



Joint National Committee for Higher Education Staff

Trade union side national claim - 2010

Submitted 19 March 2010

Introduction

The 2009/10 pay round resulted in an unsatisfactory settlement. Not only were there negative perceptions about UCEA's commitment to the negotiating process, the settlement of less than RPI resulted in a pay cut in real terms. Inflation over the period 2008 to 2010 was particularly difficult for low paid staff. This might have been alleviated had a fixed lump sum increase been applied. It is worth noting that one institution paid such an arrangement as part of its support staff settlement.

The early move by UCEA to link job security to the pay award, combined with the stated inability to negotiate a national approach to avoid redundancies was of great concern to the trade union side. In essence, the employers were calling for pay restraint in the full knowledge that over recent years the mean average of Vice Chancellor (VC) and Principal pay had increased by much greater rates than the vast majority of those employed by the sector. We are aware of recent press coverage on pay increases for Vice Chancellors' and Principals' pay and will be studying the forthcoming THE survey closely as it appears that senior management have not been practicing what they preached. Staff will not be prepared to listen for a second year to calls for restraint from those who have pocketed significant increases for themselves.

The five trade unions bring to the negotiation table considerable experience in securing and building proper negotiations on pay and conditions and it is with these skills and experiences that we approach the 2010/11 pay negotiations.

Economic background and changes to earnings in the economy

The 2010 Pay Award covers 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2011. This pay claim needs to consider the current economic climate and economic projections until 1 August 2011.

The 2009-10 pay settlement provided for a 0.5% pay uplift across all salary points. The monthly RPI figures below show inflation over the first six months of this pay award:

	RPI % change over 12 months
--	--------------------------------------

August 2009	-1.3%
September 2009	-1.4%
October 2009	-0.8%
November 2009	0.3%
December 2009	2.4%
January 2010	3.7%

Source: www.statistics.gov.uk

IDS Pay Report 1040, January 2010, had the following monthly average forecasts for all-items RPI inflation in 2010:

January	3.2%	July	3.4%
February	3.2%	August	3.2%
March	3.7%	September	3.2%
April	4.1%	October	3.0%
May	3.8%	November	2.9%
June	3.7%	December	3.1%

The latest pay deals, using figures from the LRD payline database, for the three months to January 2010 show an overall mid-point increase of 1.5% on lowest basic rates, in the three months to January. The service sector mid-point for the three months was 1.8% whilst the manufacturing mid-point was 1.5%. The median was 1.5% in the private sector and 2.9% in the public sector.

LRD figures show that in the year to December the public sector saw increases averaging 3.5%.

National Framework Agreement

In the 2009/10 trade union claims and the subsequent joint JNCHES trade union side statement on common issues, we raised a number of points related to the framework agreement and terms and conditions, including the working week, annual leave, shift and on-call premia, London weighting, parental leave, flexible working and work life balance.

We note that UCEA is reluctant to address such issues nationally, reflecting its subscribers' views on local determination. However, JNCHES is a joint negotiating committee and trade union members and their representatives consistently press us to raise such issues nationally. UCEA should be clear that there are considerable concerns across the sector at the current localised negotiations that have delivered unequal and unfair terms and conditions in many HEIs and which in many are

perceived as historical and sometimes arbitrary in nature. Not to address the concerns that the trade union side is repeatedly mandated to raise nationally can only undermine the bargaining machinery.

In response to the points made in our 2009/10 claim, UCEA quoted the report "Conditions of employment in higher education", produced by IDS. UCEA used this to claim that conditions in HE were substantially better than other sectors. We would remind UCEA that when we first received a copy of the report the trade unions expressed our concerns at the methodology and challenged some of the statistics. For instance, we do not accept the results on leave. We argue that the categories used in the IDS report do not reflect the actual situation, as many HEIs have horizontal integration of leave, which is related to grade and not staff group and therefore (particularly for support staff, who work across all grades) it is not possible give a simplistic number as the report seems to suggest. We are also aware that some institutions also link working hours to grades and so these statistics are also questionable.

More importantly, we have never stated that we think that all HEI's have bad terms and conditions; we are aware that some have comparatively good conditions. Our point has always been that a significant number of HE employers are worse than average in some areas and for some sections of staff. So for instance using the IDS report's questionable statistics: in 2008 13.7% of HEIs offered 20 days leave to support staff and a further 26.4% offered fewer than 25 days (the median for staff outside of HE) – and indeed surprisingly 4% of HEI's even offered some academic staff less than 25 days. We believe that HEI's should be seeking to be the best employers rather than seeking to use statistical means and medians to argue for worsening staff conditions.

As part of the 2009/10 pay settlement a number of the issues raised in the claim were referred to a pay and data research group. Whilst we welcome this acknowledgement of our concerns, the current terms of reference of the working group focuses on studying the current situation. We hope that the findings of this study will address the shortcomings of the IDS survey. However to paraphrase one commentator our job is not just to interpret the world in various ways — the point is to change it.

We believe that the results should be used as a basis to introduce national minimum terms and conditions to ensure an easy means of ensuring best practice across the sector. We seek to ensure that HEIs are exemplar employers and offer cutting edge terms and conditions in recognition of the UK's position as one of the best providers of HE in the world.

Equalities


From the table and chart below, it is clear that although there was a narrowing of the gender pay gap for academic staff between 2008 and 2009, the gap is still 15%, and the best that can be said is that the gap has been fluctuating over the past decade between about 15% and 18%,

Gender pay (GP) gap

Higher education teaching professionals' pay (ASHE) 1999-2009

April	Female (F)	Male (M)	F as % M	GP gap*
	£	£		
1999	27,427	33,699	81.4%	18.6%
2000	29,578	34,787	85.0%	15.0%
2001	29,838	35,964	83.0%	17.0%
2002	30,455	37,839	80.5%	19.5%
2003	32,436	39,348	82.4%	17.6%
2004	33,438	39,882	83.8%	16.2%
2005	35,804	43,707	81.9%	18.1%
2006	37,333	44,138	84.6%	15.4%
2007	37,365	45,857	81.5%	18.5%
2008	38,128	46,474	82.0%	18.0%
2009	41,556	49,060	84.7%	15.3%

*the extent to which female pay lags behind male pay; based on ASHE published data, and likely to include a small percentage of teaching professionals not actually employed in the HE sector; Full-time gross mean average annual pay; % calculations UCU; Source: ONS ASHE Table 14.7a - unavailable before 1999



*GP gap = gender pay gap: the extent to which female pay lags behind male pay; based on ASHE published data, and likely to include a small percentage of teaching professionals not actually employed in the HE sector; Full-time gross mean average annual pay; % calculations UCU; Source: ONS ASHE Table 14.7a - unavailable before 1999

For support staff HESA recorded mean salaries of £26,818 for full time males and £24,160 for women showing an 11% difference in favour of men. The JNCHES 'Review of higher education finance and pay data' suggested that this data may be influenced by the concentration of men and women in different occupations, however more work is needed to see if this is correct and also what can be done to address this.

There is an urgent need to address the gender pay gap for all occupational groups.

Occupational specific evidence

It is worth restating that for the low paid within higher education, inflation measures for food and fuel rose at a higher rate than the overall RPI. The RPI rate on food and fuel increases including travel costs never dropped below 2% over the period 2007 to 2009. The eventual percentage improvement in pay for the Aug 2009 date of 0.5% did not resolve that underlying difference. The total increase for staff on the bottom spine point was worth around £65 per annum before tax and national insurance deductions. This meant an increase of less than £1 per week for the group most directly affected by the higher costs of food and fuel inflation.

For academic staff, as the tables below show, recent rises have not kept pace with comparable professions:

Changes in pay since 1999 (cash terms)

April	All employees	Public sector	Personnel, training and industrial relations managers	Information and communication technology managers	Police officers (inspectors and above)	Medical practitioners
	£	£	£	£	£	£
1999	21,314	20,820	34,612	38,314	42,567	51,188
2000	22,801	21,688	37,418	42,329	43,161	56,802
2001	23,925	22,319	43,261	45,714	43,735	59,936
2002	24,911	23,329	45,879	47,810	45,270	62,385
2003	25,818	24,402	45,296	48,861	46,022	66,263
2004	26,946	25,672	45,744	48,433	50,027	67,050
2005	28,191	26,972	47,993	49,939	51,584	81,451
2006	29,331	27,694	49,449	51,567	53,036	79,083
2007	29,999	28,304	52,732	49,526	54,241	78,882
2008	31,323	29,413	53,980	52,128	54,156	83,687
2009	31,916	30,900	52,243	52,540	56,421	84,451
change 1999- 2009	49.7%	48.4%	50.9%	37.1%	32.5%	65.0%
SOC Code from 2002			1135	1136	1172	2211

April	* Higher education teaching professionals	Further education teaching professionals	Secondary education teaching professionals	Solicitors and lawyers, judges & coroners	Chartered & certified accountants	Librarians
	£	£	£	£	£	£
1999	31,735	27,707	24,608	37,564	30,637	22,123
2000	33,117	25,511	26,139	41,000	31,730	22,333
2001	33,962	26,055	27,303	45,784	34,493	22,460
2002	35,371	27,615	29,330	46,627	35,626	22,068
2003	37,120	28,274	30,678	49,308	36,582	22,995

2004	37,647	28,774	31,542	50,086	38,476	23,697
2005	40,913	30,149	33,084	51,653	39,037	24,782
2006	41,788	30,889	33,361	54,785	40,631	24,606
2007	42,620	32,683	34,442	55,189	39,589	25,195
2008	43,360	33,769	35,779	58,398	40,796	25,649
2009	46,251	34,090	36,837	59,993	40,338	27,140
change 1999- 2009	45.7%	23.0%	49.7%	59.7%	31.7%	22.7%
SOC Code from 2002	2311	2312	2314	2411	2421	2451

* based on ASHE published data, and likely to include a small percentage of teaching professionals not actually employed in the HE sector

Full-time gross mean average annual pay; % calculations UCU

Source: ONS ASHE Table 14.7a (except 'public sector' Table 13.7a) - unavailable before 1999

Training, development and apprenticeships

The trade union side believes that there is a danger that training and development will suffer as HEIs seek to cut back on budgets, with a knock on effect on career pathways and development. We seek a national commitment from UCEA to training and development for all staff and to establish a technical group to explore the options, in particular, a commitment from UCEA subscribers to lifelong learning that would see planned arrangements in line with other major UK employers (including higher education). Lifelong and union learning representatives can assist in the development of locally provided education and skill enhancement to be delivered by UCEA subscribers to their higher education workforce.

In November 2009 the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act received royal assent putting apprenticeship programs on a statutory footing for the first time. The Act guarantees that every suitable young person who wants one will be entitled to an apprenticeship by 2013. The HE workforce is ageing and we need to develop new strategies that will improve the diversity and age profile of the workforce. We would recommend that the sector develop a national apprenticeship programme under the auspices of JNCHES.

Trade union side claim for 2010/11

Pay

The trade union side wishes to see:

1. an increase on all pay points equivalent to the difference between the 0.5% increase paid for the period 1 August 2009 to 31 July 2010 and the higher RPI rate expected over the same period, to ensure that HE staff do not suffer a real-terms pay cut for that year
2. an increase on all pay points equivalent to the expected RPI figure for August 2010, to ensure that there is no real-terms pay cut in the coming year
3. in the light of expectations for RPI at the point of claim, a minimum increase of 4% on all pay points
4. the lump sum of £550 underpinning of salaries for low paid staff

Job security

In recognition of the challenges facing the sector, the trade union side urges UCEA to join with other interested parties in the broadest possible campaign for a fair deal for higher education and the defence of jobs, of research and of teaching standards. Such a campaign should attempt to build the maximum possible unity between all stakeholders - unions, students, learned societies and Higher Education employers - and can win widespread support and offer the best prospect for the defence of state funding for Higher Education. In addition, the trade unions expect the employers to recognise the relationship between the quality of education and research in our institutions and the quality of the professionals on whom education and research depend. Recruitment of excellent teachers, researchers and professional support staff cannot be separated from decent pay and conditions. Therefore, part of the trade union side claim is to urge:

5. National negotiations on the provision and sustaining of jobs, leading to jointly agreed proposals to improve job security across the sector

Framework issues

Paragraph 6 of the national agreement recognises that JNCHES will be responsible for negotiation of those pay and related matters that are determined at national level and refers specifically to a regular review of the Framework pay spine and to further consideration of the provisions of the Framework Agreement for the Modernisation of HE Pay Structures (2004). Therefore the trade union side requires discussions on:

6. the removal of the bottom two pay points of the national pay spine and its extension at the top to create additional points beyond point 51
7. the assimilation to the national pay spine of hourly-paid staff and positive moves to ensure that all hourly-paid staff are employed on appropriate full-time or fractional contracts
8. jointly-agreed proposals to close the gender pay gap
9. jointly-agreed proposals to develop a national system for the remuneration of external examiners

- 10.the establishment of a technical group to address issues relating to career pathways and progression, roles and professional development for distinct occupational groups
- 11.the resolving through the JNCHES machinery of points from the 2009/10 pay claim that have not yet been addressed, in particular the 35 hour week and a minimum rate for trainee technicians
- 12.an increase to £6,000 for London Weighting and the establishment of a working group to consider the development of other high cost area supplements
- 13.the principle of fee remission for children of HE staff.

ENDS