

Review of PO, MeS and GFSc Work Level Definitions - Summary of Issues

Issue	Employer and Employee Association Positions	PSWD Comments
<u>General</u>		
WLDs should outline the basic principles of progression and classification	HSU	Agree, and the current WLDs outline these principles
General lack of clarity in the WLD's causing inconsistency in interpretation of roles between sites	Employer	Particular concern in Health
The multi-skilled nature of many health portfolio positions is not covered by the WLDs	Employer	WLDs are necessarily broad. PID or J&P should be referred to for more detail
<u>Salary concerns</u>		
Salary levels are insufficient	HSU, SAMSA	Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA
Adoption of Tasmanian model	HSU	Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA
<u>Limited career progression due to classification structures</u>		
Separate classification structure for allied health professionals	HSU	Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA
Current WLDs require the acquisition of greater skills and responsibilities when compared to previous agreement - may prove detrimental to the effective recruitment and retention of health professionals in the public sector	HSU	General comment

Upper levels of PO, MeS and GFS categories are largely unobtainable due to mandatory and inflexible requirements. More recognition of specialist roles needs to be applied in the WLD's to allow advancement - particularly applies to MeS6 level.

Employer

Not supported by data. June 2007 SA Public Sector Workforce information shows that 14% of Professional Officers under the PSM Act are in PO4 or above.

Inconsistency in application/interpretation of classifications

HSU, Employer

Local issue. Need to refer to J&P's scope of position. Not relevant to WLD's

Refer advertisements in Notice of Vacancies - eg Manager, Physiotherapist at WCH at PO3 and Team Leader, Pharmacy at PO4

HSU

Responsibility of individual agencies (eg DH) to ensure a classification level is appropriate for the job description

Accelerated progression

No recognition of experience beyond yearly increment levels - fast tracking should be enabled within level or, in some circumstances, progress to next level.

DH

CE's have the authority to appoint at any increment level

Separate agreement for health professionals

HSU

Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA

Need flexibility to appoint graduates from other disciplines (eg nurses, teachers), where their skills and training are very relevant (eg within Disability SA, Families SA or Domiciliary Care SA) but they are excluded by definition.

Employer

These disciplines are outside of a 'Professional Officers structure'. Practice in some agencies to use a dual classification position eg PO/RN

Various concerns regarding definition of "managerial responsibilities" eg the 5 requirements are not easy to interpret and apply, limited recognition of line management responsibilities (eg PO3 who is a Team Leader)

Employer

Supported for further discussions

New PO0 Level

Creation of a pre-graduate level for those in process of completing their qualification. Progression to PO1 would occur upon attainment of qualification, subject only to satisfactory performance.

Employer

Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA

PO1

Too many increments in this level - PO1 should be limited to employees with only 3 or 4 years experience. If PO1 level employees have gained post-graduate qualifications or significant specialised experience in a relevant area, they should have automatic progression to PO2

Employer

A change to the salary schedules in WPEA would breach the No Extra Claims provision

Barrier at 5th Increment

Barrier to be removed

Barrier to remain as is

Barrier to be relocated

* To top of L1 for progression to L2

* Remain in L1 but consistent with the maximum probationary period of 12 months or as a minimum at the 2nd or 3rd increment.

Employer

Employer

APESMA

Employer

Differing employer views. The removal or relocation of the barrier is not supported for further discussions.

Timing of Assessment

* To occur prior to 12 months in the 5th increment for progression to occur to the 6th increment on the 12 months anniversary. (See union schedule for proposed wording changes.)

* Further dot point required to make it clear that the assessment process does not change the incremental date, "The incremental date will be maintained"

Employer, PSA

Supported for further discussions - current wording to be reviewed

PSA

Supported for further discussions

Accelerated Progression to 7th Increment

* Needs to be some capacity for accelerated progression to 7th increment. For experienced professionals who leave the service and return, it is not reasonable for them to have to work a further 12 mths before achieving top increment

PSA

CE's have the authority to appoint at any increment level

Clinical Psychologists

* Agreed with PSA that Clinical Psychologists be appointed to the 6th increment of PO1 - needs to be clarified in criteria No recognition of length of training required - eg clinical psychologists require Masters Degree for registration but still enter at PO1.	PSA Employer	CE's have the authority to appoint at any increment level. Agency policy if necessary Reclassification issue - beyond the scope of this review
Psychologists Association: a more accurate representation of the qualifications, roles and responsibilities of Clinical Psychologists would be within the ranges of PO3 (graduate entry level), PO4 (Senior Clinician) and PO5 (Management/ Director).	Employer	Reclassification issue - beyond the scope of this review
Alternatively, development of a separate classification structure for Psychologists (inc Clinical Psychologists and Neuropsychologists).	Employer	Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA
<u>Terminology</u>		
Operational Outcomes: "With experience, responsible for straightforward projects" to be changed to previous definition of "the carriage of straightforward projects (with experience)"	PSA	Supported for further discussions
References to 'complex work' should be removed	PSA	Supported for further discussions
Replace "...become increasingly complex" with "develop to limited complexity", as appropriate to a base grade employee (paragraph 2 of introductory descriptive statements).	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Should not act or provide advice without supervision from a senior professional	PSA, HSU, Employer	Supported for further discussions
Not appropriate for PO1 to contribute to the development of the professional discipline as they undertake work work under some guidance and supervision	PSA	Supported for further discussions
Not appropriate for PO1 to provide advice regarding statutory action as they within established procedures, specific guidelines and standardised instructions	PSA, HSU, Employer	Supported for further discussions

"Provision of reports on progress of project activities including incorporating recommendations" will only occur "with experience".

HSU

Supported for further discussions

"With experience, the supervision of assigned employees" must be restricted to those employees who are nonprofessional, less skilled and/or less experienced

HSU

Supported for further discussions

L1 should be commencement level for graduates

Should be confined to the "trainee" or "internship" role

PSA

Employer does not support this as a matter for further discussions - potential reclassification implications

PO2

Post-Graduate Qualification

Requirement for post-graduate qualifications should come in at PO3

Employer, PSA

Employer has differing views re whether a 'requirement' for post -graduate qualifications should come in at PO2 or PO3. Not supported for further discussions

Requirement for post-graduate qualifications to remain at PO2 - PO2 requirement probably only applies to clinical psychologists who need to have a post-grad qualification for registration and key words are "that are necessary for registration"

Employer

Many PO2 roles do not require post-grad qualifications necessary for registration to a specialist practice, and the wording is causing confusion as to when applicable.

Employer

In Epidemiology/Public Health, it is not necessary to be registered, however post graduate qualifications are required, so the wording should be amended accordingly.

Employer

Supported for further discussions

L2 should be 1st level for an 'advanced practitioner'

At this level, refer to the work of a "practitioner"

PSA

PSA

Supported for further discussions

Supported for further discussions

Difficulty is perceived in proceeding beyond the PO1 level due to sole clinical position opportunities not being covered by 'work unit' responsibilities under PO2.

Employer

General comment

Definitions

L2 is not intended for a Manager - any references to "leader" need to be further defined

PSA

Supported for further discussions

Supervision

Supervision of health professionals is not mandatory but can occur within a small work group. As such they may "exercise and accept professional responsibility for the outcomes of a *small* work unit" and "be responsible for professional supervision of other health professionals".

HSU

Supported for further discussions

Terminology

Knowledge and Experience:

"Has attained greater specialised knowledge" is causing confusion - appears to require higher levels of expertise than 2nd dot point. Therefore, 1st dot point should be deleted.

PSA

Supported for further discussions

Operational Outcomes:

"Coordinates all phases of a project or assignment" should be removed and placed in PO3

PSA

Supported for further discussions

Working Environment:

"Exercised and accepts professional responsibility for the outcomes of a work unit" - belongs to L3 responsibilities.

HSU

Supported for further discussions

PO3

"Specialising within a professional discipline"

Agreement with this qualification

PSA

General comment

In order to broaden career paths, would prefer addition of "general specialist" role.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
<u>Should be referred to as the "first level of management", first level of specialisation", "more advanced practitioner"</u>	PSA	Supported for further discussions
Include reference to the "senior practitioner"	PSA	Supported for further discussions
PO3 level should reflect two separate types of role. The first being a supervisor having responsibility for a small, discrete work unit. This should be an experienced clinician supervising a clinical team not someone to manage a department or a large work unit. (Supervisor rather than manager.) The second is a clinical specialist within an organisation/discipline but not with statewide or national recognition.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
<u>Terminology</u>		
Operational Outcomes: "Undertakes professional duties of an innovative, novel, and/or crucial nature" not required at L3	PSA	Supported for further discussions
Knowledge and Experience: Include 1st dot point from PO2 "Has attained greater specialised knowledge" in PO3	PSA	Supported for further discussions
Generally operates as a specialist or supervises/ manages a small work group. Activities are generally subject to professional direction and management responsibilities. Responsibilities are generally within an agency.	HSU	General comment
Unlikely to exercise "high levels" of initiative and will be a "recognised specialist" only within their agency or health unit	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Advisory and consultancy services are subject to review by senior staff. Advice is limited to an area of specialist expertise.	HSU	Supported for further discussions

Suggested wording to be included: "Develops/provides professional advice and advisory/consultancy services within the agency, to industry representatives and the public within a limited area of specialised knowledge."	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Suggested wording to be included: "Within an area of specialist expertise, develops and promulgates information for management."	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Suggested wording to be included: "Contributes to the development of operational policy and broad program direction through participation in relevant intra-agency committees, working parties etc."	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Role is unlikely to involve issues that affect legislation or regulations although they may "Provide advice on the interpretation of legislation, regulations and other guideline material relating to the operations and functions of the work area."	HSU	Supported for further discussions
References to-work unit management, training, or policy/practice development need to relate to "small work unit" size.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
<u>PO4</u>		
Should be for "second level of management", "senior professional specialist", "senior professional practitioner"	PSA	Supported for further discussions
Policy and strategic directions - they may "contribute to the formulation of work unit policy and the implementation of corporate policy directives" and "contribute directly to the formulation of work unit objectives" (not directly to corporate objectives)	HSU	Supported for further discussions

Requirements at the PO4 and PO5 levels regarding an "international profile" effectively cap many career structures at the PO3 level, which is affecting the attraction of allied health professionals.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
<u>Terminology</u>		
Operational Outcomes:		
Several PO4 outcomes should be placed at PO5:	PSA, HSU	Supported for further discussions
* "Manages programs of crucial importance to the State to satisfy the Government's objectives or the agency or health unit's corporate goals."	HSU, DH	Supported for further discussions
* "Provides expert specialist advisory/consultancy skills with crucial impacts to the industry, the State and possibly the nation."	HSU	Supported for further discussions
* "Participates on inter-agency and/or national committees to develop policy, planning and other initiatives."	HSU, Employer	Supported for further discussions
* "Is the government's 'authority' in a particular specialised field."	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Inappropriate to expect "wide spread professional recognition".	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Work may involve significant complexity and innovation but this is not a prerequisite for all PO4 health professionals.	HSU	Do not agree - this should be a prerequisite for PO4
Remove reference to "a detailed knowledge of national initiatives" (para 2).	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Remove "...and highly innovative" (para 3).	HSU	Supported for further discussions
The specialist should also be recognised by un-refereed papers (para 4).	HSU	Not supported for further discussions
Re "research programs and major projects" (para 5) - replace 'and' with 'or'.	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Re "...will determine professional standards" (para 9) - must be directly related to work group he/she is associated with.	HSU	Supported for further discussions

Terminology

Introduction:

2nd para - "Decisions are likely to have a major impact on the health unit, agency, on industry, or on the State," should be removed. Similar to L5 criteria.

PSA

Supported for further discussions

"Manages... crucial impacts to the State..." and "Provides... crucial impacts to the industry" should be lessened.

HSU

Supported for further discussions

5th para - "It is expected that there will be a lack of precedent" is unrealistic for L4.

PSA

Supported for further discussions

Working Environment:

"Is the Government's "authority" in a specialised field of expertise" - replace "the" with "a".

HSU

Supported for further discussions

Publications in referred journals - should not preclude classification at L4

PSA

Supported for further discussions

Management of large work units, multi-team management, cross-site management, managements over other managers/team leaders should fall into PO4 level at a minimum.

Employer

Supported for further discussions

PO4 level should reflect two separate types of role. Firstly the manager of a discrete unit or small department. Secondly a clinical specialist with scope beyond their agency – not necessarily statewide or national recognition.

Employer

Supported for further discussions

PO5

Terminology

Introduction:

1st para - Requirement to be "The leading professional specialist" is unrealistic at L5 (*the* leading... v *a* leading...)

PSA, HSU

Supported for further discussions

6th para - "the lack of precedent is a major feature of the majority of duties and actions undertaken" is not warranted.	PSA, Employer	Supported for further discussions
4th para - "..... making significant departures from traditional approaches" is not warranted at L5.	PSA	Supported for further discussions
Reference to "highly innovative" should be replaced with "advanced complexity".	PSA	Supported for further discussions
<u>Implementation Barriers</u> Professionals working in service organisations (as opposed to research organisations) may not be able to meet criteria of publishing articles in professional journals etc	PSA	General comment
Expectation that professionals at this level would have an international reputation is not realistic - their role is confined more to the local working environment (state/national level).	PSA, HSU, Employer	Supported for further discussions
Knowledge and experience - Requirement for "higher qualifications" and recognition at a national/international level is increased from previous WLDs - must be lessened.	HSU, Employer	Supported for further discussions
Higher qualification requirement needs to be clarified, given that post graduate qualifications are referenced at PO2/PO3 level. Consideration should be given to recognition of equivalent experience gained through career development activities.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Same comment as above for "significant contribution" on a "national/international" basis.	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Some PO5s do not have "evidence of higher qualifications, and discipline recognition at national and/or international levels".	Employer	General comment
Preamble section - notable omission is the 'practitioner' role.	HSU	Supported for further discussions

Further define Operational Outcomes and Working Environment to include contributions of a strategic nature and involvement with professional committees, research and teaching. (Suggested wording provided.)	HSU	Supported for further discussions
<u>Barrier at 4th Increment</u> 4th increment - Concern regarding "Has formal responsibilities for a major agency (or health unit) program". May not be met by high level professional specialist who may work autonomously within a program, if the criterion is interpreted as implying a requirement to exercise a management role over the program.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Soft barrier is working.	Employer	General comment
<u>New PO6 Level to be created to facilitate appropriate classification of health professionals via the WLDs</u>		Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA
Should provide an appropriate classification for the national and international specialist. Will be a leading national specialist but is not expected to be a leading international specialist although they may have international recognition.	HSU	
<u>General</u>		
<u>Definitions</u>		
"Novelty" - previous definition should be restored.	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Change "novel" to "innovative".	Employer	Supported for further discussions
"Papers" - should allow un-refereed paper and "internal reports" as per previous definition.	HSU	Supported for further discussions
Define "Practitioner" and "Senior Practitioner"	PSA	Supported for further discussions
Define "Professional Supervision"	PSA	Supported for further discussions

Define "a specialist"/"specialising within a professional discipline"	PSA, Employer	Supported for further discussions
Define "program", "project".	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Define "numbers of direct reports".	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Define "major agency".	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Define "work unit"	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Clearly delineate 3 categories (Practitioners, Specialists, Managers) in PO Stream	PSA, Employer	Supported for further discussions
3 "streams" should be linked with "and/or" as many POs who manage work units also have their own area of clinical specialisation and consequently also supervise in the area.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Some occupations in Health Sector require significant levels of skills (eg Perfusionists) that are not adequately reflected in WLD's	PSA	General comment
<u>Review Schedule 3, Professional Services Stream SAPSSEI</u> Newer classifications should be included eg IT, Geographical Information Systems, Accountancy	PSA	Outside the scope of this review
Orthotists and Biomedical Engineers should be included within the PO stream (rather than the technical stream).	Employer	Outside the scope of this review
Management of the "professional creep" through classification criteria is required.	Employer	General comment - needs to be a tight control on some other disciplines (which have no direct overlap with existing PO disciplines) moving into the PO Structure.
<u>WLDs do not allow for career progression</u>		

Previous WLDs said "may include a combination of inputs" - generally understood as meaning meeting majority of inputs satisfied classification criteria/requirements (whereas current WLDs imply all inputs must be fulfilled)

PSA

Supported for further discussions

WLDs focus on specific professional discipline, whereas many PO positions (eg Social Worker, Psychologist) require expertise across a number of disciplines. Therefore difficult to assess against a criteria that has a strong focus on leadership and contributing to the professional discipline

Employer

General comment

WLDs do not satisfactorily recognise positions that are classified within more than one stream where PO is one of the streams – despite the fact that from PO3 level upwards, the definition of professional officer encompasses professional managers and supervisors.

Employer

General comment

MeS1/GFS1

General

Should be a training grade, in which scientists acquire new skills.

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

Number of increments needs reassessment

Employer

A change to the salary schedules in WPEA would breach the No Extra Claims provision

Increased level of responsibility in the WLDs for L1 has resulted in a more difficult transition to L2.

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

Terminology

The statement "Contributions are essentially operational in nature... range of learned professional techniques and theory" reflect a lack of understanding of the nature of work of medical scientists. Much of the work is *repetitive* and not "project based". Concepts of "application of acquired experience" and "learned techniques" not appropriate for L1.

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

Barrier at 6th Increment

Soft barrier should be applied to the top of L1 for progression to L2.

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

Barriers are misplaced regarding staff development.

Employer

Supported for further discussions

MeS2/GFS2

"Responsible for professional direction of other medical scientists" or the provision of "discrete professional and consultancy services" should not be required to progress to L2.

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

MeS4/GFS4, MeS5/GFS5 & MeS6/GFS6

Overall requirements and level of responsibility at L4, L5 & L6 have been raised

Requirement for L4 to be an expert within the State, for L5 to have a national profile and for L6A to have an international profile - in previous WLDs, these were requirements at the next level. Requirements should revert.

APESMA,
Employer
APESMA

General comment

Supported for further discussions

Requirement of "the leading international specialist" is unrealistic - should be amended to "possibly a leading international specialist".

Employer

Supported for further discussions

Senior classifications (MeS4 and above) are very difficult to attain. More recognition of specialist roles needs to be applied in WLDs, especially for MeS6.

Employer

Supported for further discussions

MeS4

The requirement to have a detailed knowledge of national initiatives is "a pretty steep ask"; rather, it should be expected that they are up to date with state initiatives and maintain professional ties and associations.

Employer

Supported for further discussions

MeS5

Re Working Environment: ".....decisions made will not usually be subject to professional review." There is very little scientific work that is not subject to personal review, especially in a research environment.

Employer

General comment

MeS6

Knowledge and experience elements should be amended to read "may include the following features" or "will include a combination of the following features". Precludes persons with diagnostic roles - unlikely to have "Extensive refereed publications in internationally recognised journals".

Employer

Supported for further discussions

General

WLDs fail to recognise the contribution of scientists who work in a smaller workplace

These scientists may also be expected to have skills and knowledge in other disciplines, which should be recognised by classification that is commensurate with the scientist's value to the organisation (eg L4 and above).

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

Criteria

Criteria interpreted so that at L6A/L6B the person must meet all of the listed knowledge and experience criteria. Suggest that this be modified to: "Knowledge and Experience expected in positions at the MeS6A/B level may include a combination of..."

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

Generic definitions across all professional streams

Nature of work in each category is very different.

Employer

General comment

Task of assessment panels has been made more difficult by the attempt to create a set of generic definitions.

APESMA

General comment

The “Scientific Excellence” criteria specified in Schedule 2 of the Medical Scientists (South Australian Public Sector) Award should be reviewed and incorporated in the WLDs for the relevant MeS levels (MeS2/3/4/5).

Employer

Supported for further discussions

Needs to be more separation of WLD formats for PO, MeS and GFS as the nature of work is very different due to Scientists having significant research components in their roles. The WLDs do not reflect the true scientific nature of Medical Scientist roles having borrowed heavily from the PO WLDs, and this applies to a greater degree for GFSs regarding the unique scientific research roles undertaken.

Employer

Supported for further discussions

GFS

General

WLDs show lack of understanding of the role of a GFS, placing too much emphasis on organisational responsibility etc and too little on the scientific aspects (eg research).

APESMA,
Employer

Supported for further discussions

GFS - funding

GFS at senior levels are responsible for attracting external funding that pays his/her salary plus other salaries of the workgroup - should be recognised by appropriate classification.

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

WLDs do not acknowledge significance of factors outside of the public sector which are influential in obtaining of research funding grants from NH&MRC (ie previous successful research, scientific standing and expertise within particular specialty etc).

Employer

Supported for further discussions

Status afforded to GFSs by academic institutions (ie universities), the awarding of associate/professorships is also more influential and significant to the group than WLDs.

Employer

General comment

GFS3

To expect a GFS3 to "apply for" and "manage external grant funding" and "leadership within the professional discipline" is unrealistic.

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

Managerial Allowance

Entitlement difficult to apply, clarification required.

APESMA,
Employer

Supported for further discussions

Not appropriate to expect a manager at L3 to exercise same degree of HRM or "allocation of both financial and human resources" as a L5. Guidance required as to level of managerial responsibility to be exercised at each level.

APESMA

Supported for further discussions

3 out of the 5 criteria should be sufficient for an employee to be paid the managerial allowance

PSA

Supported for further discussions

Question inclusion of responsibility for "determining operational policy and procedure"; should be amended as follows: "Is required to apply and contribute to the review of operational policies and procedures".

Employer

Supported for further discussions

Criteria should clarify that only those POs with management (not just supervisory) responsibilities qualify.

Employer

Supported for further discussions

Define "work unit" and "a large number".	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Lack of clarity exists regarding whether the allowance is intended to be "permanent to the individual" or an allowance that recognises added responsibilities - preferable to have it in a more flexible form and not locked in "for all purposes".	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Allowance should be paid similar to an additional duties allowance - would enable the allowance to be dropped if the management component of the employee's role ceases.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
The criteria for the management allowance needs to be specific enough to ensure that only those PO's with management (not just supervisory) responsibilities receive the allowance	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Allowance requirements are unclear and difficult to determine regarding eligibility, with a separate management stream being preferable.	Employer	Establishment of a separate management stream would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA
Very limited recognition within WLDs of line management responsibilities (eg PO3 Team Leader).	Employer	Supported for further discussions
Concerned that where workers at PO3 level have managerial responsibilities with staff, they are not in fact eligible for a managerial allowance unless they deal with budgets.	Employer	Supported for further discussions
<u>Quantum</u> Allowance is not adequate for managers responsible for large groups of staff and budgets.	Employer	Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA
Flat rate offered does not acknowledge increasing complexity of issues experienced by staff in large work units. Must have tiered structure.	Employer	Would breach No Extra Claims provision in WPEA