



INTRODUCTION

- 1 The current structure has become increasingly complex over time, to the point where few people possess the detailed knowledge and understanding required properly to apply the statutory provisions of the system, which the average head and governing body are expected to administer. In some cases, under the pressure of market forces and recruitment and retention difficulties, this has resulted in practices that at best are based on genuine misunderstandings and at worst are patently illegal.
- 2 The need is clear for a rationalisation of the scale and the numerous other mandatory and discretionary payments.
- 3 SHA's initial proposals for a simpler, more streamlined pay structure are outlined below. The proposals reflect a national framework that would be administered by schools. Schools' ability to employ the available discretions would depend on affordability in the context of the education funding available.

MAIN SCALE

- 4 SHA advocates the introduction of a single main scale to cover the full range of flexibilities that can currently be used. All existing allowances and discretionary performance pay awards and the AST scale would be incorporated into the new scale.
- 5 There should be a single national scale, starting at £18,000 and going up to £54,000 – to reflect the maximum that a teacher in Inner London on UPS 5, MA 5 and R+R 5 could currently earn. There would be a national cap at £30,000 to encompass the current main scale and the second point on the upper pay spine. It is anticipated that all teachers would normally progress to this point. Within this national framework, individual schools would be free to set their own cap at a higher point on the scale. For example, schools in Inner London or in the fringe areas might choose to set the cap at £36,000 and £31,500, respectively. Schools would also be able to determine the maximum on the scale that they would be prepared to pay, for example a school could stipulate that for its staff the maximum that the scale went up to was £45,000.
- 6 A threshold bar would apply after point 4 (induction plus 3 years). Teachers who do not 'pass' the threshold, would make no further progress up the scale. It would fall to the school to make these judgments. If a teacher started higher up the scale (without previously having crossed the threshold), the threshold would apply 3 points further up the scale.
- 7 The cash value of each increment would be the same to ensure equivalence at different points on the scale.
- 8 Teachers could be advanced by an appropriate number of points on the basis of recruitment (on appointment), retention, SEN responsibility and management allowances, which should be renamed 'leadership and development allowances'. They would have the right to go above the cap by the same number of points (that is their salary ceiling would be correspondingly higher).
- 9 Progress up to the cap would be incremental, but subject to the teacher crossing the threshold and being able to demonstrate continuing professional development as evidenced by annual review.
- 10 Good or excellent performance could be rewarded additionally by more rapid advancement up the scale. These performance points could be awarded on the basis that they would only take a teacher up to the cap more quickly (when they could be reviewed to see if the teacher's continuing high quality of performance warranted their personal cap being raised by the number of points so awarded, with the result that they would be made permanent) or on a permanent basis from the outset (the cap would be increased by the

number of points awarded, as above for allowances). Performance points below the cap would be portable. For example, a teacher in a school where the normal cap applied, whose salary comprised point 7 on the scale (£27,000), leadership and development allowance 4 (worth £6,000, 2 permanent performance points and 2 recruitment and retention points (worth £3,000 each), would be on point 15 on the scale (£39,000) and have a personal cap of £42,000 (point 17). The same example in a school in Inner London which set its initial cap at £36,000 (point 13) would mean that the teacher would be on point 19, with a salary of £45,000 (point 11 on the main scale, because he/she would have started 4 points higher up the scale, plus leadership and development allowance 4, plus 2 permanent performance points and 2 recruitment and retention points), and that his/her overall personal cap would be £48,000 (point 21).

- 11 Good or excellent performance could be linked to an additional AST 'standard', equivalent to highly effective performance. Such a new AST concept would be a lower level than the existing AST standard, but could also be subject to external accreditation/validation or moderation as required. Both types of AST, each with a mini-scale of three points, could be incorporated into the main scale (the maximum point on the scale could be raised for an AST in Inner London). For example, a teacher could be put on point 14 on a scale of 14 to 16 and progress would depend on continuing professional development as evidenced by annual review. Outstanding performance would be rewarded by the movement of the AST mini-scale up the main scale to, for example, points 16 to 18.
- 12 The payment of non-consolidated bonuses could be added to the scheme proposed above as an alternative to the award of performance points or enhanced progression up the pay spine. Such payments would be payable from a sum determined by the governing body for this purpose in the school budget. The pre-determined sum would be divided between individuals, teams or all of the staff according to criteria outlined in the governors' pay policy.

LEADERSHIP SPINE

- 13 SHA proposes that there should be a single leadership spine, as now, for all members of the leadership group, but that all ranges should comprise 4 points. The single spine would not differ much from the current spine (the values of the 'increments' could be adjusted). The ranges would be determined on the basis of such factors as job weight, recruitment and the challenging nature of the post. Outstanding performance would be rewarded by the movement of the range up the spine. The other features are as follows:
 - ◆ Group sizes should be retained to ensure that no head was paid below the minimum point for the group. The minimum salaries payable to deputies and assistant heads in different group-sized schools should also be specified.
 - ◆ It would be for the governing body of the school to determine an appropriate range for the head and appropriate ranges for deputies and assistant heads.
 - ◆ Movement up the range would be incremental, but subject to continuing professional development as evidenced by annual review.
 - ◆ The ranges could be moved on the basis of retention, increased job weight and performance.

PROPOSED SCALE

1	£18,000	
2	£19,500	
3	£21,000	
4	£22,500	
<hr/>		normal threshold
5	£24,000	
6	£25,500	
7	£27,000	
8	£28,500	
9	£30,000	
<hr/>		normal cap
10	£31,500	
11	£33,000	
12	£34,500	
13	£36,000	
14	£37,500) – mini AST 1 scale	
15	£39,000)	
16	£40,500)	
17	£42,000	
18	£43,500) – mini AST 2 scale	
19	£45,000)	
20	£46,500)	
21	£48,000	
22	£49,500	
23	£51,000	
24	£52,500	
25	£54,000	