

Subject

CCMASPR

CONFIDENTIAL



File 1/10
a Mr LETWIN

10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

21 May 1985

Dear Elizabeth.

TEACHERS' PAY

The Prime Minister held a further meeting last night in her room at the House of Commons to discuss your Secretary of State's proposals which had been modified in the light of the discussion earlier in the day (recorded in the minutes circulated under my letter of 20 May). Present were the Secretary of State for Education and Science, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretaries of State for Environment, and Employment, Mr. Scott (Northern Ireland Office) and Mr. Stewart (Scottish Office). Also present were Mr. Wiggins and Mr. Letwin.

The Secretary of State for Education and Science circulated the attached note setting out his proposals. He said the Government ran the risk that employers would either concede a settlement they could not afford or that an extravagant settlement would be reached via arbitration, leaving the Government faced with higher costs in return for no progress towards its education objectives. In order to prevent this, he suggested that he should issue a statement that the Government was prepared to make more money available in 1986-87 in return for agreement on appraisal and on managing the teaching force. The Government set out what it believed constituted teachers' duties and would indicate that it was willing to consider excluding mid-day supervision from the latter. The Government would indicate that it was prepared to make available £100 million in 1986-87 to finance movement of teachers to higher scales. The effect of increments would raise this to around £250 million after three years. This sum would allow 20 per cent of teachers to receive increases of 20 per cent (over and above regular pay increases); 20 per cent to receive 10 per cent; and 20 per cent to receive 5 per cent, equivalent to about 7 per cent of the total pay bill. The Secretary of State said that in his earlier statements he had promised no more than that he would recommend any bargain of this kind to his colleagues. It would be helpful if he could now say that Ministers were prepared in principle to make finance available for such a package as this would remove one layer of uncertainty.

/He suggested

CONFIDENTIAL

He suggested that mid-day supervision should be excluded from the range of teachers' responsibilities from 1986-87, and that the Government should provide additional resources of around £35 million to pay for supervision. This figure took account of the possibility that parents, especially in primary schools, might be induced to help on a voluntary basis.

In discussion doubts were raised about whether the timing was right for such an initiative. The outgoing representatives on the employers' side would have little interest in pursuing a long-term deal of this kind and, with the composition of the employers' side changing, the unions would hold out in the hope of securing a better deal later. In these circumstances the Secretary of State should not quantify the additional finance nor give any indication of how many teachers might benefit. To provide increases, over and above the regular annual increases, to as many as 60 per cent ran the risk of the initiative degenerating into a general pay increase rather than a reward for the especially effective teachers or the teachers of shortage subjects. A way should be sought to prevent the amount of extra finance in the first year rising in subsequent years. One way of doing this might be to put fewer teachers to the top of the next scale, rather than more teachers to lower down the scales; but enough better opportunities would have to be created to convince teachers that a real improvement had been made in their prospects.

It was argued that any addition to the pay bill in 1986-87 should be held within the additions of local authority expenditure and grant which were currently being discussed in E(LA). But if no clear progress were made on teachers' pay before the expenditure totals were settled (and the Government would not want to adjust the totals before the position was clearer) this would result in a reduction in local authority expenditure on other services. The right way to proceed would be to incorporate the increased pay bill for teachers into the figures if agreement was reached in time; if not the expenditure aggregates should be increased to take account of the higher teachers' pay bill.

Summing up the discussion, the Prime Minister said the Secretary of State for Education and Science should make an announcement as soon as possible. This should make clear that the Government was not able to make additional resources available in 1985-86 but that in 1986-87 it was prepared to consider making additional money available provided there was agreement on appraisal and on managing the teaching force. The statement should set out the Government's interpretation of teachers' duties and should indicate that the Government was willing to consider excluding mid-day supervision. The statement should not indicate any specific figures for the finance available or for the number of teachers who might be expected to benefit. The Secretary of State for Scotland was authorised to make a similar statement indicating that additional money would be made available in return for a pay and conditions

/package.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

package. In the Scottish context there would be less emphasis on appraisal and more on curriculum developments. For the coming year the limit at which the Government representatives would be instructed to operate a veto should be raised to 5½ per cent. The Secretary of State for Education and Science was invited to circulate a draft of his statement before issue.

I am copying this letter to Rachel Lomax (H.M. Treasury), John Ballard (Department of the Environment), David Normington (Department of Employment), John Graham (Scottish Office), Neil Ward (Northern Ireland Office), Colin Williams (Welsh Office), Henry Steel (Law Officers' Department) and John Wiggins (Cabinet Office).

*Yours sincerely
Andrew Turnbull*

ANDREW TURNBULL

Miss Elizabeth Hodkinson,
Department of Education and Science.

CONFIDENTIAL

DRAFT LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO MR MERRIDALE AND
MRS HARRISON

Throughout the current round of negotiations in the Burnham Primary and Secondary Committee, and the associated salary structure talks, I have tried to ensure that the Government's position is understood by those concerned, particularly in relation to the possibility that some additional resources might in the Government's view be justified. I think it right to make the Government's present position clear in advance of the meeting of the Burnham Primary and Secondary Committee fixed for 23 May, in relation to both 1985-86 and 1986-87.

In the light of the position reached in this year's negotiations, the Government is not able to make any additional resources available for teachers' pay in 1985-86. The cost in 1985-86 of any settlement must therefore be within what local authorities can already afford to pay, however the settlement is reached.

There has been debate about what should be regarded as the extent of teachers' contractual responsibilities. The Government believes it would be helpful if there were a generally accepted view on this matter, and if the range of teachers' duties were clearly linked with their contracts of employment. I enclose a note setting out the Government's provisional view on these duties. The Government would welcome views on these as a step towards agreement being reached as part of the basis for negotiation about teachers' pay for 1986-87. In the Government's view mid-day supervision could be excluded from the range of teachers' duties from 1986-87. The Government would then provide in the 1986-87 Rate Support Grant settlement some additional resources for mid-day supervision costs.

For 1986-87 the Government would be willing to provide some additional resources for teachers' pay in the Rate Support Grant settlement, if and only if an acceptable and firm agreement

in principle can be reached by October 1985, which would ensure progress towards the Government's objectives. The Government envisages an agreement which would require employers to promote more teachers than under the existing system to the higher salary scales, exercising their discretion in doing so in the light of the quality of teachers' work and the market value of their skills and qualifications. Over two to three years the Government believes that increased promotion could benefit a large number of teachers directly, and change pay prospects for all teachers.

Because of the wide public interest in these matters, I am making the text of this letter publicly available. I shall of course be glad to have an opportunity of discussing its contents with you at a convenient time, and I shall also let the teacher unions know that I should be happy to discuss its content with them.

I am writing in similar terms to [Nicky Harrison].

STATEMENT OF TEACHERS' DUTIES

Teachers must

- Pupils
1. teach assigned timetabled classes
 2. take an appropriate share of collective staff responsibility to cover the classes of absent colleagues
 3. plan, prepare, evaluate and review personal teaching methods and programmes in accordance with education authority and school policies
 4. take an appropriate share of collective staff responsibility to supervise pupils on arrival at and departure from school and during the school day [including the midday break?]
 5. mark, record and report on pupils' work (including homework) and progress in accordance with education authority and school policies
 6. provide guidance and counsel on educational, social and career matters in accordance with education authority and school pastoral and counselling policies
- Parents
7. consult and liaise with parents, attending meetings arranged for the purpose
- Curriculum & Examinations
8. take part in arrangements for presenting pupils in public examinations
 9. contribute to the preparation and development of courses of study and teaching materials in response to change in public examinations and assessment procedures and in accordance with education authority and school curricular policies
- Staff Matters
10. take part in performance appraisal in accordance with education authority arrangements
 11. take part in courses of in-service training and other schemes of professional development
 12. take an appropriate share of collective staff responsibility for the professional development of colleagues, including new entrants to teaching
 13. attend staff meetings
- General
14. carry out such other related duties and responsibilities at the school as may be reasonably allocated, as need arises, by the head.

NAPM

RS 23/5

ceol



2 MARSHAM STREET
LONDON SW1P 3EB
01-212 3434

My ref:

Your ref:

23 May 1985

Dear Andrew

TEACHERS' PAY

My Secretary of State would like to stress one point on the record of the Prime Minister's second meeting on 20 May which you set out in your letter of 21 May to Elizabeth Hodkinson.

At the beginning of the third paragraph on the second page you recorded the argument that any "addition" to the teachers' pay bill in 1986/87 should be contained within the totals of local authority expenditure and grant which are currently being discussed in E(LA).

Mr Jenkin has asked me to repeat the point which he raised at the meeting, but which is not recorded, or dealt with in the conclusions. Until the extra amount to be paid to the teachers is known, there cannot be an "addition" to be so contained. When it is known, then it will have to be an addition to the totals of current expenditure and Exchequer grant. If this is not done, reductions would be necessary in other local authority programmes at a time when E(LA) is already moving to a conclusion that they need to be increased. Moreover, the only possible incentive to the local authority employers to reach the hoped-for agreements rests on their taking the term "additional resources" in the letter sent to them yesterday to mean just that. In my Secretary of State's view, this is a very important consequence of the conclusions reached at the meeting over and above whatever conclusions are reached by E(LA) for 1986/87.

I am copying this letter to Elizabeth Hodkinson and the other recipients of your letter of 21 May.

Yours ever

A H Davis

A H DAVIS
Private Secretary

Andrew Turnbull Esq

THIRTY SEVEN
THE GREAT BRITAIN
LONDON SW1 0AA
01-212-2222
1985



23 MAY 1985



Vertical red text, possibly a postmark or cancellation mark, located to the left of the clock-face postmark.