

McCormac – Review of Teacher Employment

- The outcome will be subject to full and detailed discussion within the EIS and a Special General Meeting will determine the Institutes formal response.
- The EIS welcomes the commitment in McCormac that decisions which relate to conditions of service shall be the property of the SNCT. The bargaining machinery established in the 2001 Agreement is crucial to the continuation of harmonious working relationships in Scotland.
- The EIS calls on Scottish Government to ensure that there is also a full and genuine negotiation on any matters which lie outwith the scope of the SNCT.
- The EIS views with concern:
 - i) The planned removal of teachers' duties from the SNCT Handbook to be replaced by GTCS Codes of Professional Standards. This confuses contractual requirements with the demands of the regulatory body; it entrusts any subsequent changes to GTCS and not to the SNCT; and it means that the GTCS will be the arbiter of employment matters. Further, the removal of the list of duties will simply mean these are implied in the contract, rather than explicitly stated.
 - ii) The proposed induction of a flexible approach to teachers' hours is ill considered. The report is not clear how this can be delivered and it is our view that the means of delivering this effectively, even if there was an appetite to do so, would depend on the time of clock watching approach that Professor McCormac is keen to avoid.
 - iii) The absence of clear recommendations on workload is regrettable. The question of the demand on teachers and the management of time was crucial in the SNCT deciding not to implement the element in the 2001 Agreement regarding moving from three time zones to two. This desire to describe teachers' hours a class contact and time remaining disregards the requirement to control teachers' workload and the need to ensure that teachers have sufficient time to carry out demands linked to the pupils they teach.
 - iv) The removal of the CT Programme is a retrograde step. With the GTCS Revised Standard and the SNCT Code of Practice, there was an opportunity for CTs to provide a more coherent role. Any view that all teachers can deliver, the Standard is simply a backdoor to raising expectation and demand at zero cost to employees. The Standard for CTs cannot be conflated with the Standard for Full Registration. There is also a clear breach of trust for those on the route as well as for those who have strived to be CTs.
 - v) The proposal that classes can be taught by other professionals suggests dilution. The EIS has no objection to other professionals working with teachers (e.g. health professionals, sports coaches) but not replacing teaching. This is a step towards dilution of the professional standards of teachers.