



Fair Pay for Teachers

National Union of Teachers

Submission to the School Teachers' Review Body

November 2015

SUMMARY

This submission sets out the views of the National Union of Teachers, the largest teachers' union, on teachers' pay.

Despite a record number of teachers in employment, teacher supply continues to cause growing concern within the profession. So does school funding, which we will address in our supplementary submission in order to reflect the outcomes of the Government's spending announcement on 25 November.

The NUT continues to argue, on the basis of evidence as set out in this submission, that putting teacher supply on a firm footing requires action on teachers' workload and teachers' pay.

This year, the NUT puts forward a specific set of proposals on pay which would restore teachers' pay to appropriate levels - beginning with an immediate increase of not less than £2000 for all teachers from September 2016, and followed by a process of restoring pay firstly to the levels prevailing before the Coalition Government took office and then to appropriate levels relative to other professional workers for the longer term.

We call upon the STRB to adopt those proposals; and we also call upon the STRB to recognise the unfairness and discrimination already resulting from recent changes to the pay structure and to recommend the removal of those "flexibilities" and reject any further moves towards the kind of flexibility that destroys the belief that teaching will be, for the vast majority of entrants, a secure and reasonably paid career in which they can achieve the same sort of progress as other graduates.

Regrettably, the STRB has in recent years continued to accept the constraints of Government pay policy and to ignore growing problems - which it has acknowledged in its reports but never reflected in its recommendations - of recruitment, retention and morale. As we have said before, if the STRB chooses again to accept the constraints of its remit in making its recommendations on pay levels, or to make further recommendations on pay structure which extend the existing scope for unfairness and discrimination in pay decision-making, then it will be failing the profession and the country.

THE NUT'S PAY CLAIM FOR TEACHERS

This opening section of the NUT's submission sets out the Union's pay claim for teachers. Subsequent sections will consider the impact of recent changes to the pay structure, set out the growing difficulties in recruiting and retaining teachers, and consider current developments in pay prospects across the economy which will further exacerbate those difficulties.

Introduction

1. The NUT continues to reject the Government's public sector pay policy. The extension of public sector pay restraint at a time when the economy, and earnings elsewhere, continue to recover is unjustified economically and will not help recruitment and retention.
2. In summary, the NUT believes that:
 - Teacher supply remains in crisis - despite an improvement in ITT recruitment this year, the overall pattern is still one of under-recruitment, particularly serious in some areas, while schools report growing difficulties in filling vacant posts with suitable candidates.
 - Pay and employment prospects elsewhere in the economy are improving, so that new graduates can look elsewhere and options for those already in teaching will also become more attractive.
 - Pay flexibility has demonstrably failed to offer any solutions to teacher supply issues, leading instead to growing unfairness and discontent among teachers.
 - Consequently, a continuation of the Government's pay policy via a pay increase averaging 1 per cent will damage the profession irrevocably.

The NUT's pay claim

3. Recent NUT submissions have set out the growing inadequacy of teachers' pay and growing losses in pay terms but have confined themselves to calling for a significant pay increase without quantifying that increase.
4. This year, the NUT has chosen to make a specific proposal to the STRB which it will also publish widely within the profession. We believe that teachers will welcome this clear statement of our position and will widely support the proposal made.
5. The STRB should pay due attention to the NUT's proposal, made as it is on behalf of the largest single group of teachers in England and Wales represented by any one union, and the response which we believe it will receive from teachers generally.

-
6. **The NUT proposes that teachers should receive an immediate uniform increase of not less than £2000 for all teachers in September 2016.** This should be the first stage in restoring the losses since 2010 and then setting pay at proper professional levels.
 7. As the second stage, **the NUT proposes a phased restoration of teachers' pay, over as short a period as possible, to the levels which prevailed in 2010**, including also a restoration of the pay structure.
 8. As a final stage, **the NUT proposes that a further review is carried out during this period of pay restoration on pay for the longer term**, with full consideration given to pay levels elsewhere in the economy, in order to set teachers' pay thereafter at the appropriate levels.
 9. We believe that an immediate uniform pay increase of not less than £2000 would send out a desperately-needed strong signal to serving and potential teachers about teachers' pay. It would bolster the status of teaching, following successive years of pay freezes and attacks on the pay structure. Such an uncomplicated action on pay would attract significant publicity, helping teacher recruitment and retention.
 10. The proposed first stage increase would also target resources where they are most needed, as teachers in the early years of their careers would benefit most in percentage terms. This would again be a very effective means of immediately addressing the teacher supply problem, given that young graduates enter their careers with a significant amount of debt and are looking for professions with attractive pay levels.
 11. In adopting the proposal, the STRB would be sending out a strong message that it values teachers and shares with us the view that we need teacher pay levels that reflect the importance of education.
 12. Adopting these proposals will require the STRB to go beyond the constraints of the Government's pay policy and the terms of its remit. As we have said on many previous occasions, however, if the STRB regards itself as an independent body then it must necessarily see itself as free to do so. Whatever recommendations the STRB makes, the Secretary of State retains the power to decide whether to accept those recommendations. Given that fact, the STRB should feel free to make whatever recommendations it deems necessary, requiring the Secretary of State to decide how to respond and to be accountable for how she does so.
 13. The STRB must make recommendations on the basis of the evidence and must not limit its recommendations according to the Government's politically-motivated constraints. As we have said previously, teachers have the right to expect that a School Teachers' Review Body will operate independently and fairly and in the interests of education. The NUT therefore urges the STRB to adopt its proposals and make teaching a profession to which all graduates can once more aspire.

PAY STRUCTURE - THE IMPACT OF RECENT CHANGES

This section of the NUT submission reviews the current pay structure in teaching and the impact which the additional “flexibility” imposed in recent years is having on teachers’ earnings and prospects.

Introduction

14. The current remit letter from the Secretary of State invites the STRB to reflect on the changes introduced to teacher pay over the last three years. These changes, all made following recommendations from the STRB, include the removal of fixed pay scale points, the extension of performance-related pay (PRP) to all pay progression, the removal of the right to “pay portability” on moving post or re-entering teaching, and the beginnings of an attempt to make even the annual cost of living pay uplift dependent on performance. The remit letter also envisages extending schools’ “flexibility” through further measures.
15. The NUT’s view is that these ill-advised changes will not improve recruitment and retention. Rather, we think that they are already contributing to greater unfairness and discrimination, that they will cut average pay significantly in the longer term and that they will therefore exacerbate teacher supply problems.
16. The statistical data necessary to evaluate the impact of these changes properly, however, is sadly lacking. Just as the DfE consistently refused to carry out a proper equality impact assessment prior to implementing the changes, it is still to put in place any system for gathering information on schools’ pay practices following the abolition of fixed pay scales, or any firm arrangements for measuring rates of pay progression and pay rates on appointment following the implementation of the extended PRP system and the abolition of pay portability. The STRB should recommend formally that the DfE puts in place such arrangements or, failing that, should undertake its own survey work to inform its recommendations as it did with its teacher pay surveys a decade ago.
17. The NUT sought to gather its own data on this area for the 2014-15 pay year. We are currently gathering data for the 2015-16 pay year following the recent completion of pay decisions for September 2015. Our 2015-16 survey data will, due to the dates of pay decisions and the deadlines set by the STRB for evidence, need to be included in our supplementary evidence. We can, however, refer to the survey data gathered for 2014-15 as a starting point.

Fixed pay scale points

18. The STRB proposed the removal of fixed pay scale points from the STPCD in its 21st Report. This took effect for the Main and Upper Pay Scales (as they had been) in the 2013 STPCD, with "reference points" appearing in the STPCD and Departmental guidance respectively for 2013 and 2014 but with no such information for schools provided by the DfE for 2015.
19. Despite this attempt by the STRB and DfE to discourage schools from using fixed pay scales - and the STRB's further attempt to undermine these in its recommendations for 2015 - there is clearly no appetite among schools for personalised pay with the uncertainty it brings. The large majority of academy chains with which the NUT deals at national level retained fixed pay scales in 2014 and will be doing so again in 2015. Similarly, the large majority of local authorities have retained fixed pay scales in their advice to schools. The NUT is currently surveying its local area secretaries and its negotiators who deal with academy chains and will publish the results as part of supplementary evidence.
20. We have noted previously that no teacher union, nor any employer or governor body, took the view when submitting evidence for the STRB's twenty-first report that fixed incremental pay scales should be abolished. The experience of the NUT is that employers and schools generally see this particular proposal as unhelpful and do not wish to take advantage of it. We continue to believe that the STRB and the DfE are colluding in continuing to seek to force unwanted changes upon those who are better placed to judge what is and is not appropriate for schools.
21. The DfE remit refers to ensuring that "proposals are not difficult or onerous for schools to implement". Where schools have to undertake pay assessments for teaching staff moving from the very small number of schools which have adopted a different pay structure, there are obviously greater difficulties in doing so. The fact that the overwhelming majority of schools are retaining the known pay structure is also currently minimising the problems which might arise in describing pay structures and pay prospects to applicants. Most schools would wish to avoid such problems but these are bound to arise if even only a few more schools depart from national structures.
22. All of this can be avoided by the STRB accepting that its decision to recommend the removal of mandatory pay points, and to acquiesce in the removal of even advisory pay points from the STPCD and Departmental guidance, was misguided and its consequences unwanted. The STRB should now recommend the restoration of fixed pay points to the STPCD or, failing that, recommend the restoration to the STPCD of advisory pay points, uplifted each year at the same time as the uplift in pay ranges.

Performance related pay progression

23. The NUT undertook a survey of members in December 2014 on the outcomes of pay progression decisions for September 2014 and on teachers' views on the fairness of those decisions and the impact of the new PRP framework on workload and on appraisal. We are currently conducting a similar survey on 2015 pay decisions.

-
24. Although the December 2014 survey report was provided to the STRB for information during the oral evidence stage of last year's process, we set the results out here for the record and the information of others. The survey report for the current year should be available for our supplementary evidence.
 25. The December 2014 survey attracted almost 5000 respondents. While the survey response may well have been overweight in terms of respondents who did not receive pay progression, there is no reason to believe that the 600+ respondents turned down for progression were not representative of teachers turned down for progression last year.
 26. The full survey report is attached. Key findings, of which immediate notice should be taken, include the following:
 27. Among those teachers eligible for progression:
 - 28% of those notified by the date of the survey had been denied pay progression;
 - the proportion of primary teachers turned down for progression was one third higher than the proportion of secondary teachers turned down;
 - the proportion of minority ethnic teachers turned down was around half as high again as the proportion of white British teachers turned down; and
 - the proportion of part time teachers turned down was almost twice as high as the proportion of full time teachers turned down.
 28. Among those turned down for progression:
 - 89% thought that the decision about their pay progression was unfair;
 - 88% said that they had had no warning that they might not progress; and
 - 76% said that they were not going to appeal, commonly saying that they saw "no point" in doing so.
 29. Among all respondents:
 - half of all teachers said that their school's pay policy was "unfair";
 - 60% said that PRP had undermined appraisal for professional development purposes;
 - over 60% said that their appraisal objectives for the year were more demanding than before; and
 - 61% of appraisers said that the link with pay progression had increased their workload as appraisers significantly.
 30. The NUT has consistently warned that pay decisions under the extended system of PRP will often be based on inappropriate criteria or will be subjective and even discriminatory in nature. The responses to last year's survey appear to bear this out and we see no reason why matters will have changed for September 2015.
 31. As the NUT warned, teachers generally - and certain groups of teachers in particular - are at ever greater risk of non-progression. Consequently, average pay in teaching is likely to fall significantly as a result.

-
32. It is essential that the impact of the current provisions - in particular their equality impact - is robustly monitored at a national as well as at school level. The NUT expects the STRB to support this in its recommendations, having failed to ensure any equality impact prior to the imposition of the changes to the structure.
 33. The STRB should, however, consider carefully the emerging evidence of the impact of its changes on workload and appraisal as well. It should, in our view, accept that its proposals were flawed and should be reversed before too much damage is done.

Portability

34. The NUT also believes that it is time to revisit the removal of pay portability from the STPCD - a proposal from the STRB which even the then Secretary of State had not sought and which has the potential to affect the pay of women teachers in particular.
35. The vast majority of pay policies negotiated with local authorities and academy chains retain a right to pay portability within them. Although no hard data exists on schools' decisions, it appears that the vast majority of schools have retained pay portability as well, for common sense reasons at a time of recruitment difficulties.
36. Nevertheless, should pay portability cease to be applied over time, then teachers' average pay will again fall as a consequence and the first victims will those teachers returning to the profession - disproportionately women teachers, often returning from family-related career breaks - who do not have the safety net of an existing post within which they can remain.

Conflation of incremental progression and the cost of living pay uplift

37. The NUT remains concerned at the STRB's desire to end the clear distinction which has existed for many years between progression on pay scales, whether on the basis of experience or performance or both, and the annual revalorisation of those pay scales for cost of living purposes.
38. The STRB's recommendation of a 2% increase in the maximum of the Main Pay Range was in any case puzzling, since teachers on that pay point would expect to progress to the Upper Pay Range if meeting the necessary standards (as the vast majority of those applying do). The STRB's statement that its recommendation "*does not mean that all teachers currently on the maxima should receive a salary increase of 2% - a 2% increase should only be awarded where it is merited by performance*" has, however, been extremely unhelpful. It has been read by some employers and schools as meaning that they cannot increase the maximum point of any pay scale for teachers on the Main Pay Range by a uniform amount for all teachers and cannot now allow all teachers to progress to such a point when they meet the school pay policy's progression criteria. The legislation, of course, continue to permit both. The STRB has - some would allege deliberately - sought to promote confusion about school governing bodies' continuing right to adopt such pay scales as they see fit, within the constraints of the pay ranges.

-
39. As the STRB noted last year, some 44% of teachers were then at their personal pay scale maximum. The issue of the cost of living increase is therefore of far greater importance to these teachers than to the remainder who can also look forward to receiving additional pay through progression.
40. The NUT therefore calls on the STRB firstly to avoid any further such recommendations in its forthcoming report; recognising that for its recommendations to meet the test of clarity, they should accept and maintain the distinction between revalorisation of pay for cost of living purposes and progression on pay scales, whatever else they contain.

Further “flexibility”

41. The NUT believes that the result of pay flexibility, particularly at a time of funding pressures on schools, is to drive down pay for the majority, even if benefits accrue for a few. The current STRB remit considers two possible extensions of flexibility, regarding movement from the Upper Pay Range to the Main Pay Range and the introduction of non-consolidated pay increases. Both of these are considered and rejected in a subsequent section of this submission.

Conclusion

42. The NUT therefore calls on the STRB to:
- recommend the restoration of fixed pay points to the STPCD;
 - failing that, recommend the restoration to the STPCD of advisory pay points, uplifted each year at the same time as the uplift in pay ranges;
 - restore the right to pay portability; and
 - take no further steps towards confusing the nature and purpose of the cost of living increase and pay progression, but instead maintain a clear distinction between the two in its recommendations

TEACHER SUPPLY

This section examines issues of teacher supply. Despite an apparent rally in recruitment to ITT courses this year, and an increase in the overall number of teachers in post, the widely held view among school leaders and teachers generally remains that schools are facing extreme difficulties in recruiting and retaining good quality teachers in far too many subject areas.

Teacher supply - the context

43. The STRB stated in its 25th report that: *"There is a substantial body of evidence that recruitment of good teachers is becoming harder. We have noted the fall in recruitment to initial teacher training both against the Department's own targets and in absolute terms; the evidence from surveys of school leaders and from our own first-hand experience of talking to teachers, school leaders and local authorities. We are also aware that improvements in the economy are increasing the competition for the best graduates, and driving higher starting salaries. The most recent evidence shows emerging pressures on retention after three years."*
44. All of this remains true - and all is taking place against the background of a steady increase in demand for teachers prompted by rising pupil numbers.
45. The primary school population has been rising since 2009 and reached 4,376,000 in 2015. DfE statistics¹ show that the number of state-funded primary pupils is expected to reach 4,658,000 in 2019 (an increase of 6% on 2015). As a result in falling birth figures, the pace of this increase will reduce from 2019 - but the number of state primary pupils in 2024 is still expected to be 8% higher than the primary school population in 2015.
46. While the secondary school population (2,740,000 pupils in 2015) has been falling since 2005, the increases in the birth rate since 2002 mean that the number of state-funded secondary pupils will also start to rise in 2016. The secondary school population is expected to continue rising during this projection period, reaching 3,287,000 by 2024 (an increase of 20% on the 2015 population).
47. These figures have been revised upwards since last year's data was published. The primary population in 2023 is expected to be 55,000 higher than projected in 2014, whilst the secondary population in 2024 is expected to be 20,000 higher than projected in 2014.

¹ DfE (22 July 2015) Statistical First Release: *National Pupil Projections - Future Trends in Pupil Numbers: July 2015*. Available at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/446633/SFR24_2015_Projections_Text.pdf

-
48. In Wales, primary pupil numbers are expected to increase by around 5% from 2014 to 2022. Secondary school numbers are expected to decrease over the next few years, followed by a recovery as the increased primary numbers feed through to the secondary sector. The projections suggest a net increase across both phases of some 4% over the period to 2022.²
49. Notwithstanding the predicted levelling off in the rate of growth of the primary school population, the percentage increase in school rolls over the next decade – especially in English secondary schools – will require a considerable influx of extra teaching staff. This rise in pupil numbers will present increasing challenges year on year in terms of the recruitment and retention of teachers at a time of entrenched teacher shortages.

Recruitment into teaching – intakes to initial teacher training

50. Data on recruitment to ITT courses this year show an apparent welcome improvement after successive years characterised by a downwards trend in applications and acceptances. .
51. The data for 2013/14 showed that recruitment to primary ITT and many secondary subjects including maths, physics, modern languages, computer sciences and design and technology were below target. The data for 2014/15 revealed a worsening position with recruitment to ITT courses declining further to a level 14% lower than the corresponding figures for 2010/11.
52. The recently-published statistics from the DfE's Initial Teacher Training Census for 2015/16³ appear to buck the trend of recent years. The decline in numbers of new entrants to initial teacher training has halted and there has also been a modest increase in numbers enrolling on ITT courses, with primary education, history, English and PE all meeting or exceeding their Teacher Supply Model (TSM) targets for 2015/16. There were 28,148 new entrants to postgraduate ITT courses in 2015/16 compared with 25,753 in 2014/15. Undergraduate courses continued a long term decline in new entrants this year, with numbers falling by almost 500 from 5,936 in 2014/15 to 5,440 in 2015/16.
53. Caveats are, however, required. The figures for this year include 1,584 Teach First trainees who were not included in previous ITT census statistics. If these are removed from the total figures the net increase in ITT entrants falls to 811. The inclusion of Teach First recruits this year also means that comparisons by subject with previous years' intakes are not direct comparisons (and, although firm data is missing, research suggests that retention of Teach First teachers after completion of the obligatory two years in the classroom compares poorly with that of other training routes).

² STRB 25th Report (March 2015) *op. cit.* para. 3.27, p30 (citing OME analysis of Welsh Assembly Pupil Projection figures).

³ DfE (19 November 2015) Initial teacher training census for the academic year 2015 to 2016, England. Available at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/478098/ITT_CENSUS_SFR_46_2015_to_2016.pdf

54. Overall, the number of trainees recruited against the TSM target increased from 91% in 2014/15 to 94% this year, thus improving performance against target and in absolute terms. These statistics, however, only relate to a single year. Furthermore, 2015/16 is the third year running in which the initial teacher training target has not been achieved, as the table below shows. This year's recruitment figures still constitute under-recruitment which compounds the under-recruitment of the previous two years.

Table : Percentage of ITT target met since 2010/11

2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
107%	106%	100%	98%	91%	94%

55. Of greatest concern is the fact that that whilst trainee numbers have increased overall, it is only primary education and a handful of secondary subjects which have genuine cause to celebrate.
56. Primary courses filled 116% of their TSM target, whilst history (113%), English (103%) and PE (100%) also performed well. Secondary subjects, on the other hand, only filled 82% of their TSM target overall. While maths and chemistry achieved intake of 93% and 95%, other STEM subjects fared badly, especially physics (71%) and D&T (41%). Other subjects such as religious education (63%) and art and design (63%) also did badly.
57. Welcome as this year's upturn in recruitment to ITT in England is, therefore, it should not be overstated. Sustained improvements in enrolments to ITT courses over a period of years are still required.
58. The situation in Wales contrasts with that in England, in that whilst ITT enrolments have fallen by 29% since 2005/06, this fall must be viewed in the context of the Welsh Government's policy to reduce the number of new entrants to ITT courses to better meet the needs of maintained schools.⁴
59. In its 25th Report, the STRB expressed its concerns about recruitment to ITT, but failed to make the appropriate recommendations on teacher pay that would have laid solid foundations for improving the numbers of graduates entering the profession over the coming years, in the context of an increasingly competitive graduate employment market and rising pupil numbers.

⁴ Welsh Government Statistical Bulletin (13 August 2015) *Initial Teacher Training in Wales, 2013/14*. Key points (p1)
Available at <http://gov.wales/docs/statistics/2015/150813-initial-teacher-training-2013-14-en.pdf>

-
60. The NUT has some concerns about the stability of the teacher training programme, given the promotion of school-led routes in preference to higher education led teacher training courses over the past few years. In 2013/14, higher education institutions accounted for two-thirds of all postgraduate ITT courses; that proportion has now fallen to less than half (49%)⁵. The NUT shares the concerns of Universities UK that an increasing focus on the School Direct training routes has built considerable instability into the teacher training system.⁶ As Universities UK states, *"the speed of this change has created certain practical difficulties for institutions. It has reduced their ability both to plan strategically in the long term and to allocate resources from year to year, as the recruitment needs of specific schools can fluctuate."*⁷
61. There is also the issue of School Direct's under-recruitment in its first few years, which poses questions about whether the route will in the long term be potentially more prone to under-recruitment than traditional routes. While allocations to individual routes are higher than the overall target intakes, the under-recruitment to School Direct remained much greater than the HE led route. School Direct routes were allocated 18,000 places but fell short by 8,000. HE led courses also did not meet their target, but with a much smaller gap between the allocation of 17,000 places and the 13,500 starters.
62. The Universities UK message has recently been echoed by former Secretary of State for Education, Estelle Morris who observed that *"A failure to inject strategic planning has led to whole regions of the country with too few student teachers, especially in key subjects. The knock-on effect is that many schools have no local training provider and find it much more difficult to recruit."*⁸
63. Of course, the fragmentation of training routes is only part of the teacher recruitment problem. Unless urgent action is taken to reverse the recent reforms on pay and take meaningful action to reduce teacher workload, teaching will continue to look unappealing; and potential recruits will be put off by the number of teachers they see leaving the profession for precisely these reasons.

Recruitment into teaching – starting pay and pay in early career

64. There are many reasons why people consider a career in teaching. Whilst it is a challenging job, it is also a very rewarding one. It would be naïve, however, to imagine that the question of pay - both in terms of starting pay and expectation of future pay – plays no part in shaping a potential applicant's decision. At a time of teacher shortage, and in an increasingly competitive graduate employment market, it remains the case that the best way to ensure teacher supply is to ensure that teachers' pay levels hold their own against pay in other graduate professions.

⁵ DfE (19 November 2015) Initial teacher training census for the academic year 2015 to 2016, England, *op. cit* Main Text p1

⁶ Universities UK (30 October 2014): *The Impact of Initial Teacher Training Reforms on English Higher Education Institutions*, p1. Available at <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Documents/2014/ImpactOfITTReformsOnEnglishHEIs.pdf>

⁷ Universities UK (October 2014) *op. cit.* p1.

⁸ Estelle Morris 27 October 2015, 'Sleepwalking into UK's worst teacher recruitment crisis' *The Guardian* [online]. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/oct/27/teacher-recruitment-crisis-estelle-morris>

-
65. It is important that prospective teachers feel assured that a career in teaching is a rewarding one both professionally and in terms of remuneration compared to other professions. The replacement of fixed-pay scales and experienced based pay progression with unpredictable, locally determined pay policies is likely to cause confusion and concern amongst potential graduate applicants to teaching. Graduates considering teaching will find it more attractive if they have a more certain expectation of what they might earn three, five or ten years down the line, as well as starting pay that compares favourably with that available in other professions. Better pay prospects for early career teachers might also help address wastage rates in early career which are of course far higher than we would want.
66. Incomes Data Research (formerly part of IDS) is currently completing its usual research on the current labour market for graduates and on pay structure practice for graduate recruiters. Although that work is not yet publicly available, the NUT has commissioned some analysis from IDR which we will submit in order to assist the STRB's deliberations. We expect to be able to share this work with the STRB in time for the supplementary submission.
67. In the meantime the High Fliers report *The Graduate Market in 2015*⁹ suggests there were 8.1% more entry-level vacancies for graduates than the previous year - the third consecutive year that graduate vacancies have increased. This substantial increase in graduate vacancies has taken graduate recruitment beyond the pre-recession peak in the graduate job market in 2007 and means that there were more opportunities for 2015 graduates than at any time in the last decade.
68. As well as recruiting more graduates, the High Fliers survey also suggested that employers were increasing starting salaries. Whilst the Main Pay Range for teachers from 1 September 2015 starts at £22,244 outside London, starting salaries at the UK's leading graduate employers were expected to rise for the second year running in 2015, attaining a median of £30,000 for the first time.
69. Median graduate starting pay in the public sector at £20,000 lagged behind all other sectors according to the High Fliers report. Median predicted starting pay was higher for example for investment banking (£45,000), in law firms (£40,000), banking and finance (£36,500), IT and telecommunications (£30,000), oil and energy (£32,500), consulting (£31,500), accountancy and professional services (£30,000) and even retail (£26,000).
70. The 25th report of the STRB draws upon an OME analysis of the DfE School Workforce Census and the ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings to support its statement that *"the position of teachers' earnings, in terms of both starting salaries and profession-wide earnings, has remained broadly similar since our last report."*¹⁰

⁹ High Fliers Research Limited (2015) *The Graduate Market in 2015* p5. A study of the graduate vacancies and starting salaries at the UK's one hundred best-known and most successful employers, conducted Dec. 2014. Available at http://www.highfliers.co.uk/download/2015/graduate_market/GMReport15.pdf

¹⁰ STRB 25th Report (March 2015) Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-teachers-review-body-25th-report-2015> para. 3.24; p29

-
71. With regard to graduate pay progression generally, the STRB 25th Report cites a 2014 report from Incomes Data Services (IDS)¹¹ which found that average salaries of graduates with three-year tenure was 38.5% higher than the corresponding average starting rate, whilst graduates with five-year tenure had an average salary some 69% higher than the starting rate. The STRB then compares these figures with salary expectations for teachers (using DfE School Workforce statistics), finding that teachers who have received annual pay progression increases have typically seen their salaries increase through annual pay progression by 26% after three years and by 46% after five years (not including any responsibility payments). These expectations for teacher pay progression will have been at least largely based on the old system of pay increments being awarded for experience. The NUT is concerned that with performance-related pay progression now determined according to criteria set at school level, coupled with the ending of pay portability, expectations for teachers' earnings at three or five years will be even less attractive.

The teacher workforce - filling vacant posts

72. The NUT has not carried out any research itself on this area but understands that survey information is likely to be provided by other consultees on current patterns and experiences this year in seeking to appoint to vacant posts in schools. The NAHT and ASCL submissions last year cited difficulties in recruiting newly qualified teachers, classroom teachers teaching a wide range of subjects, middle leaders and senior leaders. We look forward to this year's submissions. We will comment on any evidence in our supplementary submission but consider some other relevant available data in the following sections.

The teacher workforce - numbers of vacant posts

73. DfE statistics¹² on vacancies indicate a growing number of teaching posts that schools are not able to fill but an overall low number of vacancies. The NUT suggests, however, that the STRB disregards this data as being a largely useless measure. While DfE ministers remain keen to use these statistics in their pronouncements on teacher supply, the DfE itself will tacitly acknowledge that the measure adds little to the sum of our knowledge. As the NUT and others have previously pointed out (and the STRB acknowledged in its 25th Report¹³) the vacancy rate identified in November each year does not take account of schools' actions to reorganise courses or classes to avoid a vacancy - it is widely acknowledged that the figures would be far higher in a September census - and does not yield any information on whether posts have been filled by teachers with the required experience or relevant subject specialism.

¹¹ IDS (Thomson Reuters) (April 2014) *Pay and progression for graduates 2014* (IDS)

¹² DfE – Statistics – School Workforce in England (November 2014) *Op. Cit.* (Main Tables: Table 14)

¹³ STRB 25th Report (March 2015) *Op. cit.* para. 3.46, p37

The teacher workforce - subject shortage and subject mismatch

74. The problems of recruitment mean that whilst schools are struggling to fill vacancies, more and more pupils are being taught by teachers who do not have a “relevant qualification” in the subject – a point which has again been acknowledged by the STRB. DfE school workforce statistics published in July 2015 and showing the position in November 2014, reveal that more than 24% of maths lessons, just over 20% of English lessons and 36.5% of physics lessons were taught by teachers without a relevant post A-level qualification. All of these figures – and in particular those for physics – were higher than those from the previous year.
75. The DfE’s definition of “relevant qualification” is problematic in that on the one hand, teachers without a “relevant qualification” may have significant experience or have received CPD in teaching the subject, but on the other hand a “relevant qualification” may not be an actual A level in that subject. The NUT believes that further work should be undertaken on subject mismatch and the extent to which teachers are being required to teach completely outside their subject expertise as a result of inability to appoint a more suitable teacher.

The teacher workforce - pupil to teacher ratios

76. These are also a more relevant statistic in that increases indicate a potential failure to recruit enough teachers to keep pace with pupil numbers, although there may of course be other factors at play. The latest DfE school workforce statistics¹⁴ show pupil to teacher ratios (PTR ratios) increasing slightly in 2014 - to 17.9 pupils per teacher - compared to the corresponding figures for 2013. Schools in Wales also saw a small rise to 18.4 pupils per teacher.¹⁵ Pressure on such ratios will only intensify as class sizes become bigger in response to the deteriorating state of teacher supply and rising pupil numbers.

The teacher workforce - unqualified teachers

77. There has been a further increase in the number of teachers without Qualified Teacher Status teaching in schools - from 16,600 FTE in 2013 to 20,300 FTE in 2014. Of these, 57% work in secondary schools and 29% in primary schools. Some of this increase may be traceable to teachers on the School Direct salaried route but much will be traceable to difficulties in filling posts.

¹⁴ DfE – (November 2014) Statistics – School Workforce in England *Op. cit.* (Main Tables: Table 17a)

¹⁵ Welsh Government (July 2015) Statistics for Wales *School Census Results 2015*. Available at <http://gov.wales/docs/statistics/2015/150723-school-census-results-2015-en.pdf>

The teacher workforce - other issues of composition

78. DfE initial teacher training statistics¹⁶ reveal that in 2015/16 some 22% of recruits to primary ITT and 40% of recruits to secondary ITT were men. These percentages are similar to those for 2014/15 (21% and 40% respectively). Male recruits in Wales in 2013/14 (the most recent academic year for which statistics are available) made up some 26% of students on primary and 37% of secondary ITT courses.¹⁷ The gender imbalance in the teaching profession clearly does require continuing attention.
79. DfE statistics¹⁸ also show that, overall, 45% of recruits to ITT were aged 25 or over in 2015/16, compared with 39% in 2014/15. The picture in Wales in 2013/14 was similar, in that almost half (46%) of ITT students were aged 25 and over. An increasing average age for recruits will have implications for long term projections on intakes to teacher training.
80. Recruits of Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) origin edged up to 14% in 2015/16, compared with 12% in 2014/15¹⁹. However, as the STRB has previously noted, this is significantly lower than the school age population, within which BME groups make up nearly a quarter of the population, according to OME analysis of ONS population estimates.²⁰ In Wales, all but 6% of first year ITT students recorded their ethnicity as white in 2013/14.²¹ Meanwhile, the overall proportion of new entrants who identified themselves as disabled was 8% in the academic year 2015 to 2016. Trainees with a declared disability were most prevalent on courses run by higher education institutions (10%), whereas students with disabilities made up just 6% of trainees on the School Direct (salaried) and SCITT programmes.²² These points indicate that more still needs to be done to reach out to under-represented groups in order to make teaching a more inclusive profession.

Leaving teaching - resignations and wastage and retirement

81. DfE figures²³ show that in the 12 months to November 2014 (the most recent year for which statistics are available) almost 50,000 qualified teachers in England left the state sector. This equates to one in 10 teachers leaving the profession – the highest for 10 years, and an increase of more than 25% over five years. The proportion of leavers classified as “wastage” - ie those teachers leaving teaching service but not due to retirement - has risen to almost three quarters of all departures, from less than two thirds five years earlier. The same figures reveal that more than 100,000 potential teachers have never taught, despite finishing their training.

¹⁶ DfE (19 November 2015) Initial teacher training census for the academic year 2015 to 2016, England *op. cit.* Table 3

¹⁷ Welsh Government: *Initial Teacher Training in Wales, 2013/14* (13 August 2015) *op. cit.* (Table A.5)

¹⁸ DfE (19 November 2015) Initial teacher training census for the academic year 2015 to 2016, England *op. cit.* Table 5

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Table 4

²⁰ OME analysis of ONS population estimates (age 0-19), cited in STRB 25th Report (March 2015) *op. cit.* para. 3.39 p33

²¹ Welsh Government: *Initial Teacher Training in Wales, 2013/14* (13 August 2015) *op. cit.* (Table A.3)

²² DfE (19 November 2015) Initial teacher training census for the academic year 2015 to 2016, England *op. cit.* Table 6

²³ DfE – Statistics – School Workforce in England (November 2014) *op. cit.* (Additional Tables: Table C1a).

-
82. Retirements before the normal pension age as a proportion of total retirements also continue to increase. Although the actual number of retirements on actuarially-reduced benefits (ARBs) in 2014-15 was lower than four years earlier²⁴, it represented a growing proportion of total retirements (38% of all retirements compared to only 54% being normal age retirements, with the figures for 2010-11 being 34% and 57% respectively). Although changes to the TPS anticipate teachers having to work into their late 60s in order to obtain their full pension, the NUT does not expect teachers will wish to work longer, given the physical and mental demands of the job, so that cannot be relied on in any way as a solution to problems of teacher supply.

Teacher retention - teacher morale

83. We observed in our 2014 submission to the STRB that teacher morale was at an all time low. Sadly, very little has changed since then. The entrenchment of performance related pay has done nothing to improve matters – indeed, it has arguably exacerbated existing problems.
84. According to research by Pearson/LKMco published in October 2015, more than half (59%) of teachers have considered leaving teaching in the last six months. Workload was cited as the biggest reason for leaving by 76% of respondents, whilst 43% of respondents identified insufficient pay as a driver causing them to contemplate quitting the profession. The report's authors stress that *“Particularly as they go on to have families and lay down roots, teachers need to feel that they can make a good living and benefit from good working conditions. Relative pay compared to other professions therefore needs to be kept competitive and excess workload needs urgent tackling.”*²⁵
85. The same survey found that science teachers were *“significantly”* more likely to complain about pay, with 48% identifying their low salary as the reason they had considered quitting the profession. This is a particular cause for concern given the current well-publicised difficulties in recruiting science teachers. Responding to these findings, the Chief Executive of the Association for Science Education, Shaun Reason²⁶, said that new science teachers probably started on the same salary as fellow science graduates but could become dissatisfied when they saw their contemporaries working in industry overtake their pay.
86. The findings of the above report are in accordance with a YouGov survey commissioned by the NUT and published in October 2015 which found that more than half (53%) of respondents were thinking of leaving the profession in the next two years.²⁷

²⁴ TPS resource accounts

²⁵ Pearson/LKMco (October 2015) [online] Available at <http://whyteach.lkmco.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Embargoed-until-Friday-23-October-2015-Why-Teach.pdf>

²⁶ Shaun Reason (23 October 2015) quoted in article 'Science teachers most likely to consider quitting school, research says' *The Independent* [online]. Available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/science-teachers-most-likely-to-consider-quitting-the-classroom-research-says-a6704576.html>

²⁷ YouGov (October 2015). Survey commissioned by NUT, undertaken June-July 2015. Total sample size 1,020 teachers in England. Figures have been weighted and are representative of the school population in England by phase and type.

-
87. The YouGov survey found that two-thirds (67%) of respondents were not in favour of performance related pay, and of those, 84% believed it was 'not practicable' to match an individual teacher's contribution to student outcomes. More than half (53%) of those surveyed were thinking of leaving the teaching profession in the next two years, citing a range of factors including workload, work/life balance, health concerns and pay as factors influencing their wish to leave. Two-thirds (67%) of respondents who had been teaching for 5 years or more said that their morale had declined since May 2010.
88. As far as workload is concerned, the most recent DfE teachers' workload diary survey²⁸ found that the average primary teacher worked nearly 60 hours and the average secondary teacher nearly 56 hours per week. Although differences in survey methodology make exact comparisons impossible, these hourly totals are significantly higher than those reported in the previous teacher workload diary in 2010.
89. As STRB members know, the Government undertook to look into the issue of teacher workload with a view to securing significant improvements in this area. Regrettably, however, the results of the *Workload Challenge* have been disappointing at best. A major development was the production by Ofsted of a clarification of elements of unnecessary workload. But 48% of teachers responding to the YouGov survey cited above had not heard about this and a further 30% had heard of it but said it would not help in their school.
90. Further data on teacher retention also emerged in a YouGov survey carried out in June 2015 for the Teacher Support Network (now Education Support Partnership). The results of the survey, which was conducted in England and Wales involving nearly 800 teachers, included a finding that that a third (34%) of all teachers plan to leave in one to five years' time, 54% of whom will do so to retire.
91. Other than forthcoming retirement, respondents identified other reasons for wishing to leave, the following were the chief concerns of those surveyed: excessive workload (40%); unreasonable demands from managers (24%); pay/pensions (19%); rapid pace of organisational change (18%); student behaviour (13%); attraction of working outside the education sector (13%); and attraction of other roles within the education sector (12%).
92. Excessive workload is frequently cited as a key motivator for teachers considering leaving the profession. Urgent action is needed to reduce unnecessary workload, in particular the demands of excessive accountability measures, so teachers can be free to focus on their core responsibilities in the classroom. Much more needs to be done to engage with teachers in seeking solutions to the problem of excessive workload and bureaucracy so that teachers can enjoy a healthy work/life balance and arrive each day at school feeling refreshed rather than exhausted.

²⁸ Teachers' workload diary survey 2013: Research report (February 2014) – TNS. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teachers-workload-diary-survey-2013>

-
93. As we have said previously, improving teachers' pay will not of itself resolve the workload crisis. But better pay would help to boost morale and check the outflow from the profession in the interim, and increase the chances of attracting new recruits into teaching. As the STRB says in its 25th Report, *"a strategic approach to both pay and workload is needed."*²⁹

The recruitment crisis - how schools are being forced to respond

94. Amongst its conclusions and recommendations in its 25th Report, the STRB notes that *"As competition for graduates intensifies, and increasing pupil numbers drive demand for teachers, past experience shows that teacher recruitment and retention can deteriorate very quickly. When it does, it can have a markedly adverse impact on particular schools and localities, presenting serious challenges for their leaders in maintaining quality of teaching and pupil achievement."*³⁰
95. Press reports have recently included accounts of heads engaged in 'bidding wars' with one another, as teachers move schools in response to offers of higher pay. Dr Robin Bevan, head teacher at Southend High School for Boys in Essex, told a recent Westminster Education Forum conference that teachers of shortage subjects such as maths and physics could be paid £10,000 more than the official scale, and that the proportion of school budgets that were being spent on teachers' pay was rising faster than the budgets themselves.³¹ *"We are forced to respond with some financial offer. It's more like working in the commercial world. Salary negotiation has never been part of education."* A Principal in an Essex academy stopped running 'best practice days' where teachers spent a day at another school after two of his teachers were 'poached'.³² Another school in Hertfordshire had started to contact former students and ask them if they wanted to become teachers³³.
96. Another consequence is the sharp increase in spending by schools on temporary teaching staff. A large proportion of this money is diverted into the pockets of teacher supply agencies - DfE³⁴ and EFA³⁵ data on schools' and academies' financial returns show that spending by schools and academies on agency teachers rose to £733 million in 2013-14 - while agency teachers themselves are paid well below the rates payable to teachers directly employed and do not have access to teachers' pension arrangements. The NUT continues to call for alternative solutions which would benefit schools and supply teachers alike.

²⁹ STRB 25th Report (March 2015) *Op. cit.* para. 4.33, p 50

³⁰ STRB 25th Report (March 2015) *op. cit.* para. 4.17, p47

³¹ *The Guardian*, (13 November 2015) *Bidding wars for teachers as staff shortages bite*

³² *Daily Mail* (7 November 2015) *Heads call on ex-pupils to fill teacher shortages*

³³ *Ibid*

³⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/schools-education-and-childrens-services-spending-2013-to-2014>

³⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/income-and-expenditure-in-academies-in-england-2013-to-2014>

Conclusions on teacher supply issues

97. Given the considerable rise in pupil numbers over the next decade, there will be a significant challenge in securing adequate numbers of new entrants to the profession and reducing the numbers currently leaving the profession. The NUT continues to stress the importance of improving the profile of teaching as a profession which can compete on equal terms with other choices in an increasingly buoyant graduate employment market.
98. The Government has achieved some short term successes but teacher supply needs to be secured on a long term basis. Bursaries for shortage subjects, and the policy of spending millions on advertising campaigns aimed at improving the teacher recruitment situation (described by *The Observer* as “eye-catching, but superficial”³⁶), are essentially short-term measures which will not tackle underlying problems in teacher supply. Much more needs to be done, both by reducing teacher workload to manageable levels and setting pay at competitive levels. The STRB has recognised the scale of the challenge. It must now translate its analyses into meaningful recommendations.

³⁶ *The Observer* (30 August 2015)

TEACHERS' PAY

Teachers' pay in real terms

99. We have commented in previous submissions about the steep decline in the value of teacher pay as measured against inflation. Teacher pay fell by some 15 per cent in real terms under the Coalition Government.
100. RPI inflation – widely acknowledged in pay bargaining as the most appropriate measure, as we have previously noted – stood at 0.8 per cent in September 2015 when the teachers' pay award took effect. This would still have meant a fall in real terms for some teachers, however, as a 1 per cent increase was not guaranteed as a cost of living increase for all teachers. We discuss the importance of guaranteeing an appropriate cost of living increase later in this submission.
101. The average of inflation forecasts in HM Treasury's *October Economic Forecasts*³⁷ shows that RPI inflation is expected to be around 1 per cent in the fourth quarter of 2015, before accelerating to 2.5 per cent by the fourth quarter of 2016. It is clear that, under the Government's policy of restricting public sector pay to an average of 1 per cent, teachers face another prolonged period of cuts to the real value of their pay.
102. In its 25th Report, the STRB noted consultees' view that there was a strong case for an above-inflation pay award, due to the cumulative impact of inflation on the real value of teachers' pay. The STRB did not appropriately engage with this evidence, instead blithely asserting at paragraph 4.15 that the reduction in the real value of teacher pay was "*only one of a number of considerations*".
103. In addition to the decline of teacher pay in real terms, take-home pay for teachers was cut under the Coalition Government. Teacher pension contributions went up by 50 per cent on average, from 6.4 per cent before April 2012 to 9.6 per cent on average by April 2014.
104. The combined impact of cuts to teachers' real and take-home pay under the Coalition Government was a cut of almost a fifth. It is imperative that this fall in the real value is reversed – but Government policy will instead ensure that teacher pay continues to decline in real terms.
105. This is without taking into account the impact on teacher pay progression and pay portability of the Government's dismantling of the national pay structure. Teachers wrongly denied pay progression for just one year, often on the basis of factors not within teachers' control like the school's financial position, face cumulative pay losses running into five figures.

³⁷ www.gov.uk/government/statistics/forecasts-for-the-uk-economy-october-2015

Teachers' pay in comparative terms

106. The falling value of real and take-home pay has been hugely costly for teachers. We must add to this equation the resumption, following the economic recovery, of the long term decline in the value of teacher pay compared to pay in the wider economy.
107. In its 25th Report, the STRB noted³⁸ that *"over the last decade, teachers' median earnings have tended to grow at a slower rate than earnings across the economy as a whole"*; and also noted that teachers' median earnings have lagged behind economy-wide earnings since 2010-11. The STRB also noted that *"profession-wide earnings for teachers in 2013-14 continue to trail those of other professions in most regions."*³⁹
108. Teachers' pay position relative to other professions and pay in the wider economy continues to get worse. The latest School Workforce Survey⁴⁰, published in July and showing the position at November 2014, confirmed that average teacher pay did not grow at all compared to a year earlier.
109. As we have noted previously, data on average earnings across the whole economy do not correspond directly to increases in average earnings for individuals or individual categories of jobs. Changes in average earnings across the economy reflect the increase in low-paid, temporary and part-time jobs. This compositional factor limits increases in average earnings – the focus of the STRB should be on earnings in professions with which teaching must compete in order to support teacher supply.
110. Nevertheless, even with exceptionally low levels of inflation and these distortive compositional effects, average earnings for the whole economy have picked up significantly and are now running far ahead of increases in teacher earnings. The latest official figures available at the time of writing showed that in September the 3-month average rate of increase was 3 per cent. Average earnings increases are now significantly outstripping inflation; generating real terms pay increases in the wider economy as teachers see their pay continue to fall in real terms.
111. Pay settlements in the wider economy are also running ahead of inflation. The latest information from the Labour Research Department (LRD) database of collective agreements shows that the median increase in the three months to October 2015 stood at 2.4 per cent, underlining the strengthening in pay settlements since the early months of 2015 when the going rate was 2.0 per cent. The private sector average for pay settlements was slightly higher at 2.5%.

³⁸ STRB 25th report, paragraph 3.7 and Chart 3

³⁹ STRB 25th Report (March 2015) Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-teachers-review-body-25th-report-2015> para. 3.24; p29

⁴⁰ www.gov.uk/government/statistics/school-workforce-in-england-november-2014

-
112. As the LRD noted in its October 2015 *Workplace Report* (pages 15-19), the past year has seen the reversal of the familiar post-recession pattern whereby real wages in the wider economy fell in value as pay settlements and earnings lagged inflation.
113. LRD also reported that employers are increasingly reporting skill shortages. The result will be pent-up demand for pay increases, to which employers facing skill shortages are likely to respond positively.
114. The weak state of the wider economy has had the effect of disguising the teacher supply problem in previous years. Now, however, the long period of cuts to living standards has come to an end. Serving and potential teachers will also have a much broader range of career options and will compare the pay offer in teaching unfavourably with pay in other graduate professions. For that reason, any continuation of restrictions on teachers' pay will store up further trouble for future recruitment.

ISSUES RELATED TO THE STRB REMIT

Application of a 1 per cent average pay award

115. The NUT does not accept the Government's pay policy for a pay award of only 1 per cent. Given, however, that the STRB's remit asks it to consider how the 2016 pay award should be distributed within such constraints - and given the STRB's previous enthusiasm for complying with such constraints - then we think it is necessary to set out our views on what should happen if the STRB does agree to act as the Government wishes.
116. As in previous years, the NUT sees no fair and proper alternative to applying a pay increase of 1 per cent to all pay ranges and allowances. This was the approach adopted by the STRB in 2013 and 2014. It was also the preferred approach among STRB consultees for 2015, when the STRB chose to adopt a different approach and recommend a 2% increase in the value of the maximum of the Main Pay Range and a freeze in the maximum of headteacher school group ranges. These proposals were not intellectually coherent and have caused confusion and needless dispute within schools. The justification offered for the higher uplift in the maximum of the Main Pay Range was to allow a higher pay award for teachers at that pay point who were classed as good performers - but good performers at that point would be progressing to the Upper Pay Range (provided they had applied), a fact which removes any intellectual justification for the proposal. There was no logic at all in freezing the pay of certain school leaders simply because they happened to be at the maximum of their school group range, while permitting a pay increase for school leaders paid an identical amount but not at the top of their range or school leaders paid beyond the top of their range. A 2% pay increase for teachers would have been welcomed - but it should not have been targeted at all, let alone targeted in such a peculiarly ill chosen manner. If the STRB wishes to go beyond the constraints of its remit this year, then it should do so on the basis proposed by the NUT.
117. Furthermore, making recommendations on a "general pay uplift" which do not create an entitlement to a pay increase for individuals will simply bring the STRB into increased disrepute among teachers. Whether or not the SRB accepts the case for the restoration of fixed pay scales within the STPCD itself, it should accept that its recommendations should lead to an actual pay increase, not to the denial of a pay increase by means of sleight of hand or subterfuge on the part of schools. Whatever recommendation the STRB makes on teachers' pay, it should specify that any "pay uplift" should lead to a commensurate increase in teachers' actual salaries in payment.

“Stepping down” from the Upper Pay Range to the Main Pay Range

118. The remit letter highlights the specific issue of “allowing teachers to move down from the upper pay range to the main pay range”. The reasoning behind this proposal is based on two false premises: that teachers on the Upper Pay Ranges bear different responsibilities to those on the Main Pay Range; and that teachers themselves would volunteer to step down as opposed to being obliged to do so.
119. Teachers on the Upper Pay Range have had to satisfy the standards required for progression to that Range. Once on that range, however, their professional duties and responsibilities remain no different to those of teachers on the Main Pay Range. They are expected to do their jobs competently and in line with their professional obligations and to the best of their abilities. They are not subject to different professional standards. Their job descriptions and duties are unaltered by the fact that they are being paid more. They do not, by virtue simply of being on the Upper Pay Range, occupy posts of responsibility which require them to carry out additional duties without additional payment, as para 47 of the 2015 STPCD statutory guidance makes clear, whatever many school leaders may think.
120. The present proposal is largely promoted by those who think that, in fact, teachers on the Upper Pay Range do have different responsibilities and should undertake additional work without payment compared to other teachers. Some teachers themselves regrettably think that surrendering part of their pay entitlement might allow them to escape such punitive attitudes. Regrettably there is no guarantee for them that that would happen.
121. Introducing a provision for teachers to “step down” from one pay range to another while remaining in the same post would contradict the principles of the existing pay structure. It would fly in the face of the STPCD provisions which make clear that pay scale position does not change teachers’ professional duties and that teachers should not be expected to undertake additional duties without appropriate payment. Moreover, it would send out a devastating message to serving teachers that their previous achievements count for nothing and that recognition of their experience, skills and contribution through pay progression, which has always been a foundation of the pay structure, can now be taken away.
122. If implemented, this would lead to many teachers coming under pressure to take on additional responsibilities without pay or else find themselves subject to unwarranted disciplinary or capability proceedings. At a time when schools are under enormous financial pressure as a result of inadequate funding, the introduction of such a provision will lead to unnecessary pressure on schools to follow this step. For teachers, a proposal presented as a choice will become a compulsion.
123. This proposal is fundamentally a bullies’ charter. It has nothing to do with the key objectives of supporting teacher recruitment and retention and paying teachers fairly. The STRB should have nothing to do with it.

Non-consolidated pay increases

124. The Secretary of State will no doubt set out in her own submission the logic behind the proposal for non-consolidated pay increases. If so, we will address that in full in our supplementary submission.
125. For the moment we will point out that non-consolidated pay increases would be wholly unwelcome to teachers. They would confer no benefit other than in the year in which they are received. During periods when inflation (whether prices or earnings) are at higher levels than now, they would lead to teachers' pay falling behind very quickly in real or comparative terms. They could not be relied upon as part of pay by teachers trying to secure mortgages and, for the large group of teachers still in the TPS final salary pension scheme, they would simply put the teacher's eventual pension at risk.
126. The NUT sees no function for non-consolidated increases. Whatever the proposal from the Secretary of State, the NUT will reject it and urges the STRB to do the same.

Salary sacrifice arrangements

127. The Secretary of State has asked the STRB to consider whether the STPCD's existing provisions on salary sacrifice arrangements should be extended to provide scope for a salary advance scheme for rental deposits. There are, however, no details given as to how such a scheme might operate and whether the Secretary of State envisages establishing a nationally funded scheme or simply making an option available to local authorities or schools.
128. The NUT is willing to consider the extension of the current STPCD provisions for a scheme of this kind, although we would want to see more detail before committing ourselves. This should not, however, be read as indicating support for extension of salary sacrifice arrangements for any other purposes. We hope to be able to comment further on this issue when further information about the Secretary of State's thinking is available.

Education Workforce Council's fee allowance

129. The STRB is also asked to consider the issue of the Education Workforce Council fee. The NUT believes that teachers should be fully reimbursed for the payment of such professional fees and that this should be a statutory requirement via an appropriate provision of the STPCD.
130. The STRB has previously considered this matter in relation to the GTC and GTC Wales fees and determined then that the STPCD should provide for full reimbursement of those fees. Regrettably, the DfE failed to ensure that the STPCD continued to ensure reimbursement of the full fee as time passed. The STRB should therefore ensure that this issue is settled once and for all - and does not need to be revisited annually or whenever the EWC fee rises - by recommending that the STPCD should provide for full reimbursement of the level of the EWC fee at whatever level it is set from time to time.

CONCLUSIONS

131. The NUT continues to reject the Government's public sector pay policy and call on the STRB to set out its own independent view on the necessary levels of teachers' pay, regardless of the constraints of its remit. It should be the Government that decides whether or not to accept that view and faces the political consequences.
132. The approach of promoting "pay flexibility" as a solution to recruitment and reward is being increasingly exposed as untenable during the current teacher supply crisis. Schools cannot solve for themselves such widespread and endemic problems of recruitment via the exercise of pay flexibility. This is particularly true at a time when school funding is under such overwhelming pressure - most schools have no capacity at present to exercise flexibility, other than by putting unfair downwards pressure on teachers' pay - but in any case it could only set schools against each other in an extremely undesirable way and do nothing to increase the supply of teachers. Continuing the emphasis on pay flexibility will also distract attention from the issue of school funding and its role in supporting teacher supply. The STRB should, in its recommendations, support fair funding for schools as well as fair pay for teachers.
133. We commend the pay proposals set out in the opening section of this submission and look forward to discussing them with the STRB.