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THE NATIONAL EDUCATION UNION

The National Education Union is the largest union representing teachers in the UK, with over 450,000 members in all sectors and phases of education. This report sets out the results of the 2017 annual survey of NEU members in schools and academies on pay progression and other related pay issues for September 2017.

KEY FINDINGS

Among all respondents:

- one in five teachers (21%) had received no annual cost-of-living pay increase in September 2017;
- a further 30% had still not yet heard about any annual pay increase at the time of completing the survey;
- the teachers most likely not to have received a cost-of-living pay increase were female, disabled, LGBT+, non White British and part-time teachers;
- almost half of teachers thought that linking pay to appraisal had damaged appraisal for professional development purposes and had caused teachers significantly extra work;
- over one-third thought that their school’s policy on pay progression was unfair.
Among those who were eligible for pay progression and had, where required, applied for progression (51% of the total response):

- a quarter of those surveyed had not been notified of the outcome of the decision by the time of the survey (mid-November to late December);
- almost one in five (19%) respondents eligible for progression and notified of the outcome of the pay decision had been denied progression;
- 17% of those turned down for progression had been explicitly told that this was due to funding or budgetary constraints, up from 15% last year;
- teachers were more likely to have been denied progression if they worked in academies or free schools, in secondary schools, were on the upper pay scale or worked part-time;
- rates of progression among teachers from different ethnic backgrounds were closer than in previous years.

Among those turned down for progression:

- the vast majority (92%) of those denied progression told us that they had been given no indication during the year that they were failing to meet the required standards;
- the vast majority (88%) thought the decision was unfair;
- over three quarters (78%) had, however, decided not to appeal the decision;
- 11% of those that gave a reason for choosing not to appeal told us that they were planning to leave either their job or the teaching profession or had already done so.

THE SURVEY RESPONSE

The survey was sent by email to NEU members in November 2017. The questionnaire asked them about their own pay progression in September 2017 if eligible; their views on their school’s pay policy, its application in cases of pay progression and its impact on appraisal; and other matters in relation to teachers’ pay for September 2017, in particular the application of annual cost-of-living pay increases.

The survey received 12,375 responses, a similar level to last year. In the absence of any effort by DfE to secure meaningful disaggregated data on pay increases and pay progression for individual teachers, it provides the largest data set on these issues. The NEU accepts that the survey methodology means that the survey response may potentially be overweight in terms of the proportion of respondents who did not receive pay progression. There is, however, no apparent reason why those respondents should be unrepresentative of teachers turned down for progression, in terms of their circumstances, views or personal characteristics.
The survey asked about pay increases effective from September 2017 excluding any increases due to pay progression or promotion.

Around one in five teachers (21%) had received no cost-of-living pay increase in September 2017, despite the uplift of 2% to the minimum and maximum of the main pay range and uplift of 1% to other ranges. A further 30% had not yet heard about their pay outcome at the time of completing the survey.

Despite the 2% increase to the minimum and maximum of the main pay range, almost twice as many teachers on the main pay range in September 2017 received a 1% increase as received a 2% increase (30% of respondents compared to 17%). Even for teachers at the minimum and maximum of the main pay range, it was still more common to receive a 1% increase or no pay increase at all than a 2% increase. Among teachers at the minimum, 22% of respondents told us they had received a 2% increase, 28% said they had received a 1% increase and 23% said they had not received a cost-of-living increase. Among teachers at the maximum, 15% said they had received a 2% increase, compared to 28% who had received a 1% increase and 21% who had not received an increase at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers receiving a cost of living increase from September 2017</th>
<th>Main pay range</th>
<th>Upper pay range</th>
<th>Leadership pay range</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - a 1% cost of living increase</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - a 2% cost of living increase</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - an amount other than 1% or 2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were more likely to have received no pay increase in 2017 if they were female, disabled, LGBT+, not White British or working part-time. Heterosexual, White British, non-disabled male teachers on full-time contracts were denied a cost-of-living increase just 17% of the time.

To break the response down further:

- 21% of women told us they had not received a pay increase, compared to 19% of men
- 22% of those working part-time or other flexible working arrangements had been denied a pay increase, compared to 20% of full-time teachers
- 20% of those reporting as White British had been denied a pay increase, compared to 24% reporting other ethnic origins
- 24% of those who defined themselves as disabled had received no increase, compared to 21% of those who did not
• 20% of those who defined themselves as heterosexual had received no increase, compared to 22% defining themselves as lesbian, gay, bisexual or other
• 50% of those who defined themselves as transgender had received no pay increase, compared to 20% of those who did not, although this response comprised only six teachers defining themselves as transgender

PAY PROGRESSION

Overall, 51% of all respondents were eligible for pay progression in September 2017. The remaining 49% of respondents comprised teachers on the upper pay range ineligible for progression due to being at the maximum or otherwise ineligible (37%); teachers on the maximum of the main pay range not applying for progression to the upper pay range (7%); and new entrants to teaching in September 2017 (5%).

This year, 61% of all those respondents who were eligible for pay progression had received progression and 14% had been turned down, compared to 62% and 16% last year. Some 25% of teachers were still to be notified about their pay progression when they responded, up from 23% last year and 20% the year before. Some of this rise may be due to the survey being sent out around two weeks earlier than in 2016. However, it still means that by November and December 2017, a quarter of teachers were still in limbo about their pay progression, despite the DfE’s guidance to schools that pay decisions should be taken promptly.

If we remove those who did not yet know the decision over their progression and look only at those who knew their outcome, 19% of those eligible had been denied pay progression, down slightly from last year’s figure of 21%.

The vast majority (92%) of those who had been denied progression told us that they had been given no indication during the year that they were failing to meet the required standards. DfE guidance to schools states that there should be "no surprises" when progression decisions are taken and that any concerns should be raised and addressed during the appraisal cycle. Each of our annual surveys has shown similar results, however, with this guidance being respected in less than 10% of cases year after year.

Some 17% of those teachers turned down for progression said that they had been explicitly told that the decision was due to funding or budgetary constraints, up from 15% in last year’s survey. This confirms that many pay progression decisions are in many cases not being taken by reference to standards of performance as intended.

Some 88% those who had been denied progression felt that the decision was unfair. This is a small increase on last year’s already high figure of 86% and demonstrates the continuing unhappiness of so many teachers about the operation of the current pay progression system.
Despite so many of those denied progression feeling the outcome was unfair, 78% had decided not to appeal against the decision, an increase from last year’s figure of 71%. As in last year’s survey, the proportion of teachers denied progression but not appealing was highest in primary schools.

Of those who had decided not to appeal, the same dispiriting responses were cited again and again. A worrying proportion of those teachers who gave a reason for not appealing (11%) told us that they were planning to leave their school or teaching or had already done so, showing the impact that failure to progress can have on an already-beleaguered workforce. Other common responses were that there was simply ‘no point’ in appealing, due to lack of confidence in the system or a lack of funds; that teachers were unwilling to take on the extra stress or workload of an appeal; or that all of their colleagues had been denied progression due to budget constraints.

One other common reason given for not appealing was that the teachers concerned did not know they had the right to do so. Of those who were refused progression, just 27% told us they had been informed of their right to appeal by their appraiser or head teacher.

**PAY PROGRESSION BY PAY RANGE**

Compared to the 2016 survey, the chances of achieving pay progression had improved slightly for those on both the main and the upper pay ranges, but declined for those on the leadership pay range. Teachers on the upper pay range were still more than four times more likely to have been denied progression than colleagues on the main pay range.

On the main pay range, 9% of teachers who were eligible and knew the outcome of their progression decision had been denied it. This figure is down very slightly from 10% in last year’s survey. In primary schools, 8% of such teachers had been denied progression, the same figure as last year. In secondary schools, the figure was 10%, down slightly from 11% last year.

Among teachers on the maximum of the main pay range who had applied for progression to the upper pay range (“threshold progression”), 28% of those who knew the outcome of their application had been denied progression, unchanged from last year. Teachers in academies were less likely to have been denied such progression (31%) than those in local authority-maintained schools (25%), although this represents a smaller gap than in last year’s survey.

Eligible teachers on the upper pay range were more than four times as likely to have been denied progression as those on the main pay range (39% of those who knew their outcome, compared to 9% on the main scale). This upper pay range figure was down from 43% last year. In primary schools, progression for teachers on the upper pay range who knew their outcome had been denied in 42% of cases, down from 47% last year. In secondary schools the figure was 33%, down from 37% last year.
On the leadership pay range, teachers who were eligible for progression and knew their outcome had been denied progression in 26% of cases. Well over one third (38%) of eligible leaders in secondary schools who knew their outcome had been denied progression, compared to 19% in primary schools. Some 16% of leading practitioners had been denied progression, although the sample for this group was small.

| Teachers receiving pay progression from 1 September 2017 (eligible & knew outcome) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
|                                  | Main pay range | Threshold | Upper pay range | Leadership pay range | Overall |
| Denied progression              | 9%            | 28%       | 39%             | 26%                 | 19%     |
| Received progression            | 91%           | 72%       | 61%             | 74%                 | 81%     |

**RESULTS BY SCHOOL SECTOR**

As in previous years, academies and free schools were more likely to have denied their teachers pay progression than local authority-maintained schools. Some 17% of teachers in L.A.-maintained schools who were eligible for progression and knew their outcome had been denied progression, unchanged from last year. The equivalent figure for both academies and free schools was 20%, slightly down on the figures from last year’s survey.

The difference in progression rates between school sectors is not significant in the secondary phase, with 20% of teachers who knew their outcome having been denied progression in academies, compared to 19% in local authority-maintained schools. In the primary phase, however, 21% of teachers who knew their outcome had been denied progression in academies, compared to 16% in local authority-maintained schools.

Other differences between the responses from the maintained and academy sectors include that teachers in academies were:

- more likely to know whether the school has a pay policy;
- more likely to think the school’s policy is unfair;
- more likely to think that PRP has increased workload and harmed the CPD value of appraisal; and
- more likely to have appealed against denial of progression.

**RESULTS BY EDUCATION PHASE**

Overall, the difference in progression rates between teachers in the primary and secondary phases was lower than in the 2016 survey.
Among primary teachers, some 18% of respondents who knew their outcome had been denied progression, unchanged from last year’s figure. Among secondary teachers, the figure was 19%, down from 21% last year and 22% the year before.

Other differences between the responses between the primary and secondary phases include that primary teachers were:

- less likely to know whether the school has a pay policy;
- more likely to think that PRP has increased workload and harmed the CPD value of appraisal; and
- less likely to have appealed against denial of progression.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS DENIED PAY PROGRESSION

The category of teachers most likely to be denied progression was, as in previous years, those teachers working part-time. For those eligible part-time teachers who knew their outcome, they were twice as likely to have been denied progression (34%) than their full-time colleagues (17%). This showed little change from last year’s figures of 38% and 18%. This lower rate of pay progression for part time teachers is also reflected in pay progression data we have obtained from individual employers.

While this difference was to some degree influenced by a higher proportion of part time teachers on the upper pay range, progression had been denied to 24% of part-time teachers on the main range, compared to 11% of full-time teachers (including those seeking to progress to the upper range). On the upper range, progression had been denied to 48% of part-time teachers, compared to 35% of full-time teachers.

In this year’s survey, the progression results when broken down on the basis of ethnicity were different from previous years. There were less marked differences in progression rates overall for specific groups, although still notable differences in progression rates on the upper pay range.

Progression for those who knew their outcome had been denied in 18% of cases for those identifying under one of the White British categories. For those reporting an ethnic origin outside the White British categories, the figure was also 18%. In this year’s survey, unlike in previous years, there appears to have been no greater likelihood of having received pay progression among teachers identifying as White British.

Breaking this down further, teachers reporting an Asian/Asian British ethnic origin had been denied progression in 22% of cases where they knew their outcome, down from 26% last year. Teachers reporting a Black/Black British ethnic origin had been denied progression in 17% of cases, much lower than last year’s figure of 23%. Those reporting other White origins (ie non-British) had been denied progression in 16% of cases.
On the upper pay range, the corresponding figures were 36% for those classing themselves as White British and 39% for those giving other ethnic origins. However, those reporting an Asian/Asian British origin had been denied progression in 46% of cases and those reporting a Black/Black British origin had been denied progression in more than half (52%) of cases.

On the main pay range, however, progression rates were much closer among the various groups. 9% of White British respondents who knew their outcome had been denied progression, compared to 7% of those who gave other ethnic origins. Within this latter category, 11% of respondents in the Asian/Asian British groups had been denied progression, but just 5% of those who reported as Black/Black British.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>Main pay range</th>
<th>Upper pay range</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All non-White British</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian British</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Black British</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this seeming erosion of differences in progression rates between teachers of different ethnic origins is welcome, the fact that this year’s data differed significantly from that of the last few years urges caution. There were still lower progression rates among certain groups on the upper pay range, and it may be that sampling differences account for some of the changes elsewhere. We may need to wait for another year’s data – or, preferably, a meaningful attempt by the DfE to gather data on this area through its School Workforce Census - to confirm whether this marks a genuine shift in progression trends.

Men were slightly more likely to have been denied progression than women, as in previous years’ surveys. Some 21% of eligible male teachers who knew their outcome had not received progression compared to 18% of female teachers, comparable figures to last year. Unlike last year, when men were more likely to progress on the upper range, this year women were more likely to progress on each of the three main pay ranges.

Female teachers who had been denied pay progression were once again significantly less likely than men to appeal against the decision, with 80% having decided not to appeal compared with 70% of men.

Progression rates were broadly similar when compared by sexual orientation. Some 18% of teachers identifying as heterosexual who knew their progression outcome had been denied progression, compared to 19% of those identifying as gay, 19% identifying as bisexual and 12% identifying as lesbian. 60% of teachers defining themselves as transgender had been denied progression, although this response comprised just five respondents.
Respondents were asked whether they had been absent for all or part of the 2016-17 school year due to pregnancy or maternity leave. Of such teachers who were eligible for progression and knew their outcome, a third (33%) had been denied it. This was almost twice the rate of female teachers denied progression overall. More than half (61%) of such teachers said that they had been specifically told that they had been denied progression because of their absence. This shows that obvious unlawful discrimination continues to take place in schools despite the publication of DfE guidance on this matter.

The NUT and ATL both separately warned that the Government’s proposed extension of PRP across all pay ranges – a “reform” for which no equality impact assessment was conducted by the STRB when recommending its adoption, or by the DfE in taking forward its implementation - would lead to discriminatory treatment and outcomes. Data gathered by the two unions from its member surveys and Freedom of Information data requests to individual employers since 2014 continues to demonstrate the validity of those warnings.

IMPACT ON APPRAISAL

When asked about their own appraisal, 48% of respondents said that they believed that linking pay progression to appraisal had caused them significant extra work, with 26% saying that they had been required to produce additional evidence beyond that necessary for appraisal purposes to demonstrate that they had met progression requirements. 40% believed that linking progression to appraisal had undermined the usefulness of appraisal for professional development purposes. Strikingly, each of these figures is almost identical to its equivalent in last year’s survey, suggesting that there is no greater confidence in the performance-related pay and appraisal system than there was twelve months ago.

The survey also asked about appraisal objectives recently set for 2017-18. Over half (51%) said that their appraisal objectives for 2017-18 were harder than those set for the previous year, while almost one quarter (24%) said that they had had more than 3 appraisal objectives set for the previous year.

Respondents who were involved in appraising other teachers were also asked for their comments on the process from their perspective as an appraiser. 44% said that they thought that the link between pay and appraisal had damaged the process for professional development purposes for their appraisee, compared to just 15% who said it had improved appraisal as a tool for development. Some 55% of appraisers said that the PRP system had caused them significant extra work in their role as appraiser during the appraisal process. Once again, these figures are strikingly similar to those recorded in last year’s survey.
Just 70% of appraisers told us that they thought they had received adequate training for the role. In addition, they confirmed that the link between appraisal and pay progression is far from fair and that budgetary constraints in particular are influencing decisions on progression. Some 18% of appraisers reported that they had been told by school leaders which teachers should be permitted to progress on their pay range, while 5% had been told how many teachers should be permitted to progress and 6% had specifically been told that none of their appraisees should progress.

OTHER ISSUES: PAY STRUCTURES & POLICIES

The survey also asked a number of questions about school pay structures and pay policies, relating to pay scales and other matters.

Some 79% of teachers said their school still used a structure of a six-point main pay scale and three-point upper pay scale, with less than 7% saying that their school had moved away from this approach. These figures are almost identical to those in the 2016 and 2015 surveys, and continue to support our contention that the vast majority of schools and academies do not want, and are not using, the flexibility to adopt different pay structures.

According to 83% of respondents, pay progression was linked to appraisal in their school, with 6% saying that it was not. However, only 59% of respondents answered ‘Yes’ to the question “Does your school have a pay policy that sets out how pay progression operates in your school?”, slightly down from last year, while 9% said their school did not have a policy and over 30% did not know.

This suggests not only that teachers are not being provided with basic information on pay matters but also that the concept of schools having an individual pay policy, locally determined and setting out how decisions involving the use of discretion will be taken, is still very far from being established and recognised (let alone accepted) among teachers.

Just 35% of teachers responding to our survey think that their school’s policy on pay progression is fair, almost unchanged from the figure in last year’s survey. In comparison, 34% of respondents said their school’s progression policy is overtly unfair.