TO ALL HEADS OF NATIONAL/PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS AND PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATIONS

CIRCULAR 2 OF 2016

IMPLEMENTATION OF SALARY/GRADE PROGRESSION FOR EMPLOYEES ON SALARY LEVELS 1 TO 12 IN TERMS OF PSCBC RESOLUTION 3 OF 2009

1. DPSA Circular no. 2 of 2009 dated 11 November 2009 regarding the implementation of the salary/grade progression model for employees on salary levels 1 to 12 (non-Occupation Specific Dispensation (OSD) employees) as well as the Incentive Policy Framework refers.

2. It has come to the DPSA’s attention that some departments are implementing grade progression irregularly without taking into account the grading level of the post as determined through job evaluation. They therefore grade progress employees to higher salary levels for which they are not eligible in terms of the grade progression model as envisaged in PSCBC Resolution 3 of 2009.

3. The DPSA wishes to explain this situation by means of the following examples:

(a) Incumbent A occupies a post graded on salary level 4 in terms of job evaluation. This incumbent is remunerated on salary level 4. The employee therefore qualifies for grade progression to salary level 5 (should they meet the qualifying criteria).

(b) Incumbent B occupies a post graded on salary level 4 in terms of job evaluation. This incumbent is remunerated on salary level 5. The incumbent of the post is not eligible to grade progress to salary level 6. Salary level 5 is the appropriate level in terms of the grade progression model for incumbents of posts graded on salary level 4 to grade progress to; and not salary level 6. Therefore, incumbent B remains on salary level 5, despite the fact that he/she has met the qualifying criteria.

4. Clause 3.5 of the Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council (PSCBC) Resolution 3 of 2009 read together with the Incentive Policy Framework for employees on salary levels 1 to 12 and those covered by an OSD, provides for the grade progression model to be based on the following principles:

- Posts are graded based on the outcome of Job Evaluation;
- Recognition of performance; and
- Completed continuous years of service on a salary level irrespective of the notch.”
5. Apart from what is contained in DPSA Circular 2 of 2009 and the Incentive Policy Framework, the DPSA has continuously advised departments that an employee's eligibility to grade progress is subject to the grade progression principles and model as regulated by PSCBC Resolution 3 of 2009 (which includes the fact that the grading level of a post as determined through job evaluation forms the basis from which employees can grade progress).

6. Departments are reminded that it is stipulated in Section 5(4) of the Public Service Act, 1994, that "No act by any functionary may be contrary to the provisions of any collective agreement, therefore no mandate is delegated to any Executing Authority to grant or allow any deviation from the provisions in the Collective Agreement".

7. Furthermore, Heads of Department are obliged to enforce compliance in terms of the Public Service Act, 1994, in Chapter V, Section 16A which stipulates the following:

"(2) A Head of Department shall-

(a) immediately take appropriate disciplinary steps against an employee of the department who does not comply with a provision of this Act or a regulation, determination or directive made hereunder;

(b) immediately report to the Director-General: Public Service and Administration the particulars of such non-compliance; and

(c) as soon as possible report to that Director-General the particulars of the disciplinary steps taken."

8. In conclusion, those departments that have implemented the grade progression of non-OSD employees incorrectly - therefore disregarding the fact that the grading level of a post as determined through job evaluation forms the basis from which employees can grade progress - as contained in PSCBC Resolution 3 of 2009 and DPSA Circular 2 of 2009, must immediately rectify these irregular progressions in terms of section 38 of the Public Service Act, 1994, as it is regarded as irregular granted remuneration. Therefore, the necessary remedial administrative action must be undertaken in terms of the Public Service Act, 1994, Section 16A.