and would include comparing the Senior Superintendent in CSD and Senior Superintendent of C&E with the Deputy Chief Fire Officer (currently D1) in FSD. We do not propose to recommend such an equation for salary determination purposes, because we are not satisfied that so very drastic a change can be fully justified; but we are satisfied that some changes are required.

5.19 One proposal put to us was to extend to C&E the present "through-scale" arrangements applicable in the police and fire services, under which the Officer entrant can progress to the next rank (Senior Inspector, Senior Station Officer) by seniority alone, without being successful in achieving promotion. We have no proposal to disturb this arrangement in the police and fire services, where it is well-established and valued; but we do not think it would be desirable to introduce it elsewhere.

5.20 We have considered the implications of this very carefully, and concluded that the initial step should be to extend the incremental scale for Officers of CSD and Inspectors of C&E by two points, and to make further adjustments for the next most senior ranks to reflect this change and our view that their range of responsibilities merits a higher placing on the pay scales. We have been limited in what we think it right to propose by the rank structure and the scales applicable to staff at the

Directorate level, to which we have felt able to make only a very limited adjustment. We think what we have done is a step in the right direction, and recommend that further adjustments should be considered by the Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service (SCDS) in the light of the job evaluation work that we propose they should set in train to establish appropriate remunerations for staff at the Directorate level. Against that background, **we recommend** the following pay scales for Officers in CSD and C&E :-

Officer, Industrial Officer & Inspector (C&E))))	GDS(O) 6-20
Principal Officer, Principal Industrial Officer & Senior Inspector (C&E))))	GDS(O) 21-25
Chief Officer, Chief Industrial Officer & Assistant Superintendent (C&E))))	GDS(O) 26-31
Superintendent (CSD), Superintendent of CS Industries & Superintendent (C&E)))))	GDS(O) 32-35
Senior Superintendent (CSD) & Senior Superintendent (C&E)))	GDS(O) 36-38

It should be noted that in our recommendation, GDS(O)38 is exclusively for Senior Superintendent of CSD and Senior Superintendent of C&E. This must be seen as an interim measure. Should the rank structure in either service be changed, the need for the measure we propose here must be critically reviewed, preferably by the proposed SCDS. We do not rule out the possibility of, for example, aligning the Senior Superintendent (CSD) to the Senior Divisional Officer (FSD) again in the event that a new rank of Chief Superintendent is created in CSD.

GDS(C) pay scale

5.21 Like the directorate officers in the rest of the civil service, the Senior Commanders in the GDS should have a separate pay scale. **We recommend** therefore, the introduction of a new scale, General Disciplined Services (Commander) Pay Scale (GDS(C)). In line with our recommendations in Chapter 4, **we recommend** the following pay scales :-

GDS(C)1 - \$37000	Deputy Chief Fire Officer General Manager (Correctional Services Industries)
GDS(C)2 - \$41750	Chief Fire Officer Chief Ambulance Officer Assistant Commissioner of Correctional Services Assistant Commissioner of Customs & Excise Assistant Director of Immigration
GDS(C)3 - \$48500	Deputy Director of Fire Services Deputy Commissioner of Correctional Services Deputy Commissioner of Customs & Excise Deputy Director of Immigration
GDS(C)4 - \$58150	Director of Fire Services Commissioner of Correctional Services Commissioner of Customs & Excise Director of Immigration

Incremental jumps

5.22 We have examined the relevant and most recent statistics on recruitment and wastage in the GDS. In the FSD, there have been problems in recent years at the Station Officer/Senior Station Officer and Ambulanceman ranks. Decidedly fewer qualified candidates have been coming forward for appointment as Station Officers. In the case of Ambulanceman, there has been a substantial drop over recent years in applications received and in the number of qualified candidates. In the CSD, there has been a decline in the number of applications, and in the numbers and percentages of applicants invited and turning up for interview indicating a drop in the number of suitable applicants and a declining interest in the job. In the C&E, dramatic decline in 1987-88 has brought the numbers of applications for Customs Officer to below 1979-80 levels. Figures on recruitment of Immigration Assistants show a gradual decline in all areas and the 1987-88 situation appears to be the worst so far. To help overcome recruitment (and early wastage) problems **we recommend** that there should be a one-year incremental jump after a new recruit has completed his first year's service for all the entry ranks in the few departments. These arrangements, as set out in detail in **Annex 5**, are in line with those proposed for PC and IP in Chapter 4.

5.23 As regards wastage, there has been an increase in the resignation of experienced rank and file and officers in all the GDS which has caused us considerable concern. **We find it justifiable to recommend** the provision of a second

incremental jump, like that for the PC, for Firemen, Ambulancemen and Assistant Officers II who have passed their respective qualifying examination for promotion and have completed 5 years' service or more. Similar arrangements might be considered for C&E and the Immigration Service if qualifying examinations are adopted in future.

Long service increments

5.24 We endorse the need to improve the morale of long serving and loyal rank and file who remain in the basic rank for more than 18 years. The provision of long service increments, after 18 and 25 years respectively, for the lowest entry rank in each service is therefore preserved in the GDS(R) pay scales. We have considered whether the same principle should apply to other ranks but are unable to find sufficient evidence to support any change.