

SNCT

Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers



SNCT National Event 2008

Hampden

12 March 2008

EVENT REPORT

REPORT FROM SNCT NATIONAL EVENT – 12 MARCH 2008

INTRODUCTION

The Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers held its National Event on 12 March 2008. The Event was attended by representatives from all 32 LNCTs and members of the SNCT. A list of delegates is in Appendix 1.

The Event was begun with a presentation from Angus LNCT (presentation is provided in Appendix 2) but the day was mainly participative and workshop based. The reports from the workshops are included in this report. Workshops held in the morning session were asked to identify questions for the SNCT to help focus the discussion in the Plenary Session.

Contents of Report:	Page
Opening Remarks - Joint Chairs	3
Workshop 1 Information and Reports	8
Workshop 2 Information and Reports	8
Workshop 3 Information and Reports	17
Workshop 4 Information and Reports	23
Plenary Session Questions	30
List of Delegates - Appendix 1	31
Presentation - Angus LNCT - Appendix 2	34
Presentation - Workshop 1 - Appendix 3	37

OPENING REMARKS - SNCT JOINT CHAIRS

Liz Hunter

Joint Chair (Scottish Government)

Welcome everyone to this second SNCT event for LNCT members. This follows on from the four very successful regional events held in 2006.

For those who do not know me, I am Liz Hunter the Director, Schools in the Scottish Government and Joint Chair of the SNCT with Isabel Hutton from CoSLA and Malcolm Maclver from the Teachers' Panel.

I will not be able to stay long on this occasion, unfortunately. As you will be aware, today is Budget day and as well as getting myself into position so that I know what is happening I do have to get back to Edinburgh before the Chancellor gets on his feet at lunchtime so that I can help with the briefing for Scottish Ministers. I also have to be back for two meetings with Ministers this afternoon – one on assessment under CfE and one on the development of SOAs and my role as one of the 8 Directors liaising with 4 authorities each as this work progresses.

I say that not in an obviously doomed to failure plea for sympathy with the workload, but to illustrate just how much is happening in Government and in Scottish education at the moment. There is no doubt but this is a Government in a hurry, and a huge amount has been achieved and planned for since May.

Ministers have set out their Purpose – sustainable economic growth – and the 15 national outcomes which they expect all of the public sector to be working towards. School education can easily be seen to contribute to the Purpose and to all 15 outcomes. And we have a particular contribution to make to 3 of them. These are:

- We are better educated, more skilled and more successful.
- Our young people are successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens
- Our children have the best start in life and are ready to succeed.

Since May, Ministers have set out their Skills Strategy, have started looking at the future for higher education, have got themselves into a position where they can now move forward with some pace and momentum on CfE and are preparing to set out their Early Years Framework. They have also entered a completely new relationship with local government through the concordat.

Lifelong learning and effective school education are fundamental to achieving their aims right across the board. And confident, effective, professional teachers are of course absolutely fundamental to these.

I am therefore delighted to be here today at the start of this event to make clear the Scottish Government's continuing and enthusiastic support for the SNCT.

We have come a long way since the Teachers' Agreement in 2001. Over that period, the SNCT arrangements have provided stable industrial relations, giving us all the climate needed to allow us to work together to focus on better outcomes for our children and young people. The Agreement has made it clearer than ever before what the role of a teacher is. And a third multi year pay deal for teachers is quite an achievement.

The ground work of the Agreement and the way it has been taken forward have been very important in setting the conditions for the policy developments we have seen or are still in train.

And we need to continue to work together in taking these forward. No doubt we will have to think about whether the SNCT arrangements are exactly right in the new world. It would be odd if there were no need at all for reflection after such a major change as the concordat. But we will consider what is needed together. The Scottish Government and local government are absolutely committed to working in partnership with the teachers' panel to deliver better outcomes for Scotland's children.

I wish you well for a very successful and useful event, and would now like to hand over to Malcolm MacIver of the Teachers' panel and my fellow joint chair.

Malcolm Maciver
Joint Chair (Teachers' Panel)

Colleagues,

This is the 4th national event, or series of events, organised by the SNCT in its relatively short existence.

While a number of us were around at the time of the 2001 Agreement many in this room were not there at the time. Therefore, we have to go back to the source.

The 2001 Agreement, "A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century", was a ground breaking agreement, it was concluded to benefit Scottish education and for young people in Scotland as well as a means of providing competitive salaries and modern conditions for teachers.

It was, as has been stated, a tripartite agreement between Scottish Government, local authorities and Scottish teachers.

Since the elections there have been a fair number of changes with a large number of new, elected members not around in 2001.

This event will allow you to understand the background and give you an appreciation of the SNCT as a body. I believe the SNCT is a body which has delivered. The 2001 Agreement was not solely about national matters, it was also about LNCTs, which were set up and empowered by the Agreement and about the relationship between SNCT and LNCTs.

All parties to the Agreement have a shared commitment to establish a process of dialogue. In issues such as collegiality the LNCTs will be the mechanism to deliver.

I hope all delegates find the day purposeful and provided a shared understanding of the issues on your programme. While different partners will have different perspectives this will be beneficial to all involved in Scottish education.

Isabel Hutton
Joint Chair (COSLA)

Thank you, Malcolm, for setting out some of your thoughts on how the SNCT has developed since its inception. Having been elected as a West Lothian Councillor for the first time in 2007, I am unable to comment on the relative successes of the SNCT over the last six years, but what I can do is point to some of the future challenges that we face.

I should begin by pointing out that I have only recently come to terms with the role and purpose of the SNCT. Having been endorsed by my fellow councillors as the COSLA Spokesperson for Education, Children and Young People, and having accepted the role of SNCT Joint Chair for the Employers' Side, I've had to learn the intricacies of negotiation very quickly. I was immediately exposed to the detailed protocols of the SNCT, and have enjoyed working with Malcolm and Liz in taking forward a challenging agenda, not least the 2008 pay negotiations.

I believe that the outcome of those negotiations delivered real benefits for each of the SNCT's constituent parties and will put industrial relations on a secure footing for the next three years. Yet, there will also be challenges over this period, challenges that we will only overcome by working in partnership. I refer to such disparate issues as the review of chartered teachers, reflection on the application of the SNCT job-sizing toolkit, deployment of support staff, and the development of collegiality in schools and councils. We will also work together to ensure that teachers are well rewarded for the excellent work that continues to be exhibited in the classroom.

More broadly, it is important to point to the considerable changes that have occurred since the election in terms of the relationship between the Scottish Government and Local Government. The Concordat sets out the scope and nature of those changes: greater flexibility for local authorities to channel resources to local priorities; a new focus on achieving outcomes rather than focusing on inputs, process and outputs; and a renewed sense of joint accountability for key policies in education and beyond.

Of course it will be important for the SNCT to evolve in response to these changes, but I want to stress that the fundamental make-up of the SNCT will remain the same, with the three constituent parties working together to achieve better educational outcomes for our children. The Scottish Government will continue to advance national policy, whether in relation to 'more choices more chances' or the 'curriculum for excellence'; Councils will continue to design and

implement local policy, and provide quality educational services; and the Teachers Panel will continue to advance the professional interests of teachers, while at the same time articulating a vision of what needs to be delivered for our children and young people.

Anyway, my intention today was merely to make some introductory remarks and allow maximum time for sharing best practice, for engaging with peers, and for developing that elusive notion of collegiality.

To begin this process, I'd like to invite our colleagues from Angus LNCT to say a few words about how they have taken forward work on developing Working Time Agreements and whether these have engendered a collegiate working environment.

WORKSHOP 1: THE 2001 AGREEMENT FOR BEGINNERS

This session was led by the Joint Secretaries of the SNCT and the Secretariat team. It provided an overview of the work of the SNCT, since its establishment by the 2001 National Agreement. The workshop's purpose was to assist and inform those delegates who have recently become involved in the work of LNCTs.

This session included a presentation from the Joint Secretaries which explained how the SNCT works and the relationship between LNCTs and the SNCT. It also explained the background to the 2001 National Agreement and the aims and aspirations on which it was founded.

There was no requirement to report back from this workshop. The Joint Secretaries' presentation is provided in Appendix 3.

WORKSHOP 2: IMPROVING THE COLLEGIATE CLIMATE

Reports from LNCTs indicate that collegiality is still evolving. LNCTs are deploying survey questionnaires, joint training of union representatives and school managers, seminars and other events to promote collegiate working but there is a recognition that much work still remains in this area.

The group should discuss collegiality at school level with reference to the Code of Practice on Collegiality (section 2, page 3 onwards).

The following questions should be discussed by the group:

With respect to the development of collegiality what were the expectations and what has been the experience?

How can collegiality be developed and encouraged by LNCTs, head teachers and teachers?

REPORTS FROM WORKSHOP 2

The development of collegiality was discussed in the context of school, Council and LNCT level.

Not clear understanding among teachers/HTs of what signing up to re WTAs.

Expectations depend on what the starting point is in the School/Council – wide variation in both knowledge and commitment across Councils. Collegiality working well depends on senior staff in Schools. Training for HT is a big issue. Training is time well invested at school level. Collegiality could be a focus of in-service day.

Communication from LNCTs to schools re agreements reached needs to be good and send right message re collegiality.

Council improvement/service plans not joined up with the WTAs and then to CPD plans. Too many initiatives in the service plans – means nothing gets done properly. Somebody needs to stand up and say can't all be done – need to limit priorities from Government initiatives, service improvement plans and school improvement plans. If new initiatives taken on then others must drop off agenda.

Need realistic times incorporated into WTAs.

Different practices cross 32 Councils re involvement of Elected Members (some have EMs as members of LNCT) – wide variation too of their background knowledge as many recently elected.

Different experiences between primary and secondary schools – collegiality can be facilitated by either the smaller scale of primary schools but sometimes secondaries are more organised to develop a collegiate culture.

Time off facility for TU reps can be an indicator of Council's commitment to collegiality.

Collegiality should be about teachers thinking about what is important and does it impact on the quality of what is happening in the classroom.

Main Issues evolving

Joint training key to improving collegiality. Both management and TU responsibility. Joint training would mean different things for different Councils. None wrong but what is important is that all would develop and learn.

Other key issue is raising the profile and improving the communication process from LNCTs?

With respect to the development of collegiality what were the expectations and what has been the experience.

There needs to be clear support for Collegiate Agenda from all areas of council.

Rate of progress has been disappointing. Doubt if collegiality has been made a significant priority. Collegiate working takes time and until workload issues have been addressed then collegiality will remain only an aspiration.

How can collegiality be developed and encouraged by LNCTs, head teachers and teachers?

There is a need for joint seminars (Trade Union reps and Management and HTs). LNCT agreements need to be jointly launched.

Collegiality needs to be embedded within Council's Quality Assurance Process and in the work of QIOs.

There needs to be genuine consultation rather than perceived tokenism only then will true collegiate negotiation take place.

Collegiality = empowerment = responsibility – teachers need to embrace collegiality and take this responsibility.

Lack engagement due to fear of raising issues

Outcomes of collegiality important rather than (process) discussing

School Improvement Plans need to take account of Working Time Arrangements in order that they do not become a sterile historical document.

All parties, Scottish Executive, Councils and teachers, need to make collegiality a higher priority even at the expense of other of Scottish Executive and council priorities?

The key points made during the discussion were as follows:

- In terms of expectations, it was felt that teaching staff in schools - both promoted and unpromoted - were largely unaware of the SNCT Code of Practice on Collegiality and therefore of what was expected of them
- It was not surprising therefore that, while there was evidence of good progress being made at LNCT level, the group felt that there was still much work to be done in schools before collegiality impacted on ways of working
- In particular, it was felt that there was a need to tie up issues of leadership and collegiality in schools if a collegiate climate was to be fostered (eg in terms of the role played by chartered teachers) and more generally to fully understand the roles and responsibilities of both promoted and unpromoted staff
- The group was also of the view that collegiate ways of working should incorporate both teaching and non teaching staff in schools
- The group discussed whether or not issues of age/seniority and size (of school/local authority) were having an impact on the development of collegiality but did not reach any firm conclusions on those matters
- It was felt however that even at school level there were some encouraging signs of progress emerging as the CPD framework evolved and as a result of the implementation of the Induction Scheme and the new Standard for Headship
- The group felt strongly that there was a shared responsibility for promoting/developing collegiate ways of working in schools involving the Scottish government, local authorities, trade unions/professional associations and HMIE as well as school based staff and that each by their own actions/behaviour had a duty to act as good role models
- The group felt that in monitoring and encouraging the development of collegiality in schools LNCTs should use a variety of tools including staff questionnaires, school visits and training days/events to promote the Code of Practice on Collegiality

Finally the group was of the view that it was unrealistic to expect that collegiality could be developed in schools overnight and that this was a longer term objective for us all?

Collegiality – The Expectations

- ? A wider professionalism involving managers and teachers in joint planning and decision-making.
- ? Stimulate proactive teachers rather than reactive teachers.
- ? Bring about a wider engagement in policy development. Less top-down approaches.
- ? Bring workload under control.
- ? Heightened professional (mutual) respect.

Interestingly, it became clear there was no absolute consensus on what was really being sought. Individuals had their own perspective and there appeared to be quite diverse expectations. Some of the group welcomed more engagement with management in policy formation while others saw opportunities at stage or departmental level, ie for enhanced collegiate relationships at teacher/teacher level or within departments.

Collegiality – The Experience

- ? More working groups being established.
- ? Improved in-service opportunities for participation and discussion.
- ? Emerging improvement in professional respect.
- ? More whole school CPD and joint work being undertaken.
- ? More teachers undertaking lead roles in planning groups.
- ? Some LNCT Sub-Groups being established.
- ? Some joint training emerging which has been initiated by the LNCT.
- ? Some felt the discussions on a Curriculum for Excellence provided a foundation for further collegiate engagement.

Collegiality – Some Issues

- ? Would in-service on negotiation skills help in shaping the forward agenda?
- ? Is collegiality the same thing across the different sectors?
- ? How do we actually secure time in our busy schedules to engage in collegiate activities?
- ? Can we identify more joint platforms to enhance the reality of collegiality?
- ? New entrants to the profession may be more receptive to maintaining the dynamic of collegiality.
- ? Always remember quality is better than quantity!
- ? How can best practice be recorded and disseminated?
- ? Don't forget – it's an evolutionary process, be optimistic and encouraging rather than dismissive and critical?

Initial discussions were around what is meant by 'collegiality'. In particular it was noted that newly elected councillors may not know what is meant by this term.

Concern was expressed that there had been a growth in 'managerialism' over recent years and the dilution of management posts as a result of staffing restructuring was leading to a greater degree of hierarchical management.

It was noted that simply having systems in place e.g. signed off working time agreements, meetings of staff consultative committees, may not, in themselves, be an assurance of collegiate working. A key issue was control – the degree to which teachers felt they had control over their work. In this respect, outside pressures to implement policies could undermine this. The question was posed as to the degree to which the Scottish Government, represented on the SNCT, could influence the demands of e.g. HMIE. LNCT powers more limited, but nonetheless can seek to influence the number and priority of local authority led initiatives.

The role of devolving control over the agenda to school level was discussed. Inherent in the National Agreement is the idea that collegiate working at establishment level can enable staff to exercise control. Similarly, each school's priorities should reflect its own choices in respect of educational initiatives and the input on workload.

Feeling that LNCTs should not dictate but can set standards and encourage good practice. The example of Perth & Kinross LNCT jointly visiting schools and discussing issues with staff and management, ensuring that the consultation committee was working, the working time agreement reflected genuine discussion etc.

The North Lanarkshire paper 'Working Together' had been seen by some and was felt to be a very helpful paper in respect of helping to take forward this agenda. Noted that it was the product of discussions at both school level and at authority conferences on the theme. Since the event that led to the paper there are plans for further follow-ups and a half day recall conference in the near future. The main message was that it required an ongoing momentum.

Recognised that there was an issue in relation to staff having more than just the opportunity to contribute. Do they actually do so? If not, why not? If there was a feeling that there was no point then creating opportunities would be no use.

Perhaps easier to clarify what is not collegiate working e.g. a culture of bullying, regular cases of harassment, stress cases.

Implications for learning/teaching when looking at background of producing confident, responsible young people if staff lack confidence or are felt to be lacking trust to behave as autonomous professionals.

Need for some agreement re measures of success. Perhaps more research is required into areas such as group working?

Questions; With respect to the development of collegiality what were the expectations and what has been the experience? How can collegiality be developed and encouraged by LNCTs, head teachers and teachers. Points raised by Workshop participants have been grouped as follows;

Historical Background and changing nature of leadership in schools

The historical development of the line manager approach arising out of Main created difficulties in taking forward the Collegiality agenda. Teachers contrasted this with their own definition of professional autonomy.

Scottish Education has a very hierarchical structure. Despite changes re National Testing these results were still being used by Authorities and HMle.

The 21st Century agreement highlighted the need to “reprofessionalise” the profession. There was no universal understanding of collegiality and the expectations for change that were envisaged. The essence of collegiality was to ensure that decision making was informed by professional debate and consensus.

Encouraging teachers to work in a collegiate fashion also had contractual implications and with regard to the role teachers perceived themselves as having within a line management structure.

In some cases it was more appropriate for qualified senior managers to take forward issues. In others, a more collegiate model would be appropriate, i.e., collegiality is not a replacement for school management functions.

Training

There is an ongoing requirement for Authorities to train managers in collegiality especially those wedded to the “line management approach”. Joint training would be useful in taking forward collegiality. The inspirational leadership concept recently promoted was detrimental to taking forward the much broader concept of leadership required within our schools.

External Influences on School Level Policy Implementation

It is recognized that Headteachers are under pressure from Government, HMle, from Local Authority Officers and from the Quality Assurance agenda.

In some cases insufficient challenge is made to policies coming from above. Inappropriate initiatives damage the education of children.

Teachers self-evaluate as part of their everyday reflection on their work. There are issues with HGOIS approaches with regards the prioritization of teacher time. Nevertheless, it was recognized that it would prove difficult to challenge what was now part of the Scottish educational landscape.

Developing Collegiality and Partnership Working in a new political environment

It was essential that Collegiality is embraced not only within schools but involves all the partners at all levels.

Elected Members feel that teacher trade unions should make clear to Councillors at a local level what their priorities are. Councillors spend a lot of time verifying Officers reports. There is a high level of mistrust. A silo mentality is evident in some areas of local government. Elected Member interface with Teacher Trade Unions varies from Local Authority to Local Authority. A better interface between Elected Members and Teacher Trade Unions would be desirable. This should be taken forward as appropriate within the SNCT/LNCTs.

The changed political landscape has also impacted on Cosla and ADES.

The 35 Hour Working Week

The 35 hour working week had not been delivered?

Difficulties in engaging all teachers in collegiality.

Collegiality is dependent on attitudes of trade union representatives and Head Teacher.

The pressures on Head Teacher e.g. H.M.I.E. inspection, contribute to some Head Teachers acting and making decisions without consultation.

Improvements:

- a) consider reviews of school agreements bi-monthly
- b) Some Councils have Joint Secretaries visit schools to review commitment to LNCT agreements.
- c) Local conferences could be held on implementation of LNCT agreements.
- d) Publication of literature around schools on issues arising from local conferences.
- e) Circulation of LNCT minutes to Head Teachers – Include on agenda for Head Teachers meetings.
- f) Promote joint working between management/trade union sides and joint issue of circulars/guidance etc. (North Lanarkshire).
- g) Monitoring - LNCT should review annually, school based agreement.

Note: - framework should be set out for content of school agreements.

Issues:

Renfrewshire – No senior management/selected member involvement in LNCT. No consultation on relevant issues submitted to Education Committee?

WORKSHOP 3: WORKLOAD

Schools negotiate Working Time Agreements which describe the agreed activities of teachers within a 35 hour working week context, yet the reported prevailing reality is that this generally fails to limit the working week of teachers to 35 hours.

The SNCT Working Time Research concluded that the average working week of Scottish teachers is 45 hours with head teachers averaging 55 hours.

The current SNCT work plan makes clear that workload reduction remains a priority for action in the coming period.

Towards the end of this school session the SNCT will require a progress report on LNCTs workload control initiatives and this will inform further advice from the SNCT.

The following questions should be discussed by the group:

What are the main generators of workload, from individual teacher, school, local authority and national levels?

Should we attempt to identify what teachers are required to do and what, in addition, they choose to do?

How can LNCTs monitor and manage teacher workload?

REPORTS FROM WORKSHOP 3

Question 1

Some participants felt 2001 Agreement provided no benefits at all in managing workload. This was challenged vigorously by others and expressions such as 'rose tinted spectacles when viewing pre 2001' were used.

Much discussion focused around whether or not teachers themselves choose to do things they are not required to do. The consensus was that they did things not required by Annex B nor detailed in 35 hour working week agreement but because of HMIE agenda.

All parties agreed that HMIE provided a real driver to Quality Assurance regimes within Local Authorities, which in turn put pressure on school management and resulted in micro management of teachers.

Question 2

Micro management was agreed to be contrary to the 35 hour working week agreement. Flexibility to manage individual workloads within general guidelines was seen as the most appropriate model. The notion of a 'one size fits all' agreement was seen as unhelpful. Some participants also disagreed with the notion of sharing agreements in the spirit of best practice as that could in itself be counter productive.

Very detailed working time agreements could indicate a lack of trust on the part of senior management or an unwillingness to 'lose control' – in some cases collegiality would appear still to be an aspiration rather than a reality. Lack of collegiality in the drawing up of working time agreements appeared to some participants as symptomatic of a culture of bullying in some schools.

Some participants stated that it was a management responsibility to monitor workload.... The view was expressed however that it was a shared responsibility and that teachers must also play their part in addressing workload issues, ideally through strong collegiate agreements.

Question 3

CPD for teachers on the use of modern HR policies such as Stress Management, Teacher Health and Well Being should be encouraged. Collegiality should begin in ITE institutions, the 'long hours culture' should be actively discouraged. Assertiveness training should include workload management. Joint training for teachers and managers should emphasise healthy work life balance.

The pressure and stress put on schools by HMIE should be a matter that SNCT should address. Unrealistic targets and 'very goods' and 'excellents' for expectations outwith duties outlined for all staff in 21 century agreement is unfair and probably the single biggest cause of excessive workload and stress?

The group began by discussing the issue of workload generators. The main points made were as follows:

- The SNCT research had revealed that preparation and marking took up more than the time allowance currently allowed (7 ½ hours)
- It was felt that there was a general lack of management time for promoted post holders to carry out their duties. In particular, the workload issues of PTs in faculties and HTs within cluster arrangements were highlighted
- The group was also of the view that schools still suffered from curricular initiative overload/fatigue. The current implementation of A Curriculum for Excellence while still operating 5-14 was highlighted
- School improvement plans were also seen as often being over ambitious and not accurately reflecting the amount of time allocated to curriculum development in the school working time agreement
- The amount of time taken up by quality assurance at school level was also perceived to be a significant workload generator while the educational value attached to some of that quality assurance was questioned
- Pressure on classroom teachers from both parents and head teachers were also seen as being factors
- It was also felt that poor staffing levels were a root cause of the workload problem
- Working Time Agreements were seen as being of only limited value in controlling workload

The group then went on to discuss the issue of whether it was possible to distinguish between teaching tasks which were essential and non essential. It was generally felt that such a decision was best left to the professional judgement of the individual teacher and that teachers should be reminded of this but that they needed to feel safe in making that judgement

There was then some limited discussion on how LNCTs could monitor and manage workload. The suggestions made by the group were as follows:

- The publication of Working Time Agreements across an Authority
- The sharing of “good practice”/what works across schools/local authorities
- An LNCT review of WT Agreements/School visits by LNCT
- LNCTs should encourage schools to evaluate their WT Agreements on an annual basis?

What are the main generators of workload, from individual teacher, school, local, authority and national levels?

Legislation	ASN Act and Equality Act – impact unavoidable on councils and schools
Initiatives (Education) Scottish Government	Initiative overload/fatigue
HMIE	Accountability agenda Continual improvement agenda
Teaching Culture	Good professionals and those looking for promotion do far more than 35 hours. Those who only do 35 hours considered less professional

Job cannot be done within 35 hours then the 22.5 hours maximum class contact time needs to be reviewed. Need to change the use of collegiate time, prioritise what makes a difference to pupil learning. Less on report writing, tracking)

Are all parties fully committed to making the job manageable in the 35 hour week? Scottish Government and Local Authorities must take more account of workload issues when introducing new initiatives.

Workload and discipline issues are leading to burnout for many. Stress related illness on the increase. If workload and burnout issues are not tackled then it will be a major problem in long term when NPA 65 for today's new entrants.

Should we attempt to identify what teachers are required to do and what, in addition, they choose to do?

Working Time Agreement should attempt to define core job – that can be completed in 35 hours. The cultural climate that in order to gain promotion teachers need to work in excess of 35 hours needs to be addressed. The notion that teachers who work 35 hours are somehow less committed and less professional needs to be challenged.

How can LNCTs monitor and manage workload?

LNCT – need to visit schools, interview individual teachers. Schools with agreements which vary significantly from norm should be target.

Reduction in workload must be embedded in the council's Quality Assurance Process especially in the work of QIOs.

The following comments arose during the course of the discussion:

- The Working Time Agreements have been unable to control workload.
- Unsure if an annually set WTA is actually able to deliver a 35-hour week.
- That day to day operational matters for teachers (e.g. dealing with a serious matter of pupil indiscipline) get in the way of planned work.
- Are teachers good at prioritising?
- School management needs the courage to say “no.”

There was a general acceptance within the group of the following:-

- There is a need for a system at Local Authority level to involve trade unions at an early stage in the drafting of authority service plans.
- There is a need to quantify what the workload issues are.
- The emphasis should shift from schools requiring proof of attainment to agreed outcomes?

The principal areas of discussion and points made were as follows:

- A statement in the workshop descriptor states, “The current SNCT Workplan makes clear that workload reduction remains a priority for action in the coming period.” This led the Group to question whether other parties/stakeholders in Scottish education also held that as an objective, since without joint shared commitment it would be very difficult to make progress. Might the SNCT make contact with other stakeholders to seek their engagement/support in that objective?
- Additional consideration should be given to mechanisms for achieving efficiencies of approach to workload aspects which were common to schools/teachers across Scotland through sharing of “good” practice (i.e. good in the sense of workload reduction). Might “Glow” facilitate this? Examples might be forward planning and reporting formats, assessment regimes etc. This should not conflict with the professional flexibility and creativity which contributes to effective pedagogy.
- The need exists for a more rigorous approach to Service Planning and school improvement planning; viz. to scrutinise and assess elements of plans in terms of resource inputs (especially time/work) and of the value of outputs/effects. It was recognised that the implications of proposed changes were not always readily evident or readily assessed, but that nevertheless in constructing - and constraining - plans, realism must prevail over aspirations. It was noted that a factor to deal with in this process is that the authors/promoters of change typically invest disproportionately in their support/determination to secure change – since their priority is not workload but their reputation - making it more difficult to resist or remove elements. There also tends to exist a general professional disposition not to remove or reduce as it is inferred failure. In respect of the above point, it was noted that “A Curriculum for Excellence” might provide a context which leads to a more serious evaluation of what has worth, what should be retained and what should go.
- Debate arose around the feasibility of constraining the workload of teachers where they choose to work beyond what is required of them. On one hand it was asserted that their right to choose to do so should be respected where that was being undertaken without pressure, explicit or implicit. However, it was questioned whether such a context realistically existed, whether there was genuine free will on this matter, or whether the professional climate in which teachers are being compared or judged by others (especially for career advancement) created an unhelpful expectation to work “above and beyond the call of duty”.
- In this regard it was accepted that to expect or require slavish adherence to “35 hours” was unhelpful and that individual differences would always exist and should be allowed for. However, there was nevertheless a need: to challenge the cultural stereotype of “long hours = good professional”; to assert the professional and personal benefits of a good work –life balance; to assist teachers in working more efficiently (coaching may have a role here), and to make them more confident to constrain/reduce their workload?

WORKSHOP 4: DEPLOYMENT OF SUPPORT STAFF

Annex E of the 2001 National Agreement (now Appendix 2.6 of the SNCT Handbook) listed the non-teaching tasks which should not routinely be carried out by teachers. The aim of Annex E and the provision of resources to introduce the equivalent of 3,500 support staff, was to reduce the workload of teachers and to allow teachers to allow the skills and experience of teachers to be deployed more effectively. In May 2007 the SNCT issued guidance (SNCT Advice: Guidance on the Deployment of Support Staff in Schools) to councils, managers and teachers to assist the effective deployment of support staff. This guidance set out 'Principles of Good Practice' as well as providing advice on deployment and management of support staff.

The following questions should be discussed by the group:

How have the 'Principles of Good Practice' been incorporated by your council?

How effective has the deployment of support staff been in reducing teachers' workload?

What role can LNCTs plan in continuing to address this issue?

REPORTS FROM WORKSHOP 4

Within the group there was no knowledge of how any additional support staff had been deployed as a result of the National Agreement. Although research had been undertaken no-one was aware of the detailed findings.

Practice varied markedly between authorities as to the deployment and employment of support staff. In some there were generic roles with all staff employed on permanent contracts with training opportunities and career progression. In others it remained short term contracts for specific duties. Similarly there was wide disparity in the allocation, usually on a pupil numbers basis, sometimes within clusters, other times to individual schools, sometimes with a deprivation factor.

Common concerns related to the lack of supply cover arrangements, most commonly there were none.

Retention was an issue, particularly when the employment was less secure or valued. However, the career progression systems could also lead to the loss of staff who then went on to other work having gained qualifications.

The recent Concordat was perceived as a real threat. If there was no central protection the gains made in the employment of additional support staff could easily be lost to the detriment of what was meant to be a national agreement.

Concern was expressed that in some cases the employment of support staff was at the expense of promoted posts e.g. business managers replacing DHTs.

There was an issue in relation to the maintenance of a distinction between admin/clerical support and classroom support. In some authorities this was seen as a clear distinction but not in others. It was noted that the support staff themselves seem to prefer the distinction rather than being available to undertake whatever tasks were allocated?

The following comments were made:-

- Deployment heavily pupil support rather than teacher support (because it is a Special School)
- Some authorities have separate funding
- Heads/teachers still collecting dinner money
- Next generation of headteachers may have different attitude to Annex E/Appendix 2.6 duties
- Raise matter within SNCT – LNCT – schools
- Support staff funding dependent on local authority expenditure (one Council – budget problem – cut support staff and CPD)
- Future concordat arrangements?
- Shetland – very good practice, Annex E devolved. PSO in clusters (Personal Support Officer?), worked very well, especially for larger schools – some complaint from smaller schools
- West Lothian – business managers. Paperwork associated with ASL Act
- Playground supervision – still being carried out by teachers – some senior managers regard it as part of their job
- Problems of transparency – money to schools – but not always consultation over deployment (70% of App 2.6 covered). Who does what?
- Re-visit Appendix 2.6 in the light of changes since 2001 with schools, LNCT's, SNCT
- Difficult, with budget cuts, to make changes
- Business managers in infancy – influence their remit? – bids culture – benefit/deficit of removing ring fencing?
- Working culture – some teachers/managers happy to hide in admin work
- Issue of pupil supervision – e.g. lunchtime
- Record keeping in some schools
- Assessment data and reporting – double entering – middle management activities
- PECOS arrangements - should save time?
- LNCT monitoring – we monitor working time but not support staff?

Participants' observations with regard to Support Staff

- Numbers, titles, roles, responsibilities and deployment vary significantly across different authorities.
- Rural authorities, arguably, face additional allocation challenges given the number and geographical distribution of establishments.
- Devolving funding to school level has not always resulted in enhancement of support staff numbers with Heads opting to allocate funds to support different activities/initiatives. Deployment decision making is often determined by the level of collegiality.
- Amalgamation of roles, eg *Classroom Assistant + SFL Auxiliary = Learning Assistant* can result in dilution of support being delivered to teaching staff in order to meet the additional support needs of pupils – particularly in times of budget restrictions/cuts.
- Although broadly welcomed, the introduction of business managers/bursars has created 'job-size' and workload inequities particularly at DHT level.
- Benefits can be derived from facilitating support staff meetings to consider improved ways of working to maximise impact.
- Variable provision of training, both initial and ongoing, and inconsistent access to a clear career path for support staff.

Has Teacher Workload been addressed as a result of the TP21 Recommendations?

- Sight of the benefits which have accrued has been lost amidst the 'new' initiatives, tasks and requirements that have been introduced over the same period of time.
- Impact has been variable, depending on the adequacy of provision.
- The potential for reduction in provision in the current economic climate gives significant cause for concern and will have a damaging impact on the implementation of A Curriculum for Excellence and on the continuing pursuit of 'Inclusion'.
- The inadequate and inconsistent provision of cover caused concern.
- The Education environment since the Agreement has changed but support staff remits have remained largely unaltered.

Comments in relation to Annex E and 'A Time for Teaching' Report

- Indication that some Annex E activities continue to be routinely undertaken by teachers – in particular, promoted staff. Certain duties are undertaken through 'choice', eg playground supervision as part of behaviour management strategies.

Continuing Role of SNCT and LNCTs

- Against backdrop of EOC Report, LNCTs need to monitor the appropriateness and effectiveness of the deployment of Support Staff in Schools. (**Working in a 'collegiate manner' does not cut across job descriptions and roles need to be clearly defined and respected.**)
- Schools should be encouraged to conduct mid-session reviews to evaluate the effectiveness of Support Staff deployment.
- LNCTs should seek to resist any erosion of existing levels of support.
- LNCTs have an on-going responsibility to train **all staff** to support them in fulfilling their own job requirements but also in how to work together effectively?

Our group addressed the additional questions suggested for workshop leaders but in so doing, also addressed the main questions:

Question 1

Delivery of Annex E has been patchy. Additional support staff have been recruited though many on temporary contracts. There would be appear to be some doubt as to whether the funding allocated by Scottish Executive has been fully utilised for support staff. Real concern expressed by employers that continued funding of support staff will be at the expense of other priorities. Dundee and Renfrewshire identified financial tensions between continued provision of support staff and the expressed wish of Scottish Government to see year on year reduction in class sizes. Inverclyde had moved to employ support staff but there were concerns that there were no cover arrangements when support staff were off sick or when vacancies arose. This resulted in teachers being forced to reschedule or undertake support staff duties in some cases. Aberdeen was very late in appointing support staff and the precarious financial position of the City Council has now placed these posts at risk.

Renfrewshire had real concerns that continued reduction in class sizes would result in tri level composite classes becoming the norm and suggested an increased teacher workload issue there.

All reported issues on no local discussion on deployment of support staff nor time allocation for liaison with class teachers. Role needs to be clarified.

Question 2

There were concerns expressed by employers that routine tasks were still being done by teachers and that there was a reluctance in some cases by teachers to delegate. All sides agreed that the code of good practice was not being fully utilised as training was not routinely available to teachers or Headteachers on the management and deployment of support staff.

The deployment of support staff should be a collegiate activity and the collegiality should involve the support staff themselves. The use of support staff as support for senior management only was not helpful in some areas.

The issue of CPD for support staff was a concern as correctly focused CPD could eliminate doubt as to the actual role of support staff and address the perception that some support staff are engaging in 'teacher activities'.

It was agreed that support staff should have training prior to being introduced into the classroom. The issue of support staff being mainly 'women returners' to the workplace was discussed and the confidence issues that often manifest themselves. Prior training and ongoing CPD could address this.

Question 3

The EIS document on use of support staff was agreed to be a useful starting point for informing best practice.

The merging of Classroom assistant/ SEN auxiliary posts in some areas as a result of Single Status was seen as a real disincentive and liable to make recruitment and retention more difficult.

As part of a wider discussion on best practice some of the employers side felt that use of adult: pupil ratios rather than teacher : pupil ratios might assist the retention and deployment of support staff and assist in reduction in teacher workload.

Question 4

All parties felt Annex E was still relevant today, however some of the listed tasks needed to be reviewed and updated. Continued monitoring of the use of support staff at local and national level was considered important. When (if!) more detail emerges about Curriculum for Excellence that may well require further review and refocusing of support staff tasks.

All parties were very concerned about financial pressures and the pressures to deliver high quality inclusive education in reduced class sizes without the safety net of any ring fenced money for education?

PLENARY SESSION QUESTIONS

1. Is there a national picture of the deployment of Support Staff and how can the SNCT assist in disseminating good practice and, importantly, try to encourage a 'level playing field' (especially resources in context of Concordat)?
2. Acknowledging the progress made in reducing teachers' workload through the deployment of Support Staff, what is the Panel's view as to how that impact is sustained over the longer term?
3. The 'culture' of working excessive hours appears to be endemic in the profession. How do we change this culture to make excessive working professionally and socially unacceptable thus ensure the health and wellbeing of staff?
4. Are we satisfied with the effectiveness of communication between SNCT-LNCT-schools?
5. How can the job of teachers, as it presently exists, be carried out within the 35 hour working week?
6. Does the panel believe that it would be possible to put in place a mechanism to assess the impact on teacher workload of all proposed initiatives, in order to establish whether there is the capacity to deliver?
7. Strategies for further promoting collegiality. Scope for joint initiatives and joint CPD at a local level?? Ideas??
8. How far should the role of the LNCT be one of driving change as opposed to facilitating/enabling others (schools) to effect change? Is there a balance to be struck?
9. How do we ensure joint commitment to and shared understanding of collegiality by all parties to the agreement?
 - Joint communications.
 - Joint planning and activity (eg school visits, briefing of staff, training).
 - Consideration of the importance of collegiality for national initiatives.
10. How can we develop and sustain the spirit of collegiality at all levels?
11. In what ways can joint training be used to raise the profile of the LNCT and its priorities?
12. How can you develop and maintain the spirit of collegiality at all levels?

APPENDIX 1

DELEGATE LIST

JOINT CHAIRS

LIZ HUNTER

Scottish Government

ISABEL HUTTON

Employers' Side

MALCOM MACIVER

Teachers' Panel

JOINT SECRETARIES

JOE DI PAOLA

Employers' Side

DREW MORRICE

Teachers' Panel

STEPHANIE WALSH

Scottish Government

SPEAKERS

PHILIP JACKSON

Angus LNCT

DAVID DRYSDALE

Angus LNCT

DELEGATES

(in alphabetical order)

MARGARET ALCORN

National CPD Co-ordinator
Employer's Side

DOUGIE ATKINSON

SNCT
Scottish Government

ERIC BAILLIE

SNCT
Teachers' Side

ANN BALLINGER

SNCT
Teachers' Side

KAREN BARCLAY

Area Officer
EIS

JACK BARNETT

SNCT
Teachers' Side

KAY BARNETT

Aberdeenshire
Teachers' Side

DANIEL BARRY

JOHN BLACK
SNCT
Teachers' Side

GORDON BONE

West Dunbartonshire
Employer's Side

KENNETH BROWN

East Dunbartonshire
Teachers' Side

GRANT BRUCE

Aberdeen
Teachers' Side

GORDON BULLOCH

Aberdeenshire
Employer's Side

TOM BURNETT

AHDS
COSLA Adviser

GRAEME CAMPBELL

Area Officer
EIS

WILLIE CAMPBELL

Falkirk
Employer's Side

CLLR DANNY CARRIGAN

North Lanarkshire
Employers' Side

ANGELA CONNELLY

SNCT Secretariat
Teachers' Side

HELEN CONNOR

SNCT
Teachers' Side

BOB COLMAN

Highland
Teachers' Side

BERNARD CRANIE

Shetland
Teachers' Side

JOHN CRICHTON

SNCT
Teachers' Side

RICKY CULLEN

North Lanarkshire
Teachers' Side

RON CULLEY

SNCT
Employers' Side

JAMES CUTHBERT

Shetland
Employer's Side

FIONA DALZIEL

SNCT
Teachers' Side

JOHN DENNIS

Dumfries and Galloway
Teachers' Side

JOE DI PAOLA

SNCT Joint Secretary
Employer's Side

CHARLES DOCHERTY

West Dunbartonshire
Teachers' Side

ELLEN DOHERTY

North Lanarkshire
Employer's Side

MARGARET DORAN

Glasgow
Employer's Side

CLLR GERRY DORRIAN

Inverclyde
Employer's Side

CARMEN DOUGLAS

South Ayrshire
Employer's Side

DAVID DRYSDALE

Angus
Teachers' Side

PAT FALLOW

Fife
Teachers' Side

ALISTAIR FARQUHAR

Moray
Employer's Side

KAREN FARRELL

Clackmannanshire
Teachers' Side

BILL FERNIE

Highland
Employer's Side

MAY FERRIES

SNCT
Teachers' Side

DOROTHY FINLAY

Falkirk
Teachers' Side

TONY FINN

Fife
Employer's Side

PAT FLANAGAN

Aberdeenshire
Teachers' Side

GORDON FORD

West Lothian
Employer's Side

ARTHUR FORREST

Dundee
Teachers' Side

SANDY FOWLER

South Ayrshire
Teachers' Side

BRIAN GARDNER

North Ayrshire
Employer's Side

JIM GILHOOLY

South Lanarkshire
Employer's Side

GAEL GILLAN

East Lothian
Teachers' Side

JIM GOODALL

Clackmannanshire
Employer's Side

RONNIE GOULD

Argyll and Bute
Employer's Side

KAREN GREAVES

Orkney
Employer's Side

CLLR GEFF HAMILTON

Moray
Employer's Side

PHILIP HARDING

Western Isles
Teachers' Side

IAIN HARVEY

East Ayrshire
Teachers' Side

FRANK HEALY

Area Officer
EIS

ALBERT HENDERSON

Inverclyde
Employer's Side

DOUGLAS HENDRY

Employer's Side

JACQUI HUMPHREYS

South Lanarkshire
Employer's Side

LIZ HUNTER

SNCT Joint Chair
Scottish Government

CLLR ISABEL HUTTON

SNCT Joint Chair
Employer's Side

PHILIP JACKSON

Angus
Teachers' Side

GRAHAM JARVIE

Scottish Borders
Teachers, Side

CLLR ANNE JARVIS

East Dunbartonshire
Employer's Side

RHONA JARVIS

Aberdeen
Employer's Side

KRISTINE JOHNSON

Stirling
Employer's Side

MICHAEL KELLET

SNCT
Scottish Government

ROB KELLY

Scottish Borders
Employer's Side

TONY KENT

SNCT
Teachers' Side

ELAINE KIRKHAM

Highland
Employer's Side

SONIA KORDIAK

Midlothian
Teachers' Side

ALAN LAFFERTY

East Renfrewshire
Employer's side

MAUREEN LAING

SNCT
Teachers' Side

JIM LAWSON

Orkney
Teachers' Side

DAVID LIDDELL

South Lanarkshire
Teachers' Side

GERALDINE LYDEN

West Dunbartonshire
Employer's Side

AUDREY MCAULEY

Perth and Kinross
Teachers' Side

JOHN MCCRACKEN

East Ayrshire
Teachers' Side

YVONNE MCCRACKEN

Scottish Borders
Employer's Side

IAN MCCRONE

Renfrewshire
Teachers' Side

JOSEPHINE MCDAID

West Dunbartonshire
Teachers' Side

ANNIE MACDONALD

Western Isles
Employer's Side

FIONA MACDONALD

SNCT Secretariat
Scottish Government

MURRAY MACFARLANE

North Ayrshire
Employer's Side

JOHN MCGINNESS

Argyll and Bute
Teachers' Side

DAVE MCGINTY

Area Officer
EIS

OLWEN MCGARVEY

Renfrewshire
Teachers' Side

BRIAN MCHARDY

Angus
Teachers' Side

BRIAN MCHUGH

East Renfrewshire
Teachers' Side

COLIN MACKAY

Edinburgh
Teachers' Side

PIPPA MCKEAN

Glasgow
Teachers' Side

CLLR PETER MACKENZIE

East Lothian
Employer's Side

DOUGIE MACKIE

Argyll and Bute
Teachers' Side

KENNETH MCKINLAY

East Ayrshire
Employer's Side

MALCOLM MACIVER

SNCT Joint Chair
Teachers' Side

IAN MACLEAN

Stirling
Teachers' Side

JOHN MCMILLAN

Dumfries and Galloway
Teachers' Side

CLLR JAMES MCQUADE

Renfrewshire
Employer's Side

GERRY MAGUIRE

Inverclyde
Teachers' Side

CLLR CRAIG MARTIN

Falkirk
Employer's Side

MARY MATHESON

Aberdeen
Teachers' Side

IRENE MATIER

AHDS
COSLA Adviser

CLLR ANDREW MILLER

West Lothian
Employers' Side

KAY MILLER

Scottish Borders
Teachers' Side

KEITH MILLER

Dumfries & Galloway
Employers' Side

SARAH MOAR

Orkney
Teachers' Side

DREW MORRICE

SNCT Joint Secretary
Teachers' Side

EILEEN MORRISON

Moray
Teachers' Side

MATTHEW MOSS

Shetland
Teachers' Side

CLLR JIM MUIRHEAD

Midlothian
Employer's Side

ALAN MUNRO

East Renfrewshire
Teachers' Side

DAVID MUNRO

Inverclyde
Teachers' Side

TOM MURPHY

Glasgow
Teachers' Side

ROBERT NAYLOR

Renfrewshire
Employer's Side

PAM NESBIT

AHDS
Employer's Side

CLLR PETER NIELD

Angus
Employer's Side

KEVIN O'BRIEN

East Dunbartonshire
Teachers' Side

NICKY PAGE

Midlothian
Employers' Side

JANE PECKHAM

SNCT
Teachers' Side

PETER QUIGLEY

Fife
Teachers' Side

MAIRI RAEBURN

South Ayrshire
Teachers' Side

JANET ROBERTSON

Dundee
Employer's Side

LYNN ROBERTSON

Teachers' Side

IAN ROSS

North Ayrshire
Teachers' Side

MARION ROSS

Moray
Teachers' Side

CHRISTINE SCALPELLO

Glasgow
Employer's Side

JOHN SCHOFIELD

Midlothian
Teachers' Side

LINDA SCOTLAND

Edinburgh
Teachers' Side

ALAN SCOTT

Area Officer
EIS

IAN SCOTT

North Lanarkshire
Teachers' Side

JIM SCOTT

Perth and Kinross
Employer's Side

CLLR ANDREW SIMPSON

Stirling
Employer's Side

ALISON SKEA

Orkney
Employer's Side

GORDON SMITH

East Dunbartonshire
Employer's Side

GORDON F SMITH

North Ayrshire
Teachers' Side

MARGARET SMITH

Falkirk
Teachers' Side

CLLR DOUG SNELL

Dumfries and Galloway
Employer's Side

ANDREW STEWART

Highland
Teachers' Side

DOUGLAS STEWART

Perth and Kinross
Teachers' Side

CLLR ISOBEL STRONG

Argyll and Bute
Employers' Side

GEORGE STURROCK

Dundee
Teachers' Side

CLLR MARGARET THOMSON

Angus
Employer's Side

ZOE THOMSON

East Lothian
Employer's Side

GINNY THORBURN

East Renfrewshire
Employer's Side

CLLR JIM TODD

East Ayrshire
Employer's Side

BILL TORRANCE

East Lothian
Teachers' Side

TOM TRACEY

Inverclyde
Teachers' Side

ELSIE TYSON

STEPHANIE WALSH
SNCT Joint Secretary
Scottish Government

CLLR ROBIN WATERSTON

Fife
Employer's Side

NORMA WATSON

West Lothian
Teachers' Side

CLLR KIRSTY WEST

Aberdeen
Employer's Side

SANDY WESTON

Dundee
Employer's Side

DAVID WRIGHT

Edinburgh
Employer's Side

PETER WRIGHT

West Lothian
Teachers' Side

TOM YOUNG

SNCT Secretariat
Employer's Side
Teachers' Side

APPENDIX 2

WORKING TIME AGREEMENTS: THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOOD PRACTICE

PHILIP JACKSON
DAVID DRYSDALE

ANGUS JOINT NEGOTIATING
COMMITTEE FOR TEACHERS

COLLEGIALLY- THE CODE OF PRACTICE

- Issued on 26 March, 2007 as SNCT/52 - SNCT Handbook of Conditions of Service (Appendix 1.4)
- Introduction - good practice in general
- Collegiality at Council level and at School level

COLLEGIALLY- THE CODE OF PRACTICE

- Collegiality is a process and a way of working which reflects on relationships and participation
- Collegiality depends on the existence of a climate of professional trust among the Scottish Executive Education Department, councils, directorates, school managers and school staff
- Effective collegiality will not only enhance and develop teacher professionalism; it will also enhance the learning and teaching environment in Scottish schools

COLLEGIALLY- THE CODE OF PRACTICE

COLLEGIALLY AT COUNCIL LEVEL

- Joint ownership of agreements
- LNCTs monitor and provide support, advice and training
- The principles of collegiate working at council level are reflected at school level
- In a collegiate council, the LNCT is seen as a key part of the Education Service

COLLEGIALLY- THE CODE OF PRACTICE

COLLEGIALLY AT SCHOOL LEVEL

- In schools, collegiate working is carried out within the context of the 35 hour week
- No single model of collegiality will apply to all schools
- Common principles should apply

COLLEGIALLY- THE CODE OF PRACTICE

COLLEGIALLY AT SCHOOL LEVEL

- All staff contribute to the Working Time Agreement
- The Agreement is transparent, is signed by all members of the school negotiating team
- Final Agreement respected by all

CODE OF PRACTICE ON WORKING TIME ARRANGEMENTS FOR TEACHERS

(SNCT Handbook of Conditions of Service Part 2, Appendix 2.7 and 'A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century' Annex D)

- Informs discussions at local level and supported by effective consultative arrangements at establishment level
- Effective planning procedures should assist with management of workload
- All teachers to be involved in the development of the School Plan and, where necessary, in any review
- Collegiate activities/time
- Individual and Collective activities all to be within 35 hour week

GUIDANCE – WORKING TIME ARRANGEMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT OF A COLLEGIATE CLIMATE

(SNCT Joint Secretaries letter and paper of 08.01.2008)

- Some LNCTs have developed pro formas and associated documents which provide a framework for schools to record WTAs and to facilitate the monitoring process. The SNCT commends this practice
- Good practice prevails in schools where a collegiate approach to planning is promoted and firmly set within the context of the 35 hour working week
- Staff should be encouraged to monitor and audit their own workloads and to raise concerns if and when they arise

GUIDANCE – WORKING TIME ARRANGEMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT OF A COLLEGIATE CLIMATE

- WTAs should be agreed between the Headteacher and teacher representatives and failures to agree, if any, should be referred to LNCT Joint Secretaries
- Schools undertake an annual evaluation (d)
- Returns from schools make provision for identifying and rectifying existing or emergent workload problems (f)
- The LNCT considers all school WTAs on an annual basis or as part of a rolling-programme (g)
- The LNCT supplements paper reviews by visiting a sample of schools to assist in contextualising and verifying the paper returns (i)
- LNCTs circulate examples of good practice (j)

The Development of Working Time Agreements in Angus

- The first LNCT December, 2002 (AJNCT/1) - agreed constitution for the Angus Joint Negotiating Committee for Teachers
- AJNCT/2 ('35 Hour Working Week') - guidelines based on annex D of 'ATP21'. 'Pro formas' are issued to schools to agree working hours under various headings with a separate 'balance of time available for individual teachers' sheet containing an opportunity for teachers to audit and comment
- Guidelines are also issued on the establishment of staff consultative groups
- Under 'Composition of Consultative Group' the guidance states that the size of the consultative group will vary according to the size of the school and will include the Head Teacher

The Development of Working Time Agreements in Angus

- Under 'Procedural Arrangements' reference is made to:
- The timing of meetings
 - The need for ratification of the working time agreement by the formal publication of an annual calendar, signed by the Head Teacher and by teacher representatives on the consultative group
 - The requirement for working time agreements to be made available for scrutiny by the LNCT to facilitate monitoring of the effectiveness of school consultative mechanisms
 - A referral procedure in case of failure to agree

The Development of Working Time Agreements in Angus

- Sampling working time agreements as part of a 4 year 'rolling programme' - 25% of schools asked to submit their working time agreements
- Discussions are now in progress on an annual sampling of working time agreements
- A mechanism has recently been agreed at the AJNCT whereby the Joint Secretaries can follow-up any concerns or discrepancies with individual Head Teachers

The Development of Working Time Agreements in Angus

2007 Revised 'pro forma':

- The 'Activity' headings were revised to include 'descriptors' of activities. This was based upon the 'tasks' and 'descriptions' used by the SNCT commissioned University of Glasgow Working Time Research
- The 'balance of time available to individual teachers' sheet was discarded with an 'Other' box to capture 'flexibility' and any other new commitments agreed during the session
- An 'Annual Evaluation' sheet was added in which teachers are encouraged to evaluate their personal workload against the generic figures agreed in their school

The Development of Working Time Agreements in Angus

- The revision of the working time agreement 'pro forma' was seen as an opportunity to 're-launch' AJNCT/2 (amended)
- The Joint Secretary (Teachers') and representatives of Angus Teachers' Panel spoke to a meeting of all Angus Head Teachers and answered questions
- Angus EIS hosted two training days and produced a handout entitled 'Understanding the Working Time Agreement'
- Following requests from teachers at the training days, the Joint Secretary sent to all schools exemplars of typical working time agreements in different types of schools to help inform the deliberations of school consultative groups in reaching their own working time agreement using the new 'pro forma'

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

- Working Time Agreements do not offer a panacea for making the work of teachers more manageable
- Nor do they guarantee an ethos of collegiality within our schools
- Argument for more robust procedures and process
- Need to address the root causes of excessive workload

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

TEACHER WORKING TIME RESEARCH

- The University of Glasgow published its final report in August, 2006
- The average working hours for Scottish teachers was found to be around 45 hours per week, an increase of 2.5 hours per week in the last survey commissioned by the Scottish Executive in 1993
- Promoted staff were found to work an average of 50 hours or more (50-55 hours is the commonly quoted figure) with Head Teachers working the most hours overall

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

- Non- sustainability and initiative overload – acceleration rate of change in education policy
- Comments focused on the imposition of a number of initiatives which participants feel they were not fully consulted about
- "Innovation Fatigue"

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

COLLEGIALITY

- More collegiate negotiations (view of LNCT Joint Secretaries)
- Differences in how well school committees/ consultative groups were perceived to be negotiating
- Some schools had adapted more easily to collegiate working than others
- Sufficient progress?

APPENDIX 3



SNCT NATIONAL EVENT
2008



The 2001 Agreement

Drew Morrice
Joint Secretary
SNCT

- 1990's Millennium Review – SJNC
- 1991 September – Sam Galbraith, Minister for Children and Education set up McCrone Committee of Inquiry
- 2000 May – McCrone Committee reports Scottish Executive consults with teachers' unions and employers
- 2001 Jan – Agreement reached within Implementation Group
- 2002 June – SJNC abolished
SNCT established (SNCT/1)

McCrone Committee of Inquiry

Membership

Professor Gavin McCrone, Visiting Professor, Edinburgh University
 Alan Campbell, Chief Executive, Aberdeenshire Council
 Campbell Christie, Former General Secretary, STUC
 Professor Bob Eliot, Professor of Economics, Aberdeen University
 David Hutchison, President, SBBA
 Patricia McColl, HT, Campsie Primary School, Musselburgh
 Norrie McLeod, General Manager, Standard Life
 Anne Mulgrew, HT, St Andrew's HS, East Kilbride

Terms of Reference

- a) How teachers' pay, promotion structures and conditions of service shall be changed in order to ensure a committed, professional and flexible teaching force which will secure high and improving standards of school education for all children in Scotland into the new Millennium; and
- b) The future arrangements for determining teachers' pay and conditions in Scotland following the removal of the statutory basis for the Scottish Joint Negotiating Committee (School Education) now proposed by the Scottish Executive.

Membership of the Implementation Group

- Chair – Jack McConnell MSP, Minister for Education, Europe and External Affairs
- Sam Galbraith MSP, Minister for Children and Education (October 2000)
- Cllr. Norman Murray, COSLA
- Cllr. Pat Watters, COSLA
- Cllr. Danny McCafferty, COSLA
- Cllr. Helen Law, COSLA
- Cllr. David Suckling, COSLA
- Cllr. Alan Findlay, COSLA
- Oonagh Aitken, COSLA advisor
- Gordon Jeyes, COSLA advisor
- Jim Gibson, COSLA advisor
- Alan Cuthbertson, COSLA advisor
- Bill Milligan, AHTS
- Ronnie Smith, EIS
- Malcolm Maciver, EIS
- Donald Matheson, HAS
- Pat O'Donnell, NASUWT
- Susan Leslie, PAT
- David Eaglesham, SSTA
- Alan Taylor, Advisor
- John Anderson, Advisor
- Ken Wimbor, Advisor
- George Ross, Advisor
- Jeane Freeman, Scottish Executive
- Mike Ewart, Scottish Executive
- Sarah Morrell, Scottish Executive - Secretariat
- John Swift, Scottish Executive - Secretariat
- Stephanie Walsh, Scottish Executive - Secretariat

5 Tri-Partite Sub Groups

- Conditions of Service
- Pay and Grading
- Negotiating Machinery
- Support Staff
- Career Progression

“We have agreed that, for the future, the working relationships between teacher organisations, employers and the Scottish Executive will be based on mutual respect and understanding, on shared responsibility and on the shared development of ideas and programmes for change.”

“The agreement we have reached and the process we have used to get here, represents a unique opportunity to put in place the professional conditions of service which teachers in Scotland deserve and which they need to have if they are to deliver our shared objective of the world class education service which will fit our children well for the 21st century.”

CAREER STRUCTURE

Pre 2001

Class room Teachers (Probationers)
Assistant Principal Teachers/Senior Teachers
Principal Teachers
Assistant Headteachers
Deputy Headteachers
Headteachers

Post 2001

Classroom Teacher
Probation Maingrade
Chartered Teacher
Principal Teacher
Deputy Headteacher
Headteacher

Job Sizing

Based on

- School Roll
- Management Responsibilities
- Policy Development and Monitoring
- External Liaison – Working with parents, carers, other professionals and external agencies
- Whole School Activities

Set out in SNCT/24 (Part 2, Appendix 2.2)
 Criteria for Resizing SNCT/28 (Part 2, Appendix 2.3)
 Principal/Depute Educational Psychologist SNCT/37 (Part 2, Appendix 2.4)

Duties

The duties of:

- (A) Teacher/Chartered Teacher
 Principal Teacher (Curriculum/Pastoral)
 Headteacher
 Depute Headteacher
 Set out in 2001 Agreement, Annex B now Part 2, Paragraph 2.1-2.6 of Handbook
- (B) Music Instructors
 Set out in SNCT/11 now Part 2, Paragraph 2.7 of the Handbook
- (C) QIOs and Educational Development Officers
 Set out in SNCT/12 and SNCT/32 now Part 2, Paragraphs 2.14-2.19 of Handbook
- (D) Educational Psychologists
 Set out in SNCT/16 now Part 2, Paragraph 2.8-2.13 of Handbook

Working Hours: Working Week

Year - Teachers work 195 days per annum
 - (Pupil attend for 190 days)
 - 5 days are available for INSET

Week - (Transitional Arrangements)
 - Maximum class contact from August 20
 - Personal Time 1/3 of class contact
 - Remaining time for collegiate activities

SNCT Criteria on the Working Week

The following objective conditions will be used to determine the implementation of the national agreement on the working week in August 2006.

- 1 The number of teachers in service to deliver the reduction in class contact time to 22.5 hours per week.
- 2 The establishment of national, local and school based negotiating machinery.
- 3 Clear monitoring procedures at local level.
- 4 The outcome of a sample workload survey.
- 5 A joint evaluation/audit of working arrangements at local level to assess the wider cultural climate in schools.

Use of Time Remaining

Subject to agreement at school level will include a range of activities

- Additional time for preparation and correction
- Parents meetings
- Staff meetings
- Formal assessment
- Preparation of reports, records etc
- Curriculum development
- Forward planning
- Continuing professional development
- Professional review and development

CPD and the Working Year

- Teachers are required to commit to an additional maximum of 35 hours which "shall consist of an appropriate balance of personal professional development, attendance at nationally accredited courses, small scale school based activities or other CDP activity."
- An agreed CPD plan identified during annual PRD discussion
- CPD record maintained by individual teachers
- Quality based framework to be provided for professional development

Negotiating Machinery

- SNCT - 8 COSLA
3 Scottish Government
11 Teachers' Union
- LNCT – Agreement by negotiation on matters devolved by the SNCT

Negotiating Machinery

National Matters (SNCT)

- Pay (including related allowances)
- Working week and working year
- Annual leave entitlement
- Class size
- Sick leave
- Maternity/family leave
- National and local recognition procedures
- Discipline and grievance framework
- Main duties
- Staff development and framework

Devolved Matters (LNCT)

- Other allowances
- Cover arrangements
- Appointment procedures
- Particulars of employment
- Expenses of candidates for appointment
- Transfer of temporary teachers to permanent staff
- Promotion procedures
- Staff development arrangements
- Other leave and absence arrangements
- Notice period
- Housing
- Indemnification procedures
- Disciplinary and grievance procedures

Support Staff

Annex E (now set out in Part 2, Appendix 2.5 of the Handbook) sets out a list of tasks which "should not routinely be carried out by teachers. The list is illustrative not exhaustive. These tasks would generally be undertaken by support staff thereby allowing the particular skills and experience of the teacher to be deployed most effectively."

- There will be a significant investment in additional support staff. These additional staff will include the full range of posts recommended in McCrone specifically bursar, administrative and ICT support to schools
- Monitoring by SCORE, University of Glasgow

Other Matters

- Winding Down Arrangements
- Transfer of Temporary Staff to Permanent Contracts (Paragraph 8.5)



Beyond The 2001 Agreement

Louise Wilson
SNCT 'Secretariat'

From 2001 Onwards

- The 2001 Agreement
- SNCT Circulars
- Joint Secretaries
- Joint Chairs
- 6 Working Groups

Sources of Conditions of Service

- The Scheme of Conditions of Service for Teaching Staff in Schools Education
- The 2001 National Agreement
- SNCT Circulars
- LNCT Agreements

Objectives

- Comprehensive
- Comprehensible
- Contemporary
- Consistent

Process

- Conditions of Service Working Group
- Technical Sub-Group
- SNCT

The SNCT Handbook

- Part 1 Values, objectives and structure
- Part 2 The National Scheme
- Part 3 SNCT Circulars and JC/JS letters
- Part 4 Devolved Matters
- Part 5 Other LNCT Agreements

The National Scheme

- The National Scheme of Salaries and Conditions of Service for Teachers and Associated Professionals
- Sections
- Appendices

Part 2 in Sections

- Section 1 Pay
- Section 2 Main Duties
- Section 3 Working Year and Working Week
- Section 4 Class Size
- Section 5 Annual Leave
- Section 6 Sickness Allowance and Notification
- Section 7 Family Leave
- Section 8 Disciplinary and Grievance Procedures
- Section 9 Other Provisions

Amendments and Additions

- Appendix 2.1 - pay scales and spines
- Appendix 2.3 - review of Job Sizing
- Appendix 2.5 - allowances
- Career Break Scheme
- Annual year and hours of work of EPs and QIOs

Questions & Answers

www.snct.org.uk

Current Challenges and Opportunities

Joe Di Paola
Joint Secretary
SNCT

Bargaining Machinery

- SNCT
- SNCT Joint Chairs
- Working Groups
 - Conditions of Service
 - Technical Sub-Group
 - Job-sizing Review Sub-Group
 - LNCT Review

Procedural Matters

- SNCT Joint Secretaries
 - Agenda setting
 - Advice
 - Local Disagreements
- SNCT Appeals
 - Tripartite body
 - Final Arbiters on SNCT matters

Recent Challenges

- Pay Negotiations
 - Settle Re-opener clause from previous deal
 - Three Year Deal from 2008: 2.25%, 2.5%, 2.4%
- Job-sizing Toolkit
 - FOI
 - Review of Toolkit
 - Creation of SNCT Conditions of Service Sub-Group

Ongoing Work

- Review of Job-sizing Toolkit
 - Guidance
 - Training
- Conditions of Service
 - Career Breaks
 - Educational Psychologists and QIOs
- LNCT Review

Questions & Answers

www.snct.org.uk

