IN THE FAIR WORK COMMISSION

Fair Work Act 2009

s. 156 – 4 yearly review of modern awards

AM2016/28 - Pharmacy Industry Award 2010

PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY OF AUSTRALIA - SUBMISSIONS

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Association of Professional Engineers, Scientists and Managers, Australia (APESMA) applied to the Fair Work Commission (Commission) seeking, among other things, an increase to the minimum wage rates in the *Pharmacy Industry Award 2010* (Pharmacy Award).
- 1.2 APESMA's claims were heard in conjunction with the Commission's four yearly review of the Pharmacy Award, matter number AM2014/209 (**Proceedings**).
- 1.3 On 14 December 2018, a Full Bench of the Commission issued a decision in the Proceedings in which it:
 - (a) accepted, or partially accepted, some aspects of the APESMA claim;
 - (b) rejected the remaining aspects of the APESMA claim; and
 - (c) raised, on its own initiative consistently with section 156(2) of the Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) (FW Act), a potential work value issue arising from the relativity between the minimum wage rates in the Pharmacy Award and the minimum wage rates in the Manufacturing and Associated Industries and Occupations Award 2010 (Manufacturing Award), which had not been raised by APESMA (Relativities Issue).

See: 4 yearly review of modern awards - Pharmacy Industry Award 2010 [2018] FWCFB 7621 (Decision).

- 1.4 In paragraph [199] of the Decision (and later by email), the Commission invited interested parties to file written submissions about the aspects of the APESMA claim that it accepted, or partially accepted, and the Relativity Issue.
- 1.5 These submissions, made by the Pharmaceutical Society of Australia (**PSA**) on behalf of its members, address those matters.
- 1.6 By way of introduction, and for reasons explained in detail below:
 - (a) the PSA supports the introduction of an allowance into the Pharmacy Award for pharmacists who are the holder of an accredited pharmacist qualification and who undertake professional services requiring pharmacist accreditation (see [2], Decision). PSA submits the allowance should be:

- paid weekly or fortnightly at the same time as payment of wages under clause 22 of the Pharmacy Award;
- (ii) based on 18% of the minimum weekly wage for a Pharmacist in the Pharmacy Award:
- (iii) paid to any employee who has completed a course recognised by a relevant accreditation authority (eg, the Australian Association of Consultant Pharmacy), to become an accredited pharmacist and who is required by their employer to undertake services or duties requiring accreditation as part of their role. The entitlement to the allowance should not be measured or paid based on the number of HMRs or RMMRs performed although a requirement to perform these duties would trigger an entitlement to the allowance; and
- (iv) be able to form part of an individual flexibility agreement under clause 7 of the Pharmacy Award or form part of an annualised salary under clause 27 of the Pharmacy Award.

A draft order is at Attachment A;

(b) the PSA supports increases to minimum wage rates in the Pharmacy Award for all employees classified at the Pharmacy Assistant Level 4 classification or higher. The quantum of the increase should be determined following consideration of the issues identified by the Full Bench in paragraphs [194] to [198] of the Decision.

2. About the PSA

- 2.1 PSA is the only Australian Government-recognised peak national professional pharmacy organisation representing all of Australia's 31,000 pharmacists working in all sectors and across all locations.
- 2.2 PSA is committed to improving Australia's health through excellence in pharmacist care. PSA believes the expertise of pharmacists can be better utilised to address the health care needs of all Australians.
- 2.3 PSA has a strong and engaged membership base that provides high-quality health care and are the custodians for safe and effective medicine use for the Australian community.
- 2.4 PSA works to identify, unlock and advance opportunities for pharmacists to realise their full potential, to be appropriately recognised and fairly remunerated.

3. The Issues

3.1 In the proceedings, APESMA claimed:

- (a) the creation of a new classification of 'Accredited Pharmacist' with a proposed wage rate for that classification equivalent to that of Pharmacist Manager (Classification Claim); and
- (b) increases to the minimum rates of pay for Pharmacist classifications covered by the Pharmacy Award, namely Pharmacy Interns, Pharmacist, Experienced Pharmacist, Pharmacist in Charge and Pharmacist Manager (Wage Claim).

Classification Claim

- 3.2 The Classification Claim was for the introduction of a new classification into the Pharmacy Award of an 'Accredited Pharmacist' to be defined as 'a pharmacist who is the holder of an Accredited Pharmacist qualification who undertakes professional services requiring pharmacist accreditation or credentialing'.²
- 3.3 While the Full Bench did not accept this claim in full³, it did accept that:
 - (a) the introduction of certain work in the industry (eg, HMRs and RMMRs) which can only be carried out by pharmacists with accreditation, demonstrated an increase in work value for that cohort; and
 - (b) this justified a discrete increase to award remuneration.4
- 3.4 The Full Bench said:

'[186]... We have reached that conclusion for the following reasons:

- (1) The performance of these duties requires the higher qualification of Accredited Pharmacist, which may only be obtained after undertaking a training course and successfully completing a communication module, an examination and four case studies.
- (2) The performance of HMRs and RMMRs occurs in the patient's home or aged care residence that is, a different work environment involving the exercise of distinct personal interaction skills and must be conducted in coordination with the patient's medical practitioner.
- (3) There is an entirely new level of responsibility in terms of both medical outcomes and the claiming of CPA funding.

[186] However, we do not agree that an entirely new classification of Accredited Pharmacist, as proposed by the APESMA, is either necessary or warranted. Registered

¹ APESMA, 'Outline of Submissions on APESMA Claim to Increase Pharmacist Minimum Rates of Pay for Work Value Reasons', Submissions in *4 yearly review of modern awards - Pharmacy Industry Award 2010* [2018] FWCFB 7621, AM2014/209, 4 [7]. ² Ibid 3 [2].

³ Decision [183].

⁴ Ibid [185].

pharmacists at any classification level may become Accredited Pharmacists, and any increased remuneration should operate as an equal increment to whatever may be the pharmacist's classification rate. Further, the holding of the qualification of Accredited Pharmacist does not in itself mean that the employer requires the performance of HMRs and/or RMMRs, and the evidence shows that many pharmacies do not engage in this work. These considerations support the conclusion that the appropriate course is to establish an allowance for Accredited Pharmacists who are required by their employer to perform HMRs and/or RMMRs. We consider that the establishment of such an allowance would be consistent with and necessary to achieve the modern awards objective in s 134(1), in that it is required in order for there to be a fair and relevant safety net for pharmacists performing HMRs and RMMRs. In reaching that conclusion we have taken into account all the matters specified in s 134(1)(a)-(h); each of those matters we consider to be neutral considerations. We consider for the same reason that such an allowance is necessary to achieve the minimum wages objective in s 284(1), to the extent applicable; in that respect we consider the matters identified in s 284(1)(a)-(e) to be neutral considerations.

[187] We propose to invite further submissions about the form of this allowance (such as whether it should be an annual or weekly allowance or an allowance payable each time a HMR or RMMR is performed) and its quantum.'

Wage Claim

- 3.5 The Wage Claim was advanced on two alternative basis:
 - (a) **first**, it was argued that minimum wage rates in the Pharmacy Award should be increased for 'work value reasons' see section 156(4) of the FW Act; ⁵ and
 - (b) **second**, in addition or in the alternative to the claim based on 'work value reasons', it was argued that minimum wage rates in the Pharmacy Award should be granted on the basis that flat-dollar increases to award minimum award wages which were a feature of minimum wage setting decisions from 1993 to 2010 has eroded the basis upon which the work value of pharmacists had originally been assessed, namely identified relativities with the C10 rate in the *Metal Industry Award 1984* (now the Manufacturing Award), and that these relativities needed to be restored in order for the rates of pay to correctly reflect the work value of pharmacists.⁶

⁵ APESMA, 'Outline of Submissions on APESMA Claim to Increase Pharmacist Minimum Rates of Pay for Work Value Reasons', Submissions in *4 yearly review of modern awards - Pharmacy Industry Award 2010* [2018] FWCFB 7621, AM2014/209, 10 [24]. ⁶ APESMA, 'APESMA Submissions in Reply', Submissions in *4 yearly review of modern awards - Pharmacy Industry Award 2010* [2018] FWCFB 7621, AM2016/28, 1.

- 3.6 The Full Bench rejected the relativities based argument advanced by APESMA⁷, although as alluded to earlier, the Full Bench did raise the separate and distinct Relativities Issue.⁸
- 3.7 The Full Bench did, however, accept the Wage Claim insofar as it related to increasing minimum wages in the Pharmacy Award for work value reasons. After identifying that several aspects of the claim advanced by APESMA which it said would *not* justify an increase to minimum wages in the Pharmacy Award for work value reasons⁹, the Full Bench said:

'[188]...we are satisfied that, in respect of some of the matters raised in the APESMA's case, there has been some increase in the work value of pharmacists since 1998. These matters are as follows:

- Inoculations: The work of actually administering an inoculation by injection is new work introduced in recent years involving the exercise of a discrete new skill, and requires the completion of additional approved study, the maintenance of authority to immunise, and the holding of statements of proficiency in cardiopulmonary resuscitation and first aid.
- Emergency contraception: The provision of emergency contraception, as Mr Yap explained in his evidence, requires not just the usual tasks of ensuring that the issue of the medication would be appropriate, safe and effective, but may also require analysis, advice, assistance and referral in cases where the patient is underage or may have been the victim of a sexual assault. We accept Mr Loukas' evidence that this is new work and involves an increase in accountability and responsibility.
- Downscaling of medicines: The downscaling of significant numbers of medications from prescription-only to Schedule 3 pharmacy-only medicines has increased the work value of pharmacists because it requires the pharmacist, in addition to dispensing the drug, to take on the functions previously exercised by a medical practitioner of diagnosing the patient and determining that issuing the medication would be a safe and effective medical response.
- General increase in the level of responsibility and accountability: While, for the reasons earlier stated, we have not generally accepted that the work and skills associated with patient programs established and funded under the CPAs has led to an increase in work value, we consider that the requirement for pharmacists to document these activities for the purpose of receiving funding and measuring outcomes represents a new required level of accountability and responsibility on

⁷ Decision [193].

⁸ Ibid [194] – [198].

⁹ Ibid [184].

the part of the pharmacist. Both the APESMA witnesses and the PGA witnesses acknowledged that this documentation requirement had not previously been a responsibility of pharmacists in 1998 when the relevant services had been provided on an informal and ad hoc basis.

[189] We will invite the parties to make further submissions as to how the above findings should be reflected in an adjustment to remuneration, noting that the evidence demonstrates that not all pharmacists administer inoculations or dispense emergency contraception. It may be necessary for the consideration of this matter to occur in the context of the matters raised in the next part of our decision.'

Relativities Issue

- 3.8 Although the Full Bench rejected the aspect of the Wage Claim concerning the restoration of relativities between the minimum wage rate for the Pharmacist classification in the Pharmacy Award and the minimum wage rate for the C10 classification in the Manufacturing Award¹⁰, it nevertheless identified an issue in the relativities between the classifications and minimum wage rates between those modern awards.
- 3.9 The Relativities Issue is that the classifications in the Pharmacists Award and the classifications in the Manufacturing Award do not align for equivalent qualifications.¹¹
- 3.10 The Full Bench emphasised the Relativities Issue by reference to the Australian Quality
 Framework (AQF)¹², which ranks educational qualifications above the completion of the Senior
 Secondary Certificate of Education in ten levels, including a Bachelor Degree qualification, which
 is Level 7.
- 3.11 The Full Bench pointed out that when regard is had to the minimum educational qualification requirements of a Pharmacist, including an Intern Pharmacist, and the minimum wage rates for those classifications, these employees are paid less compared to employees with *lower* education qualifications in the Manufacturing Award.¹³
- 3.12 Of this scenario, the Full Bench said:

[197] This outcome appears to be inconsistent with the principles stated and the approach taken concerning the proper fixation of award minimum rates in the ACT Child Care Decision, to which we have earlier made reference. However we note that the ACT Child Care Decision was made under a different statutory regime and pursuant to wage-fixing principles which no longer exist.

¹⁰ Ibid [193].

¹¹ Ibid [195].

¹² Ibid [195].

¹³ Ibid [196].

[198] This matter may potentially constitute a work value consideration relevant to the 4 yearly review of the Pharmacy Award. In the conduct of the review, the Commission is required to discharge its functions under s 156(2) and is not confined to matters raised by interested parties. We will as a first step invite further submissions from interested parties concerning this matter.'

4. PSA Position – Classification Claim

- 4.1 PSA strongly supports the Full Bench's conclusions that certain duties of pharmacists with accreditation namely, the requirement to conduct HMRs and RMMRs and potentially other duties warrant additional remuneration for such employees and that it is appropriate for the additional remuneration to be in the form of a special allowance.
- 4.2 In terms of the nature of the special allowance, the following issues arise for determination:
 - (a) what should be the criteria for the special allowance that is, when should it be paid;
 - (b) what should be the frequency of payment that is, how often should it be paid; and
 - (c) what should be the quantum of the special allowance that is, how much should it be.
- 4.3 We address each of these points below.

When should the special allowance be paid?

- 4.4 The criteria for payment of the special allowance should be twofold:
 - (a) first, the employee must be an accredited pharmacist, being a person who has completed a course by the relevant accreditation authority (eg, the Australian Association of Consultant Pharmacy) to become an accredited pharmacist and who, at the time of payment, maintains that accreditation; and
 - (b) second, the employee must be required by their employer to undertake as part of their role services or duties (eg, HMRs, RMMRs) that require them to be an accredited pharmacist. If the pharmacist will be required to undertake services or duties requiring accreditation (eg, HMRs, RMMRs) they will receive the proposed allowance. Conversely, if a particular pharmacist is accredited, but is not required to undertake services or duties requiring accreditation, they will not be entitled to receive the proposed allowance. This is an important requirement because it will provide the employer with the opportunity to consider the precise duties to be undertaken by a particular pharmacist and make an informed decision about the wage cost of requiring those duties to be undertaken.
- 4.5 It follows from the above criteria that the PSA would be opposed to any submission linking the entitlement of the special allowance to each occasion that an HMR or RMMR is performed.

- 4.6 There are good reasons why it is appropriate to pay the special allowance on the basis advanced by PSA and, equally, there are good reasons why limiting the payment of the special allowance to occasions when an employee performs an HMR or RMMR would be inappropriate.
- 4.7 **First**, the duties of a pharmacist which require accreditation are not fixed. While it is true that HMRs and RMMRs can only be carried out by pharmacists with appropriate accreditation, there may be other duties or programs in the future that have the same requirement.
- 4.8 Such a proposition cannot be denied and, in fact, was implicit in the argument advanced by the Pharmacy Guild of Australia (**PGA**) in opposition to APESMA's claim for the introduction of an entirely new classification for Accredited Pharmacist.
- 4.9 In their submissions dated 13 June 2017, the PGA said:

'It would be inappropriate for the inclusion of the 'Accredited Pharmacist' classification into the Pharmacy Award as the role of 'Accredited Pharmacist' is directly linked and related to several Government funded programs which may not continue into the future. Instead the inclusion of a higher duties allowance should be considered for recognition of work performed against specific Government funded programs.'

- 4.10 While the PGA accepts that government funded programs requiring accreditation might cease in future, one can assume that new government funded programs requiring duties to be carried out by pharmacists with accreditation may be introduced. Further, one can also assume that industry (and even individual employers) may look to introduce new competency standards or duties requiring accreditation.
- 4.11 Having regard to the above, it would not serve the modern awards objective in section 134 of the FW Act, that modern awards, together with the National Employment Standards, provide a fair and relevant minimum safety net of terms and conditions, taking into account (among other things) the need to ensure a simple, easy to understand, stable and sustainable modern award system, to base the special allowance on performance of HMRs and RMMRs only.
- 4.12 Such an approach is only likely to lead to future claims for amendment to the special allowance as more programs and duties requiring accreditation are developed. Similarly, such an approach could too easily see the relevance of the safety net undermined (or at least operate less clearly) by simple matters such as a name change to the HMR and RMMR services.
- 4.13 **Second**, basing the special allowance on performance of HMRs and RMMRs only, would not take into account the impact of accreditation and the requirement to perform duties requiring accreditation in the day to day work of a pharmacist.
- 4.14 An accredited pharmacist possesses a higher qualification to a registered pharmacist. A person may only become accredited if, after having completed all requirements to become a registered

¹⁴ PGA, 'Outline of Submissions for the Pharmacy Guild of Australia', Submissions in *4 yearly review of modern awards - Pharmacy Industry Award 2010* [2018] FWCFB 7621, AM2014/209 8 [38].

pharmacist (which is a Pharmacist for the purposes of the Pharmacy Award), the person has also undertaken a training course recognised by the relevant accreditation authority (eg, the Australian Association of Consultant Pharmacy) which includes successful completion of a communication module, an examination and case studies.

- 4.15 PSA notes and supports the written submissions of APESMA dated 21 December 2017, regarding the process of accreditation, which is also indicative of the commitment and effort required to both obtain and then *maintain* the status of accredited pharmacist. APESMA submitted:
 - '5.10. That the introduction of the Accredited Pharmacist qualification requires those who obtain it to undertake significant additional training and that they have additional ongoing registration requirements to that of a registered pharmacist. (It should be noted that only pharmacists who have obtained this qualification are authorized to conduct HMRs and RMMRs.) These additional educational requirements are outlined in the Statements of Mr. Yap (A.4) and Ms. Madden (A.3).'
- 4.16 In addition to allowing a pharmacist to carry out duties requiring accreditation, PSA submits that the skills derived from the process of becoming accredited and maintaining an accreditation enriches all aspects of an accredited pharmacists work including their day-to-day duties that do not require accreditation. This improves the overall value of an accredited pharmacists work, and justifies payment of the special allowance at all times.

How often should the special allowance be paid?

- 4.17 Under the Pharmacy Award, wages are paid weekly or fortnightly (see clause 22). Payment of the special allowance on a weekly or fortnightly basis best aligns to the structure of the Pharmacy Award.
- 4.18 Under the Pharmacy Award, it is possible for a Pharmacist or a Pharmacy Assistant above Level 4 to agree to enter into an annualised salary that satisfies a range of entitlements under the Pharmacy Award. The PSA submits that the special allowance should be able to form part of an annualised salary. This would mean employers who currently pay pharmacists an annual salary that is sufficient to satisfy the proposed special allowance (and other entitlements under the Pharmacy Award), would not be required to change the pharmacist's current annual salary if the proposed special allowance was included in the Pharmacy Award. The PSA submits that this strikes an appropriate balance between ensuring accredited pharmacists who are required to perform services or duties that require them to be accredited are appropriately remunerated, and not requiring employers who already pay a pharmacist an above award rate to incur an additional cost as a result of a change to the Pharmacy Award.
- 4.19 Under the Pharmacy Award, allowances can form part of an individual flexibility agreement (see clause 7). The PSA submits the special allowance should be able to form part of an individual flexibility agreement.

How much should the special allowance be?

- 4.20 There are interrelated issues arising as to the quantum of the special allowance:
 - (a) first, how should the special allowance be calculated (ie, by reference to the 'standard rate' in the Pharmacy Award or some other measure); and
 - (b) second, what should the total weekly amount of the special allowance be.
- 4.21 In relation to the first issue, PSA submit that it is appropriate for the special allowance to be based on a percentage of the minimum wage rate for a Pharmacist in the Pharmacy Award, as opposed to the *'standard rate'* or a flat dollar amount.
- 4.22 A flat dollar amount is not appropriate as it would inevitably, and hastily, result in the erosion of the value of the special allowance in real terms. The special allowance should be based on a percentage of a minimum wage rate, so that its value increases in line with any upward adjustment to minimum wage rates in modern awards under the Annual Wage Review conducted pursuant to section 285 of the FW Act.
- 4.23 The special allowance could be based as a percentage of the 'standard rate', although it may be more appropriate for it to be based on the minimum wage rate for a Pharmacist.
- 4.24 It is important to observe that the 'standard rate' in the Pharmacy Award is defined in clause 3 to be:
 - '... the minimum weekly wage for a Pharmacy Assistant Level 3 in clause'.
- 4.25 A Pharmacy Assistant Level 3 requires an employee to have obtained the competencies of Certificate III on the AQF and is equivalent to the C10 rate in the Manufacturing Award. By contrast, a Pharmacist must hold a degree qualification, so basing the special allowance on this classification is appropriate. In addition, only registered pharmacists (who are classified as Pharmacists under the Pharmacy Award) are eligible to become an accredited pharmacist.
- 4.26 It is also worth pointing out that basing the special allowance on the minimum wage rate for a Pharmacist in the Pharmacy Award, as opposed to the 'standard rate' will not be a source of inconsistency between it and other prominent allowances in the award. In this regard, the 'Broken Hill Allowance' in clause 19.7 of the Pharmacy Award is the only allowance in the award that is calculated by reference to the 'standard rate'.
- 4.27 A further reason for linking the special allowance to the minimum wage rates for a Pharmacist in the Pharmacy Award is that the partially successful Wage Claim will, and the Relativity Issue identified by the Full Bench may, lead to wage increases for Pharmacists which are presently unknown but (at least in relation to the partially successful Wage Claim), have been found to be necessary. By contrast, the minimum wage rates for the Pharmacy Assistant Level 3 classification and therefore the 'standard rate', will remain unchanged.

- 4.28 The supports linking the special allowance to the minimum wage rates for a Pharmacist in the Pharmacy Award, so that the full benefit of any increases to the minimum wage rates arising for work value reasons flows through to recipients of the special allowance.
- 4.29 Turning to the quantum of the allowance, PSA submits the special allowance should be 18% of the minimum weekly wage for a Pharmacist in the Pharmacy Award. Based on the current minimum weekly wages in the Pharmacy Award, this would result in an eligible pharmacist receiving a weekly wage (excluding amounts in respect of overtime and any other applicable entitlements) of \$1,219.41 (ie, 118% of \$1033.40).
- 4.30 This would result in the below outcome when compared to the minimum weekly wage for other classifications in the Pharmacy Award:

Classification	Minimum weekly wage (clause 17)
Pharmacist	\$1033.40
Experienced Pharmacist	\$1131.80
Pharmacist in Charge	\$1158.40
[Pharmacist receiving the proposed special allowance]	[\$1,219.41]
Pharmacist Manager	\$1290.90

4.31 PSA submits that an allowance of 18% of the minimum weekly wage for a Pharmacist, appropriately reflects the level of work performed, and value added by, eligible pharmacists, which the PSA considers is between that of a Pharmacist in Charge and a Pharmacist Manager.

5. PSA Position – Proposed Clause for the Special Allowance

Having regard to the above submissions, PSA submits that an order in the form set in Attachment A would be appropriate to give effect to the Decision in respect of the Classification Claim.

6. PSA Position - Wage Claim and Relativities Issue

- 6.1 PSA strongly supports the Full Bench's conclusions that there has been an increase in the work value of Pharmacists since 1998 and that those findings should be reflected in an upwards adjustment to the minimum wage rates in the Pharmacy Award.
- 6.2 The quantum of the increase needs to reflect the general increase in the level of responsibility and accountability and the trend towards downscaling of medicines which applies broadly across the industry, as well as new skills (such as delivering inoculations and emergency contraception) which may be carried out discretely.
- 6.3 While the PSA is concerned to ensure that any delays in passing on much needed and justified wage increases to those it represents is avoided at all costs, it also takes the view that it is difficult to finalise the Wage Claim in isolation of consideration of the Relativities Issue.

- In this regard, the PSA submits that the Relativities Issue identified by the Commission is an important one that should be subject of further consideration and it supports the course alluded to by the Full Bench in the Decision namely that the Relativities Issue should be referred to his Honour, the President, Justice Ross, for consideration as to how the matter should be determined.
- 6.5 It matters not, in the PSA's submission, that the Relativities Issue potentially raises issues with other modern awards. The issue is one that must be resolved both as a matter of fairness to employees covered by the Pharmacy Award (including employees at the Pharmacy Assistant Level 4 classification who possess competencies at the Certificate IV Level on the AQF, but whom are remunerated at a lower level to their counterparts under the Manufacturing Award 2010) and also to ensure coherence in the modern award system.
- The tables set out in Attachment B and Attachment C to this submission, are illustrative of the unfairness occasioned by the Relativities Issue. The table in Attachment B compares classifications, AQF Levels and wage rates in the Pharmacy Award and the Manufacturing Award. The table demonstrates that the levels and minimum wage rates are misaligned. The table in Attachment C shows minimum wage rates for degree qualified employees in a large number of modern awards. In all cases, the Pharmacy Award has the lowest minimum wage rates for new graduates entering a profession with a <u>four</u> year degree.
- 6.7 There are several reasons why the misalignment of classifications and wage rates between the Pharmacy Award and the Manufacturing Award should be corrected. The disparity between graduate entry wages in the Pharmacy Award and other modern awards covering professionals emphasises this.
- 6.8 **First**, the issue demonstrates a substantial disparity in minimum wage rates for employees at the same AQF levels. In *Australian Liquor*, *Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union re Child Care Industry (Australian Capital Territory) Award 1998 and Children's Services (Victoria) Award 1998 re Wage rates [2005] AIRC 28 (Child Care Case), it was observed that <i>prima facie*:
 - '[372] employees classified at the same AQF levels should receive the same minimum award rate of pay unless the conditions under which the work is performed warrant a different outcome.'
- 6.9 The Full Bench went on to say that: 'contrary to the employer's submissions the conditions under which the work of child care workers is performed do not warrant a lower rate of pay than that received by employees at the same AQF level in other awards. Indeed if anything the opposite is the case. Child care work is demanding, stressful and intrinsically important to the public interest.'

¹⁵ Child Care Case [372].

- 6.10 There is no logical basis why this finding would not apply to Pharmacists, who are essential to the maintenance of our public health system.
- 6.11 **Second**, Pharmacists have been from a work value perspective historically aligned to 'scientists'. In this regard, it is useful to note the history of the predecessors to Pharmacy Award, particularly the *Community Pharmacy (Victoria) Interim Award 1995* (Interim Award) which was the precursor to the *Community Pharmacy Award 1998* which was the pre-modern award that was most influential in the making of the Pharmacy Award.
- 6.12 In the Decision, the Full Bench said of the award history:

'[170] There was no federal award regulation of pharmacists prior to 1994. The first federal award was the Community Pharmacy (Victoria) Interim Award 1994, made by the AIRC following the referral by the State of Victoria of its industrial relation powers to the Commonwealth and dispute findings made in 1993. This interim award, made by Drake DP on 27 May 1994, applied only to community pharmacies in Victoria, and replicated the wages and conditions previously prescribed by an award of the former Industrial Relations Commission of Victoria, the Chemist Shops Award (Vic) 1987.

[171] In further proceedings in 1995, outstanding issues concerning the interim 1994 award were arbitrated before Drake DP. The PGA sought, as a first step towards the establishment of a national award, that the interim 1994 award be extensively modified to include a new classification structure (derived from relevant the NSW State award) and adjustments to penalty and overtime rates. These changes were opposed by the Salaried Pharmacists' Association (SPA). In a decision issued on 30 May 1995, the Deputy President declined to make the major changes to classifications and penalty rates sought by the PGA, but made some other modifications. The new award which resulted was the Community Pharmacy (Victoria) Interim Award 1995. There were a number of "leave reserved" matters identified in the award, including classifications, pay and pay relativities, which were to be the subject of subsequent arbitration, however agreement between the industrial parties was not reached.

[172] These outstanding matters were the subject of a hearing before Commissioner O'Shea in the following year, and were determined by him in a decision issued by him on 6 March 1996. The key conclusion in the Commissioner's decision was that pharmacists covered by the Community Pharmacy (Victoria) Interim Award 1995 should have a classification structure based upon the reference point of pay rates for professional scientists covered by Part IV of the Metal Industry Award 1976.'

6.13 The Full Bench then went on to quote selected extracts of the Commissioner O'Shea decision (see [172] of the Decision). It is useful to replicate part of Commissioner O'Shea decision in full:

'The Commission approaches its determination of this matter in the context of already lengthy proceedings which have produced some measure of agreement and have required some arbitration, but which clearly still have a considerable way to go by reason of the SPA's stated objective of a national award of the Commission covering the retail/community pharmacy sector.

The Commission, then, will obviously have regard for the many agreements reached between the parties (some of which are already reflected in the current interim award and some, more recent, have been confirmed to the Commission during the course of these proceedings) as well as the findings and decisions of the Commission which have occurred along the way to this point [see, for example, Prints L3574 and M2399].

All these preceding developments are relevant to the Commission's determination of these instant matters. It is also relevant to note that these instant matters of the Victorian award are part of proceedings on foot where the SPA is pressing for a national federal award, an approach which is not resisted by the PGA (transcript, page 384). It must be seen then that while the matters to be determined here are important in their own right, they should correctly be seen as part of a larger whole and a stage within a more extended process.

Against this background, the Commission will consider the submissions and material advanced by the parties in this matter and assess them against the requirements of the Commission's wage fixing principles.

Of particular significance in regard to this matter is the "first award" principle and the Commission, noting that this award is a minimum rates award, will fix the matters at issue so that the award meets the needs of the particular industry or enterprise while ensuring that employees' interests are also properly taken into account. It is also relevant for the Commission to ensure that appropriate structural efficiency principles are or have been applied. I include here, considerations of proper alignment by way of the application of a minimum rates adjustment process.

When one applies these considerations to the submissions of the parties in these proceedings one can see a degree of similarity but also some clear divergence. What is apparent is that the rates and classification structure of professional scientists (Metal Industry Award 1976 - Part IV) have some legitimacy as a reference point for pharmacists employed under this award.

I say this is apparent because, as the SPA demonstrated, the fact was acknowledged by the Victorian Industrial Relations Commission at an earlier point in the wage-fixing history of this award and the PGA/VECCI submissions in these proceedings acknowledged at least some points of comparison between pharmacists and professional scientists.

The SPA, for example, drew my attention to a decision of the Industrial Relations

Commission of Victoria [D 91/0006] in relation to the Chemist Shops Award in which a Full

Bench of the Victorian Commission commented as follows:

"The case prepared in support of the proposition that pharmacists should be regarded as scientists was both comprehensive and well-researched. The employer representatives did not oppose the substance of this aspect of the SPA claim.

We are quite satisfied that community pharmacists should be regarded as scientists in the same way that hospital pharmacists have been so regarded." [D 91/0006, page 4]

Further in the course of that decision, the Full Bench of the Victorian Commission stated:

"Pharmacists covered by Part I of the Chemist Shops Award are to be regarded as professional scientists for the purposes of wage fixing." [D 91/0006, page 8]

In the course of these proceedings, the relevance of professional scientists rates were also raised by the PGA by reference to its 1991 position which adopted, in part, a salary structure by reference to the bottom and top minimum classification rates of professional scientists.

VECCI submissions sought the direct alignment of the Pharmacist First Year with Level 1B of Professional Scientists Part IV of the Metal Industry Award. A number of the other salary points sought by VECCI can also be aligned with rates in the Metal Industry Award Part IV.

An acceptance of the relevance of Part IV of the Metal Industry Award does not necessarily mean a direct comparison or direct transposition of rates between the two areas of professional skills. It does, however, provide the Commission with a strong reference point for an assessment of appropriate rates.

A further reference point, given the history and likely developments in these proceedings, are rates for like work elsewhere. First award principles allow the Commission to have regard for a variety of factors in assessing what are fair and reasonable minimum rates vis-a-vis other awards and relative skills and responsibilities.

Having regard to the submissions before it, particularly those of VECCI, the Commission has come to the conclusion that the higher, supervisory classifications within the award applying in Victoria should retain a tiered arrangement which recognises differences in the size and structure of the businesses.

I have concluded that it is preferable in all the circumstances to retain the gradings of pharmacist-in-charge and pharmacist manager, together with the definitions and work level descriptions which formed part of Deputy President Drake's decision, based in part on agreements reached between the parties.

On the basis of the material before it, the Commission accepts the submissions of VECCI that the base level of Pharmacist (first year of experience) can be aligned with a Professional Scientist (4/5 year course) on the basis of qualifications and the exercise of comparable skills. But a consideration of the duties of a pharmacist compared with the relevant definitions in Part IV of the Metal Industry Award reveals a somewhat higher level of responsibility discharged by a pharmacist dispensing to the public. 16

- 6.14 The Commissioner O'Shea decision in relation to the Interim Award demonstrates that, even prior to the Child Care Case, it was well accepted at least in the context of Victorian based Pharmacists that it was appropriate for them to be regarded as scientists.
- 6.15 **Third**, the disparity is not consistent with the principles espoused in the Child Care Case concerning the proper fixation of minimum wage rates in awards. In that case the Full Bench said:

[155] In the context of the matter before us, the principles established in the Paid Rates Review decision mandate a three step process for the determination of properly fixed minimum rates:

- 1. The key classification in the relevant award is to be fixed by reference to appropriate key classifications in awards which have been adjusted in accordance with the MRA process with particular reference to the current rates for the relevant classifications in the Metal Industry Award. In this regard the relationship between the key classification and the Engineering Tradesperson Level 1 (the C10 level) is the starting point.
- 2. Once the key classification rate has been properly fixed, the other rates in the award are set by applying the internal award relativities which have been established, agreed or maintained.

¹⁶ Print M9831, 3-4.

- 3. If the existing rates are too low they should be increased so that they are properly fixed minima.'
- 6.16 In the Child Care Case, the Full Bench then connected the application of the above principles to the AQF. It held:
 - '[172] A comparison of the qualifications required at particular classification levels with those in awards which have been adjusted in accordance with the MRA process is one method for establishing properly fixed minimum rates. In that context the Australian Qualifications Framework (the AQF) is relevant.'
- 6.17 **Fourth**, the disparity between wage rates for employees under the Pharmacy Award compared to other modern awards covering graduate level employees cannot be justified. Graduate pharmacists, who possess a four year degree, should not be paid substantially less than other professionals covered by modern awards.
- 6.18 Against the above background, PSA submits it would be contrary to the modern award objective not to consider the Relativities Issue.
- 6.19 PSA further submits that the Full Bench can be satisfied that the Relativities Issue is one that relates to work value reasons, and therefore that it has power to review and address the issue (by way of increasing minimum wage rates) in the Review. There are many good reasons for this.
- 6.20 **First**, it cannot reasonably be submitted that modern awards (including modern award wages) are assumed to meet the modern awards objective and/or the minimum wages objective because of the award modernisation process undertaken pursuant to Part 10A of the *Workplace Relations*Act 2006 (**WR Act**).
- 6.21 The modern award process was a highly ambitious and pragmatic one, and the PSA submits one that did not consider minimum wages from a work value perspective especially in the Pharmacy Award in any detail. In this regard, we note the decision making the Pharmacy Award ([2008] AIRCFB 1000) included no references whatsoever to work value or minimum wages in the award.
 - Further, the Award Modernisation Request (a copy of which is at Attachment D) and Part 10A of the WR Act did not require the Australian Industrial Relations Commission to consider work value at all.
- 6.22 **Second**, the Decision emphasised that work value considerations are not constrained by reference to historical factors. In this regard, we note the conclusions reached by the Full Bench:
 - '[165] Third, the definition of "work value reasons" in s 156(4) requires only that the reasons justifying the amount to be paid for a particular kind of work be "related to any of the following" matters set out in paragraphs (a)-(c). The expression "related to" is one of broad import that requires a sufficient connection or association between two subject

matters. The degree of the connection required is a matter for judgment depending on the facts of the case, but the connection must be relevant and nor remote or accidental. The subject matters between which there must be a sufficient connection are, on the one hand, the reasons for the pay rate and, on the other hand, any of the three matters identified in paragraphs (a)-(c) – that is, any one or more of the three matters.

[166] Fourth, although the three matters identified - the nature of the work, the level of skill or responsibility involved in doing the work, and the conditions under which the work is done - clearly import the fundamental criteria used to assess work value changes under the wage fixing principles which operated from 1975 to 1981 and 1983 to 2006, the legislature in enacting s 156(4) chose not to import the additional requirements contained in those wage-fixing principle. For example, as was observed in the Equal Remuneration Case 2015, 77 s 156(4) does not contain any requirement that the work value reasons consist of identified changes in work value measured from a fixed datum point. The Full Bench in that matter said:

"[292] ... We see no reason in principle why a claim that the minimum rates of pay in a modern award undervalue the work to which they apply for gender-related reasons could not be advanced for consideration under s 156(3) or s 157(2). Those provisions allow the variation of such minimum rates for 'work value reasons', which expression is defined broadly enough in s 156(4) to allow a wideranging consideration of any contention that, for historical reasons and/or on the application of an indicia approach, undervaluation has occurred because of gender inequity. There is no datum point requirement in that definition which would inhibit the Commission from identifying any gender issue which has historically caused any female-dominated occupation or industry currently regulated by a modern award to be undervalued. The pay equity cases which have been successfully prosecuted in the NSW and Queensland jurisdictions and to which reference has earlier been made were essentially work value cases, and the equal remuneration principles under which they were considered and determined were likewise, in substance, extensions of well-established work value principles. It seems to us that cases of this nature can readily be accommodated under s 156(3) or s 157(2). Whether or not such a case is successful will, of course, depend on the evidence and submissions in the particular proceeding."

[167] Likewise, s 156(4) did not incorporate the test in the wage-fixing principles that the change in the nature of work should constitute such a significant net addition to work requirements as to warrant the creation of a new classification. In substance, section 156(3) and (4) leave it to the Commission to exercise a broad and relatively unconstrained judgment as to what may constitute work value reasons justifying an adjustment to

minimum rates of pay similar to the position which applied prior to the establishment of wage fixing principles in 1975.

[168] Fifth, it would be open to the Commission have regard, in the exercise of its discretion, to considerations which have been taken into account in previous work value cases under differing past statutory regimes. For example, although as already stated s.156(4) contains no requirement for the measurement of work value changes from a fixed datum point, we consider it likely that the Commission would usually take into account whether any feature of the nature of work, the level of skill or responsibility involved in performing the work or the conditions under which it is done has previously been taken into account in a proper way (that is, in a way which is free of gender bias and any other improper considerations) in assessing wages in the relevant modern award or its predecessor in order to ensure that there is no "double counting". Likewise, we consider that the considerations referred to in paragraph [190] of the ACT Child Care Decision, which we have earlier quoted, may be of relevance in particular cases, as may considerations in other authoritative past work value cases.

[169] Finally, even if the jurisdictional prerequisite in s 156(3) is satisfied, it remains the case that the Commission must, as required by s 138, ensure that the inclusion of the varied minimum wages term in the relevant modern award would be necessary to achieve the modern awards objective and the minimum wages objective. In this connection, it may be noted that the Full Bench in 4 yearly review of modern awards - Real Estate Industry Award 2010 said that where the wage rates in a modern award have not previously been the subject of a proper work value consideration, there can be no implicit assumption that at the time the award was made its wage rates were consistent with the modern awards objective.'

- 6.23 **Thirdly**, comparison between awards is a well-established method of assessing work value changes. We note in this regard the observations of the Full Bench in the Child Care Case that when assessing work value, it is 'it is open to an arbitrator to make comparisons with other wages and work requirements within the award, and in other awards, provided such comparisons are fair, proper and reasonable in all the circumstances.'17(emphasis added)
- 6.24 Against this backdrop, it is both permissible and appropriate for a broader enquiry in the Relativities Issue to be carried out. The PSA would seek to contribute to that enquiry.

¹⁷ Child Care Case [191].

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 PSA submits that for the reasons outlined above:
 - (a) the variations proposed in Attachment A to these submissions are appropriate to be made; and
 - (b) the Relativities Issue should be subject to further programming.

Prepared by:

Harriet Eager Partner Steve Forster Senior Associate

MinterEllison

28 February 2019

ATTACHMENT A





Fair Work Act 2009 s.156 – 4 yearly review of modern awards

4 yearly review of modern awards – *Pharmacy Industry Award* (AM2016/28)

PHARMACY INDUSTRY AWARD 2010 [MA000012]

Pharmacy Operations

SYDNEY, [insert] 2019

VICE PRESIDENT HATCHER DEPUTY PRESIDENT DEAN COMMISSIONER SPENCER

4 yearly review of modern awards – Pharmacy Industry Award 2010 – APESMA Work Value Claim

A. Further to the Full Bench decisions issued by the Fair Work Commission on 14 December 2018 and [insert], the above award is varied as follows:

- 1. By inserting a new clause 19.1 as follows:
 - 19.1 Accredited Pharmacists Allowance
 - (a) An employee who meets the requirements of an Accredited Pharmacist and who is required by their employer to undertake duties requiring accreditation will be paid 18% of the minimum weekly wage rate for a Pharmacist in clause 17 per week.
 - (b) In this clause, an Accredited Pharmacist means an employee who has completed a course accredited by a relevant accreditation authority (eg, the Australian Association of Consultant Pharmacy) to gain accreditation as a pharmacist and who continues to hold that accreditation.
- 2. By renumbering existing clauses 19.1 to 19.8 (inclusive) as clauses 19.2 to 19.9 (inclusive).

- 3. By inserting a paragraph (a) in clause 27.1 as follows:
 - (a) clause 19.1 Accredited Pharmacists Allowance;
- 4. By renumbering existing paragraphs (a) to (g) (inclusive) as paragraphs (b) to (h) (inclusive).
- B. This determination comes into operation from [insert] 2019.

ATTACHMENT B - COMPARISON OF MANUFACTURING AWARD RATES AND PHARMACY AWARD RATES

Manufacturing	Award		Pharmacy Awa	ard		AQF Alignment / PSA Comments
Classification level	Qualification required	Minimum weekly wage	Classification level	Qualification required	Minimum weekly wage	
C14	In-house training	\$719.20	Pharmacy Assistant Level 1	No qualifications	\$789.90	
C13	In-house training	\$739.90	Pharmacy Assistant Level 1	No qualifications	\$789.90	
C12	Engineering Production Certificate I or Certificate II in Engineering, or equivalent	\$768.30	Pharmacy Assistant Level 2	Acquired the competencies listed for a holder of a Certificate II in Community Pharmacy	\$808.70	
C11	Engineering Production Certificate II, or Certificate II in Engineering—Production Technology, or Certificate II in Sampling and Measurement, or equivalent	\$794.70	Pharmacy Assistant Level 2	Acquired the competencies listed for a holder of a Certificate II in Community Pharmacy	\$808.70	
C10	For an Engineering/Manufacturing Tradesperson—Level I: Recognised Trade Certificate, or Certificate III in Engineering— Mechanical Trade, or Certificate III in Engineering—Fabrication Trade, or Certificate III in Engineering— Electrical/Electronic Trade, or equivalent For an Engineering/Manufacturing Systems Employee—Level V: Engineering Production Certificate III, or Certificate III in Engineering—Production Systems, or equivalent	\$837.40	Pharmacy Assistant Level 3	Acquired the competencies listed for a holder of a Certificate III in Community Pharmacy	\$837.40	The C10 and Pharmacy Assistant Level 3 classifications both require AQF Level 3 level. The minimum wage rates are also aligned at these levels.
C9	For an Engineering/Manufacturing Tradesperson—Level II: C10 + 20% towards a Diploma of Engineering or equivalent	\$863.60				

Manufact	turing Award		Pharmacy Av	vard		AQF Alignment / PSA Comments
	For an Engineering/Laboratory Technician—Level I: Certificate III in Engineering— Technician, or Certificate III in Laboratory Skills, or Certificate III in Manufacturing Technology, provided that the minimum experience required for a Technology Cadet has been completed, or 50% towards a Diploma of Engineering, or equivalent		Pharmacy Assistant Level 3	Acquired the competencies listed for a holder of a Certificate III in Community Pharmacy	\$837.40	
C8	C10 + 40% towards a Diploma of Engineering, or equivalent	\$889.90				
C7	For an Engineering/Manufacturing Tradesperson—Special Class Level II: Certificate IV in Engineering, or C10 + 60% towards a Diploma of Engineering, or equivalent. For an Engineering/Manufacturing Technician—Level III: Certificate IV in Manufacturing Technology, provided that the minimum experience required for a Technology Cadet has been completed, or Certificate IV in Laboratory Techniques, or 45% towards an Advanced Diploma of Engineering, or 70% towards a Diploma of Engineering—Technical, or equivalent	\$913.70	Pharmacy Assistant Level 4	Acquired the competencies listed for a holder of a Certificate IV in Community Pharmacy	\$871.80	The C7 and Pharmacy Assistant Level 3 classifications both require AQF Level 4 level. However, the minimum wage rates are not aligned. Minimum wage rates for C7 are \$41.90 per week (or approximately \$2,185 per year) higher than the wage rate for the equivalent qualification in the Pharmacy Award.
C6	For an Advanced Engineering Tradesperson—Level 1: C10 + 80% towards a Diploma of Engineering—Advanced Trade, or equivalent. For an Engineering/Laboratory Technician—Level IV: 50% towards an Advanced Diploma of Engineering, or 85% towards a Diploma	\$960.00				

Manufactu	ring Award		Pharmacy Aw	/ard	· ·	AQF Alignment / PSA Comments
	of Engineering—Technical, or equivalent.					
C5	Diploma of Engineering—Advanced Trade, or equivalent.	\$979.60				
C4	80% towards an Advanced Diploma of Engineering, or equivalent.	\$1,005.90				
C3	Advanced Diploma of Engineering, or equivalent.	\$1,058.60				
C2(a)	For a Leading Technical Officer: Advanced Diploma or equivalent and sufficient additional training so as to enable the employee to meet the requirements of the relevant classification definition and to perform work within the scope of this level. For a Principal Supervisor/Trainer/Coordinator: Advanced Diploma or equivalent of which at least 50% of the competencies are in supervision/training.	\$1,085.00				
C2(b)	Advanced Diploma or equivalent and sufficient additional training so as to enable the employee to meet the requirements of the relevant classification definition and to perform work within the scope of this level.	\$1,132.40				
C1	Degree	B.2.1 of the Manufacturing Award states Professional Engineers and Professional Scientists in Level C1 are covered by the Professional Employees Award 2010, and have a	Pharmacy Intern	4 year degree	First half of training: \$883.40 Second half of training: \$913.50	Employees at the Pharmacy Intern classification and higher require a four year degree. This is at the AQF Level 7 level and is therefore equivalent to the C1 classification in the Manufacturing Award. Despite the alignment of requirements on the AQF, the wage rates for a C1 (which are derived from the <i>Professionals Award 2010</i>) and indeed lower classifications in the Manufacturing Award, can exceed the

Manufacturing	Award		Pharmacy Awa	ırd		AQF Alignment / PSA Comments
		wage relativity to C10 of the Manufacturing Award of 180/210%.	Pharmacist	4 year degree	\$1,033.40	equivalent rates in the Manufacturing Award. For example:
						a Pharmacy Intern is paid \$883.40 upon entry into the
			Experienced Pharmacist	4 year degree	\$1,131.80 ·	profession, despite holding a four year degree. This is lower than the C8 level in the Manufacturing Award, which is at AFQ Level 3. It is also approximately
			Pharmacist in Charge	4 year degree	\$1,158.40	\$95.58 per week (or approximately \$5,194.97) lower than the introductory
			Pharmacist Manager	4 year degree	\$1,290.90	wage rate for a four year degree in the <i>Professional Employees Award 2010</i> (which is \$51,279 per annum);
						• A Pharmacist is paid \$1,033.40 per week, which is less than a C3, which is only at the AQF Level 6 level. It's also paid substantially less than the C2(b) level, which is also at the AQF Level 6 level.

ATTACHMENT C - COMPARISON OF GRADUATE ENTRY LEVEL RATES IN OTHER MODERN AWARDS WITH CLASSIFICATIONS REQUIRING A 3-4 YEAR DEGREE AS COMPARED TO THE PHARMACY AWARD

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wag for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per	Relevant classification(s)	PSA Comments
	yeur degree	annum		
Pharmacy	\$46,086.98	N/A	B.5 Pharmacist is a person who is registered as a pharmacist pursuant to the relevant State or Territory law.	A Bachelor of Pharmacy is a 4 year degree
Industry Award			B.6 Experienced Pharmacist is a Pharmacist who has gained at least four years full-time experience or the part-time equivalent as a Community Pharmacist.	
			B.7 Pharmacist in Charge is a pharmacist who assumes responsibility for the day to day supervision and functioning of a community pharmacy practice.	
			B.8 Pharmacist Manager is a pharmacist who is responsible to the proprietor for all aspects of the business.	
			B.9 Pharmacy Student means a person who is undertaking an accredited course of study leading to registration as a pharmacist and who enters into a contract of employment with a proprietor of a pharmacy to work in that pharmacy.	
			B.10 Pharmacy Intern means a person who has satisfied the examination requirements for an accredited course of study leading to registration as a pharmacist* and is engaging in the period of pre-registration training required under the relevant State/Territory Pharmacy Act.	
Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Services Award	\$47,255.59	\$1,168.61 above	B.3.6 Dental Therapist Grade 1 works under the professional supervision of a higher grade professional officer as to method of approach and requirements and is a professional practitioner who performs normal professional work and exercises individual knowledge, skills, professional judgment and initiative in the application of professional principles, techniques and methods.	A Bachelor of Dentistry is a 4 year degree
			(a) This grade is the professional formation phase of a professional officer. It includes new graduates generally lacking practical experience in the application of their professional knowledge.	
			(b) The work requires initiative and professional judgment. Since experience is limited, this level is normally expected to apply only established principles, techniques and methods in early postgraduate years. With professional development, it is expected that new techniques and methods will be learnt and applied to progressively more difficult problems.	
			(c) Initially work is subject to professional supervision. As experience is gained, the contribution and the level of professional judgment increases and professional supervision decreases, until a wide range of professional tasks is capable of being performed with little technical direction.	
			(d) When experienced, advice and guidance may be provided to less experienced professional staff. They are not required to provide general professional guidance but may be required to provide general supervision of and/or train technical and other non-professional staff.	
			(e) Staff may be required to develop and apply advanced techniques learnt during the undergraduate course or later; however, decisions to incorporate such new techniques into normal procedures would be taken at a higher level.	
			It is desirable that staff at this grade have Aboriginal knowledge and cultural skills—level 1.	
			Dental Therapist Grade 1	
			Level 1 905.80	
Ambulance and Patient Transport Industry Award	\$51,105.74	\$5,018.76 above	B.1.1 Ambulance Officer (AO)/Ambulance Paramedic (AP) is an employee who holds the qualifications of Bachelor of Health Science Degree (Paramedic) or other degree qualification* applying in each State and Territory or has another equivalent accredited qualification for AO/AP recognised by the employer and has successfully completed the required clinical placements. The principal duties include assessment, treatment, care and transport of emergency and/or non-emergency patients in a pre-hospital setting.	A Bachelor of Health Science Degree (Paramedic) is a 3 year degree
			B.1.3 Intensive Care Paramedic is an Ambulance Officer/Ambulance Paramedic who has successfully completed a Graduate Diploma of Health Science or other equivalent accredited qualification and who is paid the paramedic skills allowance set out in clause <u>15.4</u> .	

¹Where the rate is expressed as a weekly rate in the relevant modern award, these have been converted to annual wages by multiplying them by 313/6.

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wag for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	e Amount above/below the minimur graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	m e				PSA Comments
2 年 2 年 2 年 2 年 2 年 2 年 2 年 2 年 2 年 2 年		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	B.1.5 Assistant Station Officer (ASO) is an Ambulance Officer, who, in addition officer, is appointed to assist a Station Officer. An ASO may also undertake clinical			or an ambulance	
			B.1.4 Station Officer/Team Manager (SO/TM) is an Ambulance Officer, who, in a Ambulance Officer, is appointed to be in charge and manage an ambulance statio	addition to th	e duties sp		
			B.1.15 Senior Station Officer is an Ambulance Officer appointed to manage and geographic or specialist area of an ambulance service.				
			14.1 Operational classifications				
				Year 1 \$	Year 2 \$	Year 3	
			Senior Station Officer	1164.90	1172.30	1177.80	
			Station Officer/Team Manager—Headquarters or Branch with 10 or more staff	1094.20	1101.80	1107.20	
			Station Officer/Team Manager—Branch with less than 10 staff	1068.50	1075.60	1081.70	
			Assistant Station Officer/Regional Relieving Officer	1040.00	1047.40	1053.50	
			Ambulance Officer	979.60	987.20	992.80	
Animal Care and	\$50,563	\$4,479.10 above	B.1 Veterinary surgeons				Note the minimum degree length for a Bachelor of
Veterinary Services Award			B.1.1 Level 1A	Veterinary Medicine is 5 years			
			(a) Level 1A is the commencement level for a graduate veterinary surgeon. The p those performed on call) are subject to supervision by a more experienced veterin progress to Level 1B no later than six months after commencement.				
			(b) For the purposes of Schedule <u>B.1.1</u> , supervision does not require the more expresent at all times. It means that the Level 1 associate has access to guidance a be in person, or by telephone, or some other suitable arranged communication (expressed back after the task is completed).	nd assistand	e on norma	l tasks. This could	
			14.1 Veterinary surgeons				
			Classification Minimum annual salary Minimum hourly rate				
			Level 1A 50,563 25.59				
Architects Award	\$51,020	\$2,933.02 above	B.1 Level 1—Graduate of Architecture				A Bachelor of Architecture is a 3 year minimum degree
			B.1.1 The graduate entry level				
			The graduate undertakes initial professional architectural tasks of limited scope as broader assignments, in office and site work.	nd complexit	y, such as ı	minor phases of	
			B.1.2 Classification level definition				
			(a) Under supervision from higher-level professionals as to the method of approace performs normal professional work and exercises individual judgment and initiative principles, techniques and methods.	ch and requi e in the appl	rements, the ication of a	e graduate rchitectural	
			(b) In assisting more senior professionals by carrying out tasks requiring accuracy architectural analysis or design, the graduate draws upon advanced techniques a undergraduate course.				
			(c) Training, development and experience using a variety of standard architectura graduate to develop increasing professional judgment and apply it progressively to				

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wage for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	(d) Decisions are related t Recommendations are rel (e) Work is reviewed by hi development and experier judgment until the level of	ated to the solution of gher-level professionee, work receives le competence at Level wages payable for ned by an architect r	employment in the occupation of an arc	erformed. d procedures. With professional ely exercises more individual	PSA Comments
					\$		
			Level 1	Graduate of Arch	nitecture		
				Entry	51,020		
				1st pay point	53,718		
				2nd pay point	56,414		
Black Coal Mining	Graduate engineers: \$44,131.65	Graduate Engineers: \$1,955.33 below	.33 below B.2.3 Graduates				A Bachelor of Engineering is a minimum 3 year degree
Industry Award		Graduate Commercial Officers: \$2,543.81 below	the completion of 12 mont and utilisation of skills and Engineer – Level 2 rate.	ths' service that engi I knowledge through	oforce without experience will start at the ineer will be assessed by the employer of experience over such period, may adv	and, having regard to the acquisition ance one increment to the Graduate	An example of a degree in a commercial discipline is a business management degree, which is a 3 year degree
			assessment of the employ over such period.	ee by the employer	vel 3 and the Engineer rate may occur be a having regard to the acquisition of skil uate Engineers will be the following percent	s and knowledge through experience	
			Classification	Per	rcentage of the Group J – Engineer's	weekly rate	
			Graduate Engine	eer – Level 1 80			
			Graduate Engine	eer – Level 2 86			
			Graduate Engin 3	eer – Level 94			
			award.		their current percentage rate increased	or decreased as a result of making this	
			(b) Commercial Graduat				
			An employee with a tertia Commercial Graduate – L	ry qualification in a c evel 1 rate. At the c	commercial discipline entering the work completion of 12 months' service that en	orce without experience will start at the iployee will be assessed by the	

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wage for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree 1	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	employer and, having regard to the acquisit may advance one increment to the Comme Advancement to the Commercial Graduate following assessment of the employee by the experience over such period.	— Level 3 and the Commercial Officer rate may occur by annual increments, ne employer, having regard to the acquisition of skills and knowledge through mmercial Graduates will be the following percentages of the Group I — rcentage of the Group I — Commercial Officer's weekly rate 80 86	PSA Comments
Broadcasting, Recorded Entertainment and Cinemas Award		\$2,399.82 below	release of content on other digital industry. (ii) Subtitling may involve the use of automatic translation) across a for documentaries. It requires the chigh level English language skills a knowledge is essential. The role of the manipulation of syntax and the require research skills in preparing background of program content. A (b) Subtitling editor Skills, competencies, duties and responsible to the competencies of th	sibilities held and exercised titler lage skills and knowledge of idiomatic English	A Bachelor of Film and Television is 3 years, but the definition of 'Subtitler' states the following so the exact degree length is unclear: (a) Subtitler (i) Subtitlers translate foreign languages into English (or visa-versa) to be used as subtitles for a television broadcast or for the release of content on other digital platforms as part of the broadcasting and recorded entertainment industry. (ii) Subtitling may involve the use of a range of computer technology (e.g. keyboard text entry, voice recognition or automatic translation) across a range of program types including general translations for recorded narrations for documentaries. It requires the use of computer equipment and software programs to achieve this. It requires high level English and foreign language skills, bilingualism and high level aural and written comprehension. It requires qualifications and accreditation in translation. It may require research skills

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wage for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum		Relevant class	ssification(s)	PSA Comments in preparing subtitles including research
				d research into programs		into the social, cultural, scientific and
				and mentorship to other subti	tling editors	historic background of program content.
			14.2 Common salary structure	and montoromp to outside		
			(a) Grade 5 entertainment emp	loyee includes the following	classifications:	
			Producer/Director's Assistant/VC Wardrobe Person, Still Photogra Television Broadcasting; Extra/S	G Operator, Assistant Floor M oher (trade level), Set and Pro tand-in, double—Television Pr	control B, Videotape Operator, Camera Operator B, anager, Hair or Makeup Artist, Carpenter—Trade level, perty Painter (trade) and Studio Hand A/Set Dresser A—ograms and Feature Films etc.; Cinema Worker Level 3; 4; and Trainee Subtitler/Subtitling Editor.	
			14.3 Adult wages			
			reduced (see F2.2). This affects	which 'Performer Class' they a uces their 'experience requirer	ng certain criteria can have their 'experience requirement' ire in, to which different pay rates apply (see cl 14.7). ment', they still need 2 years of experience before they can or this reason.	
			Classification lev	el Minimum weekly wage \$	Minimum hourly wage \$	
			Grade 1	719.20	18.93	
			Grade 2	739.90	19.47	
			Grade 3	768.30	20.22	
			Grade 4	794.70	20.91	
			Grade 5	837.40	22.04	
Educational	Academic teachers:	Academic teachers:	Academic teachers:			
Services (Post- Secondary	\$51,619	\$5,532.02 above	B.7.1 Level A			
Education) Award	Teachers and tutor/instructors: Category B: \$50,756.16 Category C: \$49,772.12	Teachers and tutor/instructors: Category B: \$2,669.18 above Category C: \$ 3,683.14 above	develop their expertise in teachir	ng and research with an increa	lance from more senior academic staff and is expected to sing degree of autonomy. A Level A academic teacher will ent qualifications and experience and may be required to	
	General staff: \$49,767.00	General staff: \$3,680.02 above	(b) A Level A academic teacher or graduate diploma level. Admir teaching they are engaged to teach			
			(c) An employee holding a relevation the sixth step of Level A.	ant doctorate or responsible fo	r the co-ordination of a subject or unit, will not be paid less	
			B.7.2 Level B			
			Level B academic teacher will m	ake an independent contribution	aching and research in their discipline or related area. A on through professional practice and expertise to the ad the activities of other staff, as appropriate to the	
			independent scholarship, resear	ch and/or professional activitie g to their discipline and may be	ny level, on the basis of an established record of es appropriate to their profession or discipline. They may e required to perform the full academic responsibilities of ogram of the institution.	

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wage for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	Relevant classification(s)	PSA Comments
			 B.7.3 Level C (a) A Level C academic teacher will play a major role or provide a significant degree of leadership in activities relevant to the profession, discipline and/or community and may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities of and related administration for the co-ordination of a large award program or a number of smaller award programs of the institution. 14.1 Academic teachers 	
			Level A A.1 51,619	
			C.3 Teachers other than TESOL teachers C.3.1 A teacher other than a TESOL teacher will be classified in accordance with the following: (a) Category B—a teacher with a four year degree or equivalent at university level in a field relevant to the teaching area.	
			 (b) Category C—a teacher with a three year degree or equivalent at university level in a field relevant to the teaching area. D.1.7 General Staff Level 4 (a) Training level or qualifications 	
			Level 4 duties typically require a skill level which assumes and requires knowledge or training equivalent to: (i) completion of a degree without subsequent relevant work experience;* (ii) completion of an advanced diploma qualification and at least one year's subsequent relevant work experience;	
			 (iii) completion of a diploma qualification and at least two years' subsequent relevant work experience; (iv) completion of a Certificate IV and extensive relevant work experience; (v) completion of a post-trade certificate and extensive (typically more than two years) relevant experience as a technician; or 	
			 (vi) an equivalent combination of relevant experience and/or education/training. (b) Occupational equivalent Graduate (i.e. degree) or professional, without subsequent work experience on entry (including inexperienced computer systems officer). Administrator with responsibility for advice and determinations. Experienced technical officer. 	,
Educational Services (Schools) General Staff Award	\$50,035	\$3,948.02 above	B.2.5 Level 5 An employee at this level performs work above and beyond the skills of an employee at Level 4. (a) Training level or qualifications	Note the length of degree is not clear or specified
			Level 5 duties typically require a skill level which assumes and requires knowledge or training equivalent to: (i) completion of a degree without subsequent relevant work experience;* (ii) completion of an advanced diploma qualification and at least one year's subsequent relevant work experience;	
			(iii) completion of a diploma qualification and at least two years' subsequent relevant work experience; (iv) completion of a Certificate IV and extensive relevant work experience;	

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wage for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	
			(v) completion of a post-trades certificate and extensive (typically more than two years') relevant experience as a technician; or
			15.1 Annual rates of pay
			Level 5
			5.1 958.90 50,035
			5.2 1004.90 52,436
Educational	3 year degree: \$50,017	3 year degree:	13.4 Progression
Services (Teachers) Award			(a) An employee who is three year trained will commence on Level 1 of the salary scale in clause 14—Minimum salary and progress according to normal years of service to Level 12 of the scale.
			(b) An employee who is four year trained will commence on Level 3 of the salary scale in clause 14 and progress according to normal years of service to Level 12.
			14.1 The minimum salary per annum payable to a full-time employee will be determined in accordance with the provisions of clause 13—Classifications, and the following table.
			Level Per year
			\$
			1 50,017
			2 51,049
			3 52,438
			4 54,329
			5 56,222
			6 57,984
			7 59,746
			8 61,637
			9 63,531
			10 65,423
			11 67,317
			12 69,208
Electrical Power	Technical Grade 6: \$56,281.00	Technical Grade 6: \$10,194.02 above	e B.2.6 Technical Grade 6
Industry Award	Technical Grade 7: \$60,491.12	Technical Grade 7: \$14,404.14 above	e An employee who has additional relevant qualifications or equivalent (post trade, technical or degree) and/or other structured training to enable the employee to perform a range of technical or supervisory duties.
	Professional/Managerial/Specialist Grade 5: \$52,070.88	st Professional/Managerial/Specialist Grade 5: \$5,983.90 above	An employee at this level provides technical guidance and supervision for either individuals or a team and performs duties in accordance with their training and skills.
			Indicative positions include:
			Work Group Supervisor.

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wage for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimun graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	B.2.7 Technical Grad	additional rel	Relevant class	alent (post trade, te				PSA Comments
			structured training to specialisation.	enable the em						
			An employee at this le accordance with their							
			Indicative positions in	clude:						
			o Senior E	ngineering Off	ficer;					
			o Principal	Technical Off	icer.					
			B.4.1 Professional/N	lanagerial/Sp	ecialist Grade 5					
					el possesses qualifications re rmation technology, science				ing,	
			supervision from high	er level profes ormal professi	el undertakes initial professic ssional employees as to meth onal work and exercises indi and methods.	nod of approach and	d requiremen	nts, the profess	onal	
			The professional emp	loyee may as:	sign and check work of techr	nical employees ass	signed to wo	rk on a commoi	n project.	
		17.1 The minimum wages payable to employees are as follows:								
			Pay Level	Technical (Grade Administrative Grade	Professional/ N Specialist Grad		Operations Grade	Minimum weekly wage \$	
			Level 5	Technical Grade 5	Administrative Grade 5	Professional / Manager / Specialist Grade 5	Operatior Grade 5	ns 998.10	, 	
			Level 6	Technical Grade 6	Administrative Grade 6		Operatior Grade 6	ns 1078.8	00	
			Level 7	Technical Grade 7		Professional / Manager / Specialist Grade 7	Operation Grade 7	ns 1159.5	60	
Health	3 year degree: \$47,599.91	3 year degree: \$1,512.93 above	B.2 Health Profession	nal employe	es—definitions					
Professionals and Support Services Award	4 year degree: \$49,697.15		A list of common health professionals which are covered by the definitions is contained in Schedule C—List of Common Health Professionals.							
Awaru			B.2.1 Health Professional—level 1							
			Positions at level 1 are regarded as entry level health professionals and for initial years of experience.							
			This level is the entry appropriate in accord	level for new gance with their	graduates who meet the req r professional association's r s deemed acceptable by the	uirement to practise ules and be eligible	e as a health for member	professional (wrship of their pro	fessional	
						The Robbs of the R				

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wage for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	Re 15.2 Health Professional employee—level 1	elevant classification(s)	PSA Comments	
				Per week		
				\$		
			Pay point 1 (UG 2 qualification)	878.40		
			Pay point 2 (three year degree entry)	912.40		
			Pay point 3 (four year degree entry)	952.60		
			Pay point 4 (masters degree entry)	985.50		
			Pay point 5 (PhD entry)	1073.60		
			Pay point 6	1111.80		
Higher Education Industry-Academic Staff-Award	\$51,619	\$5,532.02 above	A.1 Teaching and research academic staff A.1.1 Level A			
			their expertise in teaching and research with an incre	ance from more senior academic staff and is expected to develop easing degree of autonomy. A Level A academic will normally have qualifications and experience and may be required to hold a relevant		
			of the staff member, engage in scholarly, research a discipline, and undertake administration primarily rel of Level A academics will be primarily at undergradu	ning at the institution at a level appropriate to the skills and experience and/or professional activities appropriate to their profession or lating to their activities at the institution. The contribution to teaching uate and graduate diploma level.		
			18.1 Rates of pay Annual salary \$			
			Level A			
			1 51,619			
Higher Education	\$50,075.00	\$3,988.02 above	HIGHER EDUCATION WORKER LEVEL 5		Note length of degree not clear or specified.	
Industry-General Staff Award			Training level or qualifications			
			Level 5 duties typically require a skill level which ass	sumes and requires knowledge or training equivalent to:		
			o completion of a degree without subsequ	uent relevant work experience; or		
			o completion of an advanced diploma qua experience; or	alification and at least one year's subsequent relevant work		
			o completion of a diploma qualification ar	nd at least two years' subsequent relevant work experience; or		
			o completion of a Certificate IV and exten			
			o completion of a post-trades certificate a a technician; or	and extensive (typically more than two years') relevant experience as		
			o an equivalent combination of relevant e	experience and/or education/training.		
			Occupational equivalent			

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wag for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	e Amount above/below the minimun graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	n e		Relevant classi	fication(s)			PSA Comments
在 1			Graduate (i.e. degree) or profess systems officer), administrator wi	sional, withou ith responsib					
			15.1 The minimum wages payab	•					
			HEW 5	50,075.00					
Hydrocarbons	\$50,002	\$3,915.02 above	14. Minimum wages		A Bachelor of Science in Geology is 3 years.				
Field Geologists Award	,555,552	40,010102 02010	14.1 The minimum wage for a Ba \$50,002 per annum.	achelor of Sc	ience in Geology cov	vered by the class	ifications described	in <u>Schedule B</u> is	A Bachelor of Science in Geology is 3 years.
			14.2 Having regard to the hours earnings are made up as follows						
			Classifications	Annual retainer	Daily rig allowance (per full day worked)	Excess attendance allowance	Daily attendance allowance (office)	Estimated annual earnings (even time)	
				\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
			Trainee	40,430	78.36	N/A	46.43	53,281	
			Competent mudlogger	40,430	108.82	233.61	65.27	58,276	
			Senior mudlogger	46,506	108.82	233.61	65.27	64,352	
			Data engineer	52,402	117.53	269.88	71.10	71,677	
			14.3 The pay rates in clause <u>14.3</u> of work and all disability factors i location, rotating shiftwork and h	ncluding (but					
			 B.1 A Trainee mudlogger is a person who has been awarded the degree of Bachelor of Science in Geology (or in another relevant earth science) who is employed to perform mudlogging/formation evaluation duties for the first time. A Trainee mudlogger is expected to complete formal instruction and on-the-job training for periods totalling 41 full working days before advancement to the level of Competent mudlogger. B.2 A Competent mudlogger is a person who has been awarded the degree of Bachelor of Science in Geology (or in another relevant earth science) and who has satisfactorily completed a course including formal instruction and on-the-job training of at least 41 full working days. The Competent mudlogger performs a range of scientific tasks associated with the evaluation of geological formations. B.3 A Senior mudlogger is a Competent mudlogger who plans and conducts scientific formation evaluation work without detailed supervision, but with guidance on unusual features and who is usually engaged on more responsible assignments requiring substantial professional experience. Progression to this level is based upon: 						
			(a) completion of at least three y		•				
			(b) demonstrated competence in	-	•	nployer; and			
-			(c) satisfactory performance ass	essments tro	m supervisors.				

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wag for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	Relevant classification(s)		PSA Comments			
			B.4 A Data engineer is an experienced Senior mudlogger who plans and supervises the work of Senior of mudloggers, evaluates pore pressure, prepares detailed reports and is engaged on assignments requiring level of professional expertise.					
Legal Services Award	\$50,422.31	\$4,335.33 above	B.6 Level 5—Law graduate B.6.1 Characteristics This position requires the completion of a course of study which is recognised as an academic qualificatio and a formal offer by the employer to the law graduate, the acceptance of that offer and registration and a documentation required by the relevant governing bodies. 14. Minimum wages Classification Per week \$	n for admission pproval of all	A Bachelor of Laws is a minimum 3 year degree			
Medical Practitioners Award	\$49,704	\$3,617.02 above	Level 5—Law graduate 966.50 A.1 Intern is a medical practitioner in the first postgraduate year of clinical experience. 14.1 Intern minimum annual salary	Note the minimum degree length is in excess of 3 – 4 years				
Nurses Award	\$49,697.15	\$3,610.17 above	An Intern will be paid \$49,704 per annum. 14.3 Registered nurses Minimum entry rate for a: (a) four year degree is \$952.60 per week;					
Professional Employees Award	\$49,998 \$3,911.02 above		15. Minimum wages					
			Classification	Annual wages				
			Level 1 Graduate professional Pay point 1.1 (3 year degree) Pay point 1.1 (4 or 5 year degree) Pay point 1.2 Pay point 1.3 Pay point 1.4 Level 2 Experienced professional/quality auditor/experienced medical research employee Level 3 Professional/senior (lead) quality auditor/experienced medical research employee Level 4 Professional/experienced medical research employee Level 5 Experienced medical research employee	49,998 51,279 52,140 54,311 57,061 58,984 64,462 72,704 87,585				
Social, Community, Home	3 year degree: \$50,083.20 e	3 year degree: \$3,996.22 above	15.3 Social and community services employee level 3	·				

Award	Minimum graduate entry level v for classifications requiring a 3 year degree ¹	vage Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum	Relevant classification(s)	PSA Comments
Care and	4 year degree: \$51,105.74	4 year degree: \$5,018.76 above	Crisis accommodation employee level 1	1 動物性、科技等自身的自動力等可容易多元。主要的有效能力、同意等等等等。是是否是數字的數字。
Disability Services Industry Award			Per week \$	
			Pay point 1 (associate diploma/advanced certificate) 913.70	
			Pay point 2 940.00	
			Pay point 3 (3 year degree) 960.00	
			Pay point 4 (4 year degree) 979.60	
Surveying Award	3 year degree: \$50,083.20	3 year degree: \$3,996.22 above	B.1.7 Level 8 – Survey Technician Level II (125% relativity)	
	4 year degree: \$51,105.74	4 year degree: \$5,018.76 above	Survey Technician Level II is a survey technician who works above and beyond an employee at Level 9 – Survey Technician Level I and to the level of their training and who is able to use survey based computer programmes. In addition an employee at this level possesses an overall knowledge and understanding of the principles of the systems and equipment on which they are required to carry out their tasks.	
			(a) Minimum training and requirements	
			A Survey Technician Level II means a person who:	
			o has completed 50% towards an Advanced Diploma or 85% towards a Diploma;	
			o is an (entry point) Professional Surveyor (three year graduate); or	
			o equivalent.	
			B.1.8 Level 7 – Surveying Technician Level III (130% relativity)	
			Surveying Technician Level III is a survey technician who works above and beyond an employee at Level 8 – Survey Technician Level II and to the level of their training and who is able to use survey based computer programmes. In addition an employee at this level will have an overall knowledge and understanding of the principles of the systems and equipment on which they are required to carry out their tasks and a basic	
			knowledge of those aspects of civil engineering, geology, soil and fauna/environmental disciplines relevant for their surveying practice.	
			(a) Minimum training and requirements	
			A Survey Technician III (including an acting or part-time party leader) means a person who:	
			o has completed a Diploma; or	
			o is a Professional Surveyor who has completed a four year degree course, or three year degree course plus one year experience; or	
			o equivalent.	
			B.1.15 Professional surveyor—graduate	
			A Professional surveyor—graduate, is a Professional surveyor (as defined) and will mean a person who has successfully completed a course of studies approved by the Surveyor's Board or the Surveying and Spatial Sciences Institute.	
			(a) Progression to Level 3—Professional surveyor/Licensed surveyor	
			The Professional surveyor—graduate will receive increments upon the attainment of skills, and demonstration of competence which fulfill the requirements of the following levels in the classification structure as outlined in this clause.	
			Graduate three year course	
			Level	
			Entry point – Survey Technician Level II (125% relativity) 8	

Award	Minimum graduate entry level wage for classifications requiring a 3 – 4 year degree ¹	Amount above/below the minimum graduate entry level rate under the Pharmacy Industry Award per annum				Relevant classificatio	on(s)	PSA Comments
				Survey Techni	cian Level III (1	30% relativity)	7	
				Surveyor Leve	l I (135% relativ	rity)	6	
				Surveyor Leve	l II (145% relati	vity)	, 5	
				Surveyor Leve	l III (150% relat	ivity)	4	
			Graduate for	ur year course				
							Level	
				Entry point – S	Survey Technicia	an Level III (130% relativity)	7	
				Surveyor Leve	l I (135% relativ	vity)	6	
				Level II (145%	relativity)		5	
				Surveyor Leve	l III (150% relat	ivity)	4	
			15.1 Wages					
			(a) The class Definitions.	sification structur	e listed below is	s to be read in conjunction v	vith <u>Schedule B—Classification Structure and</u>	
				Wage group	Hourly rate	Weekly rate		
					\$	\$		
				Level 8	25.26	960.00		
				Level 7	25.78	979.60		