

	Feedback received/date	Response given/date	Response
<p><b>AEP (David Beaumont)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recognition the application of Soulbury scales for non-qualified teachers and teachers without substantial educational experience is not appropriate within the Soulbury agreement. The Soulbury Agreement implies the local authority employs individuals with education experience that enables them to guide and improve practise in school and ultimately be able to judge and inspect schools as Soulbury officers. As a minimum therefore to have equivalent or greater knowledge and skills to those teachers and senior leaders with whom they would work with in schools and with additional experience and seniority offer strategic advice to the local authority.</li> <li>2. Alignment with the Hay Evaluation process that emphasises managerial and financial responsibilities not professional capability and judgement in allocating salary level is not appropriate. - The Derbyshire group of EP's consists of a high number of level 8 qualified individuals who provide advice not otherwise available within the Local Authority employment structure. Advice presented by an EP for individual CYP potentially might lead to over a million pounds being spent by the Local authority , or not, that the Hay scheme fails to capture. More importantly EP work has a direct influence on the life chances of the</li> </ol>	<p>Response provided verbally at DJC on 28 June 2023. Mins/notes reflect the following update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Final draft of the report was sent round after last DJC.</i></li> <li>• <i>Framework been stared with SJCC, NEU have shared with their members.</i></li> <li>• <i>Corporate union reps have also had sight of the document.</i></li> <li>• <i>Intent to go to ACOS in October for sign off.</i></li> <li>• <i>CP has had feedback. Some helpful observations:</i></li> <li>• <i>Potentially strengthening the wording re being a qualified teacher which she will take on board and review when all feedback is received.</i></li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree and have amended the PPF doc to reflect essential requirement for post holder to be a qualified teacher.</li> <li>2. The proposals are to use the fundamental principles of the HAY scheme to rank roles to ensure a level of consistency within those paid on Soulbury pay scales. The skills and competencies required by roles are reflected within the HAY Korn Ferry scheme such as the level of technical know-how; accountability, complexity of decision making/ problem solving rather than only considering the managerial and financial responsibilities. Professional</li> </ol>

	<p>individual. School Improvement officers are likely to have been senior teachers / head teachers in school managing teams of people in school with large budgets that is not part of their role within the Local Authority. These officers similarly shape the future success of schools supporting positive outcomes for CYP as a result of their experience and training.</p> <p>3. There is no mention of the expectation that Soulbury employees should be treated as no less favourably as other employees employed within local authorities and have grounds for appeal outside the organisation. '10.1 The conditions of service of officers dealt with under this report shall be not less favourable than those prescribed for the local government services staff of the authority. The NJC for Local Government Services have agreed that officers within scope of this report should be allowed to pursue appeals relating to conditions of service through the appropriate Local Government Services machinery.'</p> <p>4. How benchmarking outside the local authority in determining grades is undertaken both locally and regionally. Derbyshire employs a large team of educational psychologists relative to</p>		<p>judgement and the competencies required to make a judgement are covered within the HAY scheme. It is important to note that it is not proposed to use the HAY evaluation scheme in its entirety to evaluate Soulbury roles.</p> <p>3. This pay principles is a framework to determine how an employee is paid, this is not a reflection of how any other terms and conditions are applied and negotiated. Links to the relevant documents outlining terms and conditions have now also been linked in the PPF for clarity.</p> <p>4. Pay benchmarking will be undertaken to look at local comparators and where appropriate national comparators. Where national pay</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>comparator (Benchmarked) authorities yet this is not reflected in the range of salaries offered and any discussion about the process has been resisted.</p> <p>5. Transparency in establishing Soulbury local terms and conditions / salary involving trade unions. Lack of engagement with trade unions by the Soulbury pay panel.  ‘2.3 The Soulbury Committee believes that consultation at local level with the associations representing Soulbury officers is an important part of establishing appropriate pay structures for all categories of Soulbury officers.’</p> <p>6. Terms of reference, in particular the impact on role and delivery of services, when using self-employed / agency staff in the absence of sufficient staff to fulfil basic expectations of employer. Repeated use of agency staff to back fill lack of staff in the Soulbury groups.</p> <p>7. The Use of SPA points: The national alternative mechanism agreed locally to extend pay scales providing recognition of the unique contribution made by Soulbury officers.</p> <p>8. The Flexible working agreement: The local agreement established with Soulbury officers on introduction of the Derbyshire</p>		<p>comparators are used regional weighting will need to be factored into the consideration where applicable. Geography and size of team/organisation will be considered wherever possible.</p> <p>5. Soulbury pay panel negotiate the national pay scales for Soulbury salary scales, but do not have a involvement in determining where individual councils appoint roles within the national pay scales. Through consultation there may provide opportunity for some feedback where appropriate.</p> <p>6. Back fill arrangement and use of agency workers etc are not specifically covered in pay principles.</p> <p>7. Application of SPA points and the process and conditions around the award of SPA points has not changed. Details of the application and assessment process for SPA points is now linked in the PPF document for completeness.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Package that provides an eight week consolidation period within the Derbyshire scheme.</p> <p>9. The discretion to extend Soulbury Officer pay scales: '6.1 The Director of Education/Children's Services has the discretion to extend local scales for Soulbury officers (with the exception of main scale educational psychologists on Scale A). The appointment and grading of the new Strategic Lead Officer managing the EPS did not reflect the additional responsibilities within this role nor the extra duties transferred to the deputy Principal EP.</p> <p>10. The requirement that the recommended pay range for all Soulbury staff is applied consistently to prevent overlap of grades and avoid reduced progression within scales.</p>		<p>8. As outlined above T&amp;C are consulted on outside of PPF, therefore there is no proposal to change the 8 week consolidation period for DCC employees paid on Soulbury pay scales. A link to the Working for us doc (<a href="https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/working-for-us-booklet-2022-to-2023">Working for us booklet 2022 to 2023 (derbyshire.gov.uk)</a>) has now been added to the PPF document.</p> <p>9. It is not anticipated at the current time that it will be necessary to exercise this discretion within DCC.</p> <p>10. The determination of pay scales should reflect the size, breadth and accountability of the role. While there will always be a small degree of variance within a pay range, as there is for DCC pay grades, the aim of the review is to have a clear framework where a description of a role can be clearly defined and applied to a pay range so that it is applied fairly and consistently for our employees.</p>
--	---	--	---

<p><b>Additional comments from Dave Beaumont requested to be noted received 04/09/23</b></p>	<p>'The basic principles of transparency and open dialogue with individuals and trade union at a local level is encouraged by the national pay negotiation bodies.</p> <p>There is no current role envisaged for trade unions within the Soulbury Pay Committee or intent as specified to share how decisions are made or the data set applied to inform decisions.</p> <p>I would re-iterate the inadequacy of the Hay framework in discriminating between the significant differences between roles across the local authority.'</p>		
<p><b>NEU (Deborah Turner)</b></p>	<p><b>Email received 11 July 2023:</b></p> <p>The NEU feels that the Pay Principles Framework is likely, if implemented, to impact centrally employed teachers. Given this the NEU feels it reasonable to ask for this consultation to be carried out when centrally employed teachers are not on leave to enable unions to consult with them in a timely manner. The NEU suggestion would be that the consultation begins on 4th September when centrally employed teachers return from annual leave.</p> <p>There is a concern that the document will enable the authority to move centrally employed teachers onto</p>	<p><i>Responses provided, by email, by CP on 13 July – as shown in red.</i></p> <p><i>The draft document was shared with the NEU on 26 May 2023 thus allowing 8 weeks for consultation prior to the school holiday period, 12 weeks in total before the final deadline for feedback (to meet ACOS deadlines) of 18 August.</i></p> <p><i>I stated at the last SJCC that no assurances could be given.</i></p>	<p>This deadline has now been extended to 5 September 2023.</p>

	<p>the single status pay scale. It appears from the wording that centrally employed teachers are unlikely to be eligible for the Soulbury pay scale and, unless delivering direct teaching, remain on Teachers pay and conditions. Can the LA provide an assurance that centrally employed teachers will not be put on the single status pay scale? Can the LA clarify the roles/services where centrally employed teachers will continue to be paid on schoolteachers pay and conditions? Similarly, can the LA provide an overview of services where it is envisaged centrally employed teachers will move to Soulbury?</p> <p>There is also a concern around the potential impact the Pay Principles Framework will have on the LAI restructure. If impacts are envisaged/likely can these be outlined at the next SJCC meeting.</p> <p>The NEU would like clarity about whether the managers of centrally employed teachers will have discussions with teams and individuals based on roles and agreed job descriptions and be able to exercise discretion when applying the Pay Principles Framework.</p> <p>Finally, there are queries about whether changes will be implemented regardless of feedback and without employee agreement.</p>	<p><i>Should there be any roles which are more appropriately aligned to single status pay terms (as per the criteria in the proposed framework) this will form part of the considerations and consultation linked to the LAI restructure.</i></p> <p><i>As above</i></p> <p><i>This is a framework based on national guidance so it is a consultative process not one of negotiation.</i></p>	<p>Where there is an essential requirement for a post holder to have a teaching qualification, as outlined in the pay principles framework, it would be appropriate for the role to be paid on either school teachers pay (and conditions) or Soulbury pay.</p> <p>Job profile and structures will be shared and there will be the opportunity for employees and their trade unions to present challenge as appropriate.</p> <p>Roles will be assessed and evaluated based on the information submitted to apply the assessment/evaluation is applied consistently and fairly, as outlined in the pay principles document.</p>
--	---	---	--

<p><b>Donna Hammond (NASUWT)</b></p>	<p><b>21 July 2023:</b></p> <p>1. We would suggest replacing 'and' with 'or' in the Teachers' pay and Conditions of Service section (attached and shown in red). Amongst other things, this would ensure that unqualified teachers paid under the STPCD are captured under this section.</p> <p>2. We request clarification regarding what salary safeguarding will be available for any teachers who end up being moved off teachers' pay and conditions, if the salary they move to is lower than their current salary. We would urge that, in fact, it is incorporated into the process that none of our members are moved to a lower salary in any circumstances.</p> <p>3. We request details regarding any process for staff to appeal or raise a concern if they feel they have been incorrectly placed on a pay scale. We urge that there <i>is</i> a process for staff to raise such concerns, with involvement from their union if they wish.</p>		<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PPF amended to read '<b>and/or</b>'. Soulbury roles for Education Improvement Professionals will also require the post holder to be a qualified teacher, but their duties won't meet the definition of 'specified work'.</li> <li>2. Salary safeguarding will be applied based on the employees current terms and conditions, not the new terms and conditions, and therefore those currently on teachers T&amp;Cs are entitled to up to 3 years salary safeguarding in accordance with the STPCD.</li> <li>3. There will be opportunity as part of the formal consultation (following the principles of the Redundancy, Redeployment, Protection of Earnings and Buy Out of Hours Policy) for colleagues and their trade union representatives to raise any concern or challenge if they feel roles have been placed on the incorrect pay scale.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Rebecca Jones, Head of EYSEN</b> and on behalf of Centrally</p>	<p><b>Email on 8 August 2023:</b></p> <p>Will we be given opportunity to feedback about how job roles match the statutory definition as I feel we</p>	<p>HT acknowledged email on 08/09/23.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>There will be opportunity for colleagues to feedback regarding any decisions</p>

<p>Employed Teachers in the team</p>	<p>can demonstrate that the specialist teacher and senior specialist teacher roles do align with the 'specified work' definition in regulation 5.</p> <p>How does the term "lessons" relate to Early Years? Will the Ofsted definition of teaching which is much wider than just "lessons" be taken into account? (for reference, the Ofsted definition of teaching in early years settings is as follows: <i>Teaching is a broad term that covers the many different ways in which adults help young children learn. It includes their interactions with children during planned and child-initiated play and activities, communicating and modelling language, showing, explaining, demonstrating, exploring ideas, encouraging, questioning, recalling, providing a narrative for what they are doing, facilitating and setting challenges. It takes account of the equipment that adults provide and the attention given to the physical environment, as well as the structure and routines of the day that establish expectations. Integral to teaching is how practitioners assess what children know, understand and can do, as well as taking account of their interests and dispositions to learn (characteristics of effective learning), and how practitioners use this information to plan children's next steps in learning and to monitor their progress.</i> (paragraph 179, Early years inspection handbook for Ofsted-registered provision for September 2023, Updated 14 July 2023. Accessed online today at: <a 121="" 481="" 658="" 839"="" href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/early-years-inspection-handbook-eif/early-years-&lt;/a&gt;&lt;/p&gt; &lt;/td&gt; &lt;td data-bbox="></a></p>	<p>relating to determining whether roles meet the definition of 'specified work' as part of the formal consultation process.</p> <p>Activity/ties would need to meet a minimum of 1 of the categories defined in regulation 5, rather than it being necessary to meet all.</p> <p>The Council does not have an employee appeals process regarding the assessment/evaluation of roles.</p> <p>The level of pay will be determined as outlined within the pay principles document to ensure fairness and consistency with those paid under the same pay scales.</p>
--------------------------------------	---	---



inspection-handbook-for-ofsted-registered-provision-for-september-2023#quality-of-education )

In terms of aligning our teaching roles to the specified work definition in regulation 5 our teachers:

- (a) Teachers and senior teachers all have caseload children for whom they plan visits and prepare what they are going to teach on that visit. Using the EYFS they aim to help children achieve and make progress through this framework.
- (b) Teachers and senior teachers model how to do things but within this is of course direct teaching of the child e.g. intensive interaction - modelling it involves teaching the child but it also empowers staff to be able to do it when our teachers are not there. This could be described as a lesson on developing interaction skills. On the same visit our teachers could teach a lesson on developing self-regulation or how to meet sensory processing needs etc. We pack a lot into one visit - multiple lessons indeed.
- (c) Teachers and senior teachers assess progress on every visit and record this plus formally assess in a timely way (as directed by SEND COP) both using our assessment tools (summative assessments) and writing our review reports (formative assessment).
- (d) As above teachers and senior teachers report on development and progress in their visit records, reports and statutory educational advice reports.