



Prime Minister

TEACHERS' PAY AND CONDITIONS : COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY REPORT

A summary is attached to this minute.
 I have today received the Report of Sir Peter Main's Committee. I attach a copy for you and the other recipients of this minute. The Report contains its own summary of recommendations, but my Department has also made a precis which I attach for greater convenience.

It is in most respects an excellent Report. It contains a good deal on the management of schools, with a welcome emphasis on the key role of the headteacher. On the more immediate issues the Committee have produced an analysis of teachers' professional duties which in all essentials matches that which we presented to them in evidence and at the same time should command general acceptance by individual teachers and the public. In addition they have declared unequivocally that these duties should now be made explicit and contractual by incorporation into national conditions of service. On the details of hours of work, class sizes etc they have proposed an ingenious reform of the present unsatisfactory national agreement which I believe the employers in Scotland will see as giving them the degree of management control of non-teaching time which they need, whilst the teachers will find it hard credibly to reject. Inevitably perhaps the Committee are critical of existing levels of educational provision for school staffing, books and equipment, lunch-time supervision etc. They do however give clear support to the contribution which can be made by a programme of school closures.

Their proposals on pay structure are very satisfactory; their pay recommendations are skewed towards headteachers and others who bear special responsibilities; and they propose a new grade of senior teacher, with promotion to the new grade competitive and offering higher status and reward to classroom teachers of proven ability.

The rates of pay which represent an average increase of 16.4% are considerably higher than we would have liked but are much what we had been led to expect. It is noteworthy however that they have in effect proposed a 2-year deal, with no further increase in 1987/88, tying in with their proposal for a biennial independent review from April 1988. The initial costs would be proportionately higher than those expected from the Coventry deal, but Coventry takes a long time to reach maturity and its long-term costs would be higher than those of Main.

Implementation of these pay recommendations - if accepted - will of course cost a good deal and, additional resources (beyond the £125m which we previously agreed to make available) will be unavoidable to cover the whole cost of the settlements. But the Main report itself makes it absolutely clear that the recommendations on duties, contracts, pay and

structure and negotiating machinery are to be taken as a single package. I believe this is right. It offers the teachers substantially less than they aspired to in pay terms and at the same time invites the unions to surrender their weapons (as they see it) by signing on for a contractual definition of duties. They will therefore be looking for an opportunity to unstitch the package. From our point of view however the report offers the prospect of a major reform. If we accept the report as a whole we have a chance of carrying the reform through, with the support of the employers and of public opinion. But if we were to show ourselves less than wholehearted in our endorsement of the package we shall give the teachers unions their opportunity and we shall lose the battle for public support. We have already agreed amongst ourselves that we must give an early response; it is essential to do so if we are to keep the initiative.

Now an early answer

I have already let it be known that I shall wish to hear the responses of the employers and the teachers before giving a definitive Government response: but it is highly desirable that I should set the tone with a very clear and positive welcome on publication. I attach a draft of the statement I would propose to issue when the Report is published on 2 October: I should be grateful for clearance.

|| It might be desirable to have a brief discussion about all this at the meeting we are to have at 4pm on Thursday.

Copies go to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Lord President, the Secretaries of State for Wales, the Environment, Employment and Education and Science, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and to Sir Robert Armstrong.

M.R.

24 September 1986

DRAFT PRESS RELEASE FOR THE SECRETARY OF STATE

I congratulate Sir Peter Main and his colleagues on this ~~[excellent]~~ Report. They were given a wide remit and were asked to work very quickly. They deserve our thanks for the speed and thoroughness with which they have done their work.

The Government will give the Report close and urgent consideration, and I urge the employers and the teachers to do likewise. Everyone concerned with Scottish education is looking ^{hopeful} to the Report as a basis for an early settlement of the issues relating to pay and conditions of service which produced the damaging dispute of the last two years. On these urgent central questions the Committee have produced a comprehensive ~~[and well-balanced]~~ set of recommendations, ~~and they have emphasised that their recommendations hang together as a unity.~~ I hope that the Report will provide a basis for a comprehensive settlement and for the period of stability and peace which the teaching profession and their pupils so badly need.

I have asked the employers and the teachers' leaders to give me their early reactions to the Report. ^{The Govt will} I shall take their views ~~fully~~ into account in giving ^{out} ~~my own~~ detailed response to it. ^{soon}

This statement would be fairly neutral if the words in square brackets were omitted.

JRS
24/9.

This is not a neutral statement even with your amendments. I have worked further.

CONFIDENTIAL UNTIL 2 OCTOBER 1986

COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO PAY AND CONDITIONS OF SCHOOL
TEACHERS IN SCOTLAND

SUMMARY OF REPORT

1. As a lead-in to the immediate questions of pay and conditions of service the first 3 chapters of the report examine aspects of the management of the school system. This is consistent with the remit.

1.1 The Committee see the headteacher as the focal point of the whole system: the person responsible for the efficient delivery of education within his school. The role of the education authority is to support him in this by giving him adequate guidelines, resources and powers; he should have much more say in staff appointments and more responsibility for the use of resources; as an immediate measure a formal statement of headteachers' duties and powers should be prepared and incorporated in their contracts of employment.

1.2 There are some detailed recommendations on the internal management structure of schools, but in general the Committee consider that the present hierarchy of 5 grades of promoted posts is satisfactory (although it needs to be used more flexibly). This view is carried forward into their recommendations on pay structure (below): they will have none of the NAS/UWT idea of a "collegiate" management.

1.3 Although not specifically mentioned in their remit the Committee devotes a separate chapter to the role of parents. Their general position is that parents are not to be equated with the consumers of a product because education yields benefits to society at large as well as to the individual pupils and parents. Accordingly the Committee give priority to re-establishing a working partnership between parents and teachers, through restored and improved liaison, rather than to giving parents a formal say in the management of schools. The Department is urged to bring to a conclusion its review of the position of school councils.

2. The next chapters are concerned with the professional role and duties of a teacher. The report identifies as teachers' duties the following:

2.1 Teaching assigned classes. Teachers must also accept that they may be expected to adapt their methods to new developments and new demands.

2.2 Preparation for teaching. Under this heading the Committee includes curriculum development, which they say has generally added to workload but has also been welcomed by teachers as an enrichment of their job.

2.3 Assessment and correction of pupils' work.

2.4 Presentation of pupils for national examinations. The increasing emphasis on internal assessment has increased the workload and has also blurred the boundaries between work undertaken directly for SEB and work done as part of the normal job for the employer. Teachers should however continue to carry their full share of all the

E. R.

work: the EIS' attempted distinction between professional and purely administrative duties is rejected. There are detailed proposals for rationalising the fees structure (primarily matters for COSLA and SEB).

2.5 Participation in schemes of professional development. This has a chapter to itself, in which the Committee is at pains to try to take some of the emotion out of performance appraisal. The line of argument is that structured professional development requires a proper assessment of the individual teacher's needs; and that in turn involves some appraisal of his performance. The Committee goes out of its way to say that it does not support the idea of merit pay. The report calls for a more rational and structured approach to staff development, but emphasises that the assessment process will require additional staff time, the cost of which it estimates on a back-of-envelope basis as an extra £3m a year (plus extra staff to cover for colleagues released for training etc).

2.6 Taking part in staff meetings and other aspects of school organisation, taking a share in responsibility for discipline and good order throughout the school (not just in class), and liaison with parents are all listed as essential duties. On the last point the Committee considers that a requirement to attend perhaps 4 evening meetings in a session would not be unreasonable.

2.7 Extra-curricular activities are explicitly recognised as purely voluntary matters of goodwill.

3. This broad list of duties is to be incorporated in the Scheme of Conditions of Service. It would thus be contractual. The Committee recognise the legal view (now backed by the Scott judgement in England) that these things are already implied duties in the contract, but consider that they should now be made plain for all to see. They reject equally the propositions that duties should be left to goodwill or to some voluntary code of conduct and that they should be prescribed in statute.

4. The report highlights 2 matters which have been much in evidence in the English dispute viz midday supervision and cover for absent colleagues. Both have in fact been troublesome in Scottish schools, but have not been raised into national issues by the unions during the dispute.

4.1 On midday supervision the report recommends that education authorities should provide ancillary staff, and gives the strongest possible hint that Government should provide additional resources to pay them. In England and Wales part of the £1.25 billion originally offered for teachers' pay was set aside for this purpose, but Scottish Ministers decided not to follow suit at the time.

4.2 On cover for absent colleagues the Committee is careful not to recommend any standard national agreement - there is none at present and there is a local dispute over the matter in Strathclyde - but it observes that actual levels of absence are higher than are assumed in staffing standards and therefore recommends a revision of the standards.

5. The Committee accept that there has been a general increase, impossible to quantify, in workload and that there need to be safeguards for teachers. They take the line that "the right way to limit workload is not by contractual specification but by better planning and management",

and give great prominence to their recommendation that the Department should now undertake a radical review of staffing standards. Their recommendations on modification of the existing "contract" are complex and ingenious. Only minor changes to maximum class sizes and maximum class contact time are proposed. Their major recommendations in this area are as follows:

5.1 That the present contractual working week of 32½ hours be abandoned altogether and replaced by a "notional standard working week" of 35 hours which would not be contractual but would be used as the working assumption for all planning and costing purposes.

5.2 That there be contractual limits to class contact time, as there are at present; to the time to be spent in school (the length of the school week to be standardised nationally, involving gains for some and losses for others); and to time which may be devoted to "programmed activities at the direction of management", to be set at 80 hours a year, outside the pupil week. The balance of time up to the notional 35 hour week would be "flexi-time" ie working hours but used at the teacher's own discretion.

5.3 That the pupil year should be reduced from 200 to 195 days, with the extra 5 days available for in-service training, parents meetings etc.

6. The Committee has made it absolutely plain that its recommendations on conditions of service and workload are to be viewed as a single package with those on pay and pay structure.

7. There are sundry recommendations related to conditions of service:

7.1 The Committee has accepted that there is no case for retaining Section 88 of the 1980 Act (dismissal of teachers) but they also recognise that there is suspicion and misunderstanding abroad on this issue, and they pass back to the Government the responsibility for selling its proposal to the profession.

7.2 Much is made of disciplinary problems in schools, particularly in the wake of the abolition of corporal punishment. This is regarded as a major cause of decline of morale. The Department is urged to mount an urgent investigation of disciplinary methods.

7.3 The Committee considers that more resources must be put into equipment, books and other items of non-teaching cost: but they also point out - mainly it seems for the benefit of parents - the diseconomies of keeping under-occupied schools open.

8. On pay structure, as noted above, the Committee generally endorses the present hierarchy of grades, and their recommendations on pay levels are explicitly skewed towards rewarding those in the most senior posts. There is one important innovation, viz the creation of a new grade of Senior Teacher. They take as their premise that "the lack of incentive for unpromoted teachers is a fundamental weakness in the pay structure", and then consider various possible remedies. Once again they reject merit pay, except for headteachers, as unworkable (probably true, in the present embryonic state of performance appraisal) and certain to be disliked by the profession at large. Nor do they like the idea of a long-service payment, even if separated from the main scale by an efficiency bar, as proposed by COSLA. Their preferred option is a separate grade, reached through normal promotion procedures, which

would therefore be seen as conferring status. They suggest that senior teachers might bear some extra responsibilities, but these should be essentially teaching-related rather than administrative, eg supervision of students and probationers, curriculum co-ordination. They envisage that over a period of 3 years or so enough senior teacher posts would be created to take about half the unpromoted teachers at present at the top of the basic scales. It is significant, and not accidental (though the report does not draw attention to the fact) that the salary proposed for senior teacher - £14,500 - corresponds to the maximum of the basic scale embodied in the Coventry agreement.

9. The report examines the problem of shortage subjects - which very much exercises Ministers in the south, where it is far more acute - but finds no case for special payments. It advocates rather enhanced grants for pre-service training in these subjects.

10. On pay levels the Committee bases its case on morale and motivation. It proposes a single basic scale, shortened to 10 points (with the top point reserved for secondary teachers only) rising to £12,900. Above that, differentials are extended: assistant principal teachers and senior teachers get £14,500, the headteachers of the largest secondary schools go to £28,500. The average increase is 16.4% on present 1986/87 pay scales, which is much as we had expected. No phasing is proposed, other than for the comparatively minor matter of promotion to senior teacher, and the new rates are proposed to apply from 1 October 1986 through to 31 March 1988 (ie no "cost of living" increase on top of this for 1987/88). The extra cost to local authorities over 1985/86 pay levels, based on the number of teachers in post in 1985/86, is estimated by the Committee at £90m in 1986/87, £144m in 1987/88, and £15m over 3 years for the introduction of senior teachers. (See the Annex for some further details.)

11. As for negotiating machinery, the Committee notes that the SJNC has no friends, even in Government, and accepts that it has not worked well (but leaves in a hint that unilateral access to arbitration might have improved matters). The report also rejects the idea of Government withdrawal from the pay process, on the basis that the Government necessarily has an interest, and must have an influence, in such a large block of expenditure. It sees no prospect that simple determination of pay by the Secretary of State would be accepted. It rejects indexation as too costly. The only option it sees left open is a review body, which it considers should deal with both pay and conditions and would sit biennially, starting in 1988. The report notes that it would be a new departure - and could set a difficult precedent - to have a review body for a group of local authority employees. As to industrial action it merely expresses the hope that teachers would find such action unnecessary if they had the protection of a review body.

Scottish Office
September 1986

Pay Levels

The salary levels recommended for the period October 1986 - March 1988 offer Scottish Teachers an average increase of 16.4% over existing 1986/87 salary levels. Quite explicitly this is to be seen as part of a 2-year deal with no further increase during 1987/88. Longer-term as the new pay system matures and promotions are made to the new Senior Teacher grade salary levels will rise over 3-4 years to some 19% above existing 1986/87 levels.

The increases recommended are structured to give more to the more experienced teachers and those in promoted posts. Against the overall average of 16.4% on top of existing salary levels:

- newly qualified teachers entering the profession will receive an increase of 9-11%, a new salary of £7,900.
- teachers with 10-12 years service but as yet unpromoted will receive 15-16%, a new basic grade maximum of £12,500 in primary and £12,900 in secondary.
- teachers who achieve promotion to the new grade of Senior Teacher will receive further increases of over 12% in secondary and 16% in primary, a common salary of £14,500.
- secondary teachers in promoted posts will receive increases averaging 15-20% depending on grade with some headteachers receiving up to 23%. The new maximum salary for a secondary headteacher in a school with over 1300 pupils would be £28,500.
- primary teachers in promoted posts will receive more generous increases averaging slightly over 24% with a new maximum salary for primary headteachers of £20,700.

Differentials for promoted staff are therefore increased sharply in primary schools and significantly in the secondary sector. The largest increases, in excess of one third, will be enjoyed by those at the top of existing scales who succeed in achieving promotion to Senior Teacher, (perhaps over a period of years one in four of all primary teachers and one in six or seven of all secondary teachers).