

PRIME MINISTER

We have had several letters complaining about the recent Clegg Report on the professions supplementary to medicine. The attached is probably the most important we have had. The physiotherapists and others are complaining about the pay increase recommended by Clegg, and also that he is recommending a longer working week - unless the pay increase is to be even smaller. I have passed the other letters to Mr. Jenkin to reply to. Would you like to reply to this one? Or shall we pass it to Mr. Jenkin as well?

P.S. says these  
complaints are justified. *Amberley*  
Clegg never really understood  
the chain and *R.*  
they are now being asked  
to take a cut in pay  
I will reply. *and*

28 March 1980

THE CHARTERED SOCIETY OF PHYSIOTHERAPY

f28

14 1 BEDFORD ROW LONDON WC1R 4ED Tel: 01-242 1941/46

Patron: HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

President: Baroness Masham of Ilton, Countess of Swinton  
Secretary: Robert J. S. Bryant, LL B ACIS FHA

The Right Hon Mrs Margaret Thatcher  
Prime Minister  
10 Downing Street  
London SW1

27th March 1980

Dear Prime Minister

There has been a breakdown in the negotiations between the Management and Staff Sides of the Whitley Council following the publication of the Clegg Report on pay comparability for the eight professions supplementary to medicine.

The representatives of physiotherapists on the Staff Side are quite unable to accept the manner in which the Commission reached its conclusions and must question the validity of the whole report and its subsequent recommendations. These appear to have been based almost entirely on a report by a firm of Management Consultants, Hay/MSL.

The Staff Side had serious reservations about the system of factor analysis proposed by Hay/MSL and their misgivings were in no way dispelled by discussions they had with the consultants prior to the study. They urged the Clegg Commission to view the Hay/MSL report with extreme caution and, together with the Management Side, were concerned to ensure that the Commission took account of the large body of evidence submitted both separately and jointly by the eight professions.

The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy itself submitted 80 pages of researched and closely reasoned evidence. We were surprised to be told by Hay/MSL that they never saw that evidence. We know also that they based their report on an actual evaluation sample of only 17 physiotherapists; two of our nine grades were not included in the sample and these came out worst in the recommendation.

The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy made the strongest possible protests about the sample size and the inappropriateness of a factor analysis system designed for other purposes being applied for physiotherapists. The Commission

has acknowledged that it would have taken a year to devise a suitable factor plan for nurses and midwives. It was clearly not possible, within the time scale available to the Clegg Commission to ensure that all factors were appropriate to the eight separate and very different professions supplementary to medicine. The Staff Side suggested that a more valid comparison would have been by indexation of individual professions through the new Earnings Survey and Index of Average Earnings but this suggestions was not accepted.

In consequence it appears that the Hay/MSL consultants took precisely that short cut which physiotherapists had anticipated and warned against - they struck an average across eight different professions and produced a mythical creature ('a PSM') who is a sort of hybrid between a dietitian, a radiographer, a speech therapist and five others.

The fallacy of this becomes more obvious when it is seen that within physiotherapy alone there are 15 separate areas of specialisation. Within the eight professions there are entry requirements ranging from 5 'O' levels to 2 'A' levels (55% of physiotherapy students enter with three 'A' levels). The duration of the courses of training for the different professions range from two years to a full Honours degree.

The Clegg Commission's remit was to establish acceptable bases of comparison. This it has clearly failed to do. In consequence it has produced recommendations shortening pay scales by one-third, changing internal relativities and lengthening the working week. These recommendations are unacceptable to physiotherapists. It is significant that the Commission with such a limited time at its disposal has produced without supporting reasons, recommendations which directly contradict those of the Halsbury Committee published five years ago after an in depth study extending over many months.

The Clegg Commission's recommendations have caused great disappointment and distress to physiotherapists, who have always refused to take part in any form of industrial action which could be harmful to their patients. The numbers who have participated in today's demonstration provide evidence of the strength of feeling within the professions. Since the recommendations are substantially based on the Hay/MSL findings, my profession cannot regard them as more than a subject for further negotiation within the Whitley Council.

Yours sincerely

Joyce Williams

Vice Chairman of Council  
Chartered Society of Physiotherapy