

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)870/12-13(04)

Ref: CB4/PL/PS

Panel on Public Service

Meeting on 15 July 2013

Background brief on policy of the Government in the calculation of salaries of government school teachers

Purpose

This paper provides background information on issues relating to the Government policy on the calculation of salaries of government school teachers, and summarizes the major views and concerns expressed by members of the Panel on Public Service ("the Panel") when the subject was discussed by the Panel on 20 June 2011.

Background

Concerns over salary differentials

2. At its meeting on 20 June 2011, the Panel met with the Administration and two government school teacher organizations¹ to follow up the concerns of some government school teachers about the salary differentials within the Government school sector and those between Government schools and aided schools. Specifically, their main concerns were that –

- (a) government school teachers with more experience were paid less than those with less experience; and
- (b) government school teachers were paid less than their counterparts in aided schools with the same number of years of service.

¹ The two organizations were the Education Employees General Union and the Union of Government School Teachers.

Factors and circumstances leading to salary differential situations

3. There are three teaching grades in the civil service, namely the two graduate grades of Education Officer and Primary School Master/Mistress and the non-graduate Certificated Master/Mistress ("CM") grade. Serving CMs in government schools may be appointed on transfer as Assistant Education Officers ("AEOs") or Assistant Primary School Masters/Mistresses ("APSMs")², subject to their suitability and the availability of vacancies. The salaries offered to government school teachers on transfer to another grade are determined in accordance with the relevant Civil Service Regulations ("CSRs"), namely CSR 130(1)³ and CSR 130(2)⁴.

Starting Salaries Reviews

4. The Administration conducted starting salaries surveys⁵ ("SSSs") in 1999, 2006, 2009 and 2012. Adjustments made to the starting salaries of CMs and AEOs/APSMs after these four SSSs are as follows:

Year of SSS	Adjustment to starting salary of CMs	Adjustment to starting salaries of AEOs and APSMs	Effective date
1999	From MPS Point 14 to 12	From MPS Point 17 to 12	1 April 2000
2006	From MPS Point 12 to 14	From MPS Point 12 to 17	1 August 2007
2009	Unchanged	From MPS Point 17 to 15	1 October 2010
2012	Unchanged	Unchanged	-

² AEO and APSM are the basic ranks of the Education Officer and Primary School Master/Mistress grades.

³ According to CSR 130(1), the entry pay of an appointee (including a new recruit and a serving civil servant appointed on transfer from one civil service grade to another) shall normally be offered at the minimum pay point of the civil service grade to which the appointee is appointed. Individual grades may offer a higher entry pay to an appointee to take account of relevant qualifications and/or experience above the prescribed levels in accordance with any prevailing arrangement promulgated by the Secretary for the Civil Service.

⁴ CSR 130(2) allows a serving civil servant to carry his existing pay (or gain one pay point over existing pay in certain circumstances) upon transfer to another civil service grade, provided that the minimum pay point of the new grade is not lower than that of the former grade.

⁵ Under the Improved Civil Service Pay Adjustment Mechanism, SSSs are conducted every three years to compare the starting salaries of civilian civil service grades with the entry pay of jobs in the private sector requiring similar qualifications. Depending on the findings of SSSs, the starting salaries for the basic ranks of civil service grades could be increased, decreased or remained unchanged.

"Carry forward arrangement" subsequent to 1999 Starting Salaries Survey

5. To ensure that serving teachers on transfer among public sector schools would not be adversely affected by the downward adjustment of the starting salary of the AEO/APSM rank as a result of 1999 SSS, the Administration had put in place a "carry forward arrangement" since 1 April 2000. Under this arrangement, a serving CM in government school who was appointed on transfer to AEO/APSM with no break in service was allowed to carry forward his existing salary, if doing so would give him a higher entry pay than the then prevailing starting salaries of the teaching grades, plus increments for relevant experience ("ICEs") where applicable. The "carry forward arrangement" also applied to aided school teachers appointed to the civil service as government school teachers.

"Normal conversion arrangement" and additional pay points subsequent to 2006 Starting Salaries Survey

6. Subsequent to the increased starting salaries of the CM and AEO/APSM ranks as a result of 2006 SSS, a "normal conversion arrangement" was applied to the affected government school teachers, who were appointed during the period from 1 April 2000 to 31 July 2007 and had been affected by the reduced starting salaries. Under this arrangement, where the pay of an affected teacher on 1 August 2007 was lower than the increased starting salary of his rank, his pay would be brought up to the increased starting salary. Where the pay of an affected teacher on 1 August 2007 was equal to or higher than the increased starting salary of his rank, his salary would be brought up to the next higher pay point. As a special arrangement, on top of the "normal conversion arrangement", additional pay point(s), namely two for AEO/APSM ranks and one for CM rank, were granted to these affected teachers who possessed a Post-Graduate Certificate in Education ("PGCE") qualification.

7. As government school teachers covered by the "carry forward arrangement" from 1 April 2000 to 31 July 2007 were not affected by the reduction in starting salaries which prevailed during this period, the "normal conversion arrangement" and the provision of additional pay point(s) for the PGCE qualification were not applied to them.

8. According to the Administration⁶, salary differentials within the government school sector, as described in paragraph 2(a) above, may arise in the following two circumstances –

⁶ LC Paper No. [CB\(1\)2436/10-11\(01\)](#)

- (a) two government school teachers were appointed as CMs in different years divided by 1 April 2000 and were re-graded as AEOs in the same year during the period from 1 April 2000 to 31 July 2007; and
- (b) two government school teachers were appointed as CMs in the same year before 1 April 2000, and one was re-graded as AEO some time between 1 April 2000 to 31 July 2007 while the other was re-graded as AEO some time after 31 July 2007.

9. As regards salary differentials between the government school sector and the aided school sector, as described in paragraph 2(b), they can be attributed mainly to the different arrangements on the grant of ICEs in the civil service and in the aided school sector⁷.

10. Cases of salary differential provided by the Education Employees General Union for the Panel meeting on 20 June 2011 are in **Appendix I** (Chinese version only).

Members' views and concerns

Salary differential problem

11. Noting that the salary differentials within the government school sector had divisive effect among teachers, some members urged the Administration to take special measures to address the problem, such as providing a one-off grant to compensate for the loss of the affected teachers.

12. The Administration explained that as government school teachers appointed at different times were subject to the then prevailing employment terms and conditions, it was not appropriate to make simplistic comparison between the employment terms of individual teachers appointed at different times. It was up to individual teachers concerned to decide, in the light of the prevailing salary offered, whether to accept appointment or to transfer between schools. As long as the relevant pay policies had been consistently applied, the teachers concerned should not feel being unfairly treated after making their decisions.

⁷ Teachers in aided schools are not civil servants although they are remunerated in accordance with the civil service pay scales and their starting salaries are adjusted in the same manner as their civil counterparts. Their salaries and other terms and conditions of appointments are determined by the Codes of Aid and rules and regulations issued by the Education Bureau. The "normal conversion arrangement" and "carry forward arrangement" were also applied to teachers in aided schools.

13. As the deputations and the Administration held very different views, some members suggested resolving the salary disputes through mediation or arbitration. The Administration responded that as the calculation of government school teachers' salaries had been handled in line with the established pay policy, there was little scope for the Administration to resolve the salary differentials through arbitration or to introduce discretionary arrangement.

Government pay policy and principle

14. Some members shared the view of the deputations that the current practice of calculating teachers' salaries, which had resulted in the salaries of some government school teachers being lower than those of aided school teachers with the same years of experience, might have breached the "healthy turnover of teachers" and the "no better than" principles of the Government pay policy.

15. The Administration explained that the measure of "healthy turnover of teachers" was aimed to ensure that teachers would not be made worse off when they moved among government and aided schools. The measure did not prescribe that two different teachers with the same qualification and teaching experience would receive the same salary upon appointment to a government school and an aided school. As to the "no better than" principle, the basis for comparison under this principle should be the remuneration package of the civil service. The principle did not mean that the remuneration package of teachers in the civil service should be aligned to that of teachers in the aided sector, when doing so was to the benefit of government school teachers.

Motion passed

16. After discussion, members remained concerned about the salary differential problem which had given rise to grievances in the teaching profession. The Panel passed the following motion at the meeting –

"That this Panel urges the Administration to review afresh the salaries and terms of employment of Government school teachers and make compensation for their loss of income arising from previous mistakes."

17. In its written response to the motion⁸, the Administration re-iterated that government school teachers and aided school teachers were employed under two separate employment systems. The rules for

⁸ LC Paper No. [CB\(1\)2966/10-11\(01\)](#)

determining the employment terms and conditions for government school teachers and aided school teachers had been consistently applied in the respective employment systems. Loss of income arising from previous mistakes was not substantiated and there was no question of making any compensation.

Council Question

18. Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou raised a written question at the Council meeting of 2 November 2011 regarding teacher salaries. In reply, the Administration provided information on (a) the grant of increments after obtaining PGCE; (b) the grant of ICEs to new recruits; (c) the mechanism for calculating the starting salaries of teachers appointed on transfer from the CM rank to the AEO/APSM rank; and (d) the Government policy on "healthy turnover of teachers". The hyperlink to the question and the Administration's reply is in **Appendix II**.

Latest development

19. The Panel will meet with the Administration and relevant teacher associations on 15 July 2013 to discuss the policy of the Government in the calculation of salaries of government school teachers.

Relevant papers

20. A list of relevant papers is given in **Appendix II**.

教育局在計算政府學校教師薪酬時
未能符合政府薪酬指引之情況

1. 2000-2003 年入職或轉職(如由 CM 轉職至 AEO)的政府學校教師的薪酬問題之兩個例子：

例 1.1 (GM→AEO\2000)

日期	津校→政府學校 教師 A (GM→AEO)	津校 教師 B (GM,無轉職)
1-9-1997	初入職津校 GM, 薪酬= 17	
1-9-1998	ICE = 1, 薪酬= 17 +1 = 18	
1-9-1999	ICE = 2, 薪酬= 17 +2 = 19	
31-8-2000	完成兼讀制教育文憑, 薪酬= 19	
1-9-2000	新入職為政府學校 AEO ICE = 3 薪酬= ? <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block; margin-top: 10px;"> = 20 by May Chan </div>	ICE = PQE* = 3 薪酬= 17 + 3 + 2 = 22 (ICE ⇒ +3, ICQ ⇒ +2)
教師 X 和教師 D 職級及職責都相若， 違反「健康轉任」政策及「不能優於」原則		

*PQE = post-qualification experience

May Chan (EDB SEO(Pay & Leave)):
不肯正面回答, 只重複「薪酬」二字之
不同理解.

立法會秘書處附註：
根據團體提供的資料，ICE為"經驗增薪點"，ICQ為"資歷增薪點"，
而PQE為"學位後之教學年資"。

例 1.2 (津校 CM→AEO\2000)

日期	津校→政府學校 教師 A (CM→AEO)	津校 教師 B (CM→GM)	註
31-8-1998	3-1997 受聘於津校, 入職 GM ICE= 2.8, 薪酬= 19		
1-9-1998	轉職為津校 CM ICE= 2.8	初入職津校 CM 薪酬= 12	
31-8-1999	ICE= 3.8 轉職前薪酬= 17	薪酬= 17	
1-9-1999	就讀全日制教育文憑	ICE = PQE* = 1 入職津校 GM 薪酬= 17 + 1 = 18	
31-8-2000	完成全日制教育文憑, 無斷職, ICE= 3.8	完成兼讀制教育文憑 薪酬= 18	
1-9-2000	受聘於政府學校,入職 AEO ICE= 2.8 薪酬(1)= 17 薪酬(2)= 12 + 2 + 2 = 16 (ICE ⇒ +2, ICQ⇒ +2) 薪酬= (1)和(2)中之較 高者 = 17	ICE = PQE = 2 獲得 ICQ+2 點 薪酬= 18 + 1 + 2 = 21 (ICE ⇒ +1, ICQ⇒ +2)	違反「健康轉任」政 策及 「不能優於」原則

*PQE = post-qualification experience

立法會秘書處附註：
根據團體提供的資料，ICE為"經驗增薪點"，ICQ為"資歷增薪點"，
而PQE為"學位後之教學年資"。

2. 2004年或以後入職或轉職(如由CM轉職至AEO)的政府學校教師的薪酬問題之兩個例子：

例 2.1 (政府學校 CM→AEO\2009)

日期	津校→政府學校 教師 A (CM→AEO)	津校 教師 B (CM→GM)	註
1995	獲得 ACTE		Adv Cert 等同 Dip Ed
31-8-1996	獲得認可大學學位資歷		
1-9-1996	CM (津校)	CM	
31-8-1997	ICE = 1	獲得認可大學學位資歷	
1-9-1997	GM (津校)	ICE = 0	
31-8-1998	ICE = 2	ICE = 1	
1-9-1998	斷職	ICE = 1	
31-8-1999	斷職	ICE = 2	
1-9-1999	CM (政府學校), ICE=2	ICE = 2	
1-9-2000	ICE = 3	ICE = 3	
...	
1-9-2008	ICE = 11, 薪酬 = 24	ICE = 11, 薪酬 = 24	CM 頂薪 = 24
1-9-2009	由 CM 轉職 AEO ICE = 1, 薪酬 = 24 + 1 = 25	受聘於津校, 入職 GM ICE = PQE* = 12 薪酬(1) = 24 + 1 = 25 薪酬(2) = 17 + 12 + 2 = 31 (ICE ⇒ +12, ICQ ⇒ +2) 薪酬 = (1)和(2)中之較高者 = 31	違反「健康轉任」政策

*PQE = post-qualification experience

立法會秘書處附註：
根據團體提供的資料，ICE為"經驗增薪點"，ICQ為"資歷增薪點"，
而PQE為"學位後之教學年資"。

例 2.2 (津校 CM→AEO\2009)

日期	津校→政府學校 教師 A (CM→AEO)	津校 教師 B (CM→GM)	註
31-8-2005	完成全日制教育文憑		
1-9-2005	初入職津校 CM, 薪酬 = 12		
1-9-2006	ICE = 1, 薪酬 = 12 + 1 = 13		
1-8-2007	調薪: CM→+1pt, 薪酬 = 13 + 1 = 14		
1-9-2007	ICE = 2, 薪酬 = 14 + 1 = 15		
1-9-2008	ICE = 3, 薪酬 = 15 + 1 = 16		
1-9-2009	受聘於政府學校, 入職 AEO ICE = 0 薪酬 = 16 + 1 = 17	受聘於津校, 入職 GM ICE = PQE* = 4 薪酬(1) = 16 + 1 = 17 薪酬(2) = 17 + 4 + 2 = 23 (ICE ⇒ +4, ICQ ⇒ +2) 薪酬 = (1)和(2)中之較高者 = 23	違反「健康轉任」政策

*PQE = post-qualification experience

立法會秘書處附註：
根據團體提供的資料，ICE為"經驗增薪點"，ICQ為"資歷增薪點"，
而PQE為"學位後之教學年資"。

3. 2000 年或以後入職的政府學校教師的增薪日期之計算問題

例 3 (增薪日期之計算)

	ICE	ICQ	詳情	註
政府學校 受影響 教師 A (AEO)	3.5	+2	2001-9-1 入職政府學校， 增薪日被重新定為緊接 一年的九月一日，ICE 只 以一整年來計算，即是說 ICE 不能全獲計算。	和年資及職級都一樣之津 校教師 B 比較，政府學校 教師 A 每年都有 6 個月得 到較低之薪酬！ 違反當時政府對官津校之 資助政策中的「不能優 於」原則或「健康轉任」 政策
津校 教師 B (GM)	一樣	一樣	2001-9-1 入職津校， 增薪日為緊接一年的三 月一日，ICE 是以一整月 來計算，即是說 ICE 全獲 計算。	

立法會秘書處附註：
根據團體提供的資料，ICE 為"經驗增薪點"，ICQ 為"資歷增薪點"，
而 PQE 為"學位後之教學年資"。

4. 在 2007 年調薪安排中受影響公務員的定義(CSBC No.9/2007 第十三段)問題

例 4 (政府學校 2007 調薪)

日期	津校→政府學校 教師 A (CM→AEO)	津校→政府學校 教師 B (GM→AEO)	註
31-8-1998	3-1997 受聘於津校， 入職 GM. ICE= 2.8, 薪酬= 19	1997-9-1 初入職津校 GM. ICE= 1, 薪酬= 17	
1-9-1998	轉職為津校 CM ICE= 2.8	完成兼讀制教育文憑 ICE= 1	
31-8-1999	ICE= 3.8 轉職前薪酬= 17	ICE= 2, 薪酬= 18	
31-8-2000	完成全日制教育文憑 無斷職, ICE= 3.8 (謝萬誠回應: 此處 教師 A 之 ICE= 2.8.)	斷職一年 ICE= 2	
1-9-2000	受聘於政府學校， 入職 AEO, 年資較深 薪酬= 17 (轉職後支取現薪的 安排, 但無 ICQ+2)	受聘於政府學校， 入職 AEO, 年資較淺 薪酬= 12 + 2 + 2 = 16 因為教師 C 斷職一年， 所以起薪點為 12. (ICE⇒+2, ICQ⇒+2)	在入職前教師 A 之 ICE 較多，在入職後 在 Seniority List 裏排 名 因而較教師 B 為 高，教師 A 年資較 深，教師 B 年資較 淺，教師 A 也合理地 較教師 B 高薪。
1-9-2001	年資較深, 薪酬= 18	年資較淺, 薪酬= 17	教師 A 合理地較教師 B 高薪。
1-9-2002	年資較深, 薪酬= 19	年資較淺, 薪酬= 18	
...	
1-9-2006	年資較深, 薪酬= 23	年資較淺, 薪酬= 22	
1-8-2007	不被納入調薪行列。 年資較深 薪酬 = 23 (ICE = 8.8 by 謝萬誠)	被納入調薪行列。 一般換算及特別安排下， ⇒ +3 pay pts 年資較淺 薪酬 = 22 + 3 = 25 (ICE = 8)	同年入職政府學校， 年資較淺之教師 B 的 薪酬竟然反高過資年 較深之教師 A 的薪酬! 違反政府薪酬原則

立法會秘書處附註：

根據團體提供的資料，ICE為"經驗增薪點"，ICQ為"資歷增薪點"，而PQE為"學位後之教學年資"。

5. 政府學校教師之認可經驗增薪點(ICE)之計算問題

教育局在計算助理教育主任教席的 ICE 時，並不將擁有文憑教席之 PQE 計算入 ICE，反觀資助中學的學位教師卻可以。這措施明顯地違反「健康轉任」政策及/或「不能優於」原則。見下三例：

例 5.1 (津校 CM→AEO\1999)

日期	津校→政府學校 教師 A (CM→AEO)	津校 教師 B (CM→GM)	註
31-8-1996	取得學士學位		
1-9-1996	初受聘於津校,入職 CM ICE= 0, 薪酬= 12		
1-9-1997	ICE= 1, 薪酬= 13		
1-9-1998	ICE= 2, 薪酬= 14 完成兼讀制教育文憑		
1-9-1999	受聘於政府學校,入職 AEO ICE= 0 薪酬= 17 + 2 = 19	受聘於津校,入職 GM ICE= PQE* = 3 薪酬= 17 + 3 + 2 = 22 (ICE ⇒ +3, ICQ ⇒ +2)	違反「健康轉任」 政策及 「不能優於」原則

*PQE = post-qualification experience

立法會秘書處附註：
根據團體提供的資料，ICE為“經驗增薪點”，ICQ為“資歷增薪點”，
而PQE為“學位後之教學年資”。

例 5.2 (津校 CM→AEO\2000)

日期	津校→政府學校 教師 A (CM→AEO)	津校 教師 B (CM→GM)	註
31-8-1997	取得學士學位		
1-9-1997	受聘於津校,入職 CM ICE = 0, 薪酬= 12	初聘於津校,入職 CM ICE = 0, 薪酬= 12	
1-9-1998	ICE = 1, 薪酬= 13	ICE = 1, 薪酬= 13	
1-9-1999	ICE = 2, 薪酬= 14 完成兼讀制教育文憑	ICE = 2, 薪酬= 14 完成兼讀制教育文憑	
1-9-2000	受聘於政府學校,入職 AEO ICE = 0 薪酬(1)= 14 + 1 = 15 薪酬(2)= 12 + 0 + 2 = 14 (ICE ⇒ +0, ICQ⇒ +2) 薪酬= (1)和(2)中之較 高者 = 15	受聘於津校,入職 GM ICE = PQE* = 3 薪酬= 12 + 3 + 2 = 17 (ICE ⇒ +3, ICQ⇒ +2)	違反「健康轉任」 政策及 「不能優於」原則

*PQE = post-qualification experience

立法會秘書處附註：
根據團體提供的資料，ICE為"經驗增薪點"，ICQ為"資歷增薪點"，
而PQE為"學位後之教學年資"。

例 5.3(即例 2.1) (政府學校 CM→AEO\2009)

日期	津校→政府學校 教師 A (CM→AEO)	津校 教師 B (CM→GM)	註
1995	獲得 ACTE		Adv Cert 等同 Dip Ed
31-8-1996	獲得認可大學學位資歷		
1-9-1996	CM (津校)	CM	
31-8-1997	ICE = 1	獲得認可大學學位資歷	
1-9-1997	GM (津校)	ICE = 0	
31-8-1998	ICE = 2	ICE = 1	
1-9-1998	斷職	ICE = 1	
31-8-1999	斷職	ICE = 2	
1-9-1999	CM (政府學校), ICE=2	ICE = 2	
1-9-2000	ICE = 3	ICE = 3	
...	
1-9-2008	ICE = 11, 薪酬 = 24	ICE = 11, 薪酬 = 24	CM 頂薪 = 24
1-9-2009	由 CM 轉職 AEO ICE = 0, 薪酬 = 24 + 1 = 25	受聘於津校, 入職 GM ICE = PQE* = 12 薪酬(1) = 24 + 1 = 25 薪酬(2) = 17 + 12 + 2 = 31 (ICE ⇒ +12, ICQ ⇒ +2) 薪酬 = (1)和(2)中之較高者 = 31	違反「健康轉任」 政策

*PQE = post-qualification experience

立法會秘書處附註：
根據團體提供的資料，ICE為"經驗增薪點"，ICQ為"資歷增薪點"，
而PQE為"學位後之教學年資"。

**Policy of the Government in the calculation of salaries of
government school teachers**

List of relevant papers

Date	Meeting/Event	References
20.6.2011	Panel on Public Service	<p>Administration paper on "Pay policy of the Government in the calculation of salaries of government school teachers" LC Paper No. CB(1)2436/10-11(01)</p> <p>Minutes of meeting LC Paper No. CB(1)173/11-12</p> <p>Administration's follow-up paper LC Paper No. CB(1)2966/10-11(01)</p> <p>Administration's response to the submission from the Education Employees General Union (Chinese version only) LC Paper No. CB(1)2263/11-12(01)</p>
2.11.2011	Council Question	Question raised by Dr PAN Pey-chyou on "Teachers salaries"