

Educational Institute Of Scotland

Highland Local Association

Highland Update June 2003

This Update is intended to cover three issues that are causing concern and confusion in staff rooms across the Authority

The 2001 Agreement (McCrone) has several elements which are due to come into effect during the period up to 2006. In August 2003 the results of the job sizing exercise which has been going on since November last year will be put into effect. At the same time the posts of Assistant Principal Teacher and Senior Teacher will disappear.

Along side this, Authorities across Scotland have been taking the opportunity to introduce new promoted post structures. **It is important to recognise that this is not part of the 2001 Agreement.** It is not and never has been the role of the National Negotiating Body or any Local body to agree such structures.

The result of these three initiatives occurring simultaneously has added to the stress normal at this time of year!

The three initiatives are dealt with separately below:

JOB SIZING

Paragraph 1.4 of the 2001 Agreement states:

“1.4 From August 2003, all posts of Principal Teachers, Depute Headteacher and Headteacher will be subject to an agreed job sizing exercise, based on the following criteria:

- *School Roll*
- *Management responsibilities – staff, finance, health and safety, welfare, pupils and resources*

- *Policy development and monitoring – development and delivery of policies and plans*
- *External liaison – working with parents, carers, other professionals and external agencies*
- *Whole school activities – participating in the whole school/authority wide activities.”*

The rationale behind this part of the Agreement was that the current system is unfair as the only criterion for the pay of promoted members of staff is the school roll. This does not take into account the different responsibilities that staff within schools have.

A Working Group from the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT) was set up.

The Working Group met on a total of 32 occasions and, from early 2002, was assisted by professional consultants from Pricewaterhouse Coopers. It was agreed early on that the basis of the job-sizing toolkit should be the criteria referred to above and the content of Annex B of the 2001 agreement. (The SSTA were fully involved from the start and made a positive contribution to the development of the toolkit). The main broad categories are:

- *leadership, management and strategic direction of colleagues*
- *curriculum development and quality assurance*
- *whole school policy and implementation*
- *responsibility for working with partners.*

During the period up to the end of December 2002 job-sizing coordinators were selected and trained from employer and union sides in each local authority area. The toolkit was tested on 250 posts from 50 schools across 10 different authorities. Thereafter, individual post-holders completed job-sizing questionnaires and the SNCT subsequently reached agreement on weightings and salary assimilation. All questionnaires should have been returned to Pricewaterhouse Coopers by the end of February for data processing. Validation checks and exception reports acted as further quality checks and involved both Pricewaterhouse Coopers and the local job-sizing coordinators

The results of this first national job-sizing of all promoted posts will lead to increased salaries for some, disappointment for many but, at the end of the day a fairer, more robust and equal pay proof method of placing promoted staff on salary points. It is, however, essential that the following facts are borne in mind.

- Every teacher in Scotland will receive the 4% increase in salaries as the final part of the 2001 agreement on 1 August 2003.

- All promoted teachers appointed before 1 April 2001 will, if the salary identified as a result of the job-sizing process is less than that (including the 4% increase) at 1 August 2003, be entitled to full lifetime salary conservation. Staff appointed after 1 April 2001 will be entitled to cash conservation for a period of 3 years or until his/her substantive (August 2003) salary overtakes the job-sized level.
- While the difficult battle to keep conservation was won in early 2001, there were those on the Management Side who were keen to try to corrupt the job-sizing process to include elements of workload and performance (eg exam and national test results). The EIS remained bitterly opposed to this approach which would have converted job-sizing into a performance related pay system. It is not PRP and job-sizing remains a pure measure of the extent of management responsibilities of the job contained within the 2001 agreement. It is not about valuing (or devaluing) any individual's effort or application.
- This was not intended to be a fifth pay rise on top of the 23.5% already awarded but, this time, restricted to promoted staff only. We had to bear in mind the interests of unpromoted and Chartered Teachers and remain aware that we will, almost certainly, have a very difficult pay round coming up in April 2004.

An additional £80 million has been allocated by the Scottish Executive to assist with the additional costs associated with the introduction of the process.

It is true to say that there are more increases in salary as a result of job-sizing in the primary sector than there are in the secondary sector. In a sense this is not surprising for the following reasons.

- The primary sector has fewer management posts than secondary with 1 promoted teacher per 110 pupils (17% of the teaching force) while in secondary there is 1 promoted post (at the moment) per 27 pupils (48% of the teaching force). Therefore any impartial measure of management responsibility must take that statistic into account.
- Historically, there were fewer grades of promoted post available to the primary school (3) as opposed to (5) within the secondary sector. However this has now been rectified with the introduction of Principal Teachers in the primary school but, the job-sizing process also reflects this pre-existing imbalance.

In future the job-sizing toolkit will, essentially, be a piece of software which will merely require an individual to input answers to the job-sizing questionnaire and the programme (containing the relevant scores and weightings) will compute the job-sizing total and the relevant salary point. In the near future agreement will be reached on the criteria which will apply before a post can be re-sized and it will be important to bear in mind that both the individual and the teacher will have an

interest in the application of re-sizing criteria and the effect of that re-sizing on a teacher's salary.

To conclude, there are winners but from a financial perspective, there are no losers. Some members will gain an increase in salary while others will be conserved (as many hundreds of teachers are as a result of falling school rolls over the past two decades).

The following is an extract from Ronnie Smiths address to the EIS AGM:

“Over the next few weeks, every Principal, Depute and Head teacher will receive a letter with information on their new salary scale placing from August. Some will be placed on higher point, some will stay the same and some will be allocated a lower point.

I imagine those in the first category will be quietly pleased; those in the middle category might be quietly disappointed; and those in the third category will be vocally outraged. Some will be more exercised by where they have been placed vis a vis this, that or the other colleague – than by their own result itself.

But let's recall the context for this.

The old pay system – based purely on whole-school roll – was discredited. It was unfair, unsustainable and discriminatory. That is why teachers – including every one of the 6 teachers' organisations involved – signed up to jettison the old system and go for job-sizing instead.

It is neither possible – nor for that matter, credible – to design a new, fair system which takes account of differences in job sizes, but produces the same outcome as its discredited predecessor. You cannot change by keeping things the same.

Nor was it ever the case that job-sizing was intended to be a covert fifth pay rise exclusively for senior promoted staff. The aim of job-sizing is to create a fair, equality-proofed method of determining salary which reflects the size of the job specified.

Of course, the pay landscape will look different as a result.

From a predictable quarter we hear cries of an anti-secondary, pro-primary plot. That charge might have stood up were the job-sizing toolkit being applied to a common base. But it is not.

In primary, some 425,000 pupils are educated in 2,300 schools, with around 3,800 promoted postholders - 1 post per 110 pupils.

In secondary, some 318,000 pupils are educated in 390 schools, with around 12,000 promoted postholders - 1 post per 27 pupils.

Any half-fair, half-objective job-sizing scheme would have to impact differently on the sectors, given the very different scale of management provision made hitherto in each sector.

But this is not about devaluing what anyone does. This is not a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. This is not about pay discrimination. It is about removing discrimination.

And let it not be forgotten that one of the truly significant achievements of the negotiations was the right to salary conservation. Nobody in any of these positions at the time of the Agreement will lose any money – not now, not ever. Contrary to the scaremongering – every teacher will enjoy at least a further 4% pay rise this August – and some will get even more.

No one is saying the scheme is perfect. It will be kept under review. But be clear. It is the product of joint work among the three sides of the SNCT and PwC – and that includes certain unions who are trying now to disassociate themselves from it.”

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL TEACHERS AND SENIOR TEACHERS

As part of the 2001 Agreement, levels of promoted posts were changed. The posts of Assistant Head Teacher, Assistant Principal Teacher and Senior Teacher will not exist after 1 August 2003. In fact AHTs have simply changed titles to DHT.

The position of APTs and STs was clarified by SNCT circular 14 and was subject to an agreement within the LNCT in March this year. All staff should have a copy of the agreement with SNCT 14 attached.

The Authority asked Headteachers to consult APTs and STs to ascertain their wishes as to which option they would prefer. The options being:

- Assimilation for salary purposes to scale point 3 of the new Chartered Teacher scale. In this option all management tasks related to the post of APT/ST will cease and duties are the same as a class teacher.
- Move to become a Principal Teacher if such a post is available in the school.

It has become clear that the Authority wish to tie in any PT post to future new structures and have been reluctant to create such posts in August. To that end it has been agreed that APT (Guidance) and APT (sole teacher in a department) may continue with their duties for another year and initially be placed on the first point of the new PT range. This salary point is identical to CT point 3. It has further been agreed that these acting PT posts will be job sized at the earliest opportunity and any increase in salary as a result of being job sized at point 2 or above will be paid retrospective to 1 August.

It is the Authority's recorded acknowledgement that no former APT/ST will be expected to carry out responsibilities of a PT from August 2003 without being appointed as a substantive Principal Teacher.

As from August there will be a PT post in Primary schools and the Authority have the opportunity to allow STs who wish, to transfer to this new position. Again the Authority wish to tie this post into future structures so whether such PT posts will be available will vary from school to school. **STs in Primary school will cease to carry out any management tasks from 1 August unless they become PTs.**

As we approach the holidays it is of some concern that APTs and STs still do not know what career route they will be taking next session. Basically if they are not taking up PT posts on 1 August they revert to class teachers with associated non management responsibilities identical to current class teachers duties

NEW PROMOTED POST STRUCTURES

This issue is the most complex of the three and of course is the one which does not have a reference to the 2001 Agreement.

For some time Authorities have been keen to restructure management arrangements in schools. They see the removal of APTs and STs as an opportunity to do so now.

Some Authorities will have new structures in place in August but most will move in a more gradual way. Highland plan to have them in place by the beginning of session 2006/2007. To date they have asked Headteachers to look at various models and to consult staff on their possible effectiveness. It is this move that has caused the confusion in schools. Some schools have looked closely at particular models while most have only discussed them briefly at staff meetings. Teachers are aware of what is happening elsewhere in Scotland and the lack of firm information has created uncertainty.

First of all the Authority have to explain to teachers why they see the need to move to new structures and justify the educational rationale behind it. It then must explain how it intends to move to any new structure and how it will affect current post holders. The EIS has asked these questions repeatedly and still have not received full answers. **It has been agreed within the LNCT that the Teacher Unions will be fully involved in the discussions during next session. Members in schools must also involve themselves in discussions at school level and let the Authority know if they feel the plans for their school are unworkable.** Similarly I would want to be kept informed as to how discussions are proceeding in schools. No new structures will begin to be put in place before August 2004 at the earliest so this coming session provides an opportunity for us to influence the procedure.

While we await educational justification for restructuring, the Authority have indicated that it is their view that it is untenable to continue with PTs paid at the lower end of the scale since that salary is considerably below that of a Chartered Teacher. So they argue it is better to have fewer PTs but individually paid more and thus ensuring that the PT post is attractive to teachers. From that premise of course comes the start of a new structure which has fewer PTs as its centre. The Authority must convince teachers that departments in secondary schools can operate and maintain high quality education without a PT at the head. The total budget available for these posts is intended to be the same as is available in the present structure.

In Primary school various models are being looked at that allows more management time for all promoted staff including the new PT post.

In both sectors number crunching is going on now that the Authority has the job sizing toolkit and weightings. To date no final model is available.

The EIS will be having meetings throughout next session starting in the first few days back. We will be seeking assurances about the evolutionary nature of any change; seeking to influence the number and nature of the new posts; negotiating remits that are manageable within the 35 hour week; ensuring that no unpromoted member of staff is asked or pressurised into carrying out management tasks; protecting current promoted postholders and ensuring that small secondary schools are treated fairly in any allocation of posts. It is clear however that members in schools will play a pivotal role in all this.

You must get involved and make your views known.

Andrew Stewart, LA Secretary & Joint Secretary LNCT, June 2003