



---

## **PAY & PAY PROGRESSION FOR SEPTEMBER 2016 A SURVEY REPORT BY NUT & ATL**

This report sets out the results of the 2016 joint annual survey of NUT and ATL members on pay progression in September 2016 and other related pay issues.

### **THE SURVEY RESPONSE**

The survey was sent by email to NUT and ATL members in late November 2016. The questionnaire asked them about their own pay progression in September 2016 if eligible; their views on their school's pay policy, its application in cases of pay progression and its impact on appraisal; and other matters in relation to teachers' pay for September 2016.

The survey received 13,000 responses this year, compared to 8,700 responses last year, and in the absence of any effort by DfE to secure data on pay progression it provides the largest data set on pay progression. NUT and ATL accept that the survey methodology means that the survey response may potentially be overweight in terms of the proportion of respondents who did not receive pay progression. There is, however, no apparent reason why those respondents should themselves be unrepresentative of all teachers turned down for progression, in terms of their circumstances, views or personal characteristics.

### **KEY FINDINGS**

Among those eligible for progression (53% of the total response):

- just over one in five (21%) of respondents eligible for progression and notified of the outcome of the pay decision had been denied progression, an increase from last year's figure of 19%;
- a larger proportion of secondary teachers than primary teachers had (as in 2015) been turned down for progression;
- teachers in academies were again more likely to have been denied progression than those in local authority-maintained schools;

- teachers from BME backgrounds were again more likely to have been denied progression than White British teachers;
- part time teachers were even more likely than in 2015 to have been turned down than full time teachers;
- one in ten (10%) of main pay range teachers had been denied pay progression, but almost half (43%) of upper pay range teachers had been denied progression and over a quarter (28%) of main pay range teachers applying for progression to the upper pay range had been turned down; and
- almost one quarter of those surveyed had not been notified of the outcome of the decision by the time of the survey (late November and early December).

Among those turned down for progression:

- almost 90% thought that the decision about their pay progression was unfair, and a similar proportion said that they had had no warning that they might not progress, both figures being largely unaltered from last year; but
- almost three quarters (71%) said that they were not appealing against the decision (with this figure being significantly higher in primary schools).

Among all respondents:

- over one-third said that their school did not have a written policy setting out how pay progression works; and
- over one-third thought that their school's policy on pay progression was unfair, rising to over half of those who said their school did not have a written policy.

## **PERSONAL PAY PROGRESSION**

In total, 53% of all respondents were eligible for pay progression in September 2016. The remaining 47% of respondents comprised teachers on the upper pay range ineligible for progression due to being at the maximum or otherwise ineligible (35%); teachers on the main pay range not applying for progression to the upper pay range (6%); and new entrants to teaching in 2016 (5%).

This year, 62% of all those respondents who were eligible for pay progression had received it and 16% had been turned down, compared to 65% and 15% last year. Some 23% of teachers, however, were still to be notified about their pay progression, compared to 20% at the same date last year. This means that by December 2016, more teachers were still in limbo with regard to their pay progression than the previous year, despite DfE guidance that pay decisions should be taken promptly.

Looking only at those respondents who knew the outcome of their pay progression decision, 21% of those eligible had been denied pay progression, an increase on last year's figure of 19%.

90% of those who were denied progression said that they had been given no indication during the year that they were not meeting or not likely to meet the required standards for progression, an almost identical figure to last year (91%). As we said in

last year's report, this suggests that the vast majority of schools are ignoring DfE guidance that there should be "no surprises" and that any concerns should be raised and addressed during the appraisal cycle.

A large majority of those who had been denied progression (86%) felt that the decision was unfair. This is only slightly lower than last year's figure of 91% and demonstrates the continuing unhappiness of so many teachers about the operation of the current pay progression system.

While slightly more teachers this year said that they were appealing or had appealed against denial of progression, 71% still said that they are not doing so, with this figure being significantly higher in primary schools. The most common reason given for not appealing, as in previous years, was simply that there was 'no point'. Amongst the other responses there was a common fear of the likely adverse consequences of submitting an appeal or reluctance to take on the additional paperwork involved in an appeal, whilst others had not been made aware of their right to appeal.

## **RESULTS BY PAY SCALE POSITION**

Among teachers on the main pay range and eligible for progression on that range, 10% of those and aware of their outcome had been denied progression, up from 8% in last year's survey. In primary schools, 8% of such teachers had been denied progression, compared to 11% in secondary schools.

Teachers on the maximum of the main pay range and eligible for progression to the upper pay range rather than further progression on the main range are not included in the above figures. Among those teachers, 28% of those who knew the outcome of their application for progression to the upper pay range had been denied it, a slight reduction from 34% last year. The figure was slightly lower for primary teachers (24%) than secondary teachers (28%). There was a more marked difference between the figures for teachers in academies and in local authority-maintained schools - 33% of such teachers had been denied progression in academies, compared to 23% in LA-maintained schools.

The upper pay range and upper pay scale have historically shown lower rates of progression than the main pay range and main scale, but the differential in progression rates between the two ranges has widened this year and the rates of non-progression on the upper pay range have increased. Progression had been denied to 43% of eligible upper pay range teachers who knew their outcome, up from 39% last year. Almost half of primary teachers on the upper scale had been denied progression (47%), compared to 37% of those in secondary schools.

Leadership teachers eligible for progression had been denied progression in 20% of cases - with 11% being denied progression in primary schools and 32% in secondary schools. Some 33% of leading practitioners had been denied progression, although the sample for this group was small.

## RESULTS BY SCHOOL SECTOR

This year's survey showed that academies were again more likely to have denied pay progression to their teachers than local authority-maintained schools. 23% of all teachers in academies eligible for progression and who knew their outcome had been denied progression. For teachers in local authority schools, the figure was 17%. In those academies which are free schools, the rate of denial of progression was higher still (25%), although the sample size was again small.

Unlike in 2015, this differential between the two sectors cannot be explained by the academy sector being secondary-dominated and the local authority sector being primary-dominated. 24% of eligible respondents at primary academies who knew their outcome had been denied progression, compared to 16% at local authority primary schools. 23% had been denied progression in secondary academies, compared to 17% in local authority secondary schools.

Looking at comparisons between the primary and secondary sectors overall, 18% of eligible primary teachers had been denied progression, compared to 17% last year. Some 21% of secondary teachers had been denied progression, slightly down from 22% last year.

Other differences between the responses from the primary and secondary sectors include the following:

- secondary teachers were more likely than primary teachers to know whether the school has a pay policy;
- they were also more likely to think the school's policy is unfair;
- they were more likely to think that PRP has increased workload and harmed the CPD value of appraisal; and
- they were more likely to have appealed against denial of progression.

Clearly all of these create some concern about the situation in primary schools where we appear to be seeing an atmosphere of both ignorance and fear in relation to pay matters.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS DENIED PAY PROGRESSION

White British teachers were again the most likely to have been awarded progression, with 20% of eligible respondents to this year's survey who knew their outcome having been denied progression compared to 23% of Black / Black British teachers and 26% of Asian / Asian British teachers. In particular, teachers identifying as "Black or Black British - African" and "Asian or Asian British - Pakistani" were significantly more likely to have been denied progression.

In the 2015 survey, Black / Black British teachers were most likely to have been denied progression. The 2016 survey, however, like the equivalent survey for 2014, found that Asian / Asian British teachers were the ethnic group most likely to have been denied pay progression. Whilst the gap between rates of pay progression for

White / White British and other ethnic groups has narrowed considerably since 2014, it is still the case that Asian / Asian British and Black / Black British teachers are lagging behind their White / White British counterparts.

As in previous years, part-time teachers were much more likely to have been denied progression. Eligible part-time teachers were this year more than twice as likely to be denied progression (38%) than their full-time colleagues (18%). Although the percentage of full time teachers denied progression was the same as the corresponding figure in the pay progression survey for September 2015, the rate of non-progression amongst part time staff has climbed by six percentage points since 2015 and demonstrates a clear correlation between part time teaching and lower rates of pay progression. This lower rate of pay progression for part time teachers is also reflected in pay progression data we have obtained from individual employers.

While this difference is to some degree influenced by the higher proportion of part time teachers on the upper pay range, part time teachers were nevertheless less likely than full time teachers to progress on both the main and upper pay ranges - by a margin of 10% for those on the main range (including those seeking to progress to the upper range) and 16% for those on the upper range.

Once again, men were slightly more likely overall to have been denied progression than women in this year's survey. Amongst those notified of the outcome, 21% of eligible male teachers had not received progression compared to 19% of female teachers. Women were more likely to have received progression on the main pay range (91% compared to 88% of men) and leadership range (86% compared to 75%) and to have been awarded progression from the main to the upper pay range (75% compared to 69%). However, men were significantly more likely to have progressed on the upper pay range (61% compared to 44% of women).

Women teachers who had been denied pay progression were significantly less likely than men to be willing to appeal against the decision, with 84% having decided not to appeal compared with 72% of men.

This year, we asked respondents about their sexual orientation and found that progression rates were slightly higher for teachers identifying as lesbian (73%) and gay (70%) than for those identifying as heterosexual (62%). For teachers who identified as bisexual, however, only 34% of eligible teachers received progression.

We also asked respondents to indicate whether they had been absent for all or part of the 2015-16 school year due to pregnancy or maternity leave. Of those teachers who had been so absent during the year, only 48% of those eligible for progression had actually received progression. This figure is substantially lower than the percentage of all women teachers eligible for progression (63%) - and some respondents' comments about reasons given by managers for non-progression show that obvious unlawful discrimination is taking place despite the publication of DfE guidance on this matter.

The NUT and ATL both warned that the Government's proposed extension of PRP across all pay ranges - a "reform" for which no equality impact assessment was

conducted by the STRB when recommending its adoption or By DfE in taking forward its implementation - would lead to discriminatory treatment and outcomes. Data gathered by the two unions from its member surveys and Freedom of Information data requests to individual employers since 2014 has since demonstrated the validity of those warnings.

## **IMPACT ON APPRAISAL**

When asked about their own appraisal, 47% of respondents believed that linking pay progression to appraisal had caused them significant extra work, with 27% saying that they had been required to produce additional evidence beyond that necessary for appraisal purposes in order to demonstrate that they had met progression requirements. 40% believed that linking progression to appraisal had undermined the usefulness of appraisal for professional development purposes. Over half (53%) said that their appraisal objectives for 2016-17 were harder than those set for last year, while almost one quarter (24%) said that they had had more than 3 appraisal objectives set for them this year.

Teachers who had been appraisers for other teachers were also asked to comment from their perspective as an appraiser. 45% said that the link between pay and appraisal had damaged the process for their appraisee for professional development purposes and 58% said that it had caused them extra work as an appraiser during the appraisal process.

These figures were again all cases slightly higher among secondary teachers than among primary teachers. This was particularly true for the responses by appraisers in secondary schools, where the figures were up to 10% higher than among their primary colleagues.

## **OTHER ISSUES: PAY INCREASES & PAY STRUCTURES**

The survey also asked a number of questions relating to pay scales and pay increases and related matters.

Only just over half (53%) of respondents said that they had personally received a 1% cost of living increase in September 2016. Some 33% of survey respondents told us that they did not know if they had received or would receive a 1% increase, while 15% said they had not received such an increase. These figures are almost unchanged from last year's survey, figures which we described at the time as 'worrying' since they suggest a growing propensity among schools to deny teachers an annual "cost of living" increase.

79% of respondents said their school still used a structure of a 6 point main pay scale and 3 point upper pay scale, with less than 6% saying that their school had moved away from this approach. These figures are little changed from last year and continue to support our contention that the vast majority of schools and academies do not want, and are not using, the flexibility to adopt different pay structures.

Some 85% of respondents said that pay progression was linked to appraisal in their school, with 5% saying that it was not. 10% (mostly teachers not themselves eligible for progression) were unable to answer. However, only 62% of respondents answered 'Yes' to the question "Does your school have a pay policy that sets out how pay progression operates in your school?", while 8% said their school did not have a policy and a worrying 30% did not know.

This suggests not only that teachers are not being provided with basic information on pay matters but also that the concept of schools having an individual pay policy, locally determined and setting out how decisions involving the use of discretion will be taken, is very far from being established and recognised (let alone accepted) among teachers.

Association of Teachers and Lecturers  
National Union of Teachers

January 2017