

**Private and Confidential**  
**Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT)**  
**Update and McCormac Review in Teacher Employment**

**Purpose**

1. This report advises the Strategic Human Resource Management Executive Group on recent developments and the outcome of negotiations on teachers pay and terms and conditions of service.

**Recommendations**

2. The Executive Group is invited to
  - i. Note the update on the negotiations with teacher unions on pay and conditions, including the acceptance by the EIS of the offer; and
  - ii. Endorse the COSLA submission (Appendix 2) on the McCormac review into teacher employment.

**Background**

3. COSLA Leaders, at their meeting on 25 February, agreed a package of changes to teachers' pay and conditions that had been agreed in principle by SNCT negotiators. This followed concessions having been made on all sides as a means of reaching a collective agreement.
4. The teachers' trade unions put the agreement in principle to their relevant salaries committees, each of which subsequently rejected the proposals. The unions then conducted a consultative ballot of their members, with the major unions (EIS, SSTA and NASUWT) all making a clear recommendation to reject. The large majority of union members who voted in each of these ballots, voted to reject.
5. As this result was anticipated, bilateral discussions between COSLA and the Scottish Government, and between the EIS and the Scottish Government, took place prior to the SNCT meeting that was scheduled for Wednesday 23 March. As well as officer discussions, COSLA's Political Group Leaders met Cabinet Secretaries John Swinney, Mike Russell and Bruce Crawford on 17 March. The outcome of all of these discussions was a reconfiguration of the proposals, with the key changes as follows:
  - the reduced pay rate for supply teachers payable for periods of supply of 5 days or less, rather than 8 days or less;
  - the removal of the proposal to reduce sickness allowance to 95% of the current entitlement;
  - the reintroduction of the Chartered Teacher proposal that would see the suspension of increments until at least April 2012; and

- the introduction of £15.31m from the Scottish Government to compensate for the above changes, with agreement that this funding would also be added to the baseline for the purpose of the next Spending Review.
6. For COSLA's officers, advisers and politicians there was a difficult balancing act to achieve between reasonable compromise to reach a negotiated settlement, and dilution of the principled position on changes to terms and conditions and their financial impact. A compromise position was taken on the basis that this was the last opportunity to resolve the issues through negotiation.
  7. As anticipated, the original proposals were rejected at the SNCT meeting on 23 March. The unions however voted, by a majority, to accept in principle, the reconfigured proposals. The vote was carried by the EIS members who all voted to accept the proposals, while the NASUWT and Voice unions voted to reject, and the SSTA abstained. The SSTA salaries committee subsequently voted to reject the new proposals, leaving only the EIS advocating acceptance.
  8. Both the EIS and SSTA undertook to consult their members on the new proposals, with the EIS recommending acceptance, and the SSTA recommending rejection.
  9. The EIS is by far the largest of the teachers' trade unions, however, such is the scale of proposed changes to terms and conditions, that there was considerable unrest amongst their membership at the recommendation to accept the Employers offer. The outcome of their ballot was therefore far from certain. Both the EIS and SSTA ballots closed on Thursday 28 April.

## **Ballot Result**

10. SSTA issued an embargoed press release on the morning of the 28 April, rejecting the revised offer. The EIS meeting to receive their ballot result was scheduled for 2.00pm that afternoon. Shortly after 3.00pm we received notification from the EIS that its membership had accepted the new offer on a vote of 56.2% for and 43.8% against.
11. The EIS holds a significant majority of the seats on the Teachers Salaries Committee (i.e. the teachers side body which incorporates the membership of all the teaching unions), and its decision is sufficient to carry the vote. The EIS issued a press release shortly thereafter intimating that teachers had voted to accept the revised pay and conditions offer. This was then forwarded to various senior members and officers in councils for information.
12. The SSTA and NASUWT unions have been in the press since the announcement of the decision to accept the revised proposals, denouncing the decision and making known their intention to seek legal advice and leave no stone unturned to oppose the changes. If these unions refuse to accept the position as it now is, they will effectively put themselves outside the SNCT bargaining machinery which is an extremely risky position for them to take. It is not anticipated that they will take this risk.
13. Attached at Appendix 1 is a copy of the revised proposal itself, which sets out the obligations which now exist for each of the three parties to the agreement.
14. The decision to accept the Employers revised proposal will result in a series of changes to terms and conditions of employment as set out in the SNCT Handbook. These changes will be progressed through the SNCT Conditions of Service Working Group which will meet over the summer to give effect to the new agreement.

15. The scale of what has been achieved should not be underestimated, particularly in the context of the financial climate presently being addressed by local government. Teachers have demonstrated considerable maturity and taken a very difficult decision in order to protect jobs, training posts for teaching students leaving university this summer and the quality of education provision that can be provided in schools. COSLA is grateful to ADES and SPDS Advisers for the support, guidance and advice provided throughout the negotiations, which were recognised as complex and difficult for all concerned.

### **Distribution of additional funding**

16. As referred to at paragraph 5 above, an additional £15.31m was made available by the Scottish Government as part of the revised SNCT agreement following rejection of the original proposition. Directors of Finance were consulted on the distribution of this additional money and recommended 'teacher numbers' as the basis of distribution. Teacher numbers was also the basis used to distribute the previous £15m added into the settlement. Leadership Board has supported this approach and will make a recommendation to Leaders on this basis when the distribution is considered by Leaders at their May meeting. It should also be acknowledged that the £15.31m will be baselined into the Local Government settlement.

### **McCormac Review**

17. Members may also be aware that Professor Gerry McCormac Principal of Stirling University had been asked by the Scottish Government to carry out a review of teacher employment. COSLA has met with Professor McCormac and his review team and has also prepared a submission based on comments received from councils. This is attached to this report as Appendix 2 for endorsement by the Executive Group.
18. We are hoping to meet again with McCormac review team over the summer so we would welcome any additional views that members may have. We expect the review to be completed by late summer – possibly the end of September.

### **Conclusion**

19. COSLA Leaders agreed movement in the Employers position on 25 February believing this necessary to reach a collective agreement with the teachers unions and the Scottish Government. Notwithstanding agreement to these concessions, the Employers offer was swiftly rejected by the unions and thereafter by their membership.
20. Pressure was applied to the Scottish Government on the basis of the November 2010 agreement between COSLA and Scottish Government whereby Scottish Government would support measures to achieve £60m worth of savings from terms and conditions from the teachers pay bill. Thereafter, Scottish Government put a further £15.31m on the table to buy out certain of the COSLA asks set out at paragraph 5 above.
21. On this basis, the EIS recommended acceptance of the offer as the best that can be achieved through negotiation with varying degrees of opposition from smaller unions. The outcome of the ballot was to accept the revised offer albeit that there remains dissent among the smaller unions and the threat of legal action. This is a risky strategy for these unions and hopefully is no more than sabre rattling. In any event the decision is now made. Finally, a basis for distribution of these additional resources has also been agreed.

**COSLA Employers Team  
May 2011**

## Appendix 1: Revised Memorandum of Understanding

### Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT) Proposed Changes to Pay and Conditions

1. The three parties to the SNCT (the Scottish Government, COSLA and the Teachers Side) referred to below as the 'three parties' agree to abide by the conditions set out in Appendix 1 attached.
2. The three parties affirm their commitment to the independently chaired review of all aspects of the McCrone Agreement chaired by Professor McCormac.
3. The three parties agree that following the outcome of the review chaired by Professor McCormac they will have tri-partite discussions looking at issues relating to teacher employment with the intention that any agreed decisions will be in place by August 2012.
4. Member Councils shall undertake to protect the number of teacher posts as far as possible in order to secure:
  - places for all probationers who require a place under the induction scheme in August 2011;
  - sufficient teaching posts available for all probationers to apply for who achieve Standard for Full Registration in summer 2011 (i.e. successfully complete their probation); and
  - a reduction in the total number of unemployed teachers.
5. The three parties agree to regard these objectives as having been met if the number of FTE teachers in publicly funded posts in Scotland reported in the census taken in September 2011 is at least 51,131
6. If the number of FTE teachers reported in the census falls below that number, then
  - the SNCT will agree changes to the measures listed in Appendix 1 affecting teacher terms and conditions that reduces the total value of the package by an amount equivalent to £40,000 for each FTE teacher below 51,131, including the possibility of reversion to the status quo ante, OR

- Where the parties to the SNCT agree that, based on census returns from individual councils, failure to achieve the figure of 51,131 FTE teachers is due to the actions of a small number of councils, SNCT may recommend to Scottish Government that, as an alternative, any sanction is applied to these Councils in a proportionate manner, having regard to the changes proposed in Appendix 1 in negotiations in the SNCT, provided that it is absolutely clear that these Councils' actions have materially contributed to the failure to comply. Where such a sanction is applied to individual councils, there would be no change to the national terms and conditions proposed in Appendix 1 of this agreement.

If either of these sanctions is applied, Scottish Government will not take any further action in response to failure to achieve the teacher employment objectives.

This document sets out the terms of proposed changes to the pay and conditions of teachers and associated professionals. It consists of six specific elements, details of which are set out below. It also includes a proposal to increase the local government settlement.

### **1. Pay Agreement 2011-2013**

There will be no pay award for teachers and associated professionals for the period from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2013. The awarding of additional salary points for teaching service, as set out in the SNCT Handbook Part 2, Section 1, paragraphs 1.15 to 1.20, will not be affected by this agreement.

### **2. Conservation for Promoted Post Holders appointed before 1 April 2001**

The conservation arrangements set out in the SNCT Handbook Part 2, Section 1, paragraph 1.63 shall be amended as follows:

From 1 April 2011, a promoted post holder currently in receipt of lifetime conservation shall receive a period of cash conservation (as defined in paragraph 1.62) until 31 March 2016 after which the conservation arrangements will cease to apply. This agreement applies to all promoted post holders for whom the previous terms of paragraph 1.63 applied.

From 1 April 2011 until 31 March 2013, a promoted post holder appointed to a post before 1 April 2001 and:

- (a) whose post is re-sized during that period and the salary is downgraded; or
- (b) who is transferred during that period, for reasons other than inefficiency or indiscipline, to another post, which has a lower salary;

shall receive a period of cash conservation (as defined in paragraph 1.62) until 31 March 2016 after which the conservation arrangements will cease to apply. This agreement applies to all promoted post holders for whom the previous terms of paragraph 1.63 applied.

From 1 April 2013, any promoted post holder appointed to a post before 1 April 2001 and;

- (a) whose post is re-sized from that date onwards and the salary is downgraded; or
- (b) who is transferred from that date onwards, for reasons other than inefficiency or indiscipline, to another post, which has a lower salary;

shall be entitled to a period of three years cash conservation.

In addition, the SNCT will provide advice to councils on mechanisms which may be utilised as means of minimising costs in relation to conservation. These will include the following:

- (i) permanent or temporary redeployment;
- (ii) where redeployment is not possible, direction from the employer that the employee carries out other duties that reflect, as far as is possible, the level of payment that they receive; and
- (iii) early retirement.

### **3. Annual Leave**

From the leave year commencing 1 September 2011, the annual leave entitlement of teachers and music instructors, currently set out in the SNCT Handbook, Part 2, Section 5, paragraph 5.3, shall be 40 days per annum. The balance, up to the current entitlement, will be redefined as School Closure. In addition, the daily and hourly rates of pay, set out in the SNCT Handbook, Part 2, Section 1, paragraph 1.5 shall be amended and will be 1/235 and 1/1645 respectively. The rate of accrual of paid leave, as set out in the SNCT Handbook, Part 2, Section 5, paragraph 5.4 shall also be amended and will be 0.2051.

The working year of teachers and music instructors shall remain at 195 days.

From 1 September 2011, teachers and music instructors who return from maternity or adoption leave and who wish to take the balance of annual leave that has accrued during that leave, shall, in the first instance, be directed to take this leave during School Closure periods.

Further, employees who have accrued statutory leave during sickness absence shall, in the first instance, be directed to take any such leave which they have accrued and not taken during the sickness absence, during School Closure periods.

#### **4. Chartered Teacher Scheme**

The award of salary increments for teachers commencing modules on an accredited Chartered Teacher Programme, currently set out in the SNCT Handbook, Part 2, Section 1, paragraph 1.25, shall be suspended with immediate effect, with the following exception. Teachers who are already working towards completion of a module or modules, shall receive one salary increment on successful completion of the module or modules. However, until further notice is provided, no additional salary increments shall be awarded for any further modules of study which are completed.

The SNCT will take a decision on the awarding of additional increments for teachers undertaking an accredited Chartered Teacher programme by April 2012.

#### **5. National Teacher Induction Scheme**

From 1 August 2011, the amount of class contact time for teachers on the National Teacher Induction Scheme shall increase from 15.75 hours to 18.5 hours per week. The SNCT Handbook, Part 2, Section 3, paragraph 3.5 and Section 9, paragraph 9.10 will be amended accordingly.

#### **6. Supply Teachers' Pay**

##### **6.1 Supply teaching**

All periods of cover teaching for periods of 5 days or less will be defined as supply. Supply teaching is where teachers may be offered work on a short term temporary basis, generally with little notice, and usually on a day-to-day basis. In such instances there is no obligation on the council to provide work or on the teacher to accept the offer of work. Each separate period of engagement of less than 5 days will be treated as a separate contract.

The duties required of a supply teacher will be to teach assigned classes together with associated preparation and correction.

From August 2011, for periods of supply of 5 days or less, payment will be on point 1 of the Main Grade Scale and for a maximum of 25 hours (comprising a maximum of 22.5 hours class contact and 2.5 hours set aside for preparation and correction, pro-rated for those who work for less than a full week). In situations where the supply period exceeds the initial 5 days, then the teacher should be issued with a fixed term temporary contract. From the 6<sup>th</sup> day onwards payment, working hours and duties will be in accordance with the SNCT Handbook.

##### **6.2 Fixed Term Appointments**

Where it is known at the outset that the period of engagement is to be more than 5 days then the teacher should be issued with a fixed term contract as described in Appendix 2.8 paragraph 3.1 of the SNCT Handbook. Payment, working hours and duties will be in accordance with the SNCT Handbook.

The relevant provisions in the SNCT Handbook, Part 2, Sections 1.23 and 1.69, remain. The relevant provisions in the SNCT Handbook, Part 2, Sections 1 and 3 will be amended to reflect these changes.

**7. Local Government Settlement**

Scottish Government and COSLA propose that the local government settlement is increased by £15.31m above the level set out in the Local Government Finance Order, to be allocated as a redetermination following agreement with COSLA over the distribution methodology. That amount will be added to baseline provision for the purposes of the next Spending Review.



i) **Introductory Remarks by COSLA**

**Teachers are one of the key professional groups within local government, and the wider public sector. The Teachers' Agreement ushered in a period of stability and renewal within the teaching profession, the importance of which should not be underestimated. The agreement has provided a good base upon which to carry out the present review of the teaching profession, and to link that to our wider aspirations for the public sector reform agenda.**

COSLA's vision for reform is based on developing public services that are integrated at a local level. We believe that optimising the benefits of public services for communities requires all the levers of reform, from legislation to public policy, from public finance to governance, and of course, the effective and progressive management of the entire workforce, including the teaching profession.

We are clear that while there have been real successes in addressing Scotland's most significant problems, more needs to be done to ensure that high quality public services fully translate into better outcomes for everyone in Scotland. That need is all the more acute at a time when resources are reducing and demand is growing quickly.

The current Review of Teacher Employment in Scotland is therefore a pivotal opportunity to further galvanise our commitment to that approach, and to ensure that our workforce is focused on delivering outcomes, rather than simply measuring its activity as a series of inputs and tasks.

This submission is not critical of the teaching profession, indeed the hard work of teachers is recognised by all those in local government. However, we also do not wish to miss an opportunity to deliver improvement by shying away from some of the big issues that are apparent to us. In that context it is vitally important to remember that local government employs over 53,000 teachers and spends approximately £5 billion each year on education, with the majority of this being invested in the education workforce. Collectively we therefore have an absolute duty to do right by our workforce, to manage the paybill responsibly, and also to ensure that the ways in which teachers work have a wider impact on improving life for communities.

Indeed, if we fail to collectively grasp the opportunity before us then there is a risk that the teachers' agreement will become an impediment to progress and improvement and not the catalyst for change that it was originally intended to be. We should therefore view the current review as an opportunity to be as radical in 2011 as the agreement was in 2001.

***Modernising the Teachers' Agreement***

**Much has changed over the ten years since the McCrone Review and the development of the Teachers' Agreement. Both the policy and financial position which the public sector faces is now very different to that of 2001.**

We therefore believe that this current review should look carefully at how policy has developed in the intervening years and the current financial challenge facing the whole public sector. In particular would expect the review to consider the

following:

1. *The need to deliver best value and get the correct balance between teacher rights and responsibilities;*
2. *The development of the Curriculum for Excellence; and*
3. *Teachers' role in the delivery of integrated children's services.*

#### **1. Best Value, and Rights and Responsibilities of Teachers**

**It is vitally important that teachers' terms and conditions do not favour individual teachers over education and the ability to deliver outcomes for children and young people.**

We therefore aspire to some rebalancing in order to further improve educational outcomes and to ensure the best possible value. Flexibility should be at the heart of any such revisions. Indeed, effective teaching should not be broken down into rigid blocks of time or functions. Instead, we should be creating terms and conditions that empower individuals and groups to work together in a collegiate way, and that allow employers to manage personal development and performance.

We must also not forget that from the age of 3 upward (and certainly from age 5) a teacher will be one of the most important adults in a child's life. It is a demanding job and society quite rightly sets high professional standards for those who become teachers. The function of teachers' terms and conditions is to define the relationship between teachers and employers, who in the case of local government are accountable through the local electorate to a much wider community. It is the employers' job to ensure that wider society's expectation and demands of a professional and highly skilled workforce are reflected in teachers' remuneration and working conditions.

However, teachers – as with most public sector employees - usually know that their job is not confined simply to basic terms and conditions. In the context of the teaching workforce, as with others across local government, the challenge is to effectively balance the protection of individual rights, while at the same time not reducing jobs to a series of rigid and inflexible duties, which can de-skill and undermine individuals, and greatly diminish the overall capacity of the education system. Instead, effective management of the workforce, inclusive of appropriate terms and conditions of employment, should allow the best employees to flourish, while at the same time ensuring that performance is managed, and resources are used to best effect.

There is a sense within local government and perhaps wider Scottish society that while the Teachers' Agreement rightly shifted this balance towards the individual teacher, in doing so it perhaps failed to more clearly set out the returns expected for pupils, employers and wider society. Therefore, while we have gained 10 years of relative harmonious industrial relations, the impact of the agreement on children's achievement and attainment is less clear cut. This in itself should be a good reason to review and revisit the agreement.

In addition the McCrone Review occurred at a time of growth within Scottish public sector finance. The years since 2001 saw public expenditure grow significantly. However, this is no longer the case and our projections are that by 2016/17 there will be £3.8 billion cash gap in funding in public sector expenditure if we continue a business as usual approach. Importantly, this gap is being driven more by a rising demand for service than reduction in available resource. This brings even more urgency to the need to ensure best value, and to scrutinise all elements of workforce management.

## **2. Development of the Curriculum for Excellence**

**Revised terms and conditions must enshrine the practice necessary to deliver on the aims of the Curriculum for Excellence.**

The Teachers' Agreement pre-dates the Curriculum for Excellence. It seems clear to us that had the new curriculum and the agreement been developed at the same time then there would have been clear links between them. The Curriculum for Excellence is the most fundamental reform of teaching and learning in Scotland for decades and stands or falls on its implementation by the teaching profession.

The current Annex B contains one reference to developing the curriculum but it does not elaborate on what is expected of teachers in both developing and delivering the curriculum. In contrast, the GTC standard for full registration is much better at describing the standard expected of teachers working in Scotland. We therefore aspire to much closer linkages across terms and conditions and standards to strengthen the obligation to be up to date with the practice, knowledge and experience necessary to deliver the new curriculum.

## **3. Teachers' role in the delivery of Integrated Children's Services**

**Teachers are part of the children's services workforce. Their terms and conditions need to stress that a teachers' primary responsibility above all others is the well being of children within their care, and that they have a duty to work in a collegiate way- not just with other teachers, but with other children's services professionals.**

Ten years ago the process of integrating services was not well developed. At that time it was easier to think of professional boundaries as the limits of responsibilities. This is no longer the case. The lines between childcare workers; residential care workers; pre-school professionals; social workers and even police officers are now more blurred than they were ten years ago. This is not about turning teachers into social workers or vice versa but about a developing awareness of the role that each professional group has for the well being and development of children.

Over the last decade there has also been a key trend towards professionalism within other parts of the children's services workforce. The creation of the Social Services Council for Scotland (SSSC) has helped develop qualifications, and career paths for workers in a similar way to that previously only experienced by teachers. It is now increasingly apparent that a modern, high functioning children's services workforce needs a range of professionals to operate successfully.

This philosophy of integrated, multi-agency working is set out under the banner of "Getting it Right for Every Child". GIRFEC is not a policy in its own right but a

programme for integrating and improving services, through culture and practice change. One of the key elements of GIRFEC is the concept of the lead professional. This is described fully on the Scottish Government's website:

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Young-People/childrenservices/girfec/Practitioners/ToolsResources/LeadProfessionalRole>

The lead professional is responsible for ensuring the development of an agreed multi-agency (education, health, social work, police) child's plan. The plan is based on an assessment of the child's need and will incorporate any single agency plans. The lead professional does not do all the work with the child and family; neither does he or she replace other practitioners who have specific roles or carry out direct work or specialist assessments. The lead professional's primary task is to make sure that all the support provided is working well, fits with involvement of other practitioners and agencies and is achieving the outcomes specified in the Child's Plan.

While Annex B of the teachers agreement does specify that teachers must '*work in partnership with parents, support staff and other professionals*' we believe that the integral role of teachers within modern multi-agency service delivery must be stressed as strongly as possible. Indeed, we would even suggest that the primary role for a teacher should not be to teach children but should be articulated in terms of ensuring the development, well being, and safety of children. This is the primary role that teachers should share with other children's services professionals.

## **ii) Responses to Specific Review Questions**

### **A. Professionalism**

*The Teachers' Agreement, which aimed to enhance the opportunities for professional development, made continuing professional development (CPD) a condition of service while also specifying that teachers should undertake a maximum of 35 hours CPD in each working year. It also required that all probationers should be guaranteed a one-year training contract.*

**1) To what extent do you agree that the arrangements for professional development set out in the Teachers' Agreement have: (Please select one option on each row)**

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
a) Led to an improved quality of learning and teaching?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Acted to develop leadership capacity within all levels of the teaching profession	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2a) Should the current arrangements for continuing professional development be changed?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

**2b) If so, how?**

COSLA fundamentally recognises the key role of high quality, well targeted CPD and lifelong

learning for the teaching workforce, and believes that these are essential components of an effective 21<sup>st</sup> century teaching workforce. We believe that this should be challenging and that it should facilitate leadership at all levels. We therefore want to ensure that schools and teachers get the greatest value and benefit from CPD arrangements and believe that there are good opportunities to do so.

We recognise and support the need to continue to develop skills and competences in our teachers throughout their careers (Donaldson recommendation 36), and we need to do what we can to nurture enthusiasm for meaningful CPD activities and effective self evaluation. We therefore aspire to a system of CPD that delivers the most meaningful approaches to these objectives, and that is not defined simply as a range of courses or training modules.

To this end, we believe that there is a need for CPD requirements to be identified in the context of the development and demonstration of necessary skills, competencies and aptitudes of teaching staff to deliver outcomes for children and improve leadership capacity within schools. We therefore support Donaldson recommendation 33 and would aspire to a system that delivers fewer CPD set piece events and more local, team-based approaches. Many of our aspirations set out in the rest of this consultation document also draw on this theme.

Generally, our members believe that the provision of 35 hours of CPD has been a useful stimulus in helping the workforce take ownership of their development. Our aspiration is to improve that process further.

Our first ambition is for stronger links between the impact of CPD its demonstrable impact on outcomes for children and young people. We believe that is the best interests of Scotland's children and young people, and of the teaching workforce.

Secondly, we are mindful that better targeting, improved relevance and different management arrangements for CPD will be required if CPD capacity is to be retained in the context of public sector finances. There can be little question that this fiscal reality will necessitate a more focussed review of the CPD system. With shrinking resources and a need to increase the pace of implementation of Curriculum for Excellence we need to be much more flexible in how staff ensure that they have all the skills and knowledge they need to carry out their duties. The great majority of staff take their professional responsibilities very seriously, but there remains a lack of flexibility around when and how staff development is carried out.

We agree that 35 hours should be retained as a minimum provision, but believe that currently the configuration is too prescriptive to meet local needs and does little to develop greater autonomy in the profession. Indeed, our preference is to recalibrate this to focus on outcomes rather than the basic "inputs" that make up CPD time or to lever that within an artificial notional number of hours. Indeed, a maximum of 35 hours can reduce flexibility and encourage a formulaic or even tokenistic approach which focuses on time not on impact. Our experience suggests the fundamental characteristics of a smart, successful teaching workforce require CPD to go beyond the specific training that is currently delivered. For that reason we would welcome a shift in emphasis from what many teachers would consider a 'modular' view of training towards one that engenders professional development and focusses on individual responsibility for the improvement of competencies.

This could take place in a number of ways. For example, it could include broadening the definition of CPD to make much more use of mentoring, leadership development, the development of an ethos and culture of collective responsibility for delivering excellence, and better use of enablers towards that such as job shadowing, coaching, assessment centres, communities of practice, and leadership development. Together, our view is that these would help target CPD on issues such as pedagogical development, the school improvement plan, the impact on learning and teaching, and leadership.

It could also mean a general requirement to undertake appropriate CPD within and outwith the working week, recognising that some requirements are best met outside the teaching week. Because local circumstances will dictate specific CPD needs, there is also great value in CPD that is developed and delivered internally within a school, team and local authority as this builds capacity and capability, secures local ownership and ensures responsibility for individual and group learning.

In addition, we strongly believe CPD should be more explicitly linked to revised Professional Review and Development processes and continuous self evaluation and review. We believe that this ought to be a formal requirement to ensure training is targeted, meaningful, and

delivers improved performance. For that to happen, we believe that CPD plans should form part of an annual performance and development review, to agree and ensure the work is undertaken and is focussed on improving performance, skill and knowledge, and to ensure effective links to wider council and educational objectives. That does not mean questioning teachers' professionalism but it does mean that it should not be left to individual teachers to determine their CPD programme in isolation– rather, we believe that stronger links to wider education, Curriculum for Excellence, and council objectives must be built in. Indeed, we also believe that there is potential to explore the use of CPD as a component of any mandatory re-accreditation process, or as part of the requirement for continuing registration with the GTCS. At heart, we are therefore arguing that the principles of professional development and the cultures and behaviours that arise from that should be part of the wider ethos and conduct of the teaching profession. We are less clear, therefore, that specific 'arrangements' for the delivery of that professional development need be spelled out in the contract of employment. Doing so seems to be unnecessarily restrictive – CPD needs are necessarily diverse and the application of solutions to these also needs to be holistic.

**We also suggest some specific areas where the current system might be enhanced:**

- In recent years, additional in-service days have been provided to support teachers. We want to ensure that this is done with sensitivity to the needs of children and young people. Rather than restrict the number of teaching days, we therefore believe that where additional time is needed for teachers to work together, options for delivering this should be explored. That might include extension of the teacher year but not the pupil year to remove the disruption caused by in service days and to allow for better scheduling of training in different ways, for example in a targeted block or by introducing additional training days in addition to the current allocation of 5.
- A clearer linkage between CPD and local/national priorities such as those set out in GIRFEC, CfE, and the Donaldson Report is needed. That would require the local discretion and flexibility we aspire to, and scaling back of 'one size fits all' provision. Similarly, there is scope to reassess whether all essential elements of CPD are being covered, including Leadership Development, Child Protection, Health & Safety, Health Promotion, Finance and Employment law (where appropriate), and clearer links to GTCS standards and competencies
- While we recognise that there is immense good work and practice, we would welcome steps to cut through the bulk of information to focus on critical and proven approaches.
- We also would welcome a re-assessment of the balance between management leadership development and leadership for learning / distributed leadership at all levels.

**B. Teachers' Duties**

*Annex B of the Teachers' Agreement outlines duties for classroom/chartered, principal, depute head teacher and head teachers, as a guide for the development of specific job descriptions in local authorities.*

**3) Do you think the prescribed set of duties in Annex B of the Teachers' Agreement are suitable for a profession implementing Curriculum for Excellence?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

**4a) Do you believe the duties need to be revised?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

**b) If so, how?**

The development of the Curriculum for Excellence gives teachers greater autonomy and freedom, and at the same time makes more calls on the professionalism of teachers. We believe that teachers' duties need to be configured to reflect that work, and to ensure that the anticipated impact of Annex B is delivered fully.

We suggest therefore that the prescribed set of duties in Annexe B should be reconfigured as a set of standards, competencies and responsibilities that are geared towards improving the professional duties required of all teachers. Such duties would engender a modern, flexible, dynamic and outward looking professional workforce, and galvanise a common commitment and identity in the pursuit of better outcomes. We also believe that doing so would reflect the significant importance of working flexibly across professional boundaries to achieve these outcomes.

Any revised duties should give all teachers responsibility for quality improvement, leadership in learning, collegiality, partnership and the defined CfE responsibilities- and we would argue that characteristics such as inclusion, community engagement, health and wellbeing and personal support, health and safety and child protection should also be made clear. In keeping with our commitment to self evaluation, we also consider that a duty related to competency based approached/self evaluation should be considered. There is also scope to use duties to help embrace technology in the delivery of education, and the management information systems associated with this.

**We also suggest some specific elements for review:**

- The Standard for Full Registration, and Standard for Headship are now well established and could become an appropriate framework for job descriptions and the duties required to reflect these. There is a need to calibrate the annex to these.
- There is scope for a Standard for middle managers which would cover principal teacher, Faculty Leaders and Depute Head Teachers posts.
- Within Principal Teacher duties, there is no reference to faculty head responsibilities. These are increasingly replaced by single subject duties and this should be formally incorporated.

**C. Career Structure**

*The Teachers' Agreement created a simplified career structure that included four main grades within both primary and secondary schools:*

- i) Classroom teacher (probationer, main grade, chartered)*
- ii) Principal teacher*
- iii) Depute head teacher*
- iv) Head teacher*

**5) To what extent do you agree that this career structure has met its aims: (Please select one option on each row)**

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
a) to provide opportunities for teachers to advance their careers in the classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) to provide opportunities for teachers to advance their careers through promotion to management roles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) to provide an appropriate number of skilled individuals able to undertake management roles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**6) To what extent do you agree that the probationary year is a crucial stage in teacher's development?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	strongly agree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	agree
<input type="checkbox"/>	neither agree nor disagree

<input type="checkbox"/>	disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	strongly disagree

**7a) Do you think that the career structure should be changed?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

**7b) If so, how?**

The curriculum is changing and structures and career pathways require to be adaptable accordingly. We also recognise the need to strike a balance between promotion possibilities, and the benefits associated with flatter collegial structures that engender distributed leadership. The financial pressures on public services should also be considered. We would envisage that career structures move away from a task and duty based system towards a system that better recognises levels of responsibility, leadership and job size. In the short term, the Chartered Teachers system requires to be reviewed and replaced, and we comment on this further in section E.

Consequently we aspire to a wider range of career pathways; current opportunities are mainly limited to Principal Teacher Faculty, Depute Head Teacher and Head Teacher, but provided that they are resourced effectively, different pathways could also be encouraged through flexible promoted posts for fixed terms and specific projects using the existing PT scale. Indeed, while the current system allows for additional responsibilities to be temporarily allocated to individuals, this facility is not widely used and could be further employed. We believe that there is strong potential for these routes to enable aspiring teachers to gain management experience, and configuring opportunities in this way would also enable head teachers and councils to evaluate performance on a fixed term basis.

We would also argue that there are strong educational benefits in contracting staff in promoted post contracts to the authority rather than a specific establishment. Doing so would ensure that resources are deployed effectively according to need, and that such opportunities also offer the widest possible exposure to a variety of settings and challenges.

Similarly, we also believe there is scope to ensure flexibility in moving staff between sectors where this is appropriate, for example by enabling Primary Head Teachers to become Secondary Head Teachers.

**We also make some specific suggestions for review:**

- more differentiation is needed between deputy head teachers and principal teachers in primary schools
- the jump from main grade teacher to a promoted post of curricular leader within revised flatter structures is felt by many educationalists to be too large. The above proposals to offer fixed term additional responsibilities would help bridge this gap

**D. Conditions of Service / Pay**

*The Teachers' Agreement specified:*

- a contractual 35 hour week for all teachers
- a maximum class contact time of 22.5 hours
- an allowance of personal time for preparation and correction, of no less than one third of class contact time
- that tasks which do not require the teacher to be on the school premises can be carried out at a time and place of the teacher's choosing
- use of remaining collegiate time to undertake activities agreed at school level
- 195 days working year, and an additional maximum of 35 hours CPD for all teachers

*The Teachers' Agreement also introduced substantial pay rises for all teachers.*

**Conditions of Service**

**8) To what extent do you agree that the conditions of service listed above: (Please select one option on each row)**

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
a) Enable teachers to deliver the best	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



outcomes for children and young people					
b) Need adjusted to reflect actual workloads and practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Help to nurture an attitude of professionalism amongst teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Are suitable to successfully implement Curriculum for Excellence?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**9a) Do you think the current conditions of service should be amended?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

**b) If yes, please specify how:**

The Teachers Agreement delivered improvements in the learning experience of pupils, and we recognise has helped engender an 'attitude of professionalism'. We would like to see that embed further and translate further into improvement to attainment and education outcomes for children and young people.

In particular, we consider there to be significant advantages to reducing the focus on tasks and duties, and on the associated compartmentalisation of the working week, including class contact time. We strongly believe that there is too much emphasis on counting hours. Instead, we would welcome the flexibility to deploy teachers according to educational need and to fit with individual school or other local factors, to increase the potential for collaborative working among and between various staff groups, and to help offset financial challenges.

While we recognise that there is difficult balance to be struck, we consider that level of flexibility to be essential to future delivery of effective education and we believe it would better serve the needs of communities.

We wish to highlight some current blockages. Firstly, we believe that working at 'a time and place of the teacher's own choosing' runs counter to the notion of working in a collegiate fashion, and creates practical difficulties in schools. Responsive and effective schools are characterised by a strong interdependence amongst staff, and our ambition is therefore to ensure that teachers are best able to work together, during the school day, to deliver and share high quality teaching and learning. When teachers leave the school, this ability is severally hampered, particularly as our experience suggests that a culture of using 'non contact' time to share and learn from each other's practice has never taken root. We would therefore argue that a more effective system would be to for teachers to spend the balance of 35 hours a week in school. This would greatly improve flexibility, and allow for real collegiate activity.

We also suggest that the configuration of the 35 hour week could be improved. We believe that it is necessary to recognise the time required to undertake duties other than face to face teaching and that a limit on maximum teaching time is required. However, demarking time into modules of marking and preparation, assessment and reporting, professional meetings, parents meeting and so forth is unhelpful and restrictive.

We believe that this quantification of blocks of time runs counter to the notion of teacher professionalism. Indeed, while TP21 intended some blocks of time to be part of phasing in arrangements only, these have now become permanent norms. We suggest that there are better alternatives to consider. One such option could be to move from a 35 hour per week model to a 140/90 four week model, or even a term cycle. That would enhance timetabling efficiency, while ensuring that teachers have sufficient time out of the classroom.

We also want to ensure that class contact time is optimally configured to deliver better outcomes for children and young people. The allocation of 22.5 hours for primary teachers means that each class has to have another teacher for one afternoon a week. We would welcome a review of this situation to deliver continuous teaching by one teacher for a full pupil week. We recognise that 2.5 hours of additional teaching time would mean less time for other activities, but believe that the overriding education justification for this is sound. Indeed, educationalists comment that in primary schools the delivery of Curriculum for Excellence is fractured by the timetabling required to achieve reduced class contact time for teachers and that it impacts on the quality of children's learning. We therefore believe that a review of contact time has advantages for all sides; there would be an educational gain in terms of primary learning experience, and savings would be realised and sustained that could be redeployed into the service. Moreover, doing so would not change the length of the working week, just its configuration. While we recognise that the configuration of secondary teaching

would not necessarily lend itself to that configuration, that does not mean that such a review in the primary sector should not be undertaken, and an assessment of whether commensurate issues could be considered in the secondary sector.

We also consider there to be too many artificial barriers to making better use of non teaching staff and believe that more could be done to enable a more diverse and mixed approach where this would deliver a better educational experience. These issues are explored further in Section F.

**We also make some specific observations:**

- There is a pressing need to bring the teaching workforce in line with others across the local government workforce by compelling teachers to self certify for all periods of absence from day 1.
- There is a need for the leadership role of Head Teachers to be enhanced, for a wider authority role to be more explicit, and for consideration to be given to some flexibility in head teacher appointments, perhaps through renewable or rolling contracts.

**Pay**

**10) To what extent do you agree that the current level of teachers' pay reflects their status as professionals working in the public sector?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	strongly agree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	agree
<input type="checkbox"/>	neither agree nor disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	disagree
<input type="checkbox"/>	strongly disagree

**11a) The Teachers' Agreement resulted in the posts of Principal Teacher, Depute Head Teacher and Head Teacher being job sized. Do you believe job sizing arrangements need to be revised?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

**b) If so, how?**

Teachers and school leaders are fairly remunerated in comparison with other local government professionals and comparable professions. Job sizing was revised recently by the SNCT and a national training programme put in place. The new arrangements from December 2010 should be given time to establish themselves before any significant decisions are taken. Nevertheless, we recognise the need for ongoing review and development, and in particular that re-engineering of job scores may be required to account for changes such as joint headships, cluster arrangements, multi-agency working, and additional support needs. Class committed primary and nursery Head Teacher's duties may also require review. Clearly, any wider changes to the management and configuration of the workforce would also require a commensurate activity to review the current sizing arrangements.

**E. Chartered Teachers**

*The Teachers Agreement created the position of Chartered Teacher within Scottish schools as a means of allowing experienced teachers to develop without having to leave the classroom.*

**12) To what extent do you agree that the Chartered Teacher Scheme has had a positive impact on: (Please select one option on each row)**

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
a) Retaining skilled professionals as classroom teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Learning and teaching quality across the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**13a) Should the Chartered Teacher Scheme be:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Retained as it is
--------------------------	-------------------

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amended
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disbanded

**13b) Please give reasons for your choice:**

COSLA fundamentally believes in the principles that led to the chartered teacher programme and the benefit and value in recognising and rewarding good practitioners. However, the chartered teacher scheme should be fundamentally changed to deliver direct links between accreditation, its demonstrable impact on teaching, learning and leadership/ professional roles in schools, and the wider delivery of education and council/ community planning objectives.

We have identified a number of issues that need to be resolved. TP21 envisaged that teachers achieving chartered status would play a key role in promoting standards of excellence within the classroom. Although there may be many positive examples of excellent practice, the system is poorly set up to ensure that. Therefore, while we are anxious to retain career routes for experienced classroom teachers who wish to develop their professional expertise within the classroom, councils report widespread disappointment that the current system does not serve schools well enough, and has in fact not effectively retained teachers in the classroom.

In particular, we are worried that there is not enough evidence of a significant impact on learning and teaching quality. Nevertheless, the scheme has served to add a new layer to the grading structure. This equates to PT scale point 4, which many argue is too great a differential.

In addition, candidates are largely self selecting and there is no inbuilt quality assurance to that process, and nor is the impact on pupil learning measured. Councils therefore need to have a much stronger role in controlling access and impact.

Instead we want any programme to be based not simply on academic success, but on success in education and clear evidence of effective and consistently high quality teaching practice. In essence we want to ensure that all Chartered Teachers to reflect the status of the best teachers across the country, and to exemplify distributed leadership and leadership for learning.

If it is deemed that such changes cannot be made, then the scheme must be scrapped, potentially to be replaced by flexible short-term payments to teachers for special projects or duties.

**F. Other Staff in Schools**

*The Teachers' Agreement created additional posts for support staff (e.g. classroom assistants, clerical staff, lab technicians) undertaking a range of tasks in Scotland's schools. Support staff were introduced to help address teacher workload while allowing teachers to focus on their key role in teaching and learning. Annex E to the Teachers' Agreement established a list of tasks that should not routinely be carried out by teachers.*

**14) To what extent do you agree that additional support staff have: (please select one option for each row)**

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
a) Helped teachers to focus on their core role as leaders of education in the classroom?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Helped school managers to focus on leading, managing and providing strategic direction for schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impacted positively on the learning of pupils?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**15a) Do you think it is necessary to revise the tasks that the Teachers' Agreement (Annex E) specifies should NOT routinely be carried out by teachers?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

**15b) If so, how?**

We are keen to recognise the strong contribution of additional support staff to delivering education in Scotland. These staff have a valuable contribution to make to children's learning and their future role should be further developed to support the learning and development of pupils. That aspiration extends to the added value that appropriate other staff such as child development officers, youth workers, sports coaches and others can bring to children's learning.

We find it anomalous that the teaching profession is defined by a list of duties which its members are not required to do. That creates an unnecessary level of demarcation and engenders a culture that is out of step with the wider ambition that all those working in education have a collective responsibility to deliver better outcomes for children and young people.

Our aspirations point towards a wider review of duties –of teachers, of ancillary staff and of professional or para-professional staff. We believe that should mean that Annex E is dropped in favour of a focus on competencies, standards and expected impact in terms of pupil outcomes.

We are also aware that the financial climate means that support staff arrangements in schools are under increasingly pressure. That pressure will become more acute without better flexibility across the system. We do not want to see a situation where simply by remaining wedded to current arrangements, other professionals are squeezed out of the education system. That is not in the interests of children and young people in the classroom, or the teaching workforce who rely on the support of other staff.

Naturally, we believe that careful consideration must be given to the appropriate deployment of support staff for the best impact on learning and teaching. Classroom assistants should not be asked to carry out teaching tasks but we do see a clear but distinct role for staff other than teachers to carry out wider duties and tasks, and a potential career development need for them. The role of other staff in special schools may provide a good example of how this approach can be extended into the mainstream.

The Curriculum for Excellence is about broadening and deepening the learning opportunities for pupils, and providing young people with relevant skills that will help them in later life. We therefore also consider this review an opportunity to re-assess how we want to define a teacher's relationship to non teachers who have particular skills or expertise that will benefit school pupils (e.g. artists, sport coaches, and members of the business community etc). We believe that the review should not be shy of considering the role that non teachers can play in the class room and beyond. This should not be viewed as de-professionalisation of the teaching profession but as an opportunity to strengthen links to the community and to provide learning opportunities for pupils that may not exist otherwise.

## **G. Negotiating Machinery**

*The Teachers' Agreement established the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT) as the tripartite body (Teacher Unions, COSLA, Scottish Government) responsible for negotiations on pay and conditions, and for establishing an appeals mechanism. It also established Local Negotiating Committees for Teachers (LNCTs) which have powers to vary certain devolved condition of service agreements and to reach agreement on a range of matters not subject to national bargaining. The roles of the SNCT and the LNCTs are set out in Annex F of the Teachers' Agreement.*

**16) How well has the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers undertaken its role?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	1 Very well
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 Well
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 Satisfactorily
<input type="checkbox"/>	4 Poorly
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 Very poorly

**17) How well have the Local Negotiating Committees for Teachers undertaken their role?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	1 Very well
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 Well
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 Satisfactorily
<input type="checkbox"/>	4 Poorly
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 Very poorly

**18a) Do you think the negotiating arrangements should be changed?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

**b) If so, how?**

It is important to recognise that the current and projected financial climate in which public services operate cannot be divorced from the operation of both national and local negotiating machinery. Workforce costs make up the majority of local government budgets, and if councils are to maintain vital services and jobs, they have a duty to communities to explore all avenues for efficiencies that are open to them. In this new time of austerity, our watch words in local government are affordability and sustainability.

Business as usual is therefore not an option, and that inevitably brings a range of new stresses and strains to the negotiating arena. Those pressures are being felt right across the local government workforce and across all its bargaining groups. The teaching workforce can be no different and we welcome the recent progress that has been made.

However, it is equally important to recognise that the SNCT has worked well over the past ten years and should be retained. Although recent negotiations have been challenging for all concerned, they have been conducted in a professional manner. The recent agreement secured through the SNCT to revised terms and conditions has demonstrated that the machinery is robust and capable of dealing with the pressures it faces.

Councils report that the local LNCT structures have been largely similarly successful in maintaining good industrial relations and agreeing circulars and policies for the benefit of the service and employees.

Indeed, it is difficult to imagine whether there is another alternative vehicle which would work more effectively than the present structure. The view is therefore that the SNCT and local equivalents should be retained- and any discussion should relate to how best to improve the operation of these. Those issues may include a review of LNCT "failure to agree" situations where the default position is maintenance of the status quo with the issue then referred to the SNCT, and ways in which unnecessarily bureaucracy can be removed, and engagement mechanisms improved.

**H. Overall impact of the Teachers' Agreement**

*The Review would like to consider the overall impact of the Teachers' Agreement.*

**19) To what extent do you agree that the Teachers' Agreement: (Please select one option on each row)**

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
a) Attracts the most skilled individuals to the profession	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Retains the most skilled individuals within the profession	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Recognises and encourages excellence in the classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Contributes to the creation of a flexible, creative, learner-centred teaching profession that can support Curriculum for Excellence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**I. Further Points**

**20) The Review Group would be pleased to consider any further points respondents wish to make about teacher employment in Scotland. (Please expand the box below if you need more space).**

We recognise the positive impact of TP21 over the last decade. We welcome the stability and continuity; fitting remuneration, and effective dialogue it has engendered. We know that Scotland has many highly skilled teachers that deliver excellent education experiences to Scotland's young people. We also recognise that the impact of TP21 on pay, security, career opportunities, and public perception are important in attracting prospective teachers into the workforce.

Much has been delivered, but with those successes now in place, Scotland should now set its sights on the opportunities that exist to reach new levels of excellence in the delivery of educational outcomes. We are therefore committed to securing an effective teaching

workforce for the future, and to clearly targeting its work on delivering better educational outcomes.

However, the changing context for education, not least the development of a Curriculum for Excellence, and the changing context in which those education services are being delivered, means that there is a strong case for redeveloping the Teachers Agreement.

Of course, the serious financial position faced by local authorities, with a resource gap of up to £3.8bn anticipated by 2016/17, requires radical service design and an increased focus on value for money. The recent changes that have been negotiated to terms and conditions are important, and we welcome them. However, the scale of the financial gap between resources and demand will require other action.

We believe that vital resources can be freed up through a review and recalibration of some elements of the agreement, and that doing so will offset the need for other measures that could be more damaging to the outcomes being experienced by children and young people. Affordability must therefore be a consideration for the Review of Teacher Employment if its recommendations are to prove achievable and sustainable. Put simply, without review and better flexibility, present and future workforce costs have the potential to significantly impact on councils' ability to direct resources to areas of greatest need.

There are therefore strong opportunities for improvement, and we believe that these can deliver advantages to children in the classroom, the workforce, and employers. The collective challenge before us is therefore to ensure that the Review of Teacher Employment in Scotland grasps these opportunities and sets in motion the further dialogue and development needed to make them a reality. We look forward to working with the review group and with other stakeholders on that task.

**21) The Review Group may wish to contact you as part of the wider Review of Teacher Employment. Would you be willing for them to do this?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No