CIVIL SERVICE CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION SCHEME

General Council Report 816

(Meetings of 29 November 1978, 31 January, 28 February and 28 March 1979)

<u>Claim that serving Civil Servants who are successful in open competitions be</u> <u>treated no less favourably than if appointed from a confined competition</u>

1 The claim was that serving Civil Servants who are successful in open competitions for higher civil service posts be treated no less favourably than if appointed from a confined competition.

2 The Staff Side stated the question arised principally in relation to the Administrative Officer, Third Secretary and Inspector of Taxes competitions; the drop in salary could be as much as £1031 in the case of an Executive Officer who became an Administrative Officer by way of open competition. Serving Officers in professional/technical grades who were successful at open competition for appointment to higher level posts could also suffer a drop in salary.

3 The Official Side stated they were sympathetic to the intention of the claim that no financial loss be sustained by a serving civil servant moving to a higher grade by open competition.

4 Following discussion it was agreed to recommend that serving civil servants who were successful in open competitions for higher posts would enter the new grade at the minimum of the scale or at their existing salary plus accrued increment, whichever was the greater. This arrangement would be effective from 1 April 1979. It would apply - also from that date - to affected officers still in the grade to which they were appointed from the open competition with appropriate adjustment in salary to cover the period already spent in the grade.

5 This report was adopted on 12 April 1979.

CIVIL SERVICE CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION SCHEME

General Council Report 966

(Meetings of 16 December 1981, 24 February and 28 July 1982)

Claim to amend General Council Report 816 concerning civil servants successful in open competitions

 The claim was that paragraph 4 of General Council Report 816 be amended to read:-

"Following discussion it was agreed to recommend that serving Civil Servants who were successful in open competition would enter the new grade at the minimum of the scale or at the existing salary plus accrued increment, whichever is the greater".

2. The Staff Side said that the current provisions created problems for civil servants who competed for posts at a level equivalent to their existing one

3. The Official Side said that they were prepared to agree to the amendment if a mark-time provision was introduced similar to that which applied in the case of confined competitions. The Staff Side indicated that this would be acceptable provided the mark-time arrangement applied from a current date only.

4. It was accordingly agreed that the amendment proposed by the Staff Side would have effect from 1 April 1979 and the mark-time provision from 28 July 1982.

5. It was also agreed that paragraph 4 of Report 816 should be amended to read as follows:-

"Following discussion it was agreed to recommend that serving Civil Servants who were successful in open competition would enter the new grade at the minimum of the scale or at the existing salary plus accrued increment, whicheve is the greater subject to the maximum of the scale not being exceeded. However, where the starting salary, so reckoned, is higher than the point the officer would have reached had all the service been in the new grade, the officer will be required to mark time on this salary until it ceases to be in excess of the point referred to. This latter provision (i.e. the mark-time arrangement) will apply from 28 July 1982".

This report was adopted on 16 August 1982

the for any many second states of the second s

and the trade of a version of the theory of the second second second second second second second second second

and a factor of the second second

The second s

and a start of the second s Second second

6.

CIVIL SERVICE CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION SCHEME

<u>General Council Report 1216</u> (Meetings of 27 March and 29 May 1991)

<u>Claim regarding the starting pay of officers who secure higher</u> <u>posts by open competition</u>

1. The claim was that the starting pay of officers who secure higher posts by open competition should be no less favourable than had the officer not been a serving civil servant.

2. The Staff Side said that the claim related to the provisions for starting pay in many open competitions which allowed successful candidates from outside the civil service to be awarded increments in recognition of qualifications or experience additional to the competition requirements while serving civil servants were required to start on the minimum or at existing pay plus accrued increment. The Staff Side said that this discriminatory treatment of serving civil servants was inequitable and unacceptable. A serving civil servant with additional qualifications or experience should receive the same treatment as a non-civil servant with the same qualifications and experience.

The Official Side pointed out that the separate treatment of 3. serving civil servants and non-civil servants as regards starting pay in open competitions had been introduced at the request of the Staff Side so as to ensure that serving civil servants would not lose money on acceptance of appointments through open competitions (General Council Reports 816 and 966). The effect of these agreements was that serving civil servants could start on higher points of a scale than non-civil servants, particularly where there was no provision for entry above the minimum for noncivil servants. Where there was provision for entry above the minimum, Departments had been instructed that additional increments should only be offered where it was necessary to meet recruitment needs. Additional qualifications or experience did not of themselves entitle a recruit to enter above the minimum. It was difficult to envisage circumstances in which an offer of additional increments to a serving civil servant would be warranted. Accordingly, the Official Side could not agree to the proposal in the claim.

4. Following further discussion, it was decided that a report be prepared in which disagreement on the claim would be recorded. This report, accordingly, records disagreement.

5. This report was adopted on 9 August 1991.