

For information

## **Legislative Council Panel on Public Service**

### **The Administration's Responses to Issues Raised by the Panel**

At the meetings of the Legislative Council Panel on Public Service ('the Panel') on 20 June 2011, 17 October 2011, 16 April 2012 and 21 May 2012, the Administration was requested to –

- (a) provide further information on measures adopted to overcome difficulties faced by the ethnic minorities in meeting the language proficiency requirements (LPRs) of specified civil service grades;
- (b) consider commissioning an academic institution to conduct a longitudinal study to keep track of the career development of civil servants who had resigned from the Government with the aim of ascertaining whether civil service jobs remained competitive and attractive in the job market;
- (c) provide the number of directorate civil servants in each specified age group for each of the financial years from 1986-1987 to 2010-2011;
- (d) provide a breakdown by age group of the number of resignees in the Civil Service in the past few years;
- (e) provide the wastage figures in the Administrative Officer (AO) grade in recent years and analyse the situation against the implementation of the new terms of appointment and conditions of service for appointees to the Civil Service with effect from June 2000; and

- (f) provide details of the three non-civil service contract (NCSC) positions filled by non-permanent residents of Hong Kong in recent years.

Our responses are set out in the ensuing paragraphs.

### **LPRs of specified civil service grades**

2. At the Panel meeting on 20 June 2011, the Administration undertook to explain the changes in the LPRs for rank and file grades implemented by the Hong Kong Police Force and the Correctional Services Department (CSD) since 2011.

3. Since 1 May 2011, the Police Force has implemented the following changes in its selection process for Police Constables (PC) –

- (a) Applicants meeting the basic academic qualifications and minimum English language proficiency standard but do not have the required minimum Chinese language proficiency standard<sup>1</sup> will be arranged to sit for the Government Standard Examination (GSE). The GSE is conducted by the Civil Service Examination Unit of the Civil Service Bureau and the examination paper is set at a level equivalent to Level 2 of the Chinese Language subject in the Hong Kong Certificate of Education Examination or the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination. In the 2011-12 financial year, there were a total of 142 such applicants. Among them, there was one Non-ethnic Chinese (NEC) who did not show up for the GSE as arranged.

- (b) Applicants will participate in a job-related ‘Practical Incident

---

<sup>1</sup> The minimum language proficiency standard for Police Constables is Level 2 or above in the English and Chinese language papers in the Hong Kong Certificate Education Examination or in the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination, or equivalent.

Handling Test' at the Group Interview stage to assess their communication ability, judgement and fact-finding ability. Under this Test, candidates will watch two videos (one in English and the other in Chinese) on Police-related incidents and then give a simple account of the incidents as shown in the videos in written English and Chinese respectively. This Test has replaced the requirement for candidates to answer three general questions in Chinese.

- (c) Applicants possessing foreign language skills will be awarded extra marks. Their written and oral proficiency will be tested with the assistance of a qualified/recognised part-time interpreter. Of the 22 applicants who had claimed to possess foreign language skills since 1 May 2011, two were NEC applicants and one of them has been appointed as a PC since February 2012 after an open, fair and competitive selection process.

4. In the two financial years 2010-11 and 2011-12, a total of 34 applications to serve as PC were received from NECs. Among them, six have been appointed as PCs, while five applications are still being processed.

5. The Force launched a scheme to hire NECs as Police Community Liaison Assistant (PCLA) in five selected Police Districts in September 2010 on a trial basis. The pilot scheme was well-received. Accordingly, the Force has extended the scheme to cover a total of 13 Police Districts where there are relatively larger NEC communities, namely Yau Tsim, Kowloon City, Wan Chai, Kwai Tsing, Yuen Long, Eastern, Sham Shui Po, Mong Kok, Sau Mau Ping, Wong Tai Sin, Tsuen Wan, Lantau and Tuen Mun. Each of these Districts is to be served by one PCLA recruited on NCSC terms on a full- or part-time basis as necessary. So far, 11 NECs have been recruited to serve as PCLAs. The Force will monitor the effectiveness of PCLA scheme and review it in about a year's time.

6. Since December 2010, CSD has done away with the Chinese language written test for serving staff of the Assistant Officer grade to be

considered for appointment to the Officer grade under the ‘Potential Officer Scheme’ and ‘Special Appointment Scheme’<sup>2</sup>; and has allowed them to answer oral questions in either English or Chinese (Putonghua or Cantonese) during the selection process. As at 1 June 2012, 11 staff in the Assistant Officer grade who are NECs participated in the revised selection process and two of them have been appointed to the Officer grade since January 2012.

7. Since September 2011, CSD has replaced the Chinese written test by a Group Interview in the recruitment of Assistant Officers II. As at 1 June 2012, it has conducted one such recruitment exercise which attracted a total of 21 applications from NECs. None of them was offered appointment in this exercise after a fair, open and competitive selection process.

### **Study on the career development of resignees after leaving the Civil Service**

8. It is important for the Administration to assess whether civil service jobs remain competitive in attracting new recruits and retaining staff of high calibre. Accordingly, Bureaux and Departments endeavour to conduct an exit interview with each resignee and invite the latter to complete an exit questionnaire. Both measures aim to find out why officers resign from the Civil Service. In our experience, these measures are more effective in ascertaining the attractiveness or otherwise of the Civil Service than a longitudinal study of the career development of resignees who may not be willing to reveal much about their post-Civil Service work and related terms of employment.

### **Age profile of directorate civil servants**

9. A breakdown by age group of directorate civil servants from 1986-1987 to 2010-2011 is at **Annex A**.

---

<sup>2</sup> ‘Potential Officer Scheme’ and ‘Special Appointment Scheme’ are special in-service advancement schemes which enable meritorious Assistant Officers nominated by their supervisors to advance to the Officer rank without having to meet the academic qualifications necessary for direct entry to the Officer grade.

## **Resignation situation in the Civil Service**

10. A breakdown by age group of civil servants who resigned from the service from 1996-97<sup>3</sup> to 2010-11 is at **Annex B**.

## **Wastage of the AO Grade**

11. The wastage figures of the AO Grade from 1990-91 to 2011-12 are at **Annex C**. The annual attrition rate for the period from 1990-91 to 2000-01 (prior to the implementation of the New Terms) ranged from 1.05% (in 1998-1999) to 5.11% (in 1994-95), while the rate for the period from 2001-02 to 2011-12 ranged from 0.98% (in 2004-05) to 2.73% (in 2010-2011).

12. To analyse the wastage situation of the AO grade against the new terms of appointment and conditions of service introduced since 2000, we have focused on non-directorate AOs since almost all directorate AOs joined the Civil Service prior to 2000. We note the attrition rates of non-directorate AOs for the period 2007-08 to 2011-12 (selected in view of the growing number of non-directorate AOs employed on the new terms of appointment and conditions of service) ranged from 1.18% to 3.42%, and the annual average was 2.33%. The comparable figures for the period 1990-91 to 1999-2000 (immediately before the introduction of the new terms of appointment and conditions of service) ranged from 1.69% to 5.33%, and the annual average was 3.39%. The annual wastage situation for the quoted periods is set out at **Annex D**.

13. Based on the analysis in paragraphs 11 and 12 above, there is no evidence to suggest that the introduction of the new appointment terms and conditions of service has resulted in a higher wastage in the AO grade. This is further underlined by the fact that the majority of the AOs who left the service had served for less than three years, suggesting that either they might not find AO work to their liking or that grade management considered them unsuitable to remain in the grade.

---

<sup>3</sup> Information on the situation before 1996-97 is not available.

## **Recruitment of non-permanent residents of Hong Kong**

14. Since the introduction of the NCSC Staff Scheme in 1999, Civil Service Bureau has approved three applications for the recruitment of non-permanent residents as NCSC staff. Details of these applications are as follows –

<b><u>Bureau/Department/Office</u></b>	<b><u>NCSC Position</u></b>	<b><u>Employment Period</u></b>
(a) Economic Analysis and Business Facilitation Unit	Senior Research Analyst	one year
(b) Marine Department	Nautical Charting Technician	one year
(c) Chief Executive-Elect's Office	Project Officer	less than three months

15. The position at (a) above was eventually filled by a permanent resident of Hong Kong, while those at (b) and (c) above were filled by non-permanent residents of Hong Kong.

Civil Service Bureau  
July 2012

## Directorate Civil Servants by Age Groups from 1986-87 to 2010-11

Age Group Year	39 or below		40-49		50-59		60 or above		Total
	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	
1986/1987	134	13.44%	453	45.44%	377	37.81%	33	3.31%	997
1987/1988	155	14.66%	479	45.32%	394	37.28%	29	2.74%	1 057
1988/1989	145	12.84%	538	47.66%	420	37.20%	26	2.30%	1 129
1989/1990	164	13.45%	586	48.08%	442	36.26%	27	2.21%	1 219
1990/1991	146	11.37%	633	49.30%	470	36.60%	35	2.73%	1 284
1991/1992	122	9.61%	624	49.18%	481	37.90%	42	3.31%	1 269
1992/1993	113	8.97%	625	49.60%	484	38.41%	38	3.02%	1 260
1993/1994	117	9.13%	616	48.09%	505	39.42%	43	3.36%	1 281
1994/1995	114	8.93%	615	48.20%	505	39.58%	42	3.29%	1 276
1995/1996	110	8.35%	654	49.62%	521	39.53%	33	2.50%	1 318
1996/1997	117	8.34%	672	47.90%	574	40.91%	40	2.85%	1 403
1997/1998	94	7.12%	655	49.58%	540	40.88%	32	2.42%	1 321
1998/1999	91	7.40%	574	46.71%	550	44.75%	14	1.14%	1 229
1999/2000	93	7.31%	549	43.16%	620	48.74%	10	0.79%	1 272
2000/2001	87	6.87%	493	38.91%	670	52.88%	17	1.34%	1 267
2001/2002	84	6.39%	495	37.67%	715	54.42%	20	1.52%	1 314
2002/2003	85	6.66%	449	35.16%	726	56.85%	17	1.33%	1 277
2003/2004	80	6.56%	422	34.59%	700	57.37%	18	1.48%	1 220
2004/2005	72	6.01%	403	33.64%	714	59.60%	9	0.75%	1 198

Age Group Year	39 or below		40-49		50-59		60 or above		Total
	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	
2005/2006	66	5.53%	385	32.24%	721	60.39%	22	1.84%	1 194
2006/2007	72	6.06%	347	29.21%	734	61.78%	35	2.95%	1 188
2007/2008	71	5.89%	327	27.14%	786	65.23%	21	1.74%	1 205
2008/2009	66	5.37%	307	24.96%	828	67.31%	29	2.36%	1 230
2009/2010	59	4.68%	316	25.04%	854	67.67%	33	2.61%	1 262
2010/2011	54	4.20%	321	24.98%	864	67.24%	46	3.58%	1 285



**Resignation of Civil Servants by Age Groups from 1996-97 to 2010-11**

Age Group Year	Below 30		30-39		40-49		50-59		60 or above		Total
	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	No.	% of total	
1996/1997	1 076	46.76%	836	36.33%	361	15.69%	26	1.13%	2	0.09%	2 301
1997/1998	915	45.39%	702	34.82%	376	18.65%	22	1.09%	1	0.05%	2 016
1998/1999	460	46.60%	318	32.22%	187	18.95%	21	2.13%	1	0.10%	987
1999/2000	285	41.25%	234	33.86%	147	21.27%	25	3.62%	0	-	691
2000/2001	295	48.85%	200	33.11%	78	12.91%	31	5.13%	0	-	604
2001/2002	200	44.55%	130	28.95%	89	19.82%	29	6.46%	1	0.22%	449
2002/2003	144	39.78%	114	31.49%	71	19.61%	33	9.12%	0	-	362
2003/2004	111	36.40%	92	30.16%	66	21.64%	36	11.80%	0	-	305
2004/2005	103	34.80%	92	31.08%	74	25.00%	27	9.12%	0	-	296
2005/2006	128	37.77%	97	28.61%	89	26.25%	25	7.37%	0	-	339
2006/2007	143	33.73%	145	34.19%	90	21.23%	46	10.85%	0	-	424
2007/2008	258	42.92%	153	25.46%	148	24.63%	42	6.99%	0	-	601
2008/2009	249	38.42%	203	31.33%	131	20.22%	64	9.88%	1	0.15%	648
2009/2010	193	37.27%	159	30.69%	119	22.97%	47	9.07%	0	-	518
2010/2011	236	37.76%	198	31.68%	132	21.12%	59	9.44%	0	-	625

**Wastage Situation in the Administrative Officer Grade**

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>(a) Number of officers who left the service for reasons other than retirement<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>(b) Strength as at the beginning of financial year</b>	<b>Attrition rate ((a) as a percentage of (b))</b>	<b>Annual Average attrition rate (%)</b>
<b>1990-91</b>	10	444	2.25	2.57
<b>1991-92</b>	13	458	2.84	
<b>1992-93</b>	15	465	3.23	
<b>1993-94</b>	14	467	3.00	
<b>1994-95</b>	24	470	5.11	
<b>1995-96</b>	12	472	2.54	
<b>1996-97</b>	15	484	3.10	
<b>1997-98</b>	13	494	2.63	
<b>1998-99</b>	5	478	1.05	
<b>1999-00</b>	6	496	1.21	
<b>2000-01</b>	7	513	1.36	
<b>2001-02</b>	9	502	1.79	1.87
<b>2002-03</b>	12	534	2.25	
<b>2003-04</b>	11	533	2.06	
<b>2004-05</b>	5	512	0.98	
<b>2005-06</b>	13	529	2.46	
<b>2006-07</b>	7	533	1.31	
<b>2007-08</b>	13	552	2.36	
<b>2008-09</b>	7	563	1.24	
<b>2009-10</b>	8	578	1.38	
<b>2010-11</b>	16	586	2.73	
<b>2011-12</b>	12	584	2.05	

<sup>1</sup> The reasons include resignation, end of agreement or probation, termination of probation or agreement, transfer or reverting back to other grades.

**Figures on Wastage<sup>1</sup> of Non-directorate Administrative Officers****New Terms<sup>2</sup> vs. Other Terms<sup>3</sup>**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Strength at beginning of the year (all on Other Terms)</b>	<b>Wastage on Other Terms</b>	
		<b>Number of officers leaving the Service<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>% of strength</b>
1990/91	226	6 (4)	2.65%
1991/92	233	7 (6)	3.00%
1992/93	232	9 (2)	3.88%
1993/94	225	12 (7)	5.33%
1994/95	219	11 (5)	5.02%
1995/96	225	6 (5)	2.67%
1996/97	250	11 (7)	4.40%
1997/98	248	8 (4)	3.23%
1998/99	236	4 (3)	1.69%
1999/00	245	5 (3)	2.04%
<b>Year</b>	<b>Strength at beginning of the year (only those on New Terms)</b>	<b>Wastage on New Terms</b>	
		<b>Number of officers leaving the service<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>% of strength</b>
2007/08	142	4 (3)	2.82%
2008/09	169	2 (2)	1.18%
2009/10	198	3 (3)	1.52%
2010/11	220	6 (5)	2.73%
2011/12	234	8 (6)	3.42%

<sup>1</sup> Left for reasons other than retirement, e.g. resignation, completion of agreement/probation, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Introduced in June 2000

<sup>3</sup> Applied prior to June 2000

<sup>4</sup> Figures in brackets denote the number of officers not yet confirmed to the permanent establishment of the Administrative Officer grade.