

Secretary of State's Response to the School Teachers' Review Body (STRB) Thirty Second Report 2022

Response of the Association of School and College Leaders

- 1 The Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) represents over 21,500 education system leaders, heads, principals, deputies, vice-principals, assistant heads, business managers and other senior staff of state-funded and independent schools and colleges throughout the UK. ASCL members are responsible for the education of more than four million young people in more than 90% of the secondary and tertiary phases, and in an increasing proportion of the primary phase. This places the association in a strong position to consider this issue from the viewpoint of the leaders of schools and colleges of all types.
- 2 ASCL welcomes the opportunity to make a written response to the Government's proposals following the STRB's recommendations to the 32nd Remit. This submission is in addition to the joint statement we have sent in partnership with the NAHT, NASUWT, NEU and Community.

Timeliness of the process

- 3 It was disappointing to see that yet again, the remit was not issued until the very end of the Autumn Term, on 17 December 2021.
- 4 It was even more disappointing that this was so delayed considering that the 3-year spending review was announced on 27 October in which the pay freeze for the public sector was lifted.
- 5 Consultees were initially issued with a deadline for submission of their evidence of 16 February 2022. On 27 January 2022 consultees were informed that the DfE was unlikely to meet the initial deadline and that it was likely to be delayed, with a potential new deadline of 4 March quoted. This deadline was confirmed on 3 February 2022.
- 6 This delay meant that the timescales for the other elements of the process (submission of supplementary evidence and oral evidence sessions) would also be delayed. The deadline for submission of supplementary evidence was pushed back from 9 March to 25 March and oral evidence sessions were pushed back from week commencing 28 March to 21-29 April.
- 7 The process was then delayed further due to the political turmoil in early July and the resulting changeover of Secretary of State for Education twice in as many days.

- 8 Whilst we acknowledge that the report and Ministerial Response were still able to be published prior to the parliament rising for summer, if the remit had been issued earlier in the Autumn Term as it should, and could, have been then the report and response would already have been published.
- 9 ASCL, along with the majority of consultees, have repeatedly voiced our concerns over the report being published at the end of the summer term, and indeed sometimes at the start of the holidays when many schools have finished for the summer break.
- 10 The table below shows the dates¹ that the report has been published since 2014. There is clear slippage in the date since 2015, and it has now become the norm for the publication to be late July.

STRB Report	Date Published
23rd Report	13 February 2014
24th Report	10 June 2014
25th Report	12 March 2015
26th Report	6 July 2016
27th Report	10 July 2017
28th Report	24 July 2018
29th Report	22 July 2019
30th Report	21 July 2020
31st Report	21 July 2021
32nd Report	19 July 2022

- 11 This creates unnecessary and unacceptable workload and stress for school leaders and is totally out of time with the requirements they face with regards to budget setting and approval.
- 12 This year has had particular impact on school leaders due to the pay award being significantly higher than the one included in the Department's proposal yet no additional funding to accompany it.
- 13 This was shortly followed by the NJC pay offer for support staff, with a £1,925 award proposed to all published pay points, representing an increase ranging from 10.5% to 4.04%. This award will be backdated to 1 April 2022 and again, accompanied with no additional funding.
- 14 School leaders were also expecting a multi-year award which would help to give them some certainty over future budget plans. But despite the STRB making recommendations for multi-year awards as requested in the remit, only the recommendation for the 2022/23 award has been accepted by the Secretary of State, with no real rationale given for this rejection of the 2023/24 award.
- 15 There will now be another remit set for the pay award for 2023/24 duplicating much of the work that has already been carried out and creating even more uncertainty for school leaders when revisiting their budget planning.

¹ [Independent reports by the STRB, OME](#)

- 16 We include further information on the issue of affordability and the lack of any additional funding in our next section.
- 17 Below are just a few examples of the immediate responses from our members:
- *I would like to echo your own concerns about this report - firstly in terms of the negative impact this pay award will have on recruitment and retention but, more pressingly, on the £70k black hole this unfunded pay award will blow in our budget one day before the end of term. Combined with the rise in energy bills, this means we will almost certainly now post a deficit budget as we have no way of responding so close to the end of term. Dispiriting and, frankly, outrageous.*
 - *We had budgeted a 3% increase for more experienced teachers and leaders for 2022-23. The decision to accept the STPCD award but not give schools additional funding for the increase to 5% will now mean that we will almost certainly be back to a cumulative deficit position. This is because I can't see how at this stage with the budget already set, agreed by trustees and submitted to ESFA, that we can avoid going from a project surplus of £25k to a huge in year deficit, as the unbudgeted pay costs will add at least £300k in unplanned expenditure. Our projected surplus was already set at a much lower level than we hoped due to having to absorb a £300k increase in energy costs*
 - *Let's set aside the fact it is not enough and unfunded – that is ridiculous enough. Let us instead focus on the timing, the absolute ridiculousness of the timing. The government issues us endless guidance – some of it rather good – on prudent financial management. This drives me to plan well; train my Heads in curriculum-led financial planning; to hold my heads to account; to have some pretty tough conversations about 'sticking to the rules'. We sweat over the minutia of our budgets, strive for alignment, squeeze every penny. And then, just a few days after our final board meeting to approve the second draft of our budget following their careful scrutiny, the goalposts are moved not just a few yards, but into another county...and the game has suddenly become charades rather than football. Seriously, what is the point trying to do this well? Our budgets are now utter nonsense. Nonsense!*
 - *A teacher pay rise/cut without funding will further increase pressure on headteachers and staffing. It is a twofold blow at the end of a very challenging year. All of our schools (cross-phase/different sizes) have struggled to set budgets this year and have already taken unenviable strategic decisions (such as not replacing staff; leaving schools running on skeleton staffing structures) in order to compensate for increased inflationary resource costs and the unprecedented rises in energy. Although we projected some increase to teacher pay in school budgets, the unfunded pay increases announced yesterday will send several schools into deficit.*
 - *Makes a total nonsense of budgeting - maintained schools already 5/12 through the year and academies have agreed and are submitting their budgets now.*

- *The STRB announcement arrived the same day as the reminder to submit our 3 year budget forecast to ESFA... which is now a work of fiction and the figures are out of date! It would be great if they could make the decisions before we have to finalise the budget!*

- 18 Writing this section brings with it a foreboding sense of déjà vu, as much of this has been said several times before but has clearly been ignored by the government.
- 19 It simply cannot continue to be the case that consultees repeatedly raise this as an important issue on behalf of their members yet nothing happens. Action must be taken to ensure that this is addressed for future remits.

Matter for recommendation

- **An assessment of the adjustments that should be made to the salary and allowance ranges for classroom teachers, unqualified teachers and school leaders to promote recruitment and retention, within the bounds of affordability across the school system as a whole and in the light of my views on the need for an uplift to starting salaries to £30,000.**
- 20 ASCL does not support differentiated pay awards and we have made our position clear that whilst we are supportive for the increase in starting salaries to £30,000, any uplifts must also be applied to all points within all pay ranges and allowances.
- 21 Starting salaries cannot continue to be increased in isolation and at the expense of experience teachers' and school leaders' pay.
- 22 We have previously voiced our concerns about the level of competitiveness of a £30,000 starting salary by the time the increase is implemented, and this is the case even more so now.
- 23 Graduate starting salaries are increasing, and inflation is at a 40-year high, wiping out any value that may have previously been attached to the significant proposed increases.
- 24 Even at 8.9%, the increase to the minimum of the Main Pay Range in England represents a real terms cut alongside RPI forecasts of 11.8% in July 2022 when the award was announced.
- 25 For experienced teachers and school leaders this represents a real terms cut of almost 7%.

Matter for recommendation

- **Recommendations for the pay awards for both 2022/23 and 2023/24.**
- 26 We were pleased to see that the STRB felt it was necessary and appropriate to exceed the government's proposed pay increases for experienced teachers and school leaders, but this did not go far enough.

27 In February 2022 the Bank of England Monetary Policy Committee predicted CPI to “peak” at 7.25% in April 2020 and then fall back to normal levels over the following two years.²

28 In March 2022 the OBR predicted CPI to be as follows (see table 1)³:

Table 1: OBR CPI forecast for 2022-23

2022 Q1	2022 Q2	2022 Q3	2022 Q4	2023 Q1	2023 Q2	2023 Q3	2023 Q4
5.786	7.716	7.476	8.731	8.086	3.523	3.350	1.454

29 The Monetary Policy Committee report in May 2022⁴ estimated a CPI of 10.25% in Q4 2022 whereas the same committee’s report in August 2022⁵ estimates Q4 CPI to be 13%.

30 The STRB report was written in June 2022 and references the MPC’s May estimate of 10.25% CPI in Q4. Since then all inflation indices have moved significantly upwards.

31 Predictions by the OBR in March for RPI were notably higher than CPI as table 2 below shows:

Table 2 – OBR CPI and RPI predictions

	2022 Q1	2022 Q2	2022 Q3	2022 Q4	2023 Q1	2023 Q2	2023 Q3	2023 Q4
RPI	8.07	10.20	9.95	10.99	9.95	5.09	4.69	2.62
CPI	5.786	7.716	7.476	8.731	8.086	3.523	3.350	1.454

32 These predictions for RPI were made in March 2022 before increases to interest rates introduced by the MPC so will not only be higher in reality due to underestimating inflation but also because of higher housing costs (included in RPI but not CPI) due to higher mortgage costs. Higher mortgage costs will act as a longer term RPI inflationary pressure due to the nature of medium term fixed rate mortgages.

33 Further confirmation of the likely high level of inflation is provided by the July 2022 HM Treasury comparison of forecasts for 2023, which predicts a range of RPI in Q4 of 1.9% to 9.6%.⁶ The median RPI of all the predicted forecasts is 4.1% and the average of the newest predictions in the report is 5.4%.

34 As stated in paragraph 25, the proposed award of 5% represents a significant real terms pay cut, and this comes on the back of another public sector pay freeze, the third pay freeze since 2010.

35 It seems bizarre then that these pay awards have been banded about as being the highest increase for teachers for thirty years⁷ when in reality, for the

² <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/monetary-policy-report/2022/february-2022>

³ <https://obr.uk/forecasts-in-depth/the-economy-forecast/inflation/#CPI>

⁴ <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/monetary-policy-report/2022/may-2022>

⁵ <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/monetary-policy-report/2022/august-2022>

⁶ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1092359/Forecomp_July_2022.pdf

⁷ [Secretary of State’s written statement 19 July 2022](#)

majority of the teaching workforce, they represent the biggest real terms cut in decades.

- 36 Year on year, evidence from consultees and the STRB shows that the recruitment and retention crisis is worsening.
- 37 As we highlighted last year, the 31st Report states⁸ that in oral evidence the Secretary of State said he was confident that the wider economic context would ease recruitment challenges. It was our view at the time that this confidence was misplaced, and this has proved to be the case.
- 38 Although the overall target for ITT applications was met in 2021/22, the overall figure masked some serious issues in some secondary subjects, with just 82% of the overall secondary target met.⁹
- 39 Data on ITT applications up to July 2022¹⁰ show that the situation this year is looking even more dire, with overall applications at various stages being lower than similar stages in 2019.
- 40 In our response to the 31st Report we noted that the Review body '*would also support a review of the existing leadership pay framework, including the factors determining pay for school leaders, the issue of pay differentials between the teacher and leadership pay ranges, and the leadership roles covered by the pay structure.*' which we hoped to see included in this year's remit.
- 41 We continue to make the case for the need for a significant increase for school leaders for several years, highlighting the diminishing differentials between the teacher and leadership pay ranges, yet in spite of recommendations from the Review Body, this area has been consistently overlooked.
- 42 In the next section we include results from our recent member survey on pay which provides strong evidence in relation to this.
- 43 We are pleased to see that the Review Body also recognises this and that it has included it as one of its most pressing areas for review as part of future priorities.
- 44 This issue cannot continue to be ignored by the Department and must now be included in the remit for the 33rd Report.

ASCL Member Pay Survey

- 45 ASCL surveyed its members in scope of the STRB recommendations over the last week of August and the beginning of September. In total 13,693 members were invited to complete the survey with 2,203 responses. This is a response rate of 16% and is notably higher than pay surveys carried out previously.
- 46 The survey data contains compelling evidence that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the remuneration of teachers and school leaders and that pay is a significant issue with regard to recruitment and retention.

⁸ STRB 31st Report (pg 64, para 4.6)

⁹ Initial Teacher Training Census 2021-22

¹⁰ Monthly statistics on initial teacher training (ITT) recruitment

- 47 When asked “does your salary have any bearing on your intentions to stay in or leave the teaching profession?” 59.1% of respondents answered that their salary has an impact on them remaining in the profession.
- 48 Of those respondents (1,302 in total), a significant majority indicated that their decision to leave the profession would be altered if pay was to increase in real terms in the future. Table 1 below contains the data from the survey.

Table 1 – responses of school leaders who indicated that pay is a factor on their intentions to stay in or leave the profession.

Please indicate your intentions in the circumstances below (answer the scenario/ scenarios that most apply):						
		Leave in the next year	Leave in 2-3 years time	Leave in 4-5 years time	Stay in the profession	Response Total
1	Pay continues to decline in real terms	162	599	409	131	1301
2	Pay remains broadly the same	96	320	510	352	1278
3	Pay improves in real terms	21	78	149	1034	1282

- 49 Table 1 indicates that only 10% of respondents would stay in the profession beyond 5 years if pay continues to decline in real terms. This figure jumps to 80% of respondents stating that they would stay in the profession beyond 5 years if pay was to improve in real terms.
- 50 The potential destinations of those who intend to leave are shown in Table 2 below. This shows that at least two thirds (67.7%) are destined for either a role outside of education or early retirement.

Table 2 – potential destinations of school leaders who indicated that pay is a factor on their intentions to stay in or leave the profession

If you do leave, what will your next role be? (choose one only)			
		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Another role within education (not teaching or leadership)	25.1%	327
2	Another role outside education	47.8%	624
3	Normal retirement	2.3%	30
4	Early retirement	19.9%	260
5	Other (please specify):	4.9%	64
answered			1305

- 51 Exactly 75% of all respondents to the survey indicated that other factors also impact on their intentions to stay in or leave the profession. It would appear that nothing has changed since ASCL’s survey of members in February 2021, which showed similar results. The factors impacting on respondents in terms of their

intention to stay in or leave the profession are shown in table 3 below.

Table 3 – Factors other than pay that impact on school leaders’ intentions to stay in or leave the profession

Please indicate which factors prompt you to consider leaving the teaching profession (choose all that apply to you):		
Answer Choice	Response Percent	Response Total
Exhaustion/fatigue	67.5%	1117
Unsustainable workload/working hours	66.5%	1100
Lack of recognition/respect from the government	57.3%	947
Stress	53.3%	882
Wellbeing	51.6%	854
Accountability measures	50.1%	828
Government education policy	50.0%	827
Pressure from funding restraints	49.2%	814
Lack of recognition of role/profession	38.4%	635
Impact of covid	13.2%	219
Other (please specify):	11.6%	192
Limited career progression	4.1%	68
<i>answered</i>		1654

- 52 There is much that can be done through the STRB remit and the associated provisions of the STPCD to address a number of the concerns identified in table 3. This is further evidence to demonstrate that urgent action is needed to address these issues. Failure to take such action will be seen in the impact on the retention of school leaders in our schools.
- 53 ASCL has repeatedly raised concerns about the wellbeing and workload/working hours of school leaders, and these results show that this is still a significant issue.
- 54 ASCL members also hold a dim view of the ability of pay rates for the profession to attract, retain and develop talent. Table 4 shows the responses.

Table 4 – How pay impacts on recruitment and retention

Please answer this question from the perspective of how pay affects the teaching profession. How effective do you think the salaries proposed for school teachers and leaders in the 2022 pay award will be in terms of?							
		Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neutral	Effective	Very Effective	Response Total
1	Attracting the best graduates to the profession	379	1005	554	246	19	2203
2	Teachers remaining in the profession	471	1149	444	118	21	2203
3	Teachers aspiring to become school leaders	442	954	666	121	20	2203
4	Leaders remaining in the profession	422	1070	606	86	19	2203
<i>answered</i>							2203

55 Table 4 shows that only 12% of respondents believe that salaries are effective in attracting the best graduates to the profession; just over 6% believe that salaries will encourage teachers to stay in the profession; a similar proportion believe that salaries encourage teachers to become leaders; and less than 5% of respondents believe that salaries will encourage school leaders to remain in the profession.

56 In conclusion, the ASCL survey of members affected by the STRB pay recommendations provides clear and compelling evidence that current and planned levels of remuneration is having, and will continue to have, a significant detrimental impact on the recruitment and retention of school teachers and leaders.

Multi year awards

57 Again, we were pleased to see that the STRB had felt it necessary to exceed the government's proposed pay increases for 2023/24 in its recommendations, and also that they agreed with the majority of consultees in that a review mechanism necessary to '*ensure that the recommended 2023 pay levels remain appropriate.*'

58 However, we were left stunned that, after issuing a remit requesting recommendations for multi year awards to which the STRB responded, the Secretary of State then chose to ignore the recommendations for 2023/24, accepting only the recommendations for 2022/23.

59 There has been no valid official explanation for the rejection of the year 2 award, except that the Secretary of State feels that it is not appropriate to determine pay awards for 2023/24 now, and simply that a remit will be issued for the 2023/24 pay award in the autumn.

60 This completely undervalues and undermines the whole process, not to mention the significant amount of work carried out by the STRB and consultees in responding to a remit for a multi year award, which will now need to be repeated.

- 61 The remit letter said that this was to help support the delivery of the £30,000 starting salaries and to 'give schools the opportunity to better plan their budgets as we make the uplifts required to reach £30,000'.
- 62 This is clearly not a priority for, or indeed of any importance to, the Secretary of State as now schools are not only facing an unfunded increase which is higher than the Department's own proposals in year 1, they have no idea what the award will be in year 2.
- 63 Many schools have used the Department's proposals in their budget models and are now left to find the shortfall between the proposed 3% and the actual 5% for the September 2022 award.
- 64 But they now also have no idea what to include in their budgets for the September 2023 award; do they budget for the 2% in the Department's evidence? Or the 3% in the STRB's recommendations? Or something entirely different? Who knows?!

Affordability

- 65 In its evidence to the STRB 32nd remit, the Department said '*Higher awards would not be appropriate given the need to strike a balance of priorities for school expenditure. School leaders must have the flexibility to make their own decisions on how to prioritise spending to best support their staff and pupils, especially in the context of education recovery. Additional investment in teacher pay beyond what is proposed will result in headteachers having to reduce investment that they would otherwise have been able to make in other areas.*'
- 66 Whilst we did not agree with the statement that higher awards would not be appropriate, the fact that the increased award comes with no additional funding simply beggars belief.
- 67 The Department itself has highlighted the impact that the funding of these awards will have on educational provision, and that is without taking into consideration the increases in inflation since the report was submitted in March, the spiralling energy costs and the unfunded support staff pay award which will be backdated to 1 April 2022.
- 68 But they still claim that the pay award is 'broadly affordable'. The following explains why they have said this.
- 69 DfE figures indicate that on average mainstream schools will have received a 5.8% increase in per pupil funding for 2022/23 (compared to 2021/22).
- 70 Minister Will Quince pointed to Institute for Fiscal Studies study on current funding for schools. "*They have said that schools should be able to manage within their existing budgets,*" (26 August 2022)
- 71 What the IFS¹¹ actually said: '*.....For 2022–23, we estimate that school costs are likely to grow by 6%, which is still below growth in the total school funding per pupil of 7.7%. In this sense, expected cost increases look just about affordable for schools in 2022–23. However, there are a number of sources of*

¹¹ [School spending and costs: the coming crunch, IFS](#)

uncertainty and the picture is likely to be very different across different types of schools.'

- 72 *...The potential problems come next year in 2023–24. After accounting for growth in specific school costs, we estimate that school spending per pupil will fall by about 1% in real terms in that year and continue to stagnate in 2024–25. This will leave school resources and purchasing power about 3% lower in 2024–25 than it was in 2009–10, a very significant squeeze on school resources in historical terms.'*
- 73 All of these calculations are based on a national average approach. So overall the costs may be affordable, but there will be winners and losers.

Affordability reality check

- 74 The following are examples of why these cost pressures are not affordable for all. In their briefing paper the IFS acknowledge that increases in income and expenditure will not be felt equally across the sector.

Variability factors

- 75 Funding distribution at national and local level: A large amount of the additional funding received this year (at national level) has been targeted towards meeting rising demands on the High Needs block within the Dedicated Schools Grant. At local level 76 local authorities (LAs) have moved money out of the schools block and into the high needs block in 2022/23 (67 LAs in 2021/22).
- 76 Cohort characteristics: The income a school receives is directly related to the characteristics of their pupil population. This varies significantly across all schools.
- 77 Workforce composition: Schools that rely more on support staff, such as special schools, will also likely see faster growth in costs.
- 78 A sample of our member responses below:

"We had budgeted a 3% increase for more experienced teachers and leaders for 2022-23. The decision to accept the STPCD award but not give schools additional funding for the increase to 5% will now mean that we will almost certainly be back to a cumulative deficit position. This is because I can't see how at this stage with the budget already set, agreed by trustees and submitted to ESFA, that we can avoid going from a project surplus of £25k to a huge in year deficit, as the unbudgeted pay costs will add at least £300k in unplanned expenditure. Our projected surplus was already set at a much lower level than we hoped due to having to absorb a £300k increase in energy costs.

Having spent over 30 years in education, I am no longer surprised by the callous disregard for school leaders and trustees shown by the Government. Their supposed high aspirations for disadvantaged pupils and 'levelling up' areas of deprivation are weasel words and easy sound bites which are not backed up with the resources needed to genuinely make a difference to those who need it most. However, this decision, taken after schools have had the most difficult two years but where staff have gone over and above, has angered more than I can remember any previous decision."

“As a school that is PFI and has a £1million deficit - where on earth am I going to find the funding to fund any pay rise????”

“There is no fat left on the bone, in fact, there is no meat left either. There is nothing left to cut.

The issues with this offer is the fact that it is unfunded (in the context of nothing left to cut, increasing costs and the increasing demands on schools to provide services that should come from other groups) then there is also the unfairness of it because the offer does not compensate for years of pay degradation or compensate colleagues equally (eg: different experience of teaching staff and support staff).

It is now hugely challenging (in some cases impossible) to get high quality staff in almost every subject area and for special education, and recruitment to support roles and school/trust leadership roles is frighteningly hard.”

”No idea where to find the money from - we have already set a deficit budget as gas and electricity are going up by 200%. Think it will cost us about £70K - so one teacher and one member of support staff? Though of course we can't cut staffing on no notice...”

“The absence of there being any funding increase for special or AP schools to offset these costs is just staggering, and a slap in the face for a part of the sector which stayed open to all children throughout the pandemic, when many schools had only a small % on school sites during lockdowns. Our most vulnerable pupils and the staff who support them have been ignored by the Government again, and the financial impact of this will be disastrous.”

“On behalf of our well-being and the pupil's education, please, in the strongest possible terms, explain [to the government] how this and future pay awards need to be fully funded for each and every school.”

Future priorities

Career paths and pay structures for teachers and school leaders

79 As stated earlier, we agree with the STRB that this should be a priority. The pay structure has become fragmented and this has disproportionately impacted experienced teachers and school leaders.

80 This item must be included in the remit for the 33rd Report.

Pay progression including Performance Related Pay

81 Whilst we were pleased to see that the STRB highlighted a review of pay progression as one of the most pressing future priorities, it is disappointing that it has taken so long to even get to this stage.

82 The joint unions, and other consultees have been calling for the removal of performance related pay from the Document for several years now.

- 83 As we have highlighted previously, PRP was removed from the STPC(W)D following recommendations from the Independent Welsh Pay Review Body in their 2nd Report¹² which were accepted by the Minister for Education in Wales¹³.
- 84 We have yet to see a remit which includes the STRB's recommendation for a review of pay progression, let alone see any recommendations as a result of the findings.
- 85 This means that teachers and leaders in England will continue to be subject to PRP for at the very least another year when teachers and leaders in Wales will be starting their third year with no PRP.
- 86 When looking at this alongside the increases to teacher and school leader pay in Wales, particularly when teachers and school leaders were subject to a pay freeze in 2021, England is really starting to lag behind.
- 87 It is imperative that this is included in the next remit.

Teacher shortages

- 88 It is undeniable that there is a recruitment and retention crisis taking place, and this is despite the publication and implementation of the Department's Recruitment and Retention Strategy in January 2019¹⁴.
- 89 Urgent action is needed to address this, and that can not just be for teachers entering the profession, and as can be seen from our member survey results, it needs to address the shortages at all stages of the profession, including leadership roles.

Flexible working

- 90 Flexible working is a great tool that can both aide recruitment and retention and support wellbeing. We have provided evidence to support this in our recent submissions to the STRB.
- 91 One of the issues we have highlighted is the shift in attitude towards flexible working due to the impact of the pandemic.
- 92 Many employers have embraced this shift and embedded flexible working in their working practices, with some offering a 'work from anywhere at anytime' policy.
- 93 The education sector needs to embrace flexible working too. Graduates can now choose from roles which offer more flexibility than ever before, but the same cannot be said for roles in teaching.
- 94 Coupled with the improved graduate market and increases in graduate salaries, this makes teaching a less appealing career choice.

¹² [IWPRB 2nd Report](#)

¹³ [Written statement in response to IWPRB 2nd report](#)

¹⁴ [Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy](#)

95 We look forward to seeing this in a future remit, and hope that this is not an item that is pushed further down the road by the Department as has happened with PRP.

Consultation on draft STPCD

96 On page 5 of the draft Document, paragraph 3 should reference the thirty second report, not thirtieth.

97 As last year, we note that the order of the columns differs from the tables for the minimum and maximum of each pay range to the tables for the advisory pay scales.

98 The pay range columns are shown here:

	England (excluding the London Area)	Inner London Area	Outer London Area	Fringe Area
--	--	------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------

99 The advisory pay scales columns are shown here:

Spine Point	Rest of England (£)	London Fringe (£)	Outer London (£)	Inner London (£)
--------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

100 This needs to be corrected so that the columns are all in the same order for consistency and to save any confusion which may result in an employer inadvertently paying an incorrect amount.

101 The information on page 8 on the September 2022 pay award is not detailed enough with regards to the main pay range.

102 Nowhere in the document are the actual differentiated percentage uplifts for points M1 to M5. A table similar to the one included in the STRB report should be included in the document which clearly shows the percentage uplift applied to each point, particularly as they are not consistent across the four pay areas.

103 The values for the maximum of the Main Pay Range for Outer London and Inner London in the table on page 20 differ from those in the advisory pay points on page 63, and from those included in the STRB report (page 83).

104 The value for the minimum of the Upper Pay Range (U1) for the Rest of England on page 63 differs from the value for the minimum of the Upper Pay Range for England in the table on page 21.

Pay Scales

- 105 We welcomed the reintroduction of more pay scales into the STPCD but, as stated in previous years, we believe that they should be a mandatory element of the STPCD in an advisory capacity for minimum pay, rather than compulsory fixed points.
- 106 We were disappointed that there was not a recommendation to reintroduce the Leadership pay scales into the Document this year.
- 107 Now that the pay scales for Unqualified Teacher, Main and Upper pay ranges have been reintroduced, it makes no sense whatsoever to exclude the Leadership pay range.
- 108 We strongly recommend that these are reintroduced to the Document at the earliest opportunity.
- 109 As in previous years, we will continue to publish updated pay scales for all pay ranges in conjunction with NAHT, NEU and Community (previously Voice), and now NASUWT, and we will encourage employers to use these as a minimum.

Conclusion

- 110 The government must take urgent action to address the recruitment and retention crisis. This cannot solely be focussed on early career teachers.
- 111 Teaching needs to be an attractive profession for a career, whether that be as a teacher or as a school leader, not just for recent graduates.
- 112 The timescale for the publication of the report and the Secretary of State's written response to it must be tightened and suitably adhered to. We cannot see a continuation of the practice of the last seven years where they are published at the very end of the summer term.
- 113 Pay awards must at least keep pace with RPI and be fully funded by the government.
- 114 We hope that this is of value to your consultation, ASCL is willing to be further consulted and to assist in any way that it can.

Louise Hatswell and Carl Parker
Conditions of Employment Specialists: Pay
Association of School and College Leaders
21 September 2022