NJ 09 - 7

# NEW JNCHES TRADE UNION SIDE

## Pay and Conditions Claim 2009/10

## NEW JNCHES PAY CLAIM

### 1. Introduction

This is the first pay claim from the JNCHES signatory trade unions to the new JNCHES pay bargaining machinery. It is a joint claim on behalf of the academic and support staff unions EIS, GMB, UNISON and Unite, submitted under single table bargaining. Our claim covers a wide range of issues that staff have told us are important and which, if addressed, would make HE institutions employers of choice for workers.

### 2. HE funding – affordability

There has been considerable comment in the sector about longer term sustainability, which was to an extent reflected in the final report of the JNCHES finance and pay data review. However more recent evidence suggests that the picture is not as gloomy or uncertain as might have been expected.

At the beginning of this year the government's grant letter to HEFCE from John Denham, Secretary of State for the Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills says: 'Maintaining our deservedly high reputation for quality is crucial". We agree and, as HE is by necessity a labour intensive industry and as quality is directly related to staff, retention is vital. This means rewarding staff properly.

In an interview with the THE (26th Feb) the Secretary of State remarked that "I think that any view of what sort of Higher Education system a country such as ours needs [over the next 10 to 15 years] will tell us that it needs to grow and needs to have more resources" and "I think it right that we need to put more money into higher education over time as a society". Such statements are to be welcomed and ought to give some comfort for sustainability in the sector.

HEFCE has recently announced funding to the sector for 2009-10 is £7,994 million, a 3.8% increase on the previous year, including a 7.7% increase in research funding. This is a significant uplift for the sector and is higher than for most other public services. The government has also brought forward £219 million capital funding.

The Scottish Government announced the outcome of the 2007 Strategic Spending Review(SSR) on 14 November 2007. The table below sets out the outcome of the Council's budget and spending plans for HEIs for the three financial years 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11.

| Financial Year SR Outcome for HEIs | 2007-08 Budget £M | 2008-09 Draft Budget £M | 2009-10 Plans £M | 2010-11 Plans £M |
|---|---:|---:|---:|---:|
| Recurrent Funding for HEIs | 925.1 | 947.6 | 986.4 | 1,030.2 |
| Capital for HEIs | 85.0 | 87.4 | 94.7 | 95.2 |
| Total | 1,010.1 | 1,035.0 | 1,081.1 | 1,125.4 |

HEIs in Scotland received £1,015,024,000 with an additional capital budget of £87m. in 2008-9. We expect that the finalised budged for 2009-10 will be released in April, 2009."

The total HEFCW grant for 2008-9 was £441 million in 2008-9, a 3.23% increase on the previous year. Of this £357 million was distributed to HEIs an increase of 2.5% on the previous year.

There has been some turbulence in the distribution of research funding as a result of the research assessment exercise. The announcement in England has negatively affected some institutions, however because of the general increase in funding few have seen real term reductions and those that have are not ones that have traditionally had precarious funding. Indeed the future for research intensive universities seems secure as the Government seeks to set long terms plans and John Denham has stated that he expects the sector to" recognise and reward the highest levels of research". The RAE results have shown widespread evidence of international standards in research and this shows quality across the UK, which is underpinned by national pay scales. HEFCW have also just announced that it will fund research in a similar way to HEFCE although is not guaranteeing that all excellent research will be funded. We wait to hear from Scotland.

Whilst the government has increased HE funding it is also looking for increased productivity in return and is expecting that institutions will play a role in supporting the private sector during the recession. The sector is also expanding by another 10,000 students this year. This means more work with little sign of an increase in staff to look after these additional students.

Although it is recognised that the JNCHES Review of HE finance and Pay Data was conducted prior to the impact of much of the financial crisis, the report showed that the sector was generally in a healthy financial state. The review reported that the proportion of institutions running at a surplus as well as the size of both the historical and projected surpluses has grown in the last five years. The levels of surplus as a proportion of income grew from 1% of turnover in 2005/6 to 1.9% of turnover by 2009/10. Institutions reported healthy levels of cash and forecasted further growth in surpluses.

We acknowledge that pay awards over the last decade have moved staff from being the worst paid in the public sector to more stable and comparable levels. However we also note that the JNCHES review identified significant gaps in statistics relating to support staff, which we believe need addressing.

Taking the above into account we believe that the sector's future looks sustainable. We believe that it is important that staff pay is not seen as an easy target by those looking to cut costs, as this will affect the ability of employers to maintain the quality outlined by John Denham. We agree with Bill Wakeham who said that there is a need to sustain pay levels in the sector gained over the last few years.

## 3. Economic background

The current economic climate is currently difficult to predict for the forthcoming year August 2009 – August 2010 which is the period that the pay award will cover. All forecasters are predicting significant volatility for inflation with a continuing drop in the short term. Most predictions expect inflation to continue falling during the spring and into the summer of 2009 when the next HE pay round begins. However it is expected that inflation will begin to rise again by the end of 2009 and into 2010.

We would also note that inflation also affects different groups in different ways. Gas prices have risen by 51.3% electricity by 30.5% and water by 6.5% and so it is not much consolation to those whose majority spending is on the above to know that the price of a new car has dropped 14.6% or TV and audio equipment is 16.5% less than last year. Yet both of the latter figures have a direct impact on average inflation figures.

Similarly, pay deals are hard to predict with the statistics for the 3 months up January showing settlements averaging at 3.9% across the UK workforce. IDS predictions for 2009 suggest that public and private sector settlements will average around 3.5% (range from 2.9% to 4%). We would also note that the Government's much vaunted pay policy appears no longer to be in play as the Head of the Civil Service Gus O'Donnell has written to the civil service unions stating that there is no 2% limit on public sector pay".

Much has been made of the "8% pay increase" for HE staff in 2008. However it should be noted that the awards came in two stages: a 3% pay increase in May 2008 (i.e. for 8 months of 2008) followed by a 5% increase in October 2008 (i.e. for 3 months of 2008). However, although the HE staff 's monthly salaries were 8% higher during any month in the last quarter compared to any month in the first quarter, the total pay increase for 2008 was 3.28%; which is less than the annual RPI of 4.4%

## 4. Recruitment and Retention

The Government's pre-budget report issued in November 2008 stated: 'the objectives for public sector pay remain unchanged – recruiting and retaining a high quality workforce; affordability and value for money."

The recent UCEA recruitment and retention study found few general difficulties, however there were some persistent challenging areas. Problems were reported in specific academic occupations such a business/management, accounting finance and law, plus increased difficulties for biological science staff.

Amongst support staff, recruitment of administrative/professional staff was the main problem area with more than one in five respondents having difficulties recruiting accountants, finance professionals and 'other' administrative/professional staff. Similarly some HEIs reported recruitment difficulties amongst IT technicians. The main reason given for these difficulties was that pay levels in the private sector were more favourable.

Employers also reported some difficulties in retaining manual staff, particularly cleaning and catering staff.  Manual staff have the highest turnover rate of 10%. We believe that there still remain problems of low pay in the sector. Some institutions are addressing this by looking at the concept of the 'Living wage' (see section 9b).

However we believe there is a greater concern about the future and that is the increasing age of the workforce. HESA stats for 2006/7 show that around a fifth of the workforce is over 55, with higher levels in manual groups – chefs, gardeners electrical/construction  24%, cleaners/catering/security 30% and drivers, maintenance supervisors and plant operatives 36%.

**5. National Framework Agreement - Pay Spine**

We understand that almost 20% of academic staff (mostly on professorial grades) working in HEIs are not covered by the national pay spine (we are not aware of equivalent statistics for senior support staff). We believe that this is a significant weakness. It also reflects the reality that the spine is limited and a significant number of staff are not on the spine as they earn above the top point.  In recent years staff above the spine, and in particular senior management have received pay increases that outstrip pay awards. The most recent evidence is a survey from Scotland that showed that principals had received an average 10% increase last year. There is also clear evidence of equal pay issues in the sector at the top of the scales and above as senior positions, particularly amongst academic staff, are dominated by white men.

At the other end of the scale UCEAs publication 'A Review of the Implementation of the Framework Agreement' showed that two in five agreements start above the bottom point of the national scale.  This is no doubt to address the recruitment and retention issues identified above.

Taking the above into account we believe it is time to look at the national pay spine and address its weaknesses. However we do not believe that at this time it is right to interfere with the middle points, but suggest that there is room to do some work at the top and bottom of the grades.

**6. Contribution points**

When negotiating the national framework agreement the employers insisted on including a section on contribution points. Whilst noting that the scheme is up and running in many institutions, we have major concerns about the system. From the start a number of HEIs agreed with us that the idea of CPs was misguided and would cause more trouble than it was worth and so did not introduce a scheme (the UCEA review of the implementation of the framework agreement noted that around 25% of HEIs had not got a scheme). When writing the JNCHES guidance, which was issued in 2005 all parties struggled to identify good examples of what contribution meant and how it could be measured. Our experience is that local schemes have not improved on the national guidance and measures are unclear and subjective. Additionally the process for agreeing awards is often confusing, subjective and open to inconsistency. We believe that they could possibly open up equal pay issues.

We are also receiving indications that, as economic circumstances change, institutions are not utilising the contribution points to their previous extent. We have concerns that over time the bunching that occurs within the top end of grades will cause resentment of staff who see themselves restricted by artificial ceilings. This is exacerbated as some institutions have not yet set out their proposals for progression within and between grades.

Consequently we believe that there should be a JNCHES review of the implementation of contribution points schemes.

**7. Terms and conditions:**

**7a. 35 hour week**
A key objective of the support staff unions during the 2006 pay negotiations was to make progress in further reducing the working week with a view to moving to a standard 35 hour week across the sector. There has been some progress seen in the results of a UCEA commissioned survey detailed in the "Conditions of Employment in Higher Education" in June 2008. We have some concerns about the methodology of the survey, however believe that it gives some general indicators about conditions in the sector. The survey suggested that around 41% of institutions had a standard 35 hour week for support staff. Breaking down these figures show that around half of pre-92 institutions have a 35 hour week compared to around a quarter of post-1992 universities. We believe that as such a significant proportion of employers are able to achieve these standard hours there is no reason why the remaining ones cannot also do so. We are seeking a commitment from UCEA to work with us to ensure that the 35 hour week becomes a standard across the sector

**7b. Annual leave.**
Statistics on annual leave are difficult to interpret as institutions have begun to acknowledge that occupational based leave opens them up to potential equal pay challenges. The UCEA report on conditions of employment suggested that the median basic annual leave entitlement in 2008 was 35 days for academic staff and 25 days for support staff. However the majority of institutions have now extended the preferential leave for academic staff to support staff in the equivalent grades. Whilst this 'horizontal harmonisation' has solved their short terms equal pay problems it often creates a stark grade boundary where terms and conditions improve significantly at one or in some places two grade boundaries.

Recent UCEA reports comparing employment conditions and highlighting the benefits of working in HE tend to focus on private sector comparators to support the employers arguments rather than public service comparisons:

Examples of current basic public service leave agreements include:
Cabinet Office 30 days + 2 stat. days
Fire Service 25/28 days (grade dependent) + 2 stat. days
NHS 27 days + stat & long service leave

| | |
|---|---|
| Further Education | 30 days for support staff and 40 for teaching staff |
| Welsh Assembly | 31 plus stat days |

These show that the current levels of leave are not as generous as might be perceived especially for support staff in lower grades.

**7c. Shift and on-call premium payments**

The national framework agreement was not meant to directly affect premium payments stating: 'The rates for these allowances remain unchanged unless renegotiated locally with the recognised trade unions'. A number of employers exploited this clause, tying in changes to premium payments to framework agreement re-grading negotiations. In places these changes have significantly undermined national rates.

We believe that local based negotiated payments need re-nationalising and we are seeking the following minima overtime payments:

Saturdays: time and a half.
Sundays: Double time
Rest Days: For staff who work 5 days from 7; time and a half for first day worked, double time for second day.
Public Holidays and extra statutory days: Double time plus 1 day off for every holiday worked.
Premium rates for part time staff need to be reviewed
Staff should have the option to receive their overtime as time off in lieu. This should be calculated at the enhanced rate.

We also believe that grade related restrictions on premium payments – often linked to grades should not exist and all staff who work beyond their normal working week should be entitled to claim the premia set out above.

**7d. London Weighting**

We are calling for the introduction of a standard rate of £4,500 for London weighting for all staff currently covered by London and fringe area allowance payments. This is particularly important to end the recruitment and retention difficulties in London where some institutions have reported turnover rates of between 40 and 50% among manual and other low paid staff.

The differentials in London weighting create a barrier to harmonising terms and conditions across the sector and perpetuate the binary divide. The equalisation of London weighting across institutions should be prioritised.

In a league table of public sector London weighting, the higher education sector comes bottom. Police officers currently receive an allowance of £6,393,[1] an allowance rate that has enable the Metropolitan Police to stem the flow of staff away from London, NHS currently receive £5,638 and teachers receive £6,090, firefighters receive £4,727 and the Audit Commission £5,388 including a free travel card.

We strongly believe that it is essential to maintain the flat rate element of the allowance. The London weighting allowance was introduced to address a range of additional London costs

[1] Figures taken from House of Commons Members Estimate committee see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmmemest/578/578iiw15.htm

such as housing, travel, commuting and the higher stress of living and working in London, these costs remain the same regardless of grade or position and should be the same for all. The element of London weighting for lower paid staff is of greater importance, since it is a significant element of pay, which has accounted for up to 25% of salary.

One of the key recommendations of the Pay Board when introducing London allowances in 1974 was, ‘If London weighting is to be based on considerations of equity and the need to put London employees on a par with those working elsewhere, it is essential that it is an across the board payment.’ Any recommendations to move away from principles of equity will be rejected.

The London Consortium failed to deliver its remit following its establishment as part of the 2003 pay settlement. There needs to be a serious review of the negotiating machinery for the negotiation of the London weighting and the management of the impact that harmonisation through implementation of the Framework Agreement.

### 7e. Maternity, Paternity and Adoption leave. Parental Leave, Time Off for Dependents and Flexible Working Arrangements

These benefits are a barometer of employer commitment to work-life balance for all. We accept that the HE sector compares favourably to some other sector according to the UCEA report ‘Conditions of employment’. However we believe that there is confusion about recent statutory changes to maternity, paternity and adoption leave introduced in April 2008. We would propose that JNCHES guidance is produced on the statutory changes which could be expanded to include advice on flexible working which are due to come into force in April 2009.

### 7f. Work life balance

The issues at 7e form the core basis of JNCHES guidance on Work life Balance was agreed and published in February 2008. The Guidance is designed to highlight the main legal entitlements in the area and to identify examples of good practice, and should be considered alongside existing local policies and relevant national agreements inherited by JNCHES. Three quarters of HEIs offer flexible working arrangements, with 94 per cent offering maternity pay provisions above the statutory entitlement. Almost half offer career breaks (24/7 Work Life Balance Survey 2008).

## 8. Training and development

We have not completed the requirements of the national framework agreement. Under the section entitled ‘Staff Development and Review’ it states that ‘JNCHES will develop further guidance on staff development and review…..” this has not been done and we request that negotiations on this unfinished business are re-started Career development can potentially support the sector in reducing further staff turnover particularly in areas where retention has incurred some difficulties

## 9. Occupation specific evidence

Unions have worked on a number of specific projects identifying particular occupational issues:

### 9a. Secretarial and Clerical

Union sponsored research has examined the key employment issues for secretarial, clerical and administrative staff in HE. The survey of over 700 respondents revealed that this group of workers in HE are better qualified than equivalent staff in any other sector. More than a third of respondents were educated to degree level, 9.7% held masters degrees and 1.3% had PhDs. The research highlights the hidden talent and potential in the sector and shows they should receive appropriate recognition and increased career opportunities.

The study also revealed that just under half of respondents said they sometimes had problems managing on their salary, with an additional 13% saying they often had problems. Just under 70% said they worked additional hours, of which 27% received no TOIL or overtime.

Whilst a significant majority of staff were satisfied with their access to training and believed they worked in a happy and supportive environment. However over half were concerned at the lack of career progression. There was also considerable concern about lack of, or limits to, flexible working.

### 9b. Manual Staff – the Living Wage

We have earlier noted the problems in recruiting and retaining manual staff. Some HEIs have begun to recognise the concept of the ‘Living Wage’. Also known as the ‘minimum income standard’ this is increasingly being used to determine the basic level of income required to avoid poverty and have a ‘low cost but acceptable’ standard of living. Most recently the Greater London Authority[2] calculated that a living wage of £7.45 an hour or £15,344 (including means tested state benefits) was needed to avoid living in poverty in London. They are ensuring that all their staff are paid above this minimum level, and that all contracts they are responsible for have staff paid above this rate. The lowest point on the HE pay scale is now £13,085 a year or £6.65 an hour for those on a 37 hour week.

Union commissioned research published in January 2009 looked at ‘The Business Case for the Living Wage’. This report documents the findings of a research project conducted during October and November 2008 to explore the impact of the living wage – and the move of contracted out services back in-house - on the costs, standards and effect on employees involved in the cleaning service at Queen Mary, University of London. Prior to the move back in house most staff were on the minimum wage, had minimum holiday entitlement, no sick pay, no pension and no compassionate leave. Supervisors were responsible for collecting the keys to the buildings, ordering new cleaning materials and training new staff for just a few extra pence in their pay. Staff reported having no official induction and no access to training. Turnover was reported to be high and many had little regard for the job. Unsurprisingly after returning to the institutions the staff were overwhelmingly positive about their new jobs and highlighted the advantages of not only increased pay and benefits, but also working for the college with better management and opportunities. for career development. The research shows that the move to a ‘living wage employer’ and return to in-house has stimulated improvements in

[2] A Fairer London: The Living Wage in London, GLA Economics, April 2007, http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/economic_unit/docs/a_fairer_london_2007apr.pdf

job quality, productivity and service delivery, with very little increase in costs. In addition, the decision has strong support in and beyond the wider community at QMUL.

**9c. Technicians**

A recent report commissioned by HEFCE *(Highly Skilled Technicians in Higher Education, HEFCE 2004)* highlighted the need to recognise the contribution that technical support make to good research. It observed that 'Formal opportunities for highly skilled (and other) technicians to obtain training are piecemeal, and training is too often seen as a cost rather than investment'. The OECD Report on its *Review o*f *Higher Education in Ireland* also articulates a need for development: 'technician support needs long term training to establish the requisite specialist skills base.

The study was concerned primarily with those in research support roles. It focused on the way skilled technical support is organised and delivered, by considering evidence from case studies in Higher Education (HE) institutions and comparator organisations. It is an indictment that 5 years on little has been done to address the same issues and a number of issues need specific attention:

*Training.* Formal opportunities for highly skilled (and other) technicians to obtain training are piecemeal, and training is too often seen as cost rather than investment.

*Funding and continuity of contracts***.** The uncertain status of funding and lack of continuity of contracts for staff with high research related skills. This may threaten the medium-term viability of technical support for research as the present cohort of technicians retires.

*High skill technical support roles: problems of classification.* The 'highly skilled technician' is a widely acknowledged but ill-defined concept, perhaps associated with inferred skill levels and perceived replaceability. There is an assumption that these highly skilled roles are associated with research, though there is no simple way of distinguishing in existing data sources between those technicians who concentrate on research and those whose duties relate principally to teaching.

*Recruitment and retention.* Recruitment and retention can be summarised for two broad disciplinary groups:

- In bio-medicine/life sciences: units recruit young graduates to largely technical roles, though they may be on research scales. Research grants support only short-term contracts but there is no shortage of applicants. However, those with technical aptitude have no clear career path to follow.
- In physical sciences/engineering: there is a continuing need for 'traditional' technicians with experience and specialised knowledge essential to maintenance/design of research equipment. Such staff have followed traditional technical careers and vocational training routes, in HE and outside.

*Training and career development.* Recognising quality in technicians' work, particularly at the higher skill end where it interfaces directly with research, is problematic. There is a changing context for highly skilled technical work. Much personal development takes place on the job and integrating formal training opportunities with these on-the-job factors would require a shift from a cost to an investment training culture. The problem is that acquisition of experience and higher technical skills is neither easily accredited nor rewarded through career progression

**9d. Academics**

Salaries of the Lecturers 2 and 3 groups have fallen in real terms during the period 2001-2002 to 2006-2007 using the definitions in Para 81 of the Review of Higher Education Finance and Pay Data (RHEFPD), i.e.
*Lecturer 1:* Lecturers A from the pre-1992 universities and Lecturers from the post-1992 universities and colleges; and Lecturers (Scottish CSCFC scale).
*Lecturer 2:* Lecturers B from the pre-1992 universities, Senior Lecturers from the post-1992 universities and colleges; Senior Lecturers (Scottish CSCFC scale) and any locally determined lecturers.
*Lecturer 3:* Senior Lecturers and Readers from the pre-1992 universities and Principal Lecturers and Readers from the post-1992 universities and Colleges; and any locally determined lecturers."

In simplistic terms Lecturer 1 would mean a "standard lecturer" who is at or near the bottom of the standard lecturer pay scale points, Lecturer 2 a "standard lecturer" who is at or near the top of the standard lecturer pay scale points and Lecturer 3 a "senior lecturer" who is on a higher range of pay scale points than a "standard lecturer".

The Review of Higher Education Finance and Pay Data, para 355 shows:

Table 5.12 **Full-time Academic Median Salaries 2001/02 – 2006/07 (£)**

| Group | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | Change (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Junior Researchers | 21,503 | 22,445 | 24,097 | 24,820 | 26,470 | 28,290 | 31.6 |
| Researchers | 30,819 | 32,125 | 33,230 | 34,227 | 36,959 | 38,068 | 23.5 |
| Lecturer 1 | 24,017 | 25,033 | 25,894 | 26,671 | 27,929 | 29,409 | 22.5 |
| Lecturer 2 | 32,537 | 33,679 | 34,838 | 35,883 | 36,959 | 38,068 | 17.0 |
| Lecturer 3 | 38,603 | 39,958 | 41,333 | 42,059 | 43,321 | 43,638 | 13.0 |
| Professor/Head of Department | 48,397 | 50,298 | 52,120 | 54,300 | 56,894 | 60,371 | 24.7 |
| Other | 30,913 | 33,000 | 33,679 | 34,227 | 35,482 | 38,373 | 24.1 |
| **All Groups** | **31,573** | **32,952** | **34,838** | **35,883** | **36,959** | **38,772** | **22.8** |

Source: Data commissioned from HESA for the Review

(Note: The following analysis uses median salaries rather than mean salaries due to fact that the median is less sensitive to extreme values).

Table 5.12 shows that the nominal salary of the Lecturer 3 group increased by 13.0% between 2001 and 2007, whereas that of the Lecturer 2 group by 17.0%. The corresponding inflation rate of 17.2% however leads to lower real salaries for both Lecturer 2 and Lecturer 3 groups (see paragraph 353 of the Review of Higher Education Finance and Pay Data).

The data also shows that junior researchers, researchers, Lecturer 1 and Professors Groups have had pay increases in real terms. The EIS believes that Lecturer 2 and Lecturer 3 Groups (Standard Lecturers and Senior Lecturers respectively) should also benefit from higher salaries.

This measure would also have the effect of continuing the “catch up” of Lecturers 2 and 3 salaries with those of the junior and professor groups, as both groups have enjoyed much larger % pay increases. It should be noted that the latest pay increases, including that for 2008-09 were an ‘across the board’ increase and therefore have not affected the relative drop in pay for Lecturer 2 and Lecturer 3 groups compared to junior researches, researchers, Lecturer 1 and Professor groups.

A comparison of the mean versus the median salaries for the lecturer 3 group shows that most lecturers in “Lecturer 3” group have received less than the average (mean) % pay increment.

**Table 5.11 Full-time Academic Mean Salaries 2001/02 – 2006/07 (£)**

| Group | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 | 2004/05 | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | Change (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Junior Researchers | 22,285 | 23,247 | 24,881 | 25,330 | 27,891 | 29,946 | 34.4 |
| Researchers | 31,430 | 32,635 | 33,804 | 32,623 | 36,515 | 37,930 | 20.7 |
| Lecturer 1 | 24,460 | 25,497 | 26,566 | 26,187 | 29,004 | 30,279 | 23.8 |
| Lecturer 2 | 31,317 | 32,436 | 33,313 | 34,020 | 35,336 | 36,707 | 17.2 |
| Lecturer 3 | 37,412 | 38,763 | 39,808 | 40,319 | 42,176 | 43,280 | 15.7 |
| Professor/Head of Department | 50,565 | 52,937 | 55,237 | 57,462 | 60,398 | 64,074 | 26.7 |
| Other | 31,348 | 33,196 | 35,599 | 36,762 | 38,530 | 41,146 | 31.3 |
| **All Groups** | **31,380** | **32,787** | **34,754** | **35,623** | **37,887** | **40,053** | **27.8** |

Source: Data commissioned from HESA for the Review

Mean salary Lecturer 3 (2006/07) : £43,289, Median salary Lecturer 3 (2006/07): £43,638. Mean % pay change for Lecturer 3: 15.7%, Median % pay change for Lecturer 3: 13.0%.

The Review of Higher Education Finance and Pay Data suggest that the lower % pay changes in the Lecturer 3 group is down to compositional changes within the group with higher paid members leaving or promoted and lower paid members joining. We believe that consideration should be given to how to raise median salaries within the Lecturer 3 group.

**THE CLAIM**

**We:**

1. Are seeking a pay agreement that builds upon recent pay increases.

2. Are interested in a one year deal.

3. Believe that the top of the nationally agreed 51 point pay spine should be extended by at least two points

4. Propose that the bottom two points of the nationally agreed pay spine should be removed and grading structures amended accordingly.

5. Propose that there is JNCHES review of the implementation of contribution points schemes.

6. Continue to seek a sector wide standard 35 hour working week (with a phased reduction with proper timescales if appropriate); 30 days holiday minimum for all staff and the opening of negotiations to identify and agree appropriate national minima for shift and on-call premium payments.

7. Propose that there should be a common minimum London Weighting allowance of £4,500.

8. Are looking to produce new national JNCHES guidance on maternity, paternity care and adoption leave, including permanency orders and guardianship, and on work-life balance.

9. Believe that we should complete the work required under the national framework agreement and produce national training and development guidance.

10. Are aware that the finance pay and data review identified gaps in comparative data, particularly in relation to support staff and will be seeking agreement on how we can move forward on this.

11 Are aware that UCU are not currently signed up to the new JNCHES agreement and are also seeking to negotiate pay. Whilst we hope that UCU will be participating in the new JNCHES by the time that the final offer is made, we propose that if they are not, we should insert a clause to ensure that any settlement is reserved and is not subject to any group outside new JNCHES negotiating any different amounts. We also reserve the right to submit further items or re-submit existing items for negotiations should UCEA enter into negotiations or make settlements outside of new JNCHES.