

GOVERNMENT OF ANGUILLA

**JOB REGRADING PROJECT
2007**

REPORT

DECEMBER 2007

GOVERNMENT OF ANGUILLA

JOB REGRADING PROJECT 2007

JOB REGRADING TEAM

Mr Kenneth Banks	Retired Permanent Secretary	Chairman
Mr Fabian Fahie	Retired Permanent Secretary	Deputy Chairman
Ms Valarie Hodge	Deputy Director, HRM	Member
Mrs Serene Carter-Davis	Quality Assurance Office, MSD	Member
Mr Alkins Rogers	Director of Sports	Member
Mr Dwayne Adams	Technical Teacher	Member
Mrs Aphrodite Fleming	Executive Secretary	Administrative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. INTRODUCTION

- Background
- The Assignment
- The Need For Re-Grading

3. RE-GRADING EXERCISE

- Outline Of The Process Adopted
- Assistance To Departments

4. RESULTS

5. REVISION OF JOB EVALUATION MANUAL

- Job Evaluation Procedures
- Challenge Procedures
- The Job Evaluation Committee
- Authority
- Membership

6. THE RAY DURRANT REPORT 2005

- Link Between Ray Durrant And Current Job Re-Grading Exercise
- Coordinator Special Needs And Literacy Coordinator In Education
- Travel Allowances
- Pay And Reward Policy, Strategy And Procedures
- Additional Issues Considered
- System Of Progression To Grade
- Officers Appointed/Promoted Without Benchmark Qualifications
- Officers Appointed To Posts As “Appointees” Designate
- Retaining A Degree Of Pay Differential
- Reduction In Number Of Grades To 12
- Salary Decompression
- General Job Evaluation Exercises Every 3 Years

7. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- Re-grading Exercise
- The Ray Durrant Report 2005

APPENDICES

- A. Contract**
- B. Comparison 2005-2007**
- C. Results Sorted Alphabetically**
- D. Department Score Sheets**
- E. Job Evaluation Manual**

REPORT ON THE REGRADING OF JOBS IN THE ANGUILLA PUBLIC SERVICE 2007

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 In January 2007 the Department of Public Administration contracted a Team of six active and retired Public Servants to carry out a re-grading exercise of the jobs in the Anguilla Public Service, with administrative support provided by an officer from the Department of Public Administration.

The stated objectives of the exercise were to:

- i. Review the grading guidelines and procedures within the Civil Service, and recommend revisions and edits;
 - ii. Review job descriptions for each Ministry and Department of Government;
 - iii. Re-grade posts in the public service; and
 - iv. Review the conversion process of the Ray Durrant exercise.
- 1.2 This report now represents the collective work of the Team, which consisted of protracted meetings with all Permanent Secretaries and Heads of Department over a period of 10 months. All jobs were rated, graded or re-graded in the presence of representatives of the Ministries and Departments who were encouraged to be actively involved in the process.
- 1.3 The Anguilla Public Service (APS) has changed considerably since the last comprehensive re-grading exercise was carried out ten years ago. These changes which include: changes in personnel; more highly trained officers; organizational restructuring of the service agencies; and increased use of information technology in the work place and to a lesser extent in the delivery of services. These factors have combined to effect significant changes in job grades as reflected in this Report.
- 1.4 The proposed scores for most jobs have increased and many have been elevated to higher grades. The new demands of the service now require expansion of the middle management posts with increased training including degrees and professional qualifications. As a result the ranks of the management and professional jobs have increased. As the Public Sector continues

to be reformed this trend is expected to continue. A chart indicating the recommendations of the Team and the existing scores is provided for easy comparison.

- 1.5 During the exercise the Team was constantly reminded of the dissatisfaction within the service with many aspects of the Durrant Report especially the method of progressing into grade. While the team is aware of the difficulties which it was intended to address, it is evident that some officers are being disadvantaged by what is in our opinion a blanket approach. We are therefore recommending a more targeted approach, which addresses the area of appointment of staff without the minimum qualifications. We are of the opinion that in light of the economic performance of Anguilla in the years since the Durrant Report, this should not be a method of reducing the wage bill.
- 1.6 The Team found itself hampered in grading larger departments by the lack of headroom caused by the reduced number of grades. This was particularly evident in the Education Department which has many professional jobs and a steep pyramid structure. The reduction of grades implemented in keeping with the Durrant Report therefore needs to be reviewed.
- 1.7 In the process of the exercise the Team became well acquainted with the Job Evaluation Manual, its strengths and weaknesses. Generally we were pleased with the grading instrument but in reviewing the procedures there are some areas which we believe could be improved. Our proposals are included in a revised manual appended to the main document.

2. INTRODUCTION

Background

- 2.1 The current job evaluation model used in the Anguilla Public Service (APS) was first implemented in 1998, following the Government of Anguilla's (GOA) acceptance of the report and recommendations of human resource consultants, Charles Bobb-Semple and Stevenson Sarjeant on the evaluation of jobs in the Anguilla Public Service. The Semple-Sarjeant Report recommended the periodic evaluation, every two to three years, of all jobs in the Public Service to take account of changes in the relevant factors in the intervening period. It also recommended the appointment of a standing Job Evaluation Committee with significant autonomy to address challenges to job rating scores assessed for existing jobs, as well as to evaluate new jobs created during the intervals between APS wide job evaluation exercises. In practice, extensive use has been made of the Job Evaluation Committee since 1998, though with less autonomy than recommended by the consultants, serving primarily as a technical advisory committee on the rating and grading of jobs.
- 2.2 A general evaluation of all jobs in the Public Service in keeping with the Semple-Sarjeant recommendation should have taken place in or about 2000, following their 1997/98 evaluation. This did not happen. It was not until 2004, that a consultant, Mr. Ray Durrant, from the UK Government's Centre for Management and Policy Studies was commissioned to examine and make recommendations on the grading structure and system of allowances within the APS. The Terms of Reference for the Ray Durrant study, initially, also required the consultant to:

“devise a new job evaluation system and grading structure to incorporate existing allowances and to secure the existing strengths and eliminate weaknesses, without creating further complications, which could negatively impact the morale of officers. The new job evaluation system and the grading structure would be required to reflect the true worth of each position in the Public Service” (Annex B to Ray Durrant Report, page 2, sub-paragraph 5).

2.3 The requirement to devise a new Job Evaluation Scheme was dropped from the project prior to Mr. Durrant commencing work. Nevertheless, he reviewed the Semple-Sarjeant job evaluation model as adopted by the APS. In his report on the consultancy dated May 2005 he has this to say at Section 6, paragraph 6.3 of the Report:

“The scoping study and the subsequent detailed desk analysis identified the existence in the APS of a sound, modern, factor-based job evaluation system underpinned by a comprehensive and accurate set of job descriptions. The main building blocks were therefore in place and the work carried out by previous consultants in 1997/98 had provided a solid foundation for both grading and pay structures”.

2.4 The Durrant consultancy therefore was limited to addressing grades and the pay associated therewith and the system of allowances. Ray Durrant recognized the need for periodic general evaluations of all public service jobs. He also recognized the need for the process to be ongoing and continuous between general job evaluations. In his recommendations on pay and grading issues he states as follows at subsection 6.28:

“This review, like many others, had the benefit of hindsight, and a continuing theme of this report is the recognition that the absence of a formal process of evaluation and review was a major factor in undermining the strength of the position established by Bobb-Semple and Sarjeant in 1998. It might be foolish to repeat that omission this time around”.

The Assignment

2.5 The Deputy Governor’s Office and the Department of Public Administration, in 2006, a year after implementation of the recommendations in the Ray Durrant Report and after the award of a 10% salary increase, decided to commission a major exercise to re-grade (evaluate) all the jobs in the APS. It was decided further, to use the Semple-Sarjeant methodology and to employ resources available locally, knowledgeable and experienced in the use of the Semple-Sarjeant job evaluation instruments, to undertake the exercise. As a result, a six man team was assembled in December 2006 and commenced the review and rating of all jobs in the APS in January 2007 (See Appendix I). Originally slated to be completed in April 2007, the project proved to be more complex and involved than initially envisaged.

2.6 Terms of Reference were drawn up and agreed (See Appendix) the main focus of which were to review the job descriptions for the jobs within the APS and to rate and grade the jobs. The Team was encouraged and in practice found it appropriate to go beyond the strict text of the TORS and consider issues concerning implementation of the Ray Durrant recommendations. An area specifically singled out is the system of progression to grade, one of the key recommendations of the Report, which is causing dissatisfaction among some public officers who feel disadvantaged by it. In addition, issues such as the number of grades, the salary compression ratio, limitations in the application of the rating instruments to those departments in which professionals at various levels of education, training and experience undertake closely similar or the same duties.

The Need for Re-Grading

2.7 The need for a job re-grading exercise had become overdue by the end of 2006, when the Job Re-grading Team was constituted. Eight years had elapsed since the first service wide job evaluation and grading project using the Semple-Sarjeant job evaluation and grading model. Major changes taken place in the wider Anguillian job market in the eight years since 1998. The APS itself had undergone major transformation in a number of areas partly as a result of organizational transformation and development initiatives, arising from the wider public sector development project of which the 1997/98 job evaluation and grading exercise was a major programme component.

2.8 The main factors making the conduct of a job re-grading exercise an urgent priority include:

- i) significant growth and diversification in the APS leading to the need for new jobs, with new and more in depth knowledge and skills;
- ii) increased complexity of jobs, increased risks, responsibilities and authority in some jobs and reduced and revised responsibilities and authority in others;
- iii) introduction of new technologies, especially ICT;
- iv) introduction of revised and/or new management, administrative and operating procedures and methodologies, partly resulting from the requirements to operate with enhanced ICT, but also resulting from the need to deliver new or enhanced services and address new governance issues;
- v) institutional and organizational reform and development;

- vi) the need for more advanced levels of technical and experiential knowledge and skills to address the more complex issues of delivering the products and services produced by the APS and of administering the APS;
- vii) the establishment of outsourcing as a generally accepted means by which the GOA delivers some of its services and sources some of its needs;
- viii) continued corporatization of the public sector;
- ix) the new highly dynamic, competitive and fast paced private sector environment driven by massive foreign and domestic direct investment;
- x) the transformation of the GOA's fiscal position of a major fiscal deficit and severe fiscal limits at the beginning of the decade to significant and sustained fiscal surpluses, affordability and flexibility;
- xi) the lingering residual issues from implementation of the Semple-Sarjeant job evaluation project and the Durrant consultancy; and
- xii) the relative harmony in industrial relations in the APS and the need to preserve such an environment.

2.9 This job review and re-grading exercise could go a long way towards establishing the job evaluation system as a best practice within the APS and consolidating it as an ongoing process in the service. It commissioning is timely. Further delay in the conduct of a re-grading exercise most likely would have made the process much more complex and time consuming than this 2007 exercise.

3. RE-GRADING EXERCISE

Outline of the Process adopted

- 3.1 In carrying out the exercise, the Team adopted an open and participatory approach. During the grading of each Ministry or Department every effort was made to have the Permanent Secretary attend, the Head of Department and any senior staff members which the Ministry felt could make a contribution. It meant that on occasions as many as four members from the ministry and department concerned were present. During the grading of the Education Department the team ensured that the teachers union was represented.
- 3.2 While the final score was always the decision of the Team, every effort was made to seek the views and active participation of the personnel from the ministries present and ensure that they had a full understanding of the Team's reasoning in arriving at the individual factor scores.
- 3.3 While this participatory approach caused some delays in the process, it meant that the staff had a full appreciation of the process and mostly left feeling that their views were taken on board and the jobs graded fairly. Attendance by permanent secretaries, departmental heads and senior staff members also added significantly to their knowledge and understanding of the job rating and grading process and the rating and grading instruments.
- 3.4 The Team generally did not begin grading any ministry or department until it had a full appreciation of the role or mandate of the organization. This included:
 - i) an overview of any legislation which brought it (ministry or department) into being or gives its staff any unique authorities or responsibilities;
 - ii) current and future activities; and
 - iii) an understanding of the organization's structure.

- 3.5 Prior to grading each job the Job Descriptions (JDs) were reviewed. Checks were made for:
- i) compatibility with the mandate of the organization and its structure as understood;
 - ii) the integrity and internal logic of the JD document; and
 - iii) the consistency of language.

Philosophy of Team

- 3.6 In grading posts, the Team made a special effort to ensure the hierarchy of jobs, in keeping with the organization structure of the departments, was always maintained. Although this proved a challenge in the management grades in some departments, where highly specialized professionals reported to managers of a different discipline, we were able to arrive at suitable rationales to ensure the hierarchy was maintained in all but one case.
- 3.7 Contrary to earlier grading, the Team opined that for the three factors: Judgement and Creativity; Management Coordination and Control; and Responsibility for Decisions all Heads of Department (HODs) should be given at least 400 points. The team also agreed that all HODs should at least have mastery of the relevant subject area. Taken together these two decisions meant that no HOD fell any lower than grade C.

Problems/Challenges

- 3.8 During the exercise, the Team encountered many challenges which impacted negatively on the delivery of the project. Not the least of these was the **lateness of the preparation of the JDs**. The PS Public Administration's memorandum of October 2006 had requested that all JDs should be ready for 7th January 2007. By this date only a handful of departments had even begun the process. As a result it was not possible to begin grading until the middle of February. In fact many departments did not supply JDs until after the April 30th when the project was expected to be completed.
- 3.9 On several occasions when the Team met there were no documents available for grading. ***We recommend that prior to any subsequent re-grading exercise sufficient time be given***

to ministries to adequately prepare JDs so as to avoid unnecessary delays during the rating and grading process.

- 3.10 Even more disappointing and time consuming was the **inadequacy of the JDs** provided. In reviewing the documents it was very evident that some HODs were unfamiliar with the structure of JDs. This became more apparent in discussion with them during the grading process. This meant that many more hours had to be spent in revising and restructuring JDs than was envisaged at the start of the process. Several JDs had to be rejected and sent back to the department for complete restructuring. The most common mistake was the submission of JDs for management grades on non-management formats and *visa-versa*.

We recommend that staff in the ministries, especially HODs, be provided with training in the structure and preparation of JDs.

- 3.11 The **lack of clarity in Organization Structures** also caused some difficulty during the grading process. When referring to the organograms presented it was found on occasions that these were not in keeping with relationships identified by the staff present or the JDs available, as several reporting and supervisory relationships indicated on the charts were not reflected in the key job duties. Often senior staff presented a conflicting view of the hierarchy of the department. In fact on one occasion a senior post presented for grading, was not shown on the organization chart and in another, senior staff members were unaware that one of the staff members was designated a deputy head in the department. These ambiguities had to be resolved prior to finalizing grades and resulted in much time wasting.

We recommend that organization structures be regularly reviewed and updated to ensure that they are in keeping with the growth and development of the departments and the way they deliver services. .

- 3.12 Several **vacancies** now exist in the APS. Often in grading, it was noted that where senior posts were not filled, there was a tendency by some staff to ignore the role of these positions when making representation for the scope of subordinate positions, thereby inflating their worth. Often this oversight was also built into the JD causing an overlap of duties. It is noted that while vacancies exist some of the same departments continue to create new jobs in the same unit. The result was often that the value of current jobs was reduced. *We recommend that where efforts fail to recruit suitable candidates to fill vacancies over an extended period, departments should redesign existing jobs to cover these services. This may not be necessary where a completely new service is being introduced.*

3.13 The Team found itself involved quite often in the **naming of posts**. This was necessary to ensure that positions with the same or similar name in different departments carried the same level of responsibilities. An example of one such irregularity which occurred frequently was ‘Technologist’ and ‘Technician’. While the team endeavoured to place ‘Technologist’ in supervisory positions and ‘Technician’ in the lower and entry level positions, some departments used these names inter-changeably. There was also some irregularity in the use of the names ‘Manger’ and ‘Supervisor’. The post of Auditor in the various departments of the Ministry of Finance also comes to mind. The proliferation of names was also an issue in some departments where names were created to describe the exact task an officer carried out and not the more general functions. The results of this was that where it was possible to have similarly named posts in the department concerned, there were instead several differently named posts performing similar functions. As a consequence the flexibility afforded to the HOD to deploy staff on a daily basis is considerably limited. *We recommend that in an effort to maintain flexibility in the deployment of staff, posts’ names in departments should reflect common functions and not the specific duties or activities of the post.*

3.14 While we were generally impressed by the applicability and effectiveness of the **grading instruments**, there were times when we felt they did not do justice to some jobs. These were mainly in the area of professional jobs like teachers, and those where the safe keeping of money was involved. We are of the opinion that Teachers are disadvantaged by continuing the payment of non-pensionable allowances for Head of Year and Head of Department ALHCS. These duties should be included for grading. There is something to be said for creating a third instrument for the grading of professional jobs. The reduction of management grades from eight to six in the Durrant Report also meant there was lack of head room when grading senior jobs in larger Departments. *We recommend that the Ministry of Education consider creating Posts for Head of Year and Head of Department in the ALHCS. We also recommend that Government considers reinserting the two grades removed as a result of the Durrant report.*

3.15 The Team was well aware that there were **attempts at manipulating** the system to further the case for individual staff members. These attempts were often due to favouritism and nepotism. They were generally made after the grading of the department was completed. They took the form of:

- i) further (unsolicited by the Team) revisions to JDs;

- ii) special appeals; and
- iii) submission of JDs for totally new jobs not mentioned earlier.

It usually became apparent quite early in reviewing an unsolicited JD that there was someone in mind for filling the new post. It was often obvious that the negative impacts on the rest of the departments concerned were not carefully considered.

Assistance to Departments

- 3.16 In order to facilitate the job re-grading process, the Team conducted a seminar for all public servants to sensitize them to the objectives of the programme and the implementation of the process. At that meeting the team also offered to meet with individual departments to give advice on the preparation and review of documents. While only one Department took up the offer of a meeting, several others provided individual JDs for review.

Duration

- 3.17 The original period set for the conduct of the job re-grading exercise was three and a half months from January 2007 to April 17th 2007. In practice this period proved to be too short because the work involved was greater than initially estimated, a number of delays were experienced due to the slow pace at which JDs were submitted to the Team and the increased role of the team in ensuring that the JDs were prepared to satisfactory standards. The completion date was extended several times. In the final analysis the exercise was not completed until the end of October 2007, a period of ten months.

4. RATING AND GRADING/RE-GRADING RESULTS

The results of the review of JDs, rating, grading and re-grading of jobs are contained in the following Tables and documents appended to the text of this Report and forming the most important part of the Report and most significant output from the project:

Job Re-Grading Results JRC 2007			
	Positions	Score	Grade
A	Attorney General	1975	A
1900	Permanent Secretary CMO	1975	A
	Permanent Secretary EDICT	1975	A
	Permanent Secretary Education Sports & Youth & Culture	1975	A
	Permanent Secretary Finance	1975	A
	Permanent Secretary MICUAF	1975	A
	Permanent Secretary Public Administration	1975	A
	Permanent Secretary Social Development	1975	A
	Chief Education Officer	1850	B
B	Accountant General	1775	B
1875	Chief Engineer	1775	B
	Chief Medical Officer	1775	B
	Chief Parliamentary Counsel	1775	B
	Chief Statistician	1775	B
	Comptroller of Inland Revenue	1775	B
	Director Internal Audit	1775	B
	Director of Economic Planning	1775	B
	Director, Disaster Management	1775	B
	Director, HRM	1775	B
	Director, Information Technology	1775	B
	Director, Technology & Information Security, Public Utilities	1775	B *
	PAS Finance	1775	B
	Senior Crown Counsel	1775	B
	Comptroller of Customs	1750	B
	Director LSD	1750	B
	Chief Magistrate	1750	B
	Principal Assistant Secretary - Immigration, Labour, Lands & Planning	1750	B
	Principal Assistant Secretary - Internal Relations	1750	B
	Principal Planning Officer	1750	B
	Registrar Supreme Court	1750	B
C	Chief Fire Officer	1675	C
1675	Chief Project Officer	1675	C

	Director Construction & Housing	1675	C
	Director Environment	1675	C
	Airport Manager	1650	C
	Chief Immigration Officer	1650	C
	Chief Nursing Officer	1650	C
	Chief Probation Officer	1650	C
	Chief Veterinary Officer	1650	C
	Commissioner of Social Development	1650	C
	Director Information & Broadcasting	1650	C
	Director of Agriculture	1650	C
	Director of Fisheries	1650	C
	Director of Health Protection	1650	C
	Director of Library Services	1650	C
	Director of Sports	1650	C
	Director of Youth & Culture	1650	C
	Director Quality Management	1650	C
	Education Planner	1650	C
	Health Planner	1650	C
	Post Master General	1650	C
	Principal, ALHCS	1650	C
	Registrar Commercial Registry	1650	C
	Social Development Planner	1650	C
	Superintendent of Ports	1650	C
	Superintendent of Prisons	1650	C
	Water Engineer	1650	C
	Crown Counsel	1575	C
	Deputy Director, Public Admin	1575	C
	Deputy Director, Public Admin	1575	C
	Parliamentary Counsel/Crown Counsel	1575	C
	Coordinator Adult and Continuing Education	1550	C
	Deputy Accountant General	1550	C
	Deputy Comptroller of Customs	1550	C
	Deputy Principal Planning Officer	1550	C
	Magistrate/Deputy Registrar of High Court	1550	C
	Education Officer, Assessment Measurement & Testing	1550	C
	Education Officer, Curriculum	1550	C
	Education Officer, Multi-Professional	1550	C
	Education Officer, Primary/Pre-Primary	1550	C
	Labour Commissioner	1550	C
	Senior Engineer Roads & Drainage	1525	C
	Deputy Director, Information Technology (2 Posts)	1475	C

	Deputy Director, Internal Audit	1475	C
	Director National AIDS Programme	1475	C
D	Chief Building Inspector	1450	D
1450	Chief Electrical Inspector	1450	D
	Coordinator, TVET	1450	D
	Education Psychologist	1450	D
	Principal Primary	1450	D
	Rehabilitation & Development Coordinator- Prison	1450	D
	Deputy Principal	1425	D
	Probations Correctional Services Counselor -	1425	D
	Surveyor General Shipping	1425	D
	Budget Officer	1375	D
	Deputy Comptroller-Inland Revenue	1375	D
	Deputy Director Disaster Management	1375	D
	Press & Information Officer	1375	D
	Senior Planner (Development Control)	1350	D
	Administrative Services Manager/Financial Manager(MICU)	1350	D
	Deputy Director of Agriculture	1350	D
	Operations Engineer- Water	1350	D
	Principal Environmental Health Officer PEHO	1350	D
	Senior Quality Officer (Health Services)	1350	D
	Deputy Director - LSD	1350	D
	Water Lab Technologist	1350	D
	Coordinator PRU/WISE	1325	D
	Director/Deputy Commissioner Social Development	1325	D
	Reading Recovery Tutor	1325	D
	Statistician	1325	D
	Substance Misuse Therapist	1325	D
	Technical Officer Transport	1325	D
	Supervisor/Director Juvenile Care Centre	1300	D
	Buildings Engineer	1275	D
	Deputy Chief Fire Officer	1275	D
	Senior Analyst Programmer	1275	D
	Senior Communications Engineer	1275	D
	Senior Systems Engineer	1275	D
	Senior Project Officer	1275	D
	Careers Coordinator	1250	D
	Curriculum Officer	1250	D
	Deputy Airport Manager/Operations	1250	D
	Deputy Chief Immigration Officer	1250	D
	Deputy Director of Sports	1250	D
	Deputy Director, Fisheries and Marine Resources	1250	D

	Deputy Registrar Commercial Registry	1250	D
	Deputy Superintendent of Prisons	1250	D
	Finance Office Manager- Water	1250	D
	Marine Biologist	1250	D
	Senior School Health Nurse	1250	D
	Social Worker Court Services- Judicial	1250	D
E	Assistant Chief Surveyor	1225	E
1225	Chief of Port Security	1225	E
	Deputy Post Master General/ Operations	1225	E
	Deputy Post Master General/ Sales & Marketing	1225	E
	Deputy Principal Primary	1225	E
	Ports Manager	1225	E
	Coordinator Conservation Education	1175	E
	Education & Training Officer	1175	E
	Human Resource Information Systems Officer	1175	E
	Air & Sea Ports Facilities Manager	1150	E
	Architectural Officer	1150	E
	Assistant Comptroller of Customs	1150	E
	Chief Information Officer	1150	E
	Deputy Director of Library Services	1150	E
	Deputy Director of Youth & Culture	1150	E
	Guidance Counselor Education	1150	E
	Land Information Systems Administrator	1150	E
	Marketing & Communications Officer -Agriculture	1150	E
	Programme Manager DIB	1150	E
	Reference Librarian	1150	E
	Coordinator Environment and Sustainable Development	1150	E
	Senior Geographical Information Systems Officer	1150	E
	Surveillance Officer Health Services	1150	E
	Testing & Measurement Officer Education	1150	E
	Vehicles Superintendent	1150	E
	Accountant Treasury	1125	E
	Auditor (Inland Revenue)	1125	E
	Design Engineer Roads	1125	E
	Fire Station Officer	1125	E
	Senior Social Worker	1125	E
	Speech Therapist Education	1125	E
	Trade & Investment Officer	1125	E
	Commerce Officer	1100	E
	Graduate Teacher	1100	E
	Senior Air Traffic Control Officer	1100	E
	Analyst Programmer	1075	E
	Business Process Analyst	1075	E

	Communications Engineer	1075	E
	Emergency Communications Officer	1075	E
	Finance Officer	1075	E
	National AIDS Programme Officer	1075	E
	Programme Officer Disaster Management	1075	E
	Project Officer Finance	1075	E
	Senior Internal Auditor	1075	E
	Superintendent of Buildings	1075	E
	Systems Engineer	1075	E
	Admin Services Manager/ Office Manager Judicial	1050	E
	Assistant Superintendent/Training Development Officer Prison	1050	E
	Building Inspector	1050	E
	Debt Officer	1050	E
	Deputy Labour Commissioner	1050	E
	Electrical Inspector	1050	E
	Enforcement Officer -Planning	1050	E
	Office Manager CMO	1050	E
	Planner	1050	E
	Prison Correctional Services Counselor	1050	E
	Quality Officer (Health Services)	1050	E
	Senior Environmental Health Officer SEHO	1050	E
	Agronomist	1050	E
	Horticulturist	1050	E
	Live Stock Officer	1050	E
	Plant Protection Officer	1050	E
F	Specialist Teacher II	1025	F
1025	Technically Trained Teacher III	1025	F
	Auditor (Treasury)	975	F
	Clerk to Executive Council	975	F
	Operations Manager Treasury	975	F
	Accounts Supervisor – Post Office	950	F
	Community Planning Officer	950	F
	Education Welfare Officer	950	F
	Geographical Information Systems Officer-Planning	950	F
	Prison Tutor	950	F
	Programme Officer - Sports	950	F
	Senior Juvenile Care Worker	925	F
	Senior Probation Officer	925	F
	Social Worker	925	F
	Specialist Teacher I	925	F
	Technically Trained Teacher II	925	F
	Clerk to House of Assembly	900	F
	School Nurse	850	F

	Assistant Registrar LSD	825	F
	Deputy Chief Port Security	825	F
	Environmental Health Officer EHO	825	F
	Fire Sub Officer	825	F
	Intake Officer Social Development	825	F
	Land Surveyor	825	F
	Principal Immigration Officer	825	F
	Senior Statistical Officer	825	F
	Programme Officer - Culture	800	F
	Programme Officer - Youth	800	F
	Roads Inspector	800	F
	Taxpayers Services Supervisor	800	F
	Tax Collections Supervisor	800	F
	Internal Auditor	775	F
	Vehicles Technologist	750	F
G	Air Traffic Control Officer III	392	G
392	Senior Customs Officer	382	G
	Senior Immigration Officer	373	G
	Reading Recovery Teacher/ Certificated Teacher II	372	G
	Sergeant Port Security	369	G
	Magistrate's Court Clerk	357	G
	Executive Assistant	355	G
	Distribution Foreman/Supervisor (Water)	350	G
	Judicial Executive Assistant	348	G
	Senior Labour Officer	346	G
	Senior Systems Technician	343	G
	Enforcement Compliance Officer IRD	339	G
	Information Officer	338	G
	Principal Prison Officer	338	G
	Supervisor Postal Services	337	G
	Technically Trained Teacher I	337	G
	Land Information Systems Technician	331	G
	Leading Firefighter	331	G
	Planning Technician Development Control	331	G
	Planning Technician Development Planning	331	G
	Water Inspector/ Service Connection Supervisor	328	G
	Roads Technician	325	G
	Probation Officer	321	G
	Acorn Administrative Officer	320	G
	Sigtas System Administrator IRB	319	G
	Statistical Officer	318	G
	Naturalisation Processing Officer	317	G
	Senior Land Registration Officer	317	G

	Bursar, ALHCS	315	G
	Court Reporter	315	G
	Air Traffic Control Officer II	313	G
	Court Administration & Registration Officer	313	G
	Passport Officer	313	G
	Information & Broadcasting Technician	312	G
	Sales & Marketing Officer DIB	312	G
	Certificated Teacher	309	H
H	Senior Vector Control Officer	309	H
310	Snr Survey Technician/Snr Survey Assistant	309	H
	Customs Officer	305	H
	Roads Inspector	305	H
	Principal Cashier	304	H
	Veterinary Assistant	304	H
	Water Lab Technician	303	H
	Fisheries Officer	301	H
	Finance Administrator Police	299	H
	Environment Officer	297	H
	Senior Announcer	297	H
	Valuation Officer LSD	297	H
	High Court Clerk	296	H
	Air Traffic Control Officer I	294	H
	Administrative Officer	293	H
	Executive Secretary	293	H
	Immigration Officer II	293	H
	Agricultural Assistant	292	H
	Senior Library Assistant	290	H
	Juvenile Care Worker	288	H
	Accounts Officer Postal	287	H
	Research Officer Fisheries	287	H
	Payroll Officer	285	H
	Prison Officer	285	H
	Senior Postal Officer	284	H
	Resource Centre Technician	283	H
	Tax Officer II	283	H
	Vehicle Inspections Foreman	281	H
	Steel Pan Instructor	277	J
J	Accounts Officer II (Bank)	274	J
280	Corporal - Port Security	273	J
	Intellectual Property Officer	273	J
	Accounts Officer - Public Admin	272	J
	Headman - Agriculture	272	J

	Bailiff	270	J
	Assistant Customs Officer	269	J
	Uncertificated Teacher	268	J
	Sales Officer Post Office	267	J
	Environmental Health Assistant	266	J
	Technical Assistant/Water Quality	266	J
	Physical Education Instructor	265	J
	Systems Technician I	265	J
	Help Desk Administrator	262	J
	Communications Officer	262	J
	Accounts Officer/Snr Accounts Clerk (Ledger)	261	J
	Community Service (Outreach) Officer	257	J
	Labour Officer	256	J
	Piers & Harbour Master	256	J
	Survey Assistant/Survey Technician	253	K
K	Land Registration Officer	253	K
255	Accounts Payable Officer	253	K
	Statistical Assistant	252	K
	Accounts Officer/Snr Clerical Officer- Soc Dev	251	K
	Senior Clerical Officer	251	K
	Data Maintenance Technician Fisheries/LSD	247	K
	Vector Control Officer	245	K
	MET Officer	241	K
	Assistant Building Technician	240	K
	Assistant Electrical Technician	240	K
	Assistant Planning Technician	240	K
	Technical Assistant DOI	239	K
	Aeronautical Information Systems Officer	238	K
	Assistant Information Officer DIB	238	K
	Public Records & Data Officer (Court)	238	K
	Cashier - IRD	237	K
	Cashier Soc Dev	237	K
	Collection Officer IRD	237	K
	Judicial Clerical Officer	235	K
	Announcer	231	K
	Systems Technician II	228	L
L	Firefighter	225	L
230	Clerk of Works - Water	222	L
	Assistant Valuation Officer LSD	219	L
	Immigration Officer I	219	L
	Security Officer	217	L
	Tax Officer I	212	L

	Acorn Administrative Assistant	210	L
	Laboratory Technician Education	210	L
	Teaching Assistant	210	L
	Pension Clerk	204	L
	Social Security Clerk	204	L
	Postal Officer	202	L
	Taxpayer Assistant IRD	199	L
	Library Assistant	194	L
	Data Entry Clerk Immigration	190	M
M	Office Attendant	190	M
-190	Postal Assistant	189	M
	Accounts Payable Clerk	188	M
	Customs Guard	188	M
	Clerical Officer	186	M
	Telephone Operator/Receptionist	186	M
	Vehicle Inspections Officer	183	M
	Fisheries & Research Assistant	161	M
	Library Attendant	148	M

5. REVISION OF JOB EVALUATION MANUAL

Job Evaluation Procedures

- 5.1 The Team found the established procedure for the revision and rating of jobs to be largely reliable and transparent. It ensures that the jobs being evaluated are adequately reflected in the JD document and fairly weighted in their positions in the ministries and departments.

Challenge Procedures

- 5.2 It is suggested that (iv) under the Challenge Procedures in the Job Rating Manual be amended to read as follows: ***“Where either the departmental head or employee representative disagrees with the consideration, the matter is referred to the Job Evaluation Committee (JEC) for resolution. The Job Evaluation Committee reserves the right to invite the holder of the job in question to again state his/her case before the final revision”***.

The Job Evaluation Committee

Authority

- 5.3 The Manual should be amended to explicitly state that the JEC is empowered to recommend amendments to organizational charts.
- 5.4 There is a need for revisions to some departments’ organizational charts to reflect the changes made during the grading process. As of now this remains the responsibility of the

departments.

- 5.5 Point (v) under Authority of the JEC should be amended to include “*Job Duties*”.
- 5.6 The Manual should also be modified to give the JEC responsibility to educate the public servants who attend job rating sessions of the JEC into the application of the *Rating Process* and use of the *Rating Document*.

Membership

- 5.7 It is recommended that there be an addition to the sub-section on Membership to address the removal of members from the Job Evaluation Committee.

6. THE RAY DURRANT REPORT 2005

- 6.1 Mr. Ray Durrant of the British Government's Centre for Management and Policy Studies was contracted to review and make recommendations on the existing system of job grades and pay scales and to review the system of allowances paid in the APS. The exercise took place over the period September 2004 to April 2005. His report entitled "The Revision of Salary Grades of Public Officers: Final Report on Review Carried out Between September 2004 and April 2005" was presented in May 2005. It was adopted by the Government and its main recommendations on changes to the grading system, the consolidation of Responsibility and Inducement Allowances into basic pay and the abolition of Duty Allowance without consolidating it into basic pay were approved and implemented.
- 6.2 Mr. Durrant's Report made a number of recommendations that have not yet been implemented. They include:
- i) giving consideration to the development of a pay and reward strategy for the APS, which includes provisions for linking pay to performance;
 - ii) development and implementation of a regular process of pay review as part of a reward strategy; and
 - iii) re-evaluation (as soon as possible) of the posts of Coordinator of Special Needs and Coordinator of Literacy in the Education Department.
- 6.3 The recommendation for the abolition of the system of Travel Allowances, however, did not receive the GOA's approval, although it was agreed that significant reform and updating of the existing system of Travel Allowances were necessary and overdue. As such therefore, Durrant's recommendation for the abolition of the present system of Travel Allowance and the design and implementation of a new system was not implemented. Instead, significant reforms and the updating of the existing system of Travel Allowances were introduced quite recently, in October 2007.

Link between Ray Durrant and current Job Re-Grading Exercise

6.3 The current job re-grading project undertaken by the Job Regrading Team 2007, is consistent with the Durrant recommendation that a regular process of job and pay review needs to be adopted. To institutionalize the process so that it becomes part of the regular operating mechanism of human resource management in the Public Service, a policy decision, basic terms of reference and procedural guidelines for putting such reviews into motion, would seem to be necessary. Durrant specifically draws attention in his report to the negative impact of failure to keep the system of grades under regular review every 24 months or so. Such grade, scale and pay reviews can only be beneficial if they are part of a larger review which includes the re-evaluation and rating of jobs to take account of changes that affect the relative value of a job to the Public Service in the periods between reviews. Mr. Durrant's work did not include the re-evaluation and rating of jobs to confirm the grades they are in or to determine the grades to which they should migrate. The Job Regrading Team 2007 was commissioned to undertake this exercise. This exercise has implications for the number of grades in the system and the extent to which the various jobs can be readily accommodated within the system of grades. Consideration has to be taken of job differentiation, the deepening of organizational hierarchies within departments and the Public Service as a whole, as opposed to reducing the number of grades and the flattening of the departmental and ministry organizations in the middle and upper levels of these hierarchies.

Coordinator Special Needs and Literacy Coordinator in Education

6.4 The recommendation that the posts of Coordinator of Special Needs and Coordinator of Literacy be re-evaluated should have been addressed in the process of reviewing the grades for the jobs in the Education Department, as part of the current re-grading project. However, the Education Department has to first settle the principle of making these jobs established jobs rather than seeing them as responsibilities that should be rotated. To the extent that the Education Ministry and Department feels that its current approach is still preferable, the status quo will remain. However, the Team has come to the view that making these jobs established positions would make them more attractive to eligible teachers and help to deepen and broaden the professional opportunities for teachers. As such therefore they fell within the Team's scope of work. The Education Ministry and Department did not, however, present these jobs for rating and grading.

- 6.5 *It is recommended that the Education Ministry and Department revisit their present policy that treats the Coordinator Special Needs and Literacy Coordinator jobs as special responsibilities that are rotated between competent educators with the requisite knowledge, skills and experience and consider converting these positions into jobs in the establishment.*

Travel Allowances

- 6.6 Relatively slow progress was made on preparations for reform of the system of Travel Allowances, since Mr. Durrant's Report of 2005. That work now has been completed, and the current system has been improved and brought up to date as of October 2007. This means that the basic structure in place for at least three decades will be maintained. The new rates have substantially removed the disadvantages suffered by Public Officers, who in effect subsidized the GOA's transportation costs by using their vehicles at the low rates of Travel Allowance. These rates had been reduced some 15 years ago in 1993 and had never been restored to their 1992 levels. The view of the Team is that the reform of the system is preferable to Durrant's recommendation to abolish it and replace it with a new system as recommended by him. However, the Team has not been able to study the system reforms in detail and is not in a position to comment further.

Pay and Reward Policy, Strategy and Procedures

- 6.7 *A pay and reward strategy will require careful consideration. Expert input and advice should be sought from a seasoned professional, specialized in advising on and implementing pay and reward systems and strategies. This should be addressed as soon as possible.*

Additional Issues Considered

- 6.8 The Team has come to the view that the performance of its mandate requires that it reviews and makes recommendations on:
- i) the system and experience of progression to grade implemented on the recommendation of the Ray Durrant Report;
 - ii) the impacts of the reduction in the number of grades from 18 to 12 and the proposed further reduction by up to two additional grades;
 - iii) the salary compression ration of 4:1;

- iv) policy and procedures for the institutionalization of periodic APS wide job evaluation (rating and grading) exercises and for a system of continuous job evaluation to enable the rating and grading of jobs in between the conduct of the service wide exercises; and
- v) periodic salary reviews every two to three years in conjunction with job evaluation exercises.

System of Progression to Grade

6.9 The Team's TORS specifically mandated them to review "the conversion process (from the old to the new grades) recommended by Mr. Durrant and implemented since 2005, particularly in relation to promotions to a new grade." This is therefore a primary focus of the review of the Ray Durant report and recommendations on from his 2004-05 re-grading consultancy.

6.10 A System of Progression to Grade is the strategy recommended by Mr. Durrant and implemented in the Public Service to effect the transition and assimilation of jobs from the Semple-Sarjeant 18 grade system to the reduced Durrant 12 grade system. The Durant Report does not clearly and unequivocally clarify the rationale and objectives of the progression system as recommended and deployed in the Service. It has been deduced however, that considerations included:

- i) The need to keep down the immediate and direct cost of adjusting salaries and to restrict the add-on cost effects on the GOA's budget over the medium term;
- ii) The ability of the GOA to fund the costs of the adjustments and at the same time fund a salary increase, given the fiscal difficulties of the preceding seven years (1998 – 2005) that rendered the GOA unable to award a general salary increase for Public Officers until 2005;
- iii) Payment of salary to officers appointed to posts with less than the bench mark qualifications, at less than the minima of the grades, until they obtain the requisite bench mark qualifications;
- iv) Payment of salary less than the minima of the grades to officers appointed to posts as "appointees" designate, pending their completion of training and/or internship specific to the duties and functions of the posts prior to assuming their duties in full;

- v) Maintenance of a degree of pay differential between posts that previously were in different grades and between incumbents in the same posts but for different periods of time, reflected in their pay differentials prior to implementing the Ray Durant. Report.
- 6.11 It appears from anecdotal evidence that there is considerable dissatisfaction among a significant number of Public Officers about the System of Progression to Grade and how it has affected them individually. Not all officers are affected and those who have been affected have been impacted to varying degrees. It is difficult therefore to make specific recommendations on changes to the system or for the replacement of the system, without a thorough examination of its workings and the variations in its impact on officers depending on the circumstances of their appointments to the positions they hold. What is also of concern is that new entrants to the service are also significantly impacted. The Team did not have the time to undertake a detailed examination of the system. This notwithstanding, account should be taken of the significant improvement in the GOA's fiscal position, in the last four years, and of the requirement placed on the Durrant consultancy to seek to fix major deficiencies in the Semple-Sarjeant system as implemented, without creating significant new challenges or worsening existing deficiencies in the system. Steps should be taken in this regard to address and correct the problematic areas of the System of Progression to Grade, whether by reforming or replacing it.
- 6.12 *It is recommended that specific work be undertaken to review the System of Progression to Grade in keeping with Mr. Durrant's recommendation that implementation of his recommendations be evaluated at least 24 months after implementation. The review should consider the System's strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations to consolidate the strengths and address the weaknesses.*
- 6.13 The GOA since 2004 has enjoyed a healthy fiscal balance, which it appears, will continue for the foreseeable future. The particularly difficult fiscal straights of 2001 to 2003 no longer exist. They strongly influenced the consultant's approach to determining the cost that the GOA could afford to pay for the 2005 salary adjustment arising from the regarding of jobs and the pure salary increase granted by the GOA. It is appropriate therefore to consider reforming or replacing the progression system taking into account the new and favourable fiscal reality (20% across the board increase in 2007) and the prospects for long run fiscal sustainability.

Officers appointed/promoted without Benchmark Qualifications

- 6.14 There is some merit in starting officers appointed to posts without the benchmark qualifications at salaries several points below the minimum salary of the grade as an interim measure, provided specific action is taken to ensure that the officers are given access to the requisite training required to achieve the minimum benchmark within a given period. Failure to obtain the benchmark qualification within the stipulated period would pose other challenges for which policy would need to be clearly and carefully enunciated.
- 6.15 *It is recommended that provision is retained for officers without the benchmark qualifications to start below the minimum of the grade of the post and to progress to the minimum on acquiring the requisite qualification or otherwise satisfying the minimum requirements for the post by an alternative approved route.*

Officers Appointed To Posts As “Appointees” Designate

- 6.16 There is also merit in a system of appointments and promotions that has provision under certain circumstances starts persons appointed to a post as “appointees” designate, below the minimum of the grade until they assume in full the duties of the post to which they are appointed. In the past, some attempt was made to incorporate this into the human resource administration system, but it seems to have fallen into disuse in recent years.
- 6.17 *The recommendation is that the policy on and system of appointments and promotions should include provision for “appointees” designate to start below the grade minimum during their internship and specific preparatory training to assume in full the duties of the post.*

Retaining a Degree of Pay Differential

- 6.18 A policy should be introduced for maintaining a degree of pay differential between posts formerly in different grades but which end up in the same grade, as a result of a salary revision and a reduction in the number of grades in the APS. It should also address the situation of incumbents who were at different points in the same grade prior to the implementation of changes to the grading system. In the case of the implementation of the Ray Durrant grade reduction from 18 to 12 grades and the conversion to grade mechanism, some officers have been left significantly dissatisfied. Officers at the maximum of their grades prior to a salary

and/or grade revision also invariably present a challenging issue to be dealt so as to achieve minimal dissatisfaction. There are no magic formulae. It is felt that the staff representative associations might be able to help in finding mutually satisfactory resolutions to these issues that are fair and equitable and yet keep the system simple. There is a strong feeling of distributive injustice among some employees.

- 6.19 *The deficiencies in converting from an existing grading system to a revised system that place at a disadvantage officers, in post for some time, who meet the benchmark qualifications, or have been appointed to posts and commence their duties in full from the outset, need to be addressed and corrections made, in order to retain a degree of existing pay differential between incumbents, maintain the morale and enthusiasm of such officers at the highest levels and maintain or achieve distributive justice.*

Reduction in Number of Grades from 18 to 12

- 6.20 Mr. Durrant's considerations in recommending reducing the grades from 18 to 12 appear to have been focused on the distribution of the jobs in the Public Service in the various grades as they were in 2004 and early 2005. It does not appear that the likely impacts of the reduction were fully examined in relation to the changing circumstances of the Public Service, which at the time of the consultancy was already experiencing significant expansion, diversification and deepening. For example, the growing demands on some departments were already requiring the deepening of their organizations at the middle management and professional levels. In particular, the limitation of the number of Management and Professional grades to six, arising from implementing Mr. Durrant's recommended reduction for 18 to 12 grades has posed difficulties in the grading of some middle level management and professional jobs.
- 6.21 The Anguilla Public Service will become more complex in the medium to long term and will need more employees with varying levels of in depth professional and technical knowledge and skills as well as experience, within its ranks. The grading system needs to be flexible enough to cater for the variations in the levels of knowledge, skills and experience that will be required of various posts and the consequential compensation that will need to be associated therewith to achieve a significant degree of competitiveness with the private sector, sufficient to enable the GOA to attract and retain some of the "brightest and the best" talent available.

- 6.22 The grading system and salary scales that are based on it are also intended to provide incentives to officers to earn and to seek promotion to jobs in higher grades. Where junior and middle level management and professional grades are closely bunched together and are close to senior management and professional grades, with top management and professional grades not far off, the attractiveness to an officer of earning promotion to senior and top professional and management grades is significantly reduced. The compensation that goes along with shouldering the responsibility for managing departments and ministries; for recommending and formulating policy; and directing the planning and programming of the annual operations of departments and ministries, is being increasingly regarded as not attractive enough for it to be worthwhile in an officer's judgement to take on the additional stress and pressure of leading these sub-organizations within the Public Service.
- 6.23 Similar comments are applicable particularly to the top grades of the Non-management and Non-professional category of jobs. These are the grades in which great difficulty is being experienced in some departments to attract skilled technical and sub-professional persons to fill vital posts, such as various types of technicians in various technological, construction, processing, health care and similar fields. Perhaps an increase in the number of grades would provide additional flexibility to place senior technical and supervisory level officers into grades more closely related to the knowledge, skills and experience required by the jobs and the actual variations in the knowledge, skills and experience of incumbents and recruits.
- 6.24 *It is recommended that the number of grades be re-examined in light of practical difficulties encountered in placing recruits and incumbents into grades with salary scales that are competitive enough to attract and retain capable officers. After careful study favourable consideration should be given to increasing the number of grades.*
- 6.25 An increased number of grades would give greater flexibility in determining the rating and grading of posts, would enable and provide for the grading of jobs in the medium term to reflect the deepening of knowledge and skill levels in the Public Service taking into account the increased and diversified role of the Public Service in a rapidly developing and transforming Anguilla. It would also improve competitiveness with the private sector in recruiting and retaining quality talent at the sub-professional and supervisory (as well as the professional and management) levels.

Salary Decompression

- 6.26 It appears that Ray Durrant did not give due recognition to the underlying rationale for Semple-Sarjeant recommending across the board responsibility/inducement allowances for grades 1-4, of their system of grades, in his review of and recommendation regarding the compression ratio of 4:1. The recommendation was an effort on their part to achieve, in practical terms, the decompression of salaries paid to jobs in the highest grades and increase competitiveness with the private sector. By adding these allowances related to job duties and responsibilities and to competitiveness, that is the Responsibility/Inducement Allowances, they concluded that the GOA could attract the highly trained. At the same time they sought to recognize the GOA's budget constraint.
- 6.27 Durrant on the other hand, took into account only the basic pay in the Semple-Sarjeant grades. Semple-Sarjeant attempted to address what they perceived to be uncompetitive salaries in the upper echelons of the public service by recommending this interim solution, which in effect would have decompressed the ratio to 6:1 as correctly estimated by Durrant. This salary ratio of 6:1 over the years, has been lower than ratios for other public services in the Caribbean. An examination should be made of the extent to which ratios in other Caribbean public services have changed in recent times and the directions of the changes. The 4:1 ratio currently in the APS may therefore be even more divergent from the typical salary ratio in the Region.
- 6.28 Maintenance of the 4:1 ratio between the lowest and highest salaries in the system of grades in the APS, reflecting a relatively compressed salary range, is one of the factors accounting for the restriction on the ability to assign higher salary scales to technical and supervisory and middle management and professional grades. This is because the ceiling on the salaries of the highest paid jobs is relatively too low. This has caused the "bunching" together of salary scales for grades and jobs in the professional and management grades especially in departments where it has become necessary to implement greater degrees of job and grade differentiation based on job levels and duties, required knowledge and skills, judgement, creativity, management coordination, supervision and decision making.
- 6.29 *The salary compression ratio should be addressed in the next salary review exercise and steps taken to reduce the degree of compression by increasing the ratio from 4:1 to at least 5:1 and for the medium term not to exceed 6:1.*

General Job Evaluation Exercises every 3 Years and System Maintenance in between

- 6.30 *It is strongly recommended that APS wide job evaluation (rating and grading) exercises be conducted at least every three years.*
- 6.31 *It is also recommended that a standing Job Evaluation Committee (JEC) be institutionalized as an advisory committee with strong power of recommendation, along lines similar to the relationship of the decisions/recommendations of the Public Service Commission to the final decisions taken by the Deputy Governor in human resource matters, with the scope of the JEC's authority clearly defined and its procedures established.*

Salary Reviews every Three Years

- 6.32 The issue of officers at the top of their grades and scales being stuck can be partly addressed by periodic salary reviews and the award of general salary increases. In addition, consideration may be given to an element of cost of living adjustment on an annual basis, a proposal that has received some consideration in the past in addition to performance or merit increases. The existing system of annual increments functions as an automatic cost of living adjustment and not as a performance based incremental system.
- 6.33 *It is recommended that a salary review be undertaken at least every three years and subject to the Government's fiscal position and the inflation rate, salary increases be granted to the Service as a whole.*
- 6.34 *It is also recommended that the merits of a formal system of cost of living adjustments be investigated.*

Miscellaneous Recommendations

- 6.35 It is proposed that:
- i) *Managers and other personnel in departments be trained in writing job descriptions and in rating jobs;*
 - ii) *In the conduct of periodic general job evaluations in the future adequate time should be allotted and taken for ministries and departments to review, revise and/or prepare*

new job descriptions and for Public Administration to thoroughly review them before handing them over to the evaluation team for rating; and

- iii)** *Adequate time should also be allotted for the evaluation team to have a final check of job descriptions in determining the time necessary for the team to complete its rating and grading exercise.*

6.36 It is recommended that in relation to the Education Department:

- i) The application of the rating instruments to jobs in the Education Department be assessed and recommendations made for any variations to the instruments for purposes of applying them to such jobs; and*
- ii) Consideration be given to the feasibility of establishing a parallel but separate system for dealing with the teaching service to take account of the peculiar features of the teaching profession.*

7. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

REGRADING EXERCISE

7.1 *Recommendation 1 (Ref. 3.9)*

We recommend that prior to any subsequent re-grading exercise sufficient time be given to ministries to adequately prepare JDs so as to avoid unnecessary delays during the grading process.

7.2 *Recommendation 2 (Ref. 3.10)*

We recommend that staff in the ministries, especially HODs, be provided with training in the structure and preparation of JDs.

7.3 *Recommendation 3 (Ref. 3.11)*

We recommend that organization structures be regularly reviewed and updated to ensure that they are in keeping with the growth and development of the departments and the way they deliver services.

7.4 *Recommendation 4 (Ref. 3.12)*

We recommend that where efforts fail to recruit suitable candidates to fill vacancies over an extended period, departments should redesign existing jobs to cover these services. This may not be necessary where a completely new service is being introduced.

7.5 *Recommendation 5 (Ref. 3.13)*

We recommend that in an effort to maintain flexibility in the deployment of staff, posts' names in departments should reflect common functions and not the specific duties or activities of the post.

7.6 *Recommendation 6 (Ref. 3.14)*

We recommend that the Ministry of Education consider creating Posts for Head of Year and Head of Department in the ALHCS. We also recommend that Government considers reinserting the two grades removed as a result of the Durrant report.

REVISION OF JOB DESCRIPTION MANUAL

7.7 Recommendation 7 (Ref. 5.2)

It is suggested that (iv) under the Challenge Procedures be amended to read as follows: *“Where either the departmental head or employee representative disagrees with the consideration the matter is referred to the Job Evaluation Committee (JEC) for resolution. The Job Evaluation Committee reserves the right to invite the holder of the job in question to again state his/her case before the final revision”*.

7.8 Recommendation 8 (Ref. 5.3)

The Manual should be amended to explicitly state that the JEC is empowered to recommend amendments to organizational charts.

7.9 Recommendation 9 (Ref. 5.4)

There is a need for revisions to some departments’ organizational charts to reflect the changes made during the grading process. As of now this remains the responsibility of the departments.

7.10 Recommendation 10 (Ref. 5.5)

Point (v) under Authority of the JEC should be amended to include *“Job Duties”*.

7.11 Recommendation 11 (Ref. 5.6)

The Manual should also be modified to give the JEC responsibility to educate the public servants who attend job rating sessions of the JEC into the application of the *Rating Process* and use of the *Rating Document*.

7.12 Recommendation 12 (Ref. 5.7)

It is recommended that there be an addition to the sub-section on Membership to address the removal of members from the Job Evaluation Committee.

THE RAY DURRANT REPORT 2005

7.13 *Recommendation 13 (Ref. 6.5)*

It is recommended that the Education Ministry and Department revisit their present policy that treats the Coordinator Special Needs and Literacy Coordinator jobs as special responsibilities that are rotated between competent educators with the requisite knowledge, skills and experience and consider converting these positions into jobs in the establishment.

7.14 *Recommendation 14 (Ref. 6.7)*

A pay and reward strategy will require careful consideration. Expert input and advice should be sought from a seasoned professional, specialized in advising on and implementing pay and reward systems and strategies. This should be addressed as soon as possible.

7.15 *Recommendation 15 (Ref. 6.12)*

It is recommended that specific work be undertaken to review the System of Progression to Grade in keeping with Mr. Durrant's recommendation that implementation of his recommendations be evaluated at least 24 months after implementation. The review should consider the System's strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations to consolidate the strengths and address the weaknesses.

7.16 *Recommendation 16 (Ref. 6.15)*

It is recommended that provision is made for officers without the benchmark qualifications to start below the minimum of the grade and progress to the minimum on acquiring the requisite qualification or otherwise satisfying the minimum requirements for the post by an alternative approved route.

7.17 *Recommendation 17 (Ref. 6.17)*

The recommendation is that the policy on and system of appointments and promotions should include provision for "appointees" designate to start below the grade minimum during their internship and specific preparatory training to assume in full the duties of the post.

7.18 *Recommendation 18 (Ref. 6.19)*

The deficiencies in converting from an existing grading system to a revised system that places at a disadvantage officers, in post for some time, who meet the benchmark

qualifications, or have been appointed to posts and commence their duties in full from the outset, need to be addressed and corrections made, in order to retain a degree of existing pay differential between incumbents, maintain the morale and enthusiasm of such officers at the highest levels and maintain or achieve distributive justice.

7.19 Recommendation 19 (Ref. 6.24)

It is recommended that the number of grades be re-examined in light of practical difficulties encountered in placing recruits and incumbents into grades with salary scales that are competitive enough to attract and retain capable officers. After careful study favourable consideration should be given to increasing the number of grades.

7.20 Recommendation 20 (Ref. 6.29)

The salary compression ratio should be addressed in the next salary review exercise and steps taken to reduce the degree of compression by increasing the ratio from 4:1 to at least 5:1 and for the medium term not to exceed 6:1.

7.21 Recommendation 21 (Ref. 6.30)

It is strongly recommended that APS wide job evaluation (rating and grading) exercises be conducted at least every three years.

7.22 Recommendation 22 (Ref. 6.31)

It is also recommended that a standing Job Evaluation Committee (JEC) be institutionalized as an advisory committee with strong power of recommendation, along lines similar to the relationship of the decisions of the Public Service Commission to the final decisions/recommendations taken by the Deputy Governor in human resource matters, with the scope of the JEC's authority clearly defined and its procedures established.

7.23 Recommendation 23 (Ref. 6.33)

It is recommended that a salary review be undertaken at least every three years and subject to the Government's fiscal position and the inflation rate, salary increases be granted to the Service as a whole.

7.24 Recommendation 24 (Ref. 6.34)

It is also recommended that the merits of a formal system of cost of living adjustments be investigated.

7.25 Recommendation 25 (Ref. 6.35)

It is proposed that:

- i) Managers and other personnel in departments be trained in writing job descriptions and in rating jobs;**
- ii) In the conduct of periodic general job evaluations in the future adequate time should be allotted and taken for ministries and departments to review, revise and/or prepare new job descriptions and for Public Administration to thoroughly review them before handing them over to the evaluation team for rating; and**
- iii) Adequate time should also be allotted for the evaluation team to have a final check of job descriptions in determining the time necessary for the team to complete its rating and grading exercise.**

7.26 Recommendation 26 (Ref.6.34)

It is recommended that in relation to the Education Department:

- i) The application of the rating instruments to jobs in the Education Department be assessed and recommendations made for any variations to the instruments for purposes of applying them to such jobs; and**
- ii) Consideration be given to the feasibility of establishing a parallel but separate system for dealing with the teaching service to take account of the peculiar features of the teaching profession.**

APPENDIX

A

Contract

APPENDIX

B

Comparison 2006-2007

Job Re-Grading Comparison 2007 & JRC			
	Positions	Score	Score
		JRC	2007
A	Attorney General	1975	1975
1900	Permanent Secretary CMO	1975	1975
+	Permanent Secretary EDICT	1975	1975
	Permanent Secretary Educ Sports& Youth & Culture	1975	1975
	Permanent Secretary Finance	1975	1975
	Permanent Secretary MICUAF	1975	1975
	Permanent Secretary Public Administration	1975	1975
	Permanent Secretary Social Development	1975	1975
	Chief Education Officer	1850	1750
B	Accountant General	1775	1650
1875	Chief Engineer	1775	1675
	Chief Medical Officer	1775	1675
	Chief Parliamentary Counsel	1775	<i>New Job</i>
	Chief Statistician	1775	NS
	Comptroller of Inland Revenue	1775	NS
	Director Internal Audit	1775	1675
	Director of Economic Planning	1775	1675
	Director, Disaster Management	1775	NJ
	Director, HRM	1775	1675
	Director, Information Technology	1775	1675
	Director, Technology & Information Security, Public Utilities	1775	NJ
	PAS Finance	1775	1575
	Senior Crown Counsel	1775	1775
	Comptroller of Customs	1750	1650
	Director LSD	1750	1650
	Chief Magistrate	1750	1750
	PAS- Immigration, Labour, Lands & Planning	1750	<i>No Score</i>
	Principal Assistant Secretary - Internal Relations	1750	NS

	Principal Planning Officer	1750	1750
	Registrar Supreme Court	1750	1750
C	Chief Fire Officer	1675	NJ
1675	Chief Project Officer	1675	NJ
	Director Construction & Housing	1675	1675
	Director of Environment	1675	NS
	Airport Manager	1650	1325
	Chief Immigration Officer	1650	1550
	Chief Nursing Officer	1650	NJ
	Chief Probation Officer	1650	1450
	Chief Veterinary Officer	1650	1725
	Commissioner of Social Development	1650	1525
	Director Information & Broadcasting	1650	1475
	Director of Agriculture	1650	1450
	Director of Fisheries	1650	1450
	Director of Health Protection	1650	NJ
	Director of Library Services	1650	1425
	Director of Sports	1650	1650
	Director of Youth & Culture	1650	NS
	Director Quality Management	1650	NJ
	Education Planner	1650	1650
	Health Planner	1650	1650
	Post Master General	1650	1550
	Principal, ALHCS	1650	1650
	Registrar Commercial Registry	1650	1600
	Social Development Planner	1650	1650
	Superintendent of Ports	1650	1325
	Superintendent of Prisons	1650	1325
	Water Engineer	1650	1550
	Crown Counsel	1575	1575
	Deputy Director, Public Admin	1575	1225
	Deputy Director, Public Admin	1575	1375
	Parliamentary Counsel/Crown Counsel	1575	1575
	Coordinator Adult and Continuing Education	1550	1325
	Deputy Accountant General	1550	NJ
	Deputy Comptroller of Customs	1550	1450
	Deputy Principal Planning Officer	1550	1425
	Magistrate/Deputy Registrar of High Court	1550	NJ
	Education Officer, Assessment Measurement & Testing	1550	1550
	Education Officer, Curriculum	1550	1550

	Education Officer, Multi-Professional	1550	1650
	Education Officer, Primary/Pre-Primary	1550	1550
	Labour Commissioner	1550	1350
	Senior Engineer Roads & Drainage	1525	NJ
	Deputy Director, Information Technology (2 Posts)	1475	<i>Not Graded</i>
	Deputy Director, Internal Audit	1475	NJ
	Director National AIDS Programme	1475	1475
D	Chief Building Inspector	1450	1150
1450	Chief Electrical Inspector	1450	NJ
	Coordinator, TVET	1450	1350
	Education Psychologist	1450	1450
	Principal Primary	1450	1250
	Rehabilitation & Development Coordinator- Prison	1450	NJ
	Deputy Principal Campus B	1425	1525
	Probations Correctional Services Counselor -	1425	1425
	Surveyor General Shipping	1425	NJ
	Budget Officer	1375	1375
	Deputy Comptroller- Inland Revenue	1375	NJ
	Deputy Director Disaster Management	1375	NJ
	Press & Information Officer	1375	NG
	Senior Planner (Development Control)	1375	NJ
	Admin. Services Manager/Financial Manager(MICU)	1350	1050
	Deputy Director of Agriculture	1350	1125
	Deputy Director - LSD	1250	1450
	Operations Engineer- Water	1350	1250
	Principal Environmental Health Officer PEHO	1350	1325
	Senior Quality Officer (Health Services)	1350	NJ
	Water Lab Technologist	1350	1350
	Coordinator PRU/WISE	1325	NJ
	Director/Deputy Commissioner Social Development	1325	1250
	Reading Recovery Tutor	1325	1325
	Statistician	1325	1275
	Substance Misuse Therapist	1325	NJ
	Technical Officer Transport	1325	1325
	Supervisor/Director Juvenile Care Centre	1300	1300
	Buildings Engineer	1275	NJ
	Deputy Chief Fire Officer	1275	NJ
	Senior Analyst Programmer	1275	D
	Senior Communications Engineer	1275	NJ
	Senior Systems Engineer	1275	D

	Senior Project Officer	1275	NJ
	Careers Coordinator	1250	NJ
	Curriculum Officer	1250	1325
	Deputy Airport Manager/Operations	1250	1125
	Deputy Chief Immigration Officer	1250	950
	Deputy Director of Sports	1250	NJ
	Deputy Director, Fisheries and Marine Resources	1250	950
	Deputy Registrar Commercial Registry	1250	1200
	Deputy Superintendent of Prisons	1250	1050
	Finance Office Manager- Water	1250	1250
	Marine Biologist	1250	1450
	Senior School Health Nurse	1250	1250
	Social Worker Court Services (Judicial)	1250	NJ
	Assistant Chief Surveyor - E	1225	1050
E	Chief of Port Security	1225	327
1225	Deputy Post Master General/ Operations	1225	950
	Deputy Post Master General/ Sales & Marketing	1225	950
	Deputy Principal Primary	1225	1000
	Ports Manager	1225	1225
	Coordinator Conservation Education	1175	1175
	Education & Training Officer	1175	NJ
	Human Resource Information Systems Officer	1175	NG
	Air & Sea Ports Facilities Manager	1150	NJ
	Architectural Officer	1150	1350
	Assistant Comptroller of Customs	1150	1025
	Chief Information Officer	1150	NJ
	Deputy Director of Library Services	1150	1124
	Deputy Director of Youth & Culture	1150	1150
	Guidance Counselor Education	1150	1150
	Land Information Systems Administrator	1150	1050
	Marketing & Communications Officer -Agriculture	1150	NJ
	Programme Manager- DIB	1150	1150
	Reference Librarian	1150	800
	Coordinator Environment and Sustainable Development	1150	1150
	Senior Geographical Information Systems Officer	1150	NJ
	Surveillance Officer- Health Services	1150	NJ
	Testing & Measurement Officer Education	1150	NJ
	Vehicles Superintendent	1150	1075
	Accountant (Treasury)	1125	1225
	Auditor (Inland Revenue)	1125	875

	Design Engineer Roads	1125	<i>NJ</i>
	Fire Station Officer	1125	1125
	Senior Social Worker	1125	1050
	Speech Therapist	1125	1125
	Trade & Investment Officer	1125	1125
	Commerce Officer	1100	1100
	Graduate Teacher	1100	1125
	Senior Air Traffic Control Officer	1100	1000
	Analyst Programmer	1075	1075
	Business Process Analyst	1075	1075
	Communications Engineer	1075	<i>NJ</i>
	Emergency Communications Officer	1075	<i>NJ</i>
	Finance Officer	1075	1200
	National AIDS Programme Officer	1075	272
	Programme Officer- DM	1075	1075
	Project Officer- Finance	1075	1075
	Senior Internal Auditor	1075	1150
	Superintendent of Buildings	1075	1075
	Systems Engineer	1075	1075
	Admin Services Mnger/ Office Manager- Judicial	1050	<i>NG</i>
	Assistant Superintendent/Staff Training Development Officer	1050	825
	Building Inspector	1050	<i>NJ</i>
	Debt Officer- Finance	1050	<i>NG</i>
	Deputy Labour Commissioner	1050	950
	Electrical Inspector	1050	1025
	Enforcement Officer -Planning	1050	<i>NJ</i>
	Office Manager- CMO	1050	<i>NJ</i>
	Planner- Dept of Planning	1050	<i>NG</i>
	Prison Correctional Services Counselor	1050	<i>Revised</i>
	Quality Officer (Health Services)	1050	<i>NJ</i>
	Senior Environmental Health Officer (SEHO)	1050	900
	Agronomist	1050	1025
	Horticulturist	1050	1025
	Live Stock Officer	1050	1000
	Plant Protection Officer	1050	<i>NJ</i>
F	Specialist Teacher II	1025	1025
1025	Technically Trained Teacher III	1025	1025
	Auditor (Treasury)	975	875
	Clerk to Executive Council	975	328
	Operations Manager-Treasury	975	975

	Accounts Supervisor- Post Office	950	950
	Community Planning Officer	950	NJ
	Education Welfare Officer	950	1025
	Geographical Information Systems Officer	950	NJ
	Prison Tutor	950	NJ
	Programme Officer - Sports	950	950
	Senior Juvenile Care Worker	925	925
	Senior Probation Officer	925	950
	Social Worker	925	850
	Specialist Teacher I	925	825
	Technically Trained Teacher II	925	825
	Clerk to House of Assembly	900	NG
	School Nurse	850	950
	Assistant Registrar LSD	825	800
	Deputy Chief Port Security	825	NJ
	Environmental Health Officer EHO	825	255
	Fire Sub Officer	825	385
	Intake Officer Social Development	825	825
	Land Surveyor	825	800
	Principal Immigration Officer	825	-
	Senior Statistical Officer	825	800
	Programme Officer - Culture	800	800
	Programme Officer - Youth	800	800
	Roads Inspector	800	320
	Taxpayer Services Supervisor	800	NJ
	Tax Collections Supervisor	800	NJ
	Internal Auditor	775	750
	Vehicles Technologist	750	NJ
G	Air Traffic Control Officer III	392	392
392	Senior Customs Officer	382	324
	Senior Immigration Officer	373	297
	Reading Recovery Teacher	372	331
	Certificated Teacher II	372	331
	Sergeant Port Security	369	308
	Magistrate's Court Clerk	357	301
	Executive Assistant	355	299
	Distribution Foreman/Supervisor (Water)	350	292
	Judicial Executive Assistant	348	301
	Senior Labour Officer	346	303
	Senior Systems Technician	343	316
	Enforcement Compliance Officer IRD	339	39
	Information Officer	338	309

	Principal Prison Officer	338	276
	Supervisor Postal Services	337	301
	Technically Trained Teacher I	337	316
	Land Information Systems Technician	331	G
	Leading Firefighter	331	331
	Planning Technician Development Control	331	293
	Planning Technician Development Planning	331	293
	Water Inspector/ Service Connection Supervisor	328	287
	Roads Technician	325	NJ
	Probation Officer	321	321
	Acorn Administrative Officer	320	272
	Sigtas System Administrator	319	NJ
	Statistical Officer	318	314
	Naturalisation Processing Officer	317	317
	Senior Land Registration Officer	317	216
	Bursar, ALHCS	315	NG
	Court Reporter	315	337
	Air Traffic Control Officer II	313	313
	Court Administration & Registration Officer	313	NG
	Passport Officer	313	246
	Information & Broadcasting Technician	312	303
	Sales & Marketing Officer (DIB)	312	NG
	Certificated Teacher	309	303
H	Senior Vector Control Officer	309	NJ
310	Snr Survey Technician/Snr Survey Assistant	309	266
	Customs Officer	305	259
	Roads Inspector	305	NJ
	Principal Cashier	304	245
	Veterinary Assistant	304	312
	Water Lab Technician	303	NG
	Fisheries Officer	301	269
	Finance Administrator Police	299	
	Environment Officer	297	NJ
	Senior Announcer	297	303
	Valuation Officer LSD	297	279
	High Court Clerk	296	257
	Air Traffic Control Officer I	294	294
	Administrative Officer	293	272
	Executive Secretary	293	263
	Immigration Officer II	293	261
	Agricultural Assistant	292	292

	Senior Library Assistant	290	214
	Juvenile Care Worker	288	288
	Accounts Officer	287	293
	Research Officer Fisheries	287	287
	Payroll Officer	285	NJ
	Prison Officer	285	258
	Senior Postal Officer	284	<i>Revised</i>
	Resource Centre Technician	283	194
	Tax Officer II	283	NG
	Vehicle Inspections Foreman	281	NJ
	Steel Pan Instructor	277	NJ
J	Accounts Officer II (Bank)	274	247
280	Corporal Port Security	273	272
	Intellectual Property Officer	273	181
	Accounts Officer Public Admin	272	215
	Headman - Agriculture	272	219
	Bailiff	270	266
	Assistant Customs Officer	269	244
	Uncertificated Teacher	268	270
	Sales Officer Post Office	267	<i>Revised</i>
	Environmental Health Assistant	266	220
	Technical Assistant/Water Quality	266	222
	Physical Education Instructor	265	NJ
	Systems Technician I	265	NG
	Help Desk Administrator	262	NJ
	Communications Officer	262	NJ
	Accounts Officer/Snr Accounts Clerk (Ledger)	261	242
	Community Service (out reach) Officer	257	257
	Labour Officer	256	262
	Piers & Harbour Master	256	NJ
	Survey Assistant/Survey Technician	253	239
K	Land Registration Officer	253	204
	Accounts Payable Officer	253	247
	Statistical Assistant	252	230
	Accounts Officer/Snr Clerical Officer- Soc Dev	251	224
	Senior Clerical Officer	251	224
	Data Maintenance Technician (Fisheries/LSD)	247	247
	Vector Control Officer	245	199
	MET Officer	241	226
255	Assistant Building Technician	240	NJ

	Assistant Electrical Technician	240	NJ
	Assistant Planning Technician	240	184
	Technical Assistant DOI	239	250
	Aeronautical Information Systems Officer	238	226
	Assistant Information Officer	238	242
	Public Records & Data Officer	238	242
	Cashier IRD	237	234
	Cashier Soc Dev	237	234
	Collection Officer IRD	237	NJ
	Judicial Clerical Officer	235	224
	Announcer	231	229
	Systems Technician II	228	NJ
L	Firefighter	225	225
230	Clerk of Works - Water	222	222
	Assistant Valuation Officer LSD	219	197
	Immigration Officer I	219	216
	Security Officer	217	NG
	Tax Officer I	212	NG
	Acorn Administrative Assistant	210	228
	Laboratory Technician Education	210	L
	Teaching Assistant	210	197
	Pension Clerk	204	NJ
	Social Security Clerk	204	NJ
	Postal Officer	202	<i>Revised</i>
	Taxpayer Assistant (IRD)	199	199
	Library Assistant	194	179
	Data Entry Clerk (Immigration)	190	190
	Office Attendant	190	155
M	Postal Assistant	189	NJ
-190	Accounts Payable Clerk	188	188
	Customs Guard	188	175
	Clerical Officer	186	184
	Telephone Operator/Receptionist	186	M
	Vehicle Inspections Officer	183	NJ
	Fisheries & Research Assistant	161	183
	Library Attendant	148	157

APPENDIX

C

Scores Sorted Alphabetically

Job Re-Grading Alphabetically JRC 2007			
	Positions	Score	Grade
	Accountant General	1775	B
	Accountant Treasury	1125	E
	Accounts Officer	287	H
	Accounts Officer II (Bank)	274	J
	Accounts Officer Public Admin	272	J
	Accounts Officer/Snr Accounts Clerk (Ledger)	261	J
	Accounts Officer/Snr Clerical Officer- Soc Dev	251	K
	Accounts Payable Clerk	188	M
	Accounts Payable Officer	253	K
	Accounts Supervisor - Post Office	950	F
	Acorn Administrative Assistant	210	L
	Acorn Administrative Officer	320	G
	Admin Services Manager/ Office Manager Judicial	1050	E
	Administrative Officer	293	H
	Administrative Services Manager/Financial Manager(MICU)	1350	D
	Aeronautical Information Systems Officer	238	K
	Agricultural Assistant	292	H
	Agronomist	1050	E
	Air & Sea Ports Facilities Manager	1150	E
	Air Traffic Control Officer I	294	H
	Air Traffic Control Officer II	313	G
	Air Traffic Control Officer III	392	G
	Airport Manager	1650	C

Analyst Programmer	1075	E
Announcer	231	K
Architectural Officer	1150	E
Assistant Building Technician	240	K
Assistant Chief Surveyor	1225	E
Assistant Comptroller of Customs	1150	E
Assistant Customs Officer	269	J
Assistant Electrical Technician	240	K
Assistant Information Officer DIB	238	K
Assistant Planning Technician	240	K
Assistant Registrar LSD	825	F
Assistant Superintendent/Training Development Officer Prison	1050	E
Assistant Valuation Officer LSD	219	L
Attorney General	1975	A
Auditor (Treasury)	975	F
Auditor (Inland Revenue)	1125	E
Bailiff	270	J
Budget Officer	1375	D
Building Inspector	1050	E
Buildings Engineer	1275	D
Bursar, ALHCS	315	G
Business Process Analyst	1075	E
Careers Coordinator	1250	D
Cashier IRD	237	K
Cashier Soc Dev	237	K
Certificated Teacher	309	H
Chief Building Inspector	1450	D
Chief Education Officer	1850	B
Chief Electrical Inspector	1450	D
Chief Engineer	1775	B
Chief Fire Officer	1675	C
Chief Immigration Officer	1650	C
Chief Information Officer	1150	E
Chief Magistrate	1750	B
Chief Medical Officer	1775	B
Chief Nursing Officer	1650	C
Chief of Port Security	1225	E
Chief Parliamentary Counsel	1775	B
Chief Probation Officer	1650	C
Chief Project Officer	1675	C

Chief Statistician	1775	B
Chief Veterinary Officer	1650	C
Clerical Officer	186	M
Clerk of Works - Water	222	L
Clerk to Executive Council	975	F
Clerk to House of Assembly	900	F
Collection Officer IRD	237	K
Commerce Officer	1100	E
Commissioner of Social Development	1650	C
Communications Engineer	1075	E
Communication Officer	262	J
Community Planning Officer	950	F
Community Service (Outreach) Officer	257	J
Comptroller of Customs	1750	B
Comptroller of Inland Revenue	1775	B
Coordinator Adult and Continuing Education	1550	C
Coordinator Conservation Education	1175	E
Coordinator Environment and Sustainable Development	1150	E
Coordinator PRU/WISE	1325	D
Coordinator, TVET	1450	D
Corporal Port Security	273	J
Court Administration & Registration Officer	313	G
Court Reporter	315	G
Crown Counsel	1575	C
Curriculum Officer	1250	D
Customs Guard	188	M
Customs Officer	305	H
Data Entry Clerk Immigration	190	M
Data Maintenance Technician Fisheries/LSD	247	K
Debt Officer	1050	E
Deputy Accountant General	1550	C
Deputy Airport Manager/Operations	1250	D
Deputy Chief Fire Officer	1275	D
Deputy Chief Immigration Officer	1250	D
Deputy Chief Port Security	825	F
Deputy Comptroller of Customs	1550	C
Deputy Comptroller-Inland Revenue	1375	D
Deputy Director - LSD	1350	D
Deputy Director Disaster Management	1375	D
Deputy Director of Agriculture	1350	D
Deputy Director of Library Services	1150	E

Deputy Director of Sports	1250	D
Deputy Director of Youth & Culture	1150	E
Deputy Director, Fisheries and Marine Resources	1250	D
Deputy Director, Information Technology (2 Posts)	1475	C
Deputy Director, Internal Audit	1475	C
Deputy Director, Public Admin	1575	C
Deputy Director, Public Admin	1575	C
Deputy Labour Commissioner	1050	E
Deputy Post Master General/ Operations	1225	E
Deputy Post Master General/ Sales & Marketing	1225	E
Deputy Principal Campus B	1425	D
Deputy Principal Planning Officer	1550	C
Deputy Principal Primary	1225	E
Deputy Registrar Commercial Registry	1250	D
Deputy Superintendent of Prisons	1250	D
Design Engineer Roads	1125	E
Director Construction & Housing	1675	C
Director Information & Broadcasting	1650	C
Director Internal Audit	1775	B
Director LSD	1750	B
Director National AIDS Programme	1475	C
Director of Agriculture	1650	C
Director of Economic Planning	1775	B
Director of Environment	1675	C
Director of Fisheries	1650	C
Director of Health Protection	1650	C
Director of Library Services	1650	C
Director of Sports	1650	C
Director of Youth & Culture	1650	C
Director Quality Management	1650	C
Director, Disaster Management	1775	B
Director, HRM	1775	B
Director, Information Technology	1775	B
Director, Technology & Information Security, Public Utilities	1775	B
Director/Deputy Commissioner Social Development	1325	D
Distribution Foreman/Supervisor (Water)	350	G
Education & Training Officer	1175	E
Education Officer, Assessment Measurement & Testing	1550	C
Education Officer, Curriculum	1550	C
Education Officer, Multi-Professional	1550	C

Education Officer, Primary/Pre-Primary	1550	C
Education Planner	1650	C
Education Psychologist	1450	D
Education Welfare Officer	950	F
Electrical Inspector	1050	E
Emergency Communications Officer	1075	E
Enforcement Compliance Officer IRD	339	G
Enforcement Officer -Planning	1050	E
Environment Officer	297	H
Environmental Health Assistant	266	J
Environmental Health Officer EHO	825	F
Executive Assistant	355	G
Executive Secretary	293	H
Finance Office Manager- Water	1250	D
Finance Administrator Police	299	H
Finance Officer	1075	E
Fire Station Officer	1125	E
Fire Sub Officer	825	F
Firefighter	225	L
Fisheries & Research Assistant	161	M
Fisheries Officer	301	H
Geographical Information Systems Officer-Planning	950	F
Graduate Teacher	1100	E
Guidance Counselor Education	1150	E
Headman Agriculture	272	J
Health Planner	1650	C
Help Desk Administrator	262	J
High Court Clerk	296	H
Horticulturist	1050	E
Human Resource Information Systems Officer	1175	E
Immigration Officer I	219	L
Immigration Officer II	293	H
Information & Broadcasting Technician	312	G
Information Officer	338	G
Intake Officer Social Development	825	F
Intellectual Property Officer	273	J
Internal Auditor	775	F
Judicial Clerical Officer	235	K
Judicial Executive Assistant	348	G
Juvenile Care Worker	288	H
Laboratory Technician Education	210	L

Labour Commissioner	1550	C
Labour Officer	256	J
Land Information Systems Administrator	1150	E
Land Registration Officer	253	K
Land Information Systems Technician	331	G
Land Surveyor	825	F
Leading Firefighter	331	G
Library Assistant	194	L
Library Attendant	148	M
Live Stock Officer	1050	E
Magistrate/Deputy Registrar of High Court	1550	C
Magistrate's Court Clerk	357	G
Marine Biologist	1250	D
Marketing & Communications Officer -Agriculture	1150	E
MET Officer	241	K
National AIDS Programme Officer	1075	E
Naturalisation Processing Officer	317	G
Office Attendant	190	M
Office Manager CMO	1050	E
Operations Engineer- Water	1350	D
Operations Manager Treasury	975	F
Parliamentary Counsel/Crown Counsel	1575	C
PAS Finance	1775	B
Passport Officer	313	G
Payroll Officer	285	H
Pension Clerk	204	L
Permanent Secretary CMO	1975	A
Permanent Secretary EDICT	1975	A
Permanent Secretary Education Sports& Youth & Culture	1975	A
Permanent Secretary Finance	1975	A
Permanent Secretary MICUAF	1975	A
Permanent Secretary Public Administration	1975	A
Permanent Secretary Social Development	1975	A
Physical Education Instructor	265	J
Piers & Harbour Master	256	J
Planner	1050	E
Planning Technician Development Control	331	G
Planning Technician Development Planning	331	G
Plant Protection Officer	1050	E
Ports Manager	1225	E

	Post Master General	1650	C
	Postal Assistant	189	M
	Postal Officer	202	L
	Press & Information Officer	1375	D
	Principal Assistant Secretary - Immigration, Labour, Lands & Planning	1750	B
	Principal Assistant Secretary - Internal Relations	1750	B
	Principal Cashier	304	H
	Principal Environmental Health Officer PEHO	1350	D
	Principal Immigration Officer	825	F
	Principal Planning Officer	1750	B
	Principal Primary	1450	D
	Principal Prison Officer	338	G
	Principal, ALHCS	1650	C
	Prison Correctional Services Counselor	1050	E
	Prison Officer	285	H
	Prison Tutor	950	F
	Probation Officer	321	G
	Probations Correctional Services Counselor -	1425	D
	Programme Manager DIB	1150	E
	Programme Officer - Culture	800	F
	Programme Officer - Sports	950	F
	Programme Officer - Youth	800	F
	Programme Officer Disaster Management	1075	E
	Project Officer Finance	1075	E
	Public Records & Data Officer (Court)	238	K
	Quality Officer (Health Services)	1050	E
	Reading Recovery Teacher/ Certificated Teacher II	372	G
	Reading Recovery Tutor	1325	D
	Reference Librarian	1150	E
	Registrar Commercial Registry	1650	C
	Registrar Supreme Court	1750	B
	Rehabilitation & Development Coordinator- Prison	1450	D
	Research Officer Fisheries	287	H
	Resource Centre Technician	283	H
	Roads Inspector	305	H
	Roads Inspector	800	F
	Roads Technician	325	G
	Sales & Marketing Officer DIB	312	G
	Sales Officer Post Office	267	J
	School Nurse	850	F

	Security Officer	217	L
	Senior Air Traffic Control Officer	1100	E
	Senior Announcer	297	H
	Senior Analyst Programmer	1275	D
	Senior Clerical Officer	251	K
	Senior Communications Engineer	1275	D
	Senior Crown Counsel	1775	B
	Senior Customs Officer	382	G
	Senior Engineer Roads & Drainage	1525	C
	Senior Environmental Health Officer SEHO	1050	E
	Senior Geographical Information Systems Officer	1150	E
	Senior Immigration Officer	373	G
	Senior Internal Auditor	1075	E
	Senior Juvenile Care Worker	925	F
	Senior Labour Officer	346	G
	Senior Land Registration Officer	317	G
	Senior Library Assistant	290	H
	Senior Planner (Development Control)	1375	D
	Senior Postal Officer	284	H
	Senior Probation Officer	925	F
	Senior Project Officer	1275	D
	Senior Quality Officer (Health Services)	1350	D
	Senior School Health Nurse	1250	D
	Senior Social Worker	1125	E
	Senior Statistical Officer	825	F
	Senior Systems Engineer	1275	D
	Senior Systems Technician	343	G
	Senior Vector Control Officer	309	H
	Sergeant Port Security	369	G
	Sigtas System Administrator IRB	319	G
	Snr Survey Technician/Snr Survey Assistant	309	H
	Social Development Planner	1650	C
	Social Security Clerk	204	L
	Social Worker	925	F
	Social Worker Court Services-Judical	1250	D
	Specialist Teacher I	925	F
	Specialist Teacher II	1025	F
	Speech Therapist Education	1125	E
	Statistical Assistant	252	K
	Statistical Officer	318	G

Statistician	1325	D
Steel Pan Instructor	277	J
Substance Misuse Therapist	1325	D
Superintendent of Buildings	1075	E
Superintendent of Ports	1650	C
Superintendent of Prisons	1650	C
Supervisor Postal Services	337	G
Supervisor/Director Juvenile Care Centre	1300	D
Surveillance Officer Health Services	1150	E
Survey Assistant/Survey Technician	253	K
Surveyor General Shipping	1425	D
Systems Engineer	1075	E
Systems Technician I	265	J
Systems Technician II	228	L
Tax Collections Supervisor	800	F
Tax Officer I	212	L
Tax Officer II	283	H
Taxpayer Services Supervisor	800	F
Taxpayer Assistant IRD	199	L
Teaching Assistant	210	L
Technical Assistant DOI	239	K
Technical Assistant/Water Quality	266	J
Technical Officer Transport	1325	D
Technically Trained Teacher I	337	G
Technically Trained Teacher II	925	F
Technically Trained Teacher III	1025	F
Telephone Operator/Receptionist	186	M
Testing & Measurement Officer Education	1150	E
Trade & Investment Officer	1125	E
Uncertificated Teacher	268	J
Valuation Officer LSD	297	H
Vector Control Officer	245	K
Vehicle Inspections Foreman	281	H
Vehicle Inspections Officer	183	M
Vehicles Superintendent	1150	E
Vehicles Technologist	750	F
Veterinary Assistant	304	H
Water Engineer	1650	C
Water Inspector/ Service Connection Supervisor	328	G
Water Lab Technician	303	H
Water Lab Technologist	1350	D

APPENDIX

D

Scores Sheets

APPENDIX

E

Revised Job Evaluation Manual

JOB EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The following procedures shall be adopted with respect to the establishment, review and rating of jobs covered by the Job Evaluation Plans.

- (i) It shall be the responsibility of the departmental head to prepare a preliminary Job Description according to the format recommended in the Plan whenever a job is created whenever the duties and/or demands of an existing job change to the degree that the current documentation or rating does not adequately reflect the job.
- (ii) When there is an incumbent in a job which is being modified, he shall be given an opportunity before the modifications are passed to the Human Resources Department to review the Job Description and to discuss with his supervisor its adequacy in portraying the job facts.
- (iii) This preliminary Job Description (or modification of old job description) shall be passed to the Deputy Director Compensation of the Department of Public Administration, Director of Human Resources for review. The Unit shall prepare a preliminary Job Specification for Submission to the Job Evaluation Committee for rating. When the matter is approved or resolved the Human Resources department prepares final job documents, keeps originals for its files and passes copies to the respective departmental head.
- (iv) Each manager and/or supervisor shall retain copies of all the jobs reporting to this position.
- (v) After implementation, the job incumbent, employee representative or the head of

department may challenge any aspect of the job documents by following the Challenge Procedures.

- (vi) Once at least every four years all evaluations for jobs in the Public Service shall be reviewed to ensure that the system integrity is maintained.

CHALLENGE PROCEDURES

Challenges may be initiated by the incumbent, the supervisor or the departmental head. Any of these may question the adequacy of the Job Description and/or Job Specification and/or application of the Rating Scale if, in his opinion, they do not reflect the job performed.

- (I) Whenever an incumbent is concerned about the above matters he must discuss them with his supervisor. If both parties agree that the challenge is justified, the matter is to be passed to the departmental head within seven days of the discussion with a recommendation for submission to the Human resources department for review. If the supervisor disagrees, the incumbent may take the matter up with his head of department and may be accompanied by his employee representative at the related discussions. The supervisor must attend and explain the grounds for his disagreement. No effort shall be spared to achieve agreement at this point.
- (ii) Within seven days of the date of the discussion the head of department's decision is to be forwarded to the Human Resources Department for review.
- (iii) The Salary Administration Unit of the Human resources Department examines the challenge, determines its validity, and passes its consideration back to the departmental head, copying the employee representative.
- (iv) Where either the departmental head or employee representative disagrees with the consideration the matter is referred to the Job Evaluation Committee for resolution.
- (v) The Job Evaluation Committee's decisions are final and binding on all parties. The Committee, in its efforts to reach effective and just decisions, may call on any of the concerned parties to appear before it to justify arguments for or against.
- (vi) The decision of the Job Evaluation Committee shall be communicated to all the parties concerned by letter written and signed by its Secretary.

THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Job Evaluation Committee shall be a standing committee set up to deal with job evaluation matters which cannot be resolved within the normal procedural framework of the organisation's operations.

AUTHORITY

The Job Evaluation shall act as the authoritative body in the following areas of responsibility:

- (i) The review, modification and approval of Job Documents prepared by Departmental Heads and the Human Resources Department
- (ii) The resolution of problems concerning the adequacy of job documents and/or application of the Rating Scales for individual jobs which have been referred to the Committee.
- (iii) The interpretation of the Rating Scales of the Job Evaluation Plans.
- (iv) The development of guidelines required for the interpretation of the Rating Scales.
- (v) The establishment of key jobs or job functions for relativity purposes.
- (vi) INSERT

Decisions made by the Committee, within the bounds of the above areas of responsibility must be unanimous and shall be binding upon both Management and union (as applicable). Furthermore, such decisions shall not be subject to the Grievance Procedure, nor interpretation or modification by any other source or Authority.

In the vent that the Committee identifies a problem not covered within the above areas of responsibility and which has direct bearing on Job Evaluation, it shall be referred, through the Committee Chairman, to the Human Resources Department for resolution according to established organisational procedures.

The decisions of the Job Evaluation Committee shall be communicated to the respective Departmental Heads, Labour representatives, Supervisors and individual employees by its Secretary. The Human Resources Department shall be the chief source of data required by the Committee to execute its responsibility and shall develop appropriate administrative procedures for this purpose.

MEMBERSHIP

The Job Evaluation Committee shall comprise three members duly selected and appointed by the Deputy Governor and three representatives from the relevant Labour Unions. .

(i) **CHAIRMAN**

A Senior Public Servant duly appointed by the Deputy Governor, shall be the Chairman. He/she shall be responsible for the conduct of meetings and shall, after consultation with members of the Job Evaluation Committee, establish the order of priority on matters to be acted upon by the committee for each meeting. He/she shall be empowered to co-opt Head of departments to sit on the committee whenever it is deemed that their presence would contribute to the resolution of matters on the agenda.

(ii) **SECRETARY**

The Director of Human Resources or his/her duly authorised representative shall be the Secretary to the Committee. He/she shall be responsible for the research, collection and circulation to committee members of all information and data concerning matters to be discussed by the Committee and shall, in collaboration with the Chairman, prepare and circulate the agenda and the decisions of the Committee meetings.

(iii) The Chairman, after consultation with particular departmental representatives and the Union, where applicable, shall approve the participation in meetings of other departmental representatives for the purpose of giving expert advice to the Committee in its attempt to reach the most effective and acceptable decisions.

The Public Service shall take the necessary steps to ensure that all members of the Committee are familiar with the principles and practices of Job Evaluation generally and well-briefed in the philosophy, procedures and practices of the (Committee's Job Evaluation Plans).

