

**TEACHERS’
PAY & CONDITIONS OF SERVICE INQUIRY**

FINAL REPORT - PART 1
Parity, Performance & Progression
June 2003

Chairman: Mr Sean Curran CBE

Teachers' Pay and Conditions of Service Inquiry

Final Report Part 1

Parity, Performance and Progression

Chairman: Sean Curran CBE

June 2003

Teachers' Pay and Conditions of Service Inquiry

Final Report Part 1

Parity, Performance and Progression

Table of Contents

	Page
Recommendations.....	1
Introduction.....	3
Parity with Teachers in England and Wales.....	6
Raising Performance and Improving Effectiveness.....	12
Pay Progression - Classroom teachers.....	18
Pay Progression - The Leadership Group.....	24
Appendix 1 Terms of reference.....	27
Appendix 2 Invitation to submit evidence.....	29
Appendix 3 Proposed enhanced Threshold Standards.....	32

Recommendations

The recommendations listed below are confined to the issues of pay parity, teacher performance arrangements and procedures relating to the progression of classroom teachers, and also the leadership group, on their respective pay scales.

The second part of the Final Report, which we hope to finalise by the late Autumn of this year, will consider a number of other issues including conditions of service, matters arising from the National Agreement in England and the operation of the negotiating machinery.

We recommend that teachers' salaries in Northern Ireland continue to be based on parity with England and Wales and that the main terms and conditions of service should continue to be based on those applicable in England and Wales but contextualised to the particular circumstances of Northern Ireland

(Paragraphs 11 to 31)

We recommend the establishment of a School Development and Performance Management scheme consistent with the objectives set out in paragraphs 50 to 53.

(Paragraphs 33 to 53)

We recommend that, for the Main Pay Scale, teachers should continue to expect an annual increment as long as they are not in the unsatisfactory teacher procedure.

(Paragraphs 55 to 57)

We recommend that the present threshold assessment process for determining whether a teacher should move to point one of the upper pay scale should continue to be used until an acknowledged robust SDPM policy is operating in schools.

(Paragraphs 59 to 66)

We recommend that processes, consistent with the objectives set out in paragraphs 75 to 80, be put in place to enable teachers to progress to U2. Furthermore these processes for UPS progression should only be initiated following agreement at TNC on a viable project plan to ensure that a performance management scheme and arrangements for its implementation are in place in schools by September 2004. Subject to agreement on the above at TNC we recommend that the process for those teachers eligible to progress to U2 be put in place with effect from September 2003.

(Paragraphs 68 to 80)

We recommend that Governors should continue to use the existing system for leadership pay progression until September 2004 when it should be replaced by the agreed SDPM scheme.

While the award of one point for fully acceptable performance should remain we also recommend that two performance points may be awarded in any one year to a member of the Leadership Group when the relevant body considers that there is a very high quality of performance. This process can commence with the assessment of the revised objectives set for the year 2003/04.

(Paragraphs 82 to 86)

Introduction

1 This Inquiry into Teachers' Pay and Conditions of Service was established in June of 2002 with the terms of reference set out in Appendix 1. The members of the Inquiry team are Sean Curran CBE, Chairman, Plunkett Campbell, Margaret-Ann Dinsmore QC, Harry Goodman OBE and Betty McClurg OBE with Frank Horisk acting as Secretary and Carson Elliott providing secretarial support.

2 We were required initially to examine the issue of principals' and vice principals' pay. This had caused difficulty when the first group of teachers had passed through the threshold procedure and were paid on the first point of the Upper Pay Scale (UPS). The pay differentials between these teachers and those on the Leadership Pay Spine (principals and vice principals) had been reduced.

3 We reported on this matter in our Interim Report published in November 2002 and the Report was subsequently accepted by both Sides of the Teachers' Negotiating Committee (TNC) at their meeting on 17th December 2002. Payments were made to qualifying principals and vice principals, as a result of the Report, in March/April 2003.

4 In considering its terms of reference and the environment in which teachers fulfil their professional obligations to pupils, the Inquiry has been concerned to set out a contextualised improvement process for the benefit of Northern Ireland teachers and pupils and also to take account of rapid changes in education in England, Wales and Scotland. The Government at Westminster has put enormous emphasis on change in education provision throughout the UK as a result of the priority it has given to the raising of standards in Education. This process of change continues at an unprecedented pace though differently in England and Wales and in Scotland. These changes have continued during the course of our Inquiry and will, in all likelihood, continue after we conclude our work.

Although we will seek to anticipate all the possible eventualities and provide for them the Inquiry thinks it reasonable to request that our stakeholders recognise the difficulty in addressing every issue completely in this context.

Change and expectation for improved achievement by all the pupils in our schools depend fundamentally on our classroom practice and on the effectiveness with which the teaching profession is supported by the Department of Education, the employing authorities and other stakeholders.

5 The terms of reference (Appendix 1) require the Inquiry to recommend on the desirability of retaining parity and equivalence with pay levels for teachers in England and Wales. While there are other important matters within our remit, the consideration of parity and equivalence will set the framework for the rest of our recommendations and therefore is of fundamental importance.

6 Another issue which led to agreement to the establishment of the Inquiry was the dispute which arose between Teachers' side and Management side of the TNC over how teachers who had crossed Threshold to point 1 (U1) of the Upper Pay Scale should progress. Management side had proposed that a School Development and Performance Management (SDPM) scheme should be introduced to improve the standards of teaching and learning. It was to be a refinement of an earlier scheme introduced in 1995 (Staff Development and Performance Review). It was also proposed that it should be used as part of a body of evidence to inform decisions in relation to the progress of teachers and members of the leadership group up the pay scales. Teachers' side rejected the Management side proposal primarily, but not exclusively, because of its link to pay.

7 Eligible teachers in England and Wales applied to move to U2 of the Upper Pay Scale (UPS) in September 2002 and a substantial proportion were successful. In view of this, the Inquiry team believes that it is important that it reports on this issue as soon as possible, so that a procedure can be agreed and put in place to enable eligible teachers in Northern Ireland to progress.

8 In November 2002 we directly asked interested parties i.e. teacher employers, teacher associations, the Department of Education, Boards of Governors and others who would have an interest in teacher pay and conditions of service to submit evidence to us on a range of issues relating to our terms of reference. We also published a notice in the press inviting other interested parties to submit their views. Appendix 2 is a copy of the document inviting evidence. At the request of various parties we extended the period for receipt of evidence to the end of January 2003. We received over 100 responses and wish to thank all those who made submissions. In the course of our evidence gathering we visited a cross-section of schools and observed and discussed with teachers their working environment, the conditions under which they operate and the pressures they experience. We would like to thank the Principals and Staffs of the schools concerned for their cooperation and assistance.

9 In the period since, we have examined and collated all the written evidence and held a series of meetings with the employers, teacher associations, the Department of Education and other interested parties to ensure that we fully understand their points of view and arrive at informed conclusions on the areas of agreement and difference between the various

interests. In addition Inquiry members have considered an extensive range of relevant documents. Because of the complexity and the amount of information we have received it will not be possible to arrive at a considered conclusion on all the matters raised with us before the end of this academic year.

10 Taking account of the nature of the evidence received on these matters and of the desirability of improving the position of professional teachers as early as possible, the Inquiry has decided to issue its Final Report in two parts. Part 1 (this report) will deal with the issues of parity and equivalence with pay levels in England and Wales and with the issues of teacher focussed improvement and salary progression. The objective is to enable the Teacher Negotiating Committee to consider and conclude on our recommendations on these important issues in time to initiate and complete preparatory activities in the 2003/2004 academic year.

Parity with Teachers in England and Wales

11 In the terms of reference the Inquiry was asked to "inquire widely into how teachers' pay, promotion structures and conditions of service should be changed in order to support a committed, professional and flexible teaching force which will secure high and improving standards of school education for all children in Northern Ireland." At the same time we were to take into account the principles of "parity and equivalence with pay levels for teachers in England and Wales", and that "teachers' pay should be at a level to recruit, retain and motivate high quality teaching staff."

12 Before dealing with any other issue we have had to take a view on whether parity with England and Wales of pay and conditions for Northern Ireland teachers should continue or whether some other system should be introduced.

13 In taking evidence on the question of parity and equivalence the Inquiry came to the view that there is not a common understanding of what is meant by parity and equivalence.

We consider that there are three aspects to parity. These are:

- (a) the salary structure and the payments arising for an individual teacher;
- (b) the conditions of service under which teachers are employed; and
- (c) the funding of the Northern Ireland education system.

The salary structure

14 In most respects the Northern Ireland salary structure is identical to that in England and Wales. The same salary spines and management allowances are used. Northern Ireland does not have Advanced Skills teachers, Fast Track teachers or Assistant Principals. In England and Wales pay rates and hours of work are not negotiated; they are set by the Government following recommendations from the School Teachers' Review Body. In Northern Ireland there are negotiations between Employers and Teacher Unions which are fundamentally about contextualising the English and Welsh structure and pay rates to the Northern Ireland system.

Conditions of Service.

15 In England and Wales the main conditions of service are negotiated nationally with the employers and are contained in what is known as the Burgundy Book. There can then be some local minor variations.

In Northern Ireland conditions of service are broadly comparable and are negotiated centrally but there is no single compendium of these conditions. The last major change to Northern Ireland conditions of service was the Jordanstown Agreement of 1987.

Funding of Northern Ireland Education

16 Northern Ireland receives funding for public services from the Exchequer in London. Adjustments to existing funding totals are made largely via a long-standing mechanism known as the Barnett Formula. We are advised by the Department of Education that under this Formula, Northern Ireland receives a share of changes in the baselines of comparable English spending programmes. This percentage is based on the total Northern Ireland population as a percentage of the total English population and gives some 3.32% of changes to English spending baselines. The resultant Northern Ireland funding total is a block allocation and it is a matter for local decision by the responsible Minister, advised by the Department of Finance and Personnel, to determine how much will be allocated for expenditure on Education, Health and other essential services. This means that there is no guarantee that schools in Northern Ireland receive the same level of funding as their counterparts in England.

Implications of the funding mechanism for changes in teachers' salaries and conditions of service

17 Any movement for improvement in teachers' pay or conditions of service which would result in a break with parity and which would necessitate additional expenditure could only be met in a number of ways e.g.

- reduce the number of teachers or other education costs,
- secure for the education service a larger share of the Block, or
- raise more income through local taxation.

18 The DfES in England claims to be finding substantially increased funding for education and there has been much media attention and debate on the relative effectiveness of this at school level. Past decisions on teacher pay levels, the consolidation of the teacher main pay scale from nine to six points and the introduction of the new upper pay scale have all had a significantly inflationary impact on school costs. The new National Agreement for England and Wales on working conditions within schools, including a commitment to reducing the length of the working week, emerged in January of this year. A Steering Committee is considering the roll-out of this agreement and clearly this will further impact on school budgets and funding. At the time of setting the Northern Ireland 3-year spending plan this agreement was not in place in England and Wales. If these new measures were to be implemented here, any additional costs would have to be found by redistribution of funds within the Northern Ireland 3 year plan.

Evidence received on pay parity

19 In our request for evidence we asked the following questions:

- Should teachers in Northern Ireland continue to have pay parity with England and Wales?

- What are the arguments for and against continuing with this arrangement?
- If there is parity of pay should there also be parity of conditions of service?

20 The vast majority of respondents argued that parity of pay should be retained and that the present arrangements for conditions of service should also be retained.

The main reasons respondents gave for their views were:

- public sector workers in Northern Ireland generally have pay parity;
- parity of pay has generally served Northern Ireland teachers well;
- if pay parity is not maintained then teachers' salaries here would be likely to fall because there is not the same shortage of well qualified teachers as there is in England
- if there were lower salaries many of the best teachers might choose to leave, thereby reducing the quality of provision here; and
- abandonment of parity might also lead to inferior pension arrangements and conditions of service.

21 There was a strongly argued minority view that parity should be abandoned.

The main assertions for this view were that:

- Northern Ireland education had not been well served by replicating English models of provision where conditions are different;
- teachers' salaries and working hours in England and Wales and Northern Ireland do not compare well with teachers in the rest of Europe;
- the same amount of money could be divided up in Northern Ireland to give teachers' "Parity Plus";
- the new arrangements in Scotland, following the McCrone report, had led to improvements in salaries and conditions of service; and
- teachers' salaries do not compare well with the salaries of other graduates in the UK.

22 Those arguing for the abandonment of parity went on to suggest the nature of the changes they would like to see to pay and terms and conditions. Some of the changes suggested were:

- a salary scale for teachers rising to £35 000;
- automatic progression for teachers on the Upper Pay Scale as on the Main Pay Scale;
- automatic progression for principals and vice principals on their Individual School Ranges (ISR);
- the introduction of a 20 hour teaching week;
- introduction of a maximum 26 hour week;
- introduction of a 185 day year;

- the removal of the requirement for 1265 hours in which a teacher may be required to work in any one year;
- a reduction in class sizes;
- a limit of 5 hours per week that teachers could be required to stay in school after the school day;
- improved special and family leave provisions; and
- relief for teachers from routine administrative tasks.

23 Because one of the sets of proposals for replacing the parity arrangements was quite specific the Inquiry asked the Department of Education to provide indicative costs for their implementation. Since there were proposals for reductions in the working week, working year and teaching time it was assumed (and this was subsequently confirmed by the organisation concerned) that additional teachers would need to be employed if pupils were not to receive less teaching. The additional annual cost of this set of proposals was estimated to be about £285 million. The present annual cost of teachers' salaries is £750 million. In its verbal evidence the organisation suggested that the improvements they had asked for were a basis for negotiation and could be phased in, possibly over 5 years.

Other Factors

24 The first issue which we considered was whether a departure from broad parity of pay and conditions for teachers in Northern Ireland would lead to an improvement in the standard of education.

Those Unions which were in favour of a departure from parity appeared to suggest that a better paid workforce with better conditions would in itself lead to higher standards of performance. We were unable to find direct evidence to support this contention.

Evidence from the Department of Education Inspectorate (ETI) and from a publication prepared for an OECD country background report (Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers September/October 2002) indicate that in general the performance of the Northern Ireland education system compares favourably with that in England and Wales, since school leaver attainment rates are better. However this report also shows that 24% of the 16 to 65 age group are in the lowest level of competence in literacy, compared to 22% in GB and 23% in the Republic of Ireland.

25 Secondly, we considered whether the abandonment of parity would lead to better pay and conditions for teachers here. In our view the level of pay, should parity be abandoned, would probably depend on the supply/demand equation and the Government's view of what teachers should be paid in Northern Ireland.

26 Above inflation increases for teachers, the shortening of the main scale from nine points to six and the introduction of threshold assessment in recent years have significantly increased the cost of the teaching workforce, particularly for longer serving teachers. For example, a typical unpromoted teacher's salary point at the top of the Main Pay Scale was £23 193 at September 1999. This typical experienced teacher's salary point at April 2003 was £28 668 (including threshold) an increase of 23.6%. The shortening of the Main Pay Scale gave larger percentage increases to those who had more than six years service but were not yet at the maximum of that scale. In addition about 70% of teachers have management allowances ranging in value from £1 638 to £10 572.

27 It was suggested to us that the changes to the salaries and conditions of service of teachers in Scotland, following the implementation of the McCrone report, should be introduced in Northern Ireland. These changes included the introduction of a fixed working week for teachers, a reduction in teaching load, better clerical and administrative support and improvements in salaries. The Report also introduced the concept of the Chartered Teacher. This status would be achieved by successfully completing over time a series of tested professional development modules at considerable personal expense to the teacher.

The management structure was also changed. There would be a main grade and two management grades below that of head teacher and no management allowances are paid to classroom teachers. Chartered teacher scales are broadly similar to the Upper Pay Scale. The first year of employment for newly qualified teachers is guaranteed but not necessarily in a convenient locality. A winding down scheme is available for teachers who wish to reduce their workload before full retirement. These changes are being phased in over a number of years.

The evidence available to us, at this stage of the implementation, suggested that, if the equivalent of the McCrone proposals were implemented in Northern Ireland, while teacher workload would be reduced and more teachers and support staff employed at considerable cost, there might not be improvement in average teacher earnings compared to Northern Ireland since fewer teachers would be on management allowances. There was no evidence that the provision for pupils would be better or that there would be an improvement in educational standards.

Teacher Supply and demand

28 There is no general shortage of teachers in Northern Ireland. There are some shortages in particular subject areas and in particular localities. We have been told that the shortage subjects include some of the sciences, Technology, Mathematics Home Economics and Irish.

There are, in general, more teachers in Northern Ireland than there are permanent jobs for them. In a survey of teachers qualifying in 1998, published in August 2002 by Anne E Sutherland (NICER Research Unit), only 68% were in permanent teaching jobs 3 years after qualification. Of the remaining 32%, 26% were in long or short-term temporary contracts and 5% were not working. One year after qualification 37% were in permanent employment. It has been suggested to us that the increase in the use of temporary contracts partially reflects the uncertainty schools feel about their projected budgets and this restricts the availability of permanent posts.

Because less permanent posts are being made available for teachers than heretofore the Inquiry has been requested by some to recommend a scheme, similar to that in Scotland, which would guarantee newly qualified teachers at least one year of work. In our view the need for continuous employment during the initial year and the availability of consistent mentoring during early professional development is an essential part of establishing teaching excellence. We will return to this issue in Part 2 of our Final Report.

29 There is a high demand for places in Higher Education Institutions for most subject areas leading to a teaching qualification. For the academic year 2002/03 there were on average 5 applicants for each place. The standard for entry to a BEd course in Northern Ireland is considerably higher than in England and Wales with on average 20-22 points being required as opposed to 13-14 points at A-Level. For a PGCE course the usual qualification is a 2:1 Hons. degree.

30 We were told by the employers that, compared to the present day figure, it is forecast that there will be approximately 40 000 less children in schools in 10 years time. While it is acknowledged that such a forecast might prove unreliable, if it were to materialise there could be a significant fall in the demand for teachers.

Our Views

31 The overwhelming proportion of respondents argued that the present pay parity and conditions of service arrangements should be retained. Mindful of the evidence received, we concur with this view.

Those who argued for a departure from parity did so on the basis that there could be a subsequent improvement in teacher pay and conditions.

Given that:

- the present standard of Education is generally regarded as high;
- there is generally a high quality committed workforce;
- unlike the situation in England there is generally an adequate teacher supply; and
- no evidence has been presented that a major improvement in the achievements of pupils would result;

we are inclined to the view that a departure from parity would probably lead to a relative lowering of salaries for teachers in Northern Ireland compared to England. A lowering of salaries could mean that smaller numbers of highly qualified young people might wish to enter the teaching profession. In addition some of the most highly qualified teachers here might decide to move elsewhere for higher salaries and better career prospects.

In view of these factors we are not convinced that the radical step of a departure from parity would be in the best interests of either teachers or the young people in our education system.

Recommendation

32 We recommend that teachers' salaries in Northern Ireland continue to be based on parity with England and Wales and that the main terms and conditions of service should continue to be based on those applicable in England and Wales but contextualised to the particular circumstances of Northern Ireland

Raising Performance and Improving Effectiveness

33 Continuing rapid changes have been a feature of education for some years. These have arisen from:

- changes in Government policy for education;
- increasing requirements for better performance;
- demands for greater accountability of the system (to parents and the wider community); and
- advances in new technology and their influence on the teaching and learning process.

In addition there will be new pressures arising from proposed curricular changes and the proposed structural change to education in Northern Ireland following the Report on Post-Primary Education in Northern Ireland (Burns Report). All changes have to be managed and the School Development Plan (SDP) is the primary instrument for change management in school.

34 Staff require training and development to enable them to implement change and in recent years the introduction and use of the Staff Development and Performance Review (SDPR) scheme was intended to play an influential role. The primary objective of the SDPR scheme, introduced in September 1995, was to provide "high quality and well planned professional support and training" throughout teachers' careers. The scheme specifically excluded any link to pay, promotion or discipline of teachers. Its main aims were:

- to assist teachers in their professional development and career planning;

- to assist those responsible for taking decisions about the management of teachers;
- to enhance the quality of education for pupils;
- to recognise the achievement of teachers and to help them to identify ways of improving skills and performance;
- to help teachers having difficulties with their performance, through the provision of training and support; and
- to improve school management.

35 The SDPR scheme arose originally from a provision in the 1987 revision of terms and conditions to require principals, vice principals and teachers to take part in schemes for staff development and performance review. A pilot scheme was initiated in 1991 which ran for four years. In this pilot scheme the central tenets, processes and procedures were trialled in a range of schools. Following these trials the formal scheme started in September 1995. The scheme was to be phased in over five years and it was envisaged that by June 2000 all principals would have completed one (two year) cycle of SDPR and all teachers would have completed year one of the review cycle.

36 In 1997 the Management Group for SDPR asked the School of Education at Cardiff University to conduct an interim evaluation at a mid-point in its implementation. The findings of this review (An Interim Evaluation of the Teachers Staff Development and Performance Review Scheme in Northern Ireland) conducted by Alan Evans and Ken Jones, were published in May 1998. These broadly reported that the scheme was making a good start in helping schools to "widen their horizons in relation to professional growth and development" but that "Governors appeared to be unaware of the potential benefits and impact of SDPR on the operational life of the school."

37 The following year the then School of Education of Cardiff University was asked to carry out a further review and this review (SDPR Teachers' Staff Development and Performance Review. Report of the follow-up to the interim evaluation of the teachers' staff development and performance review scheme in Northern Ireland) by Alan Evans and Alan Dowler of the School of Education was completed in May 2000 and published in August of that year. The objectives set for this study were to review the outcomes of the previous report as a basis for:

- building on the positive aspects of the current SDPR scheme;
- identifying those aspects of the scheme that could be strengthened;
- exploring a range of possible options for modification; and
- formulating recommendations which might form the basis of an enhanced scheme.

In summary the principal recommendations were that:

- SDPR should be strengthened and integrated in a more coherent way within the systems and structures of the school;
- SDPR should be directly linked to the school development planning (SDP) process;
- targets and objectives arising from the process should in the main relate to or emanate from SDP;
- the outcomes should be more related to teaching and learning and to school improvement strategies;
- the process should become more a two way process for supporting the professional development of the teacher while at the same time ensuring maximum benefit to the school;
- the process should be an annual one; and
- management and training for the process should be improved.

38 As a result of this report, Management side of the TNC produced a modified scheme to be called School Development and Performance Management (SDPM). This new scheme had an added component in that it could be used as part of a body of evidence to inform pay decisions. In September 2001 a draft of this proposal was given to recognised trade unions. There was a considerable level of agreement to the use of the SDPR scheme, as proposed in the Evans/Dowler recommendations, as the basis for a performance management scheme. There was not agreement about the use of the tabled SDPM scheme to supply a body of evidence to enable pay progression. At a meeting of the Joint Working Party in March 2002 the Northern Ireland Teachers' Council rejected the proposal as tabled by management primarily, but not exclusively, because it was linked to pay. Following this breakdown in negotiations the Minister for Education announced the setting up of this Inquiry and the agreed terms of reference.

39 The proposed modifications to the SDPR scheme were also influenced by events in England and Wales. In August 1999 David Blunkett, the then Secretary of State for Education, wrote to the School Teachers' Review Body (STRB) setting out the issues to be examined in its year 2000 report. Among other issues it was to report on " a new pay structure for teachers with a performance threshold beyond which teachers may progress if they meet national standards that I would set to a new upper pay range, with progress to further points based on excellent performance". The STRB was to have regard to "the strategy for modernising the teaching profession ... and to the principles of good leadership, incentives for excellence, a strong culture of professional development and better support to teachers to focus on teaching." As part of this strategy the Government introduced a statutory Performance Management system in England and Wales from September 2000. It also accepted the STRB report of February 2000 which proposed the introduction of the UPS and the threshold procedure and these became effective from September 2000.

Evidence received

40 The evidence received by the Inquiry addressed the issue of performance management in some detail. The teacher organisations argued with different degrees of emphasis against the use of a performance management system directly linked to pay, mainly on the grounds that:

- an industrial model of performance management is not suitable for use in a teaching environment;
- there is a wide range of factors affecting schools which are not measurable; and
- such a system does not support colleagues working together.

These organisations did accept that a modified SDPR scheme could be used in schools and were generally supportive of the modifications which had been recommended by Evans and Dowler.

41 The Management side wished to see the introduction of a SDPM scheme and was supportive of a performance management model based on the review of SDPR conducted by Evans and Dowler. While there was some support for the view that the system could be used as part of a body of evidence to inform pay progression from September 2002, they too did not support the concept of direct linkage to pay.

Other Factors

42 Life long learning has become a necessary feature of life for all. Many teachers have embraced this view because their profession is one which encourages those in their care to expand their horizons and opportunities through the learning process. It would seem to us to be a contradiction if the teaching profession did not embrace this process through a review of individual teacher performance while, at the same time, recognising individual development needs and career aspirations.

43 The former Northern Ireland Teacher Education Committee in a report "A proposal for continuing professional development for teachers in Northern Ireland" published in August 2002 states "...taking part in continuing professional development is no longer an option; it is a professional obligation if the education service is properly to meet the needs of the community it serves." It goes on to state that "the truly professional teacher reflects upon and wishes systematically to improve his or her practice" and there is "the clear need for the teaching profession (to) continuously renew itself and its methods, and the assumptions upon which those methods are based."

44 Professional development of the teacher was the clear driving force for the SDPR scheme. However professional development is not an end in itself and this was recognised by Evans and Dowler in their evaluation of the SDPR scheme in May 2000. It has to meet the needs of the teacher at various stages

in his or her career and also meet the needs of the school in which the teacher is employed. Immediately after qualification there is the induction year followed by Early Professional Development (EPD) in the next two years. As the teacher becomes established the nature of professional development changes and is catered for through a Continuous Professional Development (CPD) process. For those who aspire to promotion to Principal there is now the Professional Qualification for Headship in Northern Ireland

45 The General Teaching Council for Northern Ireland has recently been established. While its primary functions relate to the registration of teachers it has a number of advisory functions and these include "the training, career development and performance management of teachers" (Paragraph 37(3b) of Statutory Instrument 1998 No 1759).

In March 2003 the Council issued a consultation document on the Guiding Principles of Continuous Professional Development. Among these principles are that:

- all teachers should have access to appropriate Professional Development Programmes during the course of their professional lives;
- Professional Development Programmes should promote a culture of respect for diversity and equality, supportive of the goal of social cohesion and commitment to the optimising of educational opportunities for all children and young people; and
- Professional Development Programmes should address not only individual needs but corporate, institutional and indeed regional priorities.

46 There is general acceptance that the professional development of the teacher has to be rooted in the school where he or she is teaching. The lack of a foundation in the needs of the school was the principal weakness of the SDPR scheme and led to the view that it should be amended to become SDPM.

The NITEC paper stated that :

- "SDPM should become the means by which principals and teachers identify and define development needs on a regular basis ("the what" of CPD);
- CPD should be the means by which identified needs and priorities can be met and taken forward ("the how" of CPD); and
- within this context, SDPM and CPD should be complementary and integrated."

47 In September 2000 Industry in Education produced a report "Milestone or Millstone? Performance Management in schools: Reflections on the experience in industry". This report showed through a series of case studies that parts of industry had teams of professionals who worked together in a

similar manner to teachers and that a performance management model could and should be used in Education. However there needed to be a suitable culture, appropriate and ongoing training and good communication between the participants. It pointed out that while salary decisions were taken separately from performance review and included other factors, they nonetheless took account of evidence gathered during the review. This report was critical of the haste with which the Department of Education in England had introduced the concept of performance management to schools and emphasised the necessity for the system to be in place for a period of time to achieve maximum benefit.

48 The Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) in England published a report "Performance Management of Teachers" based on school inspections in the Autumn term of 2001 and the Spring of 2002. This reported that while a majority of schools had introduced the new Performance Management Scheme one third of schools had not yet met the full statutory requirement. This reinforces the point that the introduction of such a system will take considerable time.

Our Views

49 There are two particular elements in our terms of reference to be taken into account in formulating our views.

These are:

- the structure of pay and conditions of service should be designed to promote and reward effectiveness in both teaching and school management; and
- [the need] to develop a framework which will support professional development of teachers consistent with the school development plan.

50 The Inquiry, after due consideration, concludes that there should be a system in schools in which there is continual self evaluation by teachers of their work and this should reflect and be aligned with the School Development Plan. This plan identifies the school's priorities and objectives and the work of staff should flow from these priorities.

The system should be based on an annual cycle and feature the following stages:

- planning where agreement is reached between the teacher and his/her team leader on objectives;
- monitoring performance including classroom observation; and
- an end of year review where performance is reviewed.

51 The evidence from the research, conducted by Industry in Education, is that rapidly introduced systems do not work. The introduction of a SDPM scheme takes time. There is no single ideal scheme; only a first step followed by continuous improvement, through on-going review and change. In

addition we believe that a performance management process should be put in place without any linkage to pay. This will reduce the anxiety teachers might have about the introduction of SDPM.

52 We believe that the TNC should accept as soon as possible a SDPM scheme not directly linked to pay and that management should arrange for effective training to be put in place so that schools may develop their individual SDPM policies by September 2004. The Inquiry team considers it unhelpful to have an explicit pay linkage to the annual cycle of objective setting and performance evaluation which should be designed to enable the truly professional teacher to reflect on and systematically improve his/her practice. We are confident that the successful introduction of such a scheme would be of substantial benefit to teachers in their work and professional development.

53 We consider that provision of training and development of all the participants in the scheme (governors, principals, senior managers/team leaders and teaching staff) should be put in place as a matter of urgency. An overlaid system of external quality assurance needs also to be put in place to ensure that the processes are carried out with rigour and consistency so that there is confidence in the outcomes. This would embrace both the training provided and the development of a school's internal processes. We also believe that there should be an arrangement for hands on support for those operating the scheme. Advisers should be made available to schools introducing the scheme and there should be sample checks of Review Statements to ensure that they are of a high standard.

54 We recommend the establishment of a School Development and Performance Management scheme consistent with the objectives set out in paragraphs 50 to 53.

Pay Progression

55 Given our recommendation on the maintenance of parity with the pay system applying in England and Wales, it was necessary to consider the structure of the system for pay progression in England and Wales as core evidence to the Inquiry.

Main Pay Scale Progression

56 Beginning teachers in Northern Ireland benefit from a structured approach to induction in the first year and early professional development in their second and third years. This is provided by the school along with the Higher Education Institutions and Education and Library Boards' Curriculum Advisory and Support Service (CASS). The level of support in their first years

is designed to consolidate professional practice and also helps to minimise teacher wastage. The proposed SDPM process, with the reviewer acting as 'critical friend', as set out in the Evans/Dowler report, should have the effect of sustaining the focus on the skills and professional development of the teacher and have the benefit of minimising the use of the unsatisfactory teacher procedure.

Evidence from both the teachers' side and the management side of the TNC and also from the Department of Education was in favour of regular annual progression up the Main Pay Scale. This is despite a provision in the draft SDPM scheme prepared by Management Side which suggested to the contrary.

Our Views

57 The Inquiry concludes that, for the Main Pay Scale, teachers should continue to expect an annual increment as long as they are not performing unsatisfactorily (demonstrated solely by the exercise of the unsatisfactory teacher procedure).

The Inquiry is aware of consideration being given to a possible change in practice in England and Wales. Our conclusion is that extending English practice to Northern Ireland to include, for example, double increments for excellent performance or limiting progression based on performance should not be contemplated for Main Pay Scale teachers before there is confidence in a new SDPM scheme among Boards of Governors, school leadership and teachers.

Recommendation

58 We recommend that, for the Main Pay Scale, teachers should continue to expect an annual increment as long as they are not in the unsatisfactory teacher procedure.

Upper Pay Scale Progression

59 In August 1999, following consultation on the Green Paper "Teachers: meeting the challenge of change", the then Secretary of State at DfES invited the School Teachers' Review Body (STRB) for England and Wales to examine and report on a new pay structure to come into place from September 2000 including: "a new pay structure for classroom teachers...with a performance threshold beyond which teachers may progress if they meet national standards that I would set to a new upper pay range, with progress to further points based on excellent performance."

60 The subsequent STRB report in February 2000 recommended the following upper pay scale parameters.

- The upper pay range should comprise five salary points.
- Teachers at the top of the pay spine who apply to cross the threshold to the new upper pay range and are assessed as meeting national performance standards being developed by the Government should be placed on the first point on that range.
- Further progression on the upper pay range should be at the discretion of the relevant body to recognise substantial and sustained performance and contribution to the school as a teacher. Points should not be awarded annually other than in exceptional circumstances, and normally at least two years should elapse between a teacher crossing the threshold and being awarded the next point above the threshold uplift.
- Once awarded the first point on the upper pay range should be a consolidated addition to pay and transferable if the teacher moves to another school.

The STRB also noted that it would consider the status of subsequent points in a further report.

These recommendations were accepted by the Secretary of State and implemented in England and Wales. The first cohort of teachers "crossed the threshold" in September 2000. Now more than 200 000 out of 507 000 teachers in England and Wales have crossed the threshold (STRB Twelfth Report January 2003 Paragraph 5.16), gaining a pay rise of approximately £2 000.

61 In September 2002 the first cohort became eligible for progression to point 2 on the UPS. The DfES produced guidance for schools in England as to how progression to point 2 on the UPS should operate. This stated that, "Progression on the upper pay scale is not automatic, but is at the discretion of the relevant body. Points may be awarded to recognise substantial and sustained performance and contribution to the school as a teacher. Normally, at least two years should elapse between a teacher being appointed to the first point on the upper pay scale after passing the threshold, and progressing to the next point on the upper pay scale. In addition to using the outcome of statutory appraisal reviews of performance to inform decisions on pay progression, the relevant body can also draw on other relevant evidence. The Secretary of State expects the relevant body to consider the totality of a teacher's work when reaching its decisions, bearing in mind the breadth of factors in the threshold standards. Objectives or targets for action form an important framework for assessing performance but there is no automatic link between meeting objectives or targets and the award of a pay point. A teacher who has made good progress on, but not quite achieved, a very challenging objective or target may have performed better and made a more significant contribution than a teacher who has met in full a less stretching objective or target."

62 At 1st April 2003 the Upper Pay Scale (England and Wales and Northern Ireland) was:

Scale Point	Annual Salary (£)	Increase from previous point (£)
U1	28,668	2,208(M6)
U2	29,730	1,062
U3	30,831	1,101
U4	31,968	1,137
U5	33,150	1,182

63 In Northern Ireland agreement was reached in 2001 on four standards for threshold assessment. These were:

- 1) core values, understanding of the curriculum and professional knowledge;
- 2) teaching and assessment of learning;
- 3) contribution to raising standards through pupil achievement; and
- 4) effective professional development.

64 Principals make the initial judgement on applications for Threshold Assessment submitted by eligible teachers in their schools. These judgements are verified by an external assessor. In the first round some 13 600 teachers met the standards with very few not meeting them. Threshold payments were backdated to 1st September 2000. At the present time further cohorts have brought the total of teachers through Threshold to approximately 15 000. This represents about two thirds of all teachers. This is a higher proportion than in England and Wales where just over 200 000 out of a total of 517 000 teachers have crossed the threshold.

65 We were told that the operation of Threshold increased bureaucracy and imposed additional workload on all involved. However this was partly due to the fact that a very large proportion of the Northern Ireland teacher workforce was eligible in the first year. We have also been told that many teachers found the process of reviewing their work and evaluating their professional competence and development extremely useful. This arises from the fact that there is no professional review process other than SDPR, which we are given to understand has practically ceased to operate in schools. The work involved for the leadership group has substantially decreased since there are now relatively small numbers of teachers in each new cohort.

Our View

66 If there was a properly operating SDPM scheme, which had the confidence of teachers, and was embedded in the school system there is a strong argument that the need for a separate threshold process would be diminished since much of the evidence that teachers have to produce now

would come from the SDPM scheme. Northern Ireland is not in that position and it will be some time before a robust scheme, which has the confidence of all, will be in place. Given these circumstances we believe that the threshold process should continue in its present form until the conditions for its amendment or abandonment are met.

Recommendation

67 The present threshold assessment process for determining whether a teacher should move to point one of the upper pay scale should continue to be used until an acknowledged robust SDPM policy is operating in schools.

Further Progression on the Upper Pay Scale

68 In England and Wales, Government guidance to schools (see paragraph 61 above) made it clear that schools would be expected to take account of the outcome of the new annual statutory performance reviews to inform their decisions on pay and progression on the Upper Pay Scale. In Northern Ireland there is no statutory performance management system for teachers. Nor has it been possible to reach agreement on a performance management scheme at the Teachers' Negotiating Committee.

69 Additionally the TNC in Northern Ireland has not agreed a process for progression on the Upper Pay Scale. The Inquiry team has specifically been asked to address this issue.

Evidence received

70 Organisations representing teachers generally promote the view that once a teacher has passed through the threshold, progression on the UPS should be automatic. Management side sees satisfactory outcomes from a performance management system being part of the body of evidence which informs decisions on progression. The Department of Education stated that there can be no movement for post threshold teachers to progress to point two on the UPS in the absence of performance management.

71 The Department of Education additionally stated that no funds have been made available to it to fund further movement on the UPS and that to enable the Department to bid for such funds, it must show that there is a performance management process in place. We were informed that current Government policy is that "funding follows reform".

Other Factors

72 The STRB in England has been asked by Government to advise on the progression process. Government was of the view that, while teachers who had passed the threshold would be eligible, except in exceptional circumstances, for movement no earlier than every two years, many teachers might proceed at a slower pace. It was also keen on a process where movement up the additional four points on the scale should be progressively

more difficult with a lower proportion of teachers reaching each subsequent step.

The teacher associations in England and Wales objected to this requirement. They argued that, when the Upper Pay Scale was being introduced, the then Secretary of State had indicated that the most competent teachers could get an initial £2 000 uplift and the chance to earn over £30 000 on performance.

73 The STRB recommended in its 2003 report (STRB Twelfth Report January 2003), where it was asked to comment on movement to points three, four and five of the UPS, that "decisions by schools on progression on the upper scale are:

- based on the criterion of substantial and sustained performance and contribution in the context of continuous improvement in the school;
- informed by the performance management system in the school; and
- take account of the fact that the rate of progression will vary between individuals." (Paragraph 5:19)

This statement is similar to its advice in previous years on the criteria for progression on the UPS.

Furthermore a report (Report on Research into Allowances and Pay Progression 12th May 2003) by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) for the STRB shows that major concerns of Headteachers in England were the lack of guidance on how progression on the UPS should work and a lack of confidence in their ability to make fine distinctions about teacher performance. In paragraph 5.13 the report states "The lack of guidance on the operation of the Upper Pay Scale, and especially conflicting advice from the Unions and the DfES on the interpretation of "substantial and sustained performance" is a concern of almost all Headteachers from the case study visits." Finding 18 of the report states that "The case study research confirmed that many Headteachers believe they are unable to objectively distinguish between the performance of teachers, to the extent envisaged in the objectives....."

74 Movement to U2 on the UPS in Northern Ireland in the near future cannot be informed by a performance management system. Teachers here would have been eligible for consideration at September 2002, had there been agreement on how it should be managed. The Department of Education has not and will not provide funds for movement to U2 in the absence of an SDPM scheme (see Paragraph 71).

Our Views

75 As pointed out above we accept that there should be an SDPM scheme. We do not accept the view that movement on the Upper Pay Scale should be automatic.

76 We believe that movement to U2 could be managed using an enhancement to the present threshold process. Progression could proceed using the existing standards but with the addition that the application must demonstrate "substantial and sustained performance and contribution by the teacher in the context of continuous improvement in the school."

77 The Inquiry team requested guidance from Alan Evans (University of Cardiff) on how the existing four threshold standards could be amended to ensure that the requirement of "substantial and sustained performance and contribution by the teacher in the context of continuous improvement in the school" could be met. His suggestions for amendments to the four standards are set out in Appendix 3 and we commend these to the TNC for consideration and agreement as a means for U2 assessment.

78 The decision on progression to U2 should be one for schools to take. We do not envisage a process of full-scale external validation as extensive as is used for the current threshold assessment. However to ensure that there is uniformity and consistency of assessment we believe that external assistance should be made available to schools which require it. In addition we consider that random samples of the assessment process documentation for U2 should be validated by external moderators/advisers.

79 In parallel with work on a performance management scheme, work should be progressed on our proposals for movement to U2. We regard these two measures as part of a single package since funding will not become available for UPS progression without the introduction of a performance management scheme.

80 We believe that when a fully operational and robust SDPM scheme is in operation in schools it should be used as part of the body of evidence (see paragraph 61) to inform decisions on pay progression on the Upper Pay Scale.

Recommendation

81 We recommend that processes, consistent with the objectives set out in paragraphs 75 to 80, be put in place to enable teachers to progress to U2. Furthermore these processes for UPS progression should only be initiated following agreement at TNC on a viable project plan to ensure that a performance management scheme and arrangements for its implementation are in place in schools by September 2004. Subject to agreement on the above at TNC we recommend that the process for those teachers eligible to progress to U2 be put in place with effect from September 2003.

The Leadership Group

82 The Leadership Group currently consists of principals and vice principals. There was a proposal that a category of Assistant Vice Principal be introduced but, with the collapse of the year 2000 negotiations in 2001, no

progress was made.

Principals are paid on a seven point scale based on the number of pupils on the school register at each Key Stage. Following our Interim Report vice principals are now paid on a five point scale which lies between the pay of the highest paid teacher in the school and the principal's ISR. Progression on the scales for the leadership group is based on the successful achievement of agreed objectives.

A survey conducted for our Interim Report showed that about half the leadership group progressed on the spine using performance objectives. We recommended in our Interim Report that Governors, in carrying out their mandatory annual review of teacher salaries, should set agreed performance criteria for principals and vice principals for the school year ahead and that when these criteria are assessed principals and vice principals should be informed of the outcome and the reasons for any decisions taken. (Paragraph 38 Interim Report)

In its evidence to the Public Accounts Committee in 2001 following the report of the Northern Ireland Audit Office (NIAO) on "Pay Flexibilities for School Principals and Vice Principals" published in November 2000 the Department of Education promised to put in place external advisers to assist Governors in their work of setting objectives and assessing the performance of the Leadership Group. We reaffirm that this should be done at an early date.

Our Views

83 We do not see the same difficulty in applying a performance management scheme to the Leadership Group as for classroom teachers. Many members of this group have, for a number of years, been rewarded on the basis of their performance and there is therefore considerable experience in some schools. Indeed the Education and Library Boards are in the process of providing a series of training seminars for Governors in the assessment of principals' pay. However it is clear that not all schools have the same level of expertise.

84 We consider that Governors should continue to use the existing system until agreement has been reached on a general SDPM scheme. Governors who require help and support should receive it from the external advisers which the Department has promised to introduce. Governors with appropriate training and support should then switch to using the new system as and from September 2004.

85 In Northern Ireland members of the Leadership Group who are successful in reaching the objectives set for them can be awarded an additional performance point on the Leadership Pay Spine. In England and Wales in its 2002 report the STRB recognised that there was a case for

permitting relevant bodies to award up to two performance points in any one year to reward very high quality performance by members of the Leadership Group. We recognise that a similar case can be made in Northern Ireland for members of this group. However we believe that it would be essential for relevant bodies who would wish to make use of this option to revisit the objectives they have set for the academic year 2003/04. The relevant body should ensure that these objectives set for the Leadership Group are sufficiently stretching to allow their achievement to warrant the award of two points for very high quality performance rather than the one point awarded for fully acceptable performance.

86 We will look at other aspects of leadership pay in the second part of our final report taking account of additional evidence we have received and the results of a survey we are having conducted on the implementation of our Interim Report.

Recommendation

87 We recommend that Governors should continue to use the existing system for leadership pay progression until September 2004 when it should be replaced by the agreed SDPM scheme.

While the award of one point for fully acceptable performance should remain we also recommend that two performance points may be awarded in any one year to a member of the Leadership Group when the relevant body considers that there is a very high quality of performance. This process can commence with the assessment of the revised objectives set for the year 2003/04.

Inquiry Terms of Reference

The Committee is requested to:

1. Inquire widely into how teachers' pay, promotion structures and conditions of service should be changed in order to support a committed, professional and flexible teaching force which will secure high and improving standards of school education for all children in Northern Ireland.
2. Examine specifically the impact of the implementation of the Pay Award 2000 on the salaries of principals and vice-principals and bring forward proposals as a matter of urgency and through an interim report.
3. Examine the existing negotiating machinery and make recommendations.

In framing recommendations, the Committee:

- (a) Should take into account the following principles:
 - parity and equivalence with pay levels for teachers in England and Wales
 - teachers' pay should be at a level to recruit, retain and motivate high quality teaching staff
 - there should be a clear and demonstrable link between additional pay for teachers and revised conditions and working practices, which meet the need for modernisation and higher standards
 - there should be opportunities for career advancement for teachers, especially teachers of acknowledged excellence, who wish to continue to deploy their skills in the classroom
 - the structure of pay and conditions of service should be designed to promote and reward effectiveness in both teaching and school management
 - develop a framework which will support professional development of teachers consistent with the school development plan

- management structures in schools should be sufficiently flexible to meet changing needs and challenges while ensuring effective delivery of the daily responsibilities of each school.
- (b). Must have regard to public expenditure issues including affordability and the implications of the Government's inflation target for the general level of public sector pay settlements.

In conducting its Inquiry, the Committee may wish to commission research and invite evidence.

Teachers' Pay and Conditions Inquiry Invitation to submit evidence

In June 2002 the Minister for Education, following a request from the Teachers' Negotiating Committee, set up an Independent Inquiry into Northern Ireland Teachers' Salaries and Conditions of Service under the chairmanship of Sean Curran CBE.

Since its establishment the members of the Inquiry team have been working on the second matter referred to it and intends to forward its interim report shortly to the Minister.

The Inquiry now wishes to invite interested parties to submit evidence on the general issue of salaries and terms and conditions of teachers in Northern Ireland and the operation of the negotiating machinery.

When the Inquiry team was having its initial discussions with key interests there were a number of themes which were often referred to as features of the NI system.

- Generally there is a high quality of education and there are well qualified teachers.
- There is not a problem in recruiting classroom teachers. However there are shortages in some specialist subjects.
- Most teachers leave the service before the statutory retirement age.
- NI produces more teachers than are needed and many young teachers find it difficult to get a permanent post. There are substantial numbers of teachers employed on a long term temporary basis.
- There is a growing problem of bureaucracy in the classroom and the school and teachers need help in dealing with this.
- There are fewer applicants for promotion to the post of principal than there used to be.
- The post of vice principal has a large range of uncertainty about it ranging from the salary paid, to the duties attached to the post in different schools.
- Teaching principals in small schools have a particularly difficult job.
- Pupil numbers are falling and will continue to do so for some time and this will further pressurise staff in small schools.
- The introduction of threshold payments has created some anomalies for the pay of principals and vice principals since they were introduced to reward class teachers. They are available to all who have management allowances (irrespective of their teaching commitment) but are not available to Vice principals or Principals in smaller schools both of whom may have a substantial teaching commitment.

- The present Teachers' Salary and Conditions of Service negotiation arrangements are not working as well as they might.
- Governors of schools have a heavy workload and they do not have the necessary training or support.

Taking these themes into account the following are issues on which the Inquiry would particularly wish to have evidence.

1 Have you any comments to make about the recommendations in our Interim Report (which will be available shortly) their implications or problems related to their application?

2 At present there is almost complete parity of pay for teachers in NI with teachers in England and Wales. Conditions of service are broadly similar but there are some differences. Should teachers in NI continue to have pay parity with England and Wales? What are the arguments for or against continuing with this arrangement? If there is parity of pay should there also be parity of conditions of service?

3 If parity is to be abandoned what differences should there be in the pay structure here and how would that pay structure contribute to the principles referred to in the terms of reference?

4 Do the present teacher promotion and school management structures properly meet the needs of schools and teachers?

5 Is there a need for changes in the nature and scope of the present conditions of service? What changes (if any) would you like to see in conditions of service and why?

6 The terms of reference state that "the structure of pay and conditions of service should be designed to promote and reward effectiveness in both teaching and school management" What are your views on how effectiveness can be promoted and rewarded?

7 What are your views on the development of "a framework which will support professional development of teachers consistent with the school development plan"? How can professional development of teachers be supported while keeping disruption of pupil learning to a minimum?

8 How can teachers be supported so that they are not diverted by bureaucratic and other requirements from their main job in the classroom of promoting the learning of their pupils? What duties, currently being carried out by teachers, could be done by others?

9 What are the reasons for the apparent fall in the number of applicants for principal posts and how can this trend be reversed?

10 How can the teaching principal in small schools be better supported?

11 Should there be changes to the way in which teachers' salaries and conditions of service are currently dealt with? If parity with England and Wales is to continue is there a case for following the recommendations of the School Teacher Review Board in detail and eliminating local negotiations? If parity were to be retained should there be changes to the present negotiating machinery to make it work more effectively? Should the Department of Education, which is not an employer, have seats on the negotiating body? If it does not have seats, but continues to be the provider of funds how best can it exercise its function?

12 If parity was not retained what local negotiating arrangements should there be? Would you support negotiations at school or employer level? Would you support the establishment of a Northern Ireland Teacher Pay Review Board with powers similar to the Board for England and Wales?

13 Should there be any changes to the role which governors currently play in setting the salaries which the leadership group receive or in monitoring the effectiveness of the work of teaching and school management?

The questions above are intended as a general guide around which respondents can structure their responses. It is not a definitive list of all the issues which impact on the salaries and conditions of service of teachers. Respondents should feel free to expand on the range of topics which should be addressed by the Inquiry so long as these are relevant to salaries and terms and conditions.

Evidence should be sent to Frank Horisk, Inquiry Secretary c/o The Regional Training Unit, Black's Road, Dunmurry, Belfast BT10 0NB not later than December 20th 2002. (later amended to 31st January 2003)

The Northern Ireland original threshold standards and the proposed enhanced standards for progression to Upper Pay Scale point 2

1 Core values, understanding of the curriculum and professional knowledge

The original standard: Teachers are effective professionals who have a thorough and up to date knowledge of their subject(s) and who take account of wider curriculum developments, which are relevant to their work.

The enhanced standard: Teachers are effective professionals who take active steps to ensure that they have a thorough and up to date knowledge of: their subject(s); the teaching of their subject(s); wider curriculum developments; and who are able to demonstrate that they integrate their knowledge of their subject(s); and of current developments into their teaching.

2 Teaching and assessment of learning

The original standard: Teachers consistently and effectively plan to meet pupils' individual learning needs using a range of appropriate learning and teaching strategies with effective monitoring and evaluation of pupils' learning.

The enhanced standard: Teachers consistently and effectively plan their teaching drawing on a range of appropriate learning and teaching strategies to meet pupils' individual learning needs. They teach effectively, assessing learning on a regular basis and evaluating the outcomes of the assessments to further improve their teaching strategies and to ensure effective learning.

3 Contribution to raising standards through pupil achievement

The original standard: As a result of the teacher's work, pupils continue to achieve in a manner consistent with targets set by the school in the light of relevant information.

The enhanced standard: The work of teachers results in measurable improvements in the standards achieved by the pupils, as evidenced by learning and assessment outcomes, which meet or exceed challenging targets set by the school.

4 Effective Professional Development

The original standard: Teachers take responsibility for their professional development and use the outcomes to improve their teaching, pupils' learning and to make an active contribution to the policies and aspirations of the school.

The enhanced standard: Teachers set clear objectives for their professional development in the light of their analysis of the aspects of their own teaching and the achievement of their pupils, which needs improvement, taking into account the context of the current development requirements of the school. The outcomes of their professional development are evidenced in the improvement in their teaching and in pupils' learning and in the contribution which they make to realising the policies and aspirations of the school.

TEACHERS' PAY & CONDITIONS OF SERVICE INQUIRY

FINAL REPORT - PART 1
Parity, Performance & Progression
June 2003