



## 'AMES Classification Review Update'

CPSU would like to address the following points made by the CEO of AMES in the email, 'AMES Classification Review Update', dated 11 February 2009:

- *'The structure is agreed except for one implementation matter concerning the composition of the appeals panel to which staff can ask for their classification to be reviewed'.*
- *'AMES and the CPSU have worked closely together over the last few months to ensure the proposed structure and translation process is open, fair, and will not disadvantage any staff member. It is a shame it cannot be put to a vote until the final administrative matter is completed'*

As pointed out to AMES HR during discussions, Industrial Organisers negotiate structures and subsequently put forward the proposal to CPSU Branch Council. CPSU Industrial Organisers must obtain the approval of Branch Council and cannot personally agree to changes to Enterprise Agreements.

The ultimate decision is made by our CPSU Secretary and the other elected members of Council.

CPSU and members of the Career Structure Consultative Committee (names distributed in last bulletin) have been working on the documentation forwarded to CPSU by AMES HR. There has been discussion mainly around the possible implications such a structure will have. We are mainly concerned with the following:

- **Employees on Salary Maintenance:** An employee appointed overgrade could potentially be on salary maintenance for many years. Pay rises resulting from upcoming agreements are unknown and it is not clear as to how long it will take for the new salary grade to 'catch up' to the employee on salary maintenance. Increments and pay rises will be received as an *ex gratia* (cash) payment. Such a payment will not increase ones overall salary nor will it be superannuable. This means that there may/will be a financial disadvantage to those on salary maintenance despite HR's assurances that no one will be financially worse off. HR has stated that they will inform employees as to how long they will be on salary maintenance. CPSU has not been provided with detailed information as to how many staff shall be on salary maintenance.
- **Competency Based Criteria v. Performance Based Criteria:** Under the new proposal, staff will, at their annual review, be judged on their performance as opposed to their competency. CPSU members are highly concerned about this given AMES HR has not provided CPSU with details of the performance system and any targets staff are required to meet.

- **Tripartite Panel:** AMES HR and the CEO have proposed that the make-up of the Work Value Review Dispute Panel be as follows: 1 AMES HR, 1 Independent Person, and 1 AMES Staff Representative. This staff representative will be elected by staff. This is problematic given AMES is divided into 3 divisions – employment, education and settlement. CPSU has proposed that the composition of the panel be 1 AMES HR, an agreed Independent Person and 1 CPSU Industrial Officer. AMES is not agreeable to this suggestion.

HR's proposed model is problematic for the following reasons:

1. The independent person will ultimately be agreed between AMES HR and AMES Staff Representative
2. AMES will be represented twice on the panel
3. The elected staff representative may be from a sector different to that of the person who has lodged the grievance
4. The elected staff representative may experience an increase in their workload given their involvement on the panel
5. CPSU members will be disadvantaged given no panel member will be representing their best interests

Other tripartite panels in the sector are set up according to CPSU model.

- **Progression:** AMES HR has made it clear that a majority of staff will receive an annual increment. According to AMES HR, a majority constitutes a minimum of 50%. This is inconsistent with assurances that no one shall be financially worse off. CPSU has put to them that this be amended to read an overwhelming majority. Comparing the current situation (where an overwhelming majority of staff receive their 1% and have been doing so over the years) with the one that is proposed (majority being a minimum of 50%), staff will be financially disadvantaged. AMES has made it clear that the 1% payable under performance development and review will be used to fund incremental progression in the new structure.

It has been implied that CPSU is delaying and/or holding up the process. CPSU cannot agree to a structure that will disadvantage staff.

Once we have an in principle agreement the document will be submitted to CPSU Branch Council for approval.

**CPSU**

**23 February 2009**