

# British Association of Teachers of the Deaf

Gillian Barton  
STRB Secretariat  
Office of Manpower Economics  
Victoria House  
Southampton Row  
London. WC1B 4AD

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> June 2013

Dear Gillian

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1. The British Association of Teachers of the Deaf (BATOD) welcomes this opportunity to submit representations and evidence to the School Teachers' Review Body (STRB).
- 1.2. BATOD has the unique position of being the only professional body which represents the interests of Teachers of the Deaf (ToDs) in the United Kingdom. BATOD members work in a range of situations and locations, not only in LA schools. Furthermore, the ToDs' specialist role operates in a very wide age range context: from the point of very early diagnosis (via the New-born Hearing Screening Programme) to Further and Higher Education settings.
- 1.3. ToDs are essential in providing and promoting curriculum access for learners who are deaf (we use this term to include all degrees of hearing loss). In mainstream school settings, the intervention of a ToD is essential in promoting high achievement towards social and educational outcomes. This is in line with the Coalition's recommendations in the DfE Business Plan 2011 - 2015 (ref: Impact Indicators – 'narrowing the gap' [p22]). Additionally, ToDs have a crucial role in supporting the Coalition's Early Intervention initiatives as outlined in the DfE Business Plan 2011-2015. ToDs are represented in every Local Authority in England and carry out essential intervention to deaf learners across the entire educational age range. ToDs work within both the maintained and non-maintained sectors. Early Intervention is a key function of ToDs and they work in partnership with NHS and social care services. ToD involvement in early diagnosis and intervention is assessed through a Quality Assurance programme carried out by National NHS consultants.
- 1.4. We would also draw attention to the fact that the context of the work of many ToDs is very similar to that of teachers of learners with other low incidence special educational needs, for example; teachers of children with visual impairment, multi-sensory impairment, and profound and multiple learning difficulties.

## 2. Questions covered in this submission, as referred to in your email of April 2013, and matters for recommendation as proposed by the Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Education, in his letter of 17<sup>th</sup> April 2013.



email: [exec@batod.org.uk](mailto:exec@batod.org.uk)  
website: [www.batod.org.uk](http://www.batod.org.uk)  
telephone: 0845 6435181

21, Keating Close, Rochester  
Medway, Kent ME1 1EQ

# British Association of Teachers of the Deaf

## Questions for consultees to cover in evidence (STRB secretariat)

### Framework for school leaders' pay

- 1 What are the *main problems* with using the current leadership pay framework to determine the pay of a head teacher:
  - (a) of a single school;
  - (b) of a federation or other arrangement under which the head has responsibility for more than one school; and
  - (c) making a wider contribution to system leadership?
- 1.1 The current pay structure on the leadership spine includes salary scales which reach a maximum of £105,097 (£112,181 for inner London). Currently pay awards for head Teachers is related to size of school (as determined by pupil numbers). However, within the current arrangements there is afforded some latitude in determining Head Teachers pay with regard to other factors. Governing bodies have the power to offer salaries which exceed the recommendation (based on current criteria) and award pay accordingly. This is determined within strict criteria and cannot exceed the maximum (L43)

Given the increasing demands Head Teachers are faced with in relation to: proposed performance related pay; federated schools, Academies; curriculum and exam changes, current maximum salaries may no longer be appropriate. Increased demands in response to the government's initiatives may not carry the remuneration required to progress them.
- 2 How best can the pay framework *balance flexibility* for governing bodies to determine leaders' pay taking account of the particular circumstances of the school and expectations that the national framework should provide for a degree of *consistency* in the treatment of similar posts between schools?

Flexibility for governing bodies to determine leaders' pay and at the same time trying to provide consistency across the UK, will be very difficult to establish. A system of moderation may assist governing bodies in determining a *pay range* in which a post should operate.
- 3 Assuming some kind of framework for governing bodies to use,
  - (a) what are the *main factors or criteria* that should be considered in determining the relative job weight and therefore the pay of a head teacher?

Current guidance recognises a number of factors that assist in determining leaders'



# British Association of Teachers of the Deaf

pay scales. Under current government proposals, we would like to see further consideration taken of additional factors as described above (1.1)

(b) how should the pay framework take account of leadership responsibilities and accountabilities of head teachers?

We would expect to see increased salaries in response to increased responsibilities and accountabilities. This would need to be determined by the governing body and be subject to national moderation as described above (2.2)

(c) What factors should determine performance-related pay progression for head teachers?

This is a difficult area. Ofsted decisions on the performance of a school do not always reflect the performance of the Head Teacher (and this is detailed in the final report). We do not agree, therefore, to this being used as a measure of performance and pay.

A measure which links the demography of the school population to leaders' pay would be more valid. A measure of 'job weight' needs to be established which reflects the relative demands of each post.

- 4 What factors or criteria should be considered in determining pay of other school leaders, bearing in mind the variety of roles in leadership teams, including the traditional Deputy/Assistant roles and those who might be leaders in teaching or in other e.g. business or pastoral roles, where the post-holders may not be qualified teachers?

Current systems and practices are already in place and should be retained as a basis for further refinement against performance related pay. Additional, more demanding, aspects of the role would need to be considered when determining pay of different roles and different personnel.

## Governance arrangements

- 5 What advice, support and structures do *governing bodies* need in assessing appropriate pay for school leadership teams?

Governing bodies will need extensive advice and training to ensure the decisions they make are robust. We would advocate a national framework as proposed by the NUT/NASUWT through their 'checklist'.

## Allowances for classroom teachers

- 6 What is the rationale for retaining separate allowances in the pay framework?



# British Association of Teachers of the Deaf

As recognised, the most widely used allowances are SEN and TLR. These have been in place for a number of years (TLR replacing Management Allowances) and represent clear demarcation of roles and responsibilities. We are in agreement with some allowances being assimilated into the leadership spine (i.e. AST and ET). SEN allowances particularly, represent a clear responsibility to ensure the most vulnerable pupils receive high quality intervention from specialist teachers. Teachers of the Deaf are one of a number of specialists in this group.

- 7 Of the current allowances provided for in the STPCD the most commonly used are TLRs and SEN allowances:

(a) what practical problems arise for schools in using these allowances?

With the recent changes in the way SEN children are identified and determined, setting an allowance to support these children may be problematic. Quantification of SEN on the school role now relies on the proxy measure of a deprivation index. This is unlikely to truly reflect the number of pupils on roll who require additional support in order to achieve their potential.

Services for deaf children carry caseloads of children who meet the classification of SEN. It is therefore fitting that teachers who have the responsibility to support deaf pupils be awarded the SEN allowance. This is currently the case and we recommend it remains so.

(b) are there simpler approaches which would help schools reward teachers appropriately for these responsibilities?

In our view, the system of allocation of SEN allowances is clear and robust and should not change. It is essential that the needs of deaf children are met by Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification and this system supports that by rewarding those teachers on completion of their additional training. We would support any exploration of extending the requirement for a mandatory additional qualification (currently limited to those teachers working with children and young people with sensory impairments and SENCos new to the post) to teachers working with other groups such as children with autism.

TLR payments rightly focus on pupils' progress and are linked to management of staff promoting that aim. There is some latitude in the allocation of TLR allowances which allows Head Teachers to award TLRs to teachers who fulfil the criteria.

8. How should the pay framework for *middle leaders, including heads for department*, be developed? For example, should some roles be rewarded within the leadership framework, rather than through TLRs?

Clearly, the range of salaries on the current leadership scale would accommodate those teachers who are currently receiving a TLR allowance. However, the leadership 'allowance' lacks the focus of a TLR payment and may be used over a range of tasks rather than aimed specifically at pupils' progress. We would caution



# British Association of Teachers of the Deaf

- against the use of the leadership scale used in this way.

## Safeguarding

- 9 Safeguarding (or a similar mechanism) is used in many organisations to protect an individual's pay for a limited period.

(a) What do you regard as the main rationale for safeguarding in the teaching profession?

We feel that safeguarding should remain for teachers who are moved to a lower salary as a result of reorganisation. Safeguarding may not be appropriate in all cases and this is something the Head Teacher and Senior Management Team would need to assess. BATOD believes the impact of an instant reduction of salary, as a result of reorganisation, would be demotivating and have a negative impact on pupil progress. The notion that salaries can be changed 'at a whim' would be detrimental to the teaching profession in general and would deter graduates from joining it.

(b) What is your view of the current safeguarding arrangements?

Current safeguarding of three years is appropriate.

(c) Are there alternative approaches which might give schools greater flexibility whilst maintaining appropriate protection for individuals?

No comment

## Non-pay conditions of service

- 10 Are there any features of the current conditions framework which may need reform, for example, to improve schools' ability to meet pupil needs by delivering teaching and learning most effectively, without placing undue burdens on teachers?

No comment

- 11 What are the key issues for teachers around working hours? Is there evidence of best practice in schools in managing time such that excessive working hours are minimised?

As professionals, teachers are self-managing and have a responsibility to ensure that they are able to meet the demands of the post whilst maintaining a 'work-life balance'. Excessive demands should be managed through the line manager.

- 12 Can you provide relevant examples of how other organisations employing graduate professionals in roles with a high degree of "client" facing, or "front line" contact, strike an appropriate balance between individual and organisational needs in setting terms and conditions?

There are many such examples within both the public and private sector and focusing on one or two may not be appropriate. We feel that professionalism needs to be maintained and reinforced within the teaching profession and sensible steps taken (through line management) to ensure that individual and organisational aims



# British Association of Teachers of the Deaf

are truly shared. The *pace* of change in education at the present time is unprecedented and carries the risk that pupil progress will be compromised.

## **Matters for recommendation – Rt Hon Michael Gove MP**

- a) how to provide a simplified and flexible framework for ensuring schools leaders' pay is appropriate to the challenge of the post and their contribution to their school or schools.

There exists a conflict between offering governing bodies the flexibility to set individual salaries and the imperative to maintain parity across England and Wales. As stated above (1.1) we feel that a national framework for Head Teachers' salaries (in fact, all teachers' salaries) should be maintained.

- b) how the current detailed provisions for allowances, other pay flexibilities and safeguarding could be reformed to allow a simpler and more flexible STPCD;

We are in agreement with a simple and flexible STPCD. Clarity is an important factor to be included in any revised STPCD. However, we are mindful that any revised document include all conditions that teachers are required to work under. Teachers of the Deaf (and, by implication, those teachers working in a similar 'low incidence' field) represent a small group of specialists who need to be considered in any revised STPCD.

- c) how the framework for teachers' non-pay conditions and service could be reformed to raise the status of the profession and support the recruitment and retention of high quality teachers and raise standards of education for all children.

BATOD believes that teachers, as professionals, have a role to play in the maintenance and promotion of teaching as a worthy profession. In our view, given the demands of the role, any further erosion of salaries is likely to have a negative impact on recruitment and retention.

## **Summary**

BATOD looks forward to receiving details of the outcome of this consultation process in due course and reiterates its willingness to participate further if required.

With best wishes

**Paul Simpson, National Executive Officer, BATOD**



email: [exec@batod.org.uk](mailto:exec@batod.org.uk)  
website: [www.batod.org.uk](http://www.batod.org.uk)  
telephone: 0845 6435181

21, Keating Close, Rochester  
Medway, Kent ME1 1EQ