

STATES OF JERSEY



MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: VOTE OF CENSURE

Lodged au Greffe on 31st January 2017
by Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSITION

THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –

to censure the Minister for Education, Deputy Roderick Gordon Bryans of St. Helier, for his failure to maintain and strengthen the Public's trust and confidence in the integrity of the States of Jersey by his repeated use of misleading data in debate.

DEPUTY G.P. SOUTHERN OF ST. HELIER

Note: In accordance with the requirements of Standing Order 21B, the following Members are additional signatories to this proposition –

1. Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade
2. Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier
3. Deputy M.R. Higgins of St. Helier.

REPORT

In his comments to my amendment to the MTFP on teachers' salaries, the Minister for Education made the following statement –

- *Newly qualified teachers (“NQTs”) starting work in Jersey currently earn up to £16,000 or 70% more than their counterparts in the U.K.*

This statement was supported by the following table –

Starting Salaries of NQTs		
Jersey MPS 3	£38,296	From January 2016
Jersey MPS 1	£33,900	
Inner London	£27,819	NASUWT figures for academic year to August 2016
England & Wales	£22,244	

This statement was false and remains so. The only way to produce a £16,000 differential is to compare the highest figure, the Jersey MPS 3 salary with the lowest, that for England and Wales. This does indeed produce a figure for Jersey which is 72% higher than that for England and Wales. Unfortunately, the data is incomplete. The figures given by the Minister for both inner London and England and Wales both refer to MPS level 1.

This is obviously an inaccurate comparison, in that all NQTs with a 2.2 Honours degree or above, are eligible to join the workforce at entry point 3, no matter where they are in the U.K. Comparison with figures for entry point 1 is incorrect.

Nevertheless, the Minister repeated this assertion early in his speech in the Assembly on 27th September –

“I want to provide a foundation of factual information ... (teachers’) starting salary was raised and it now stands up to £16,000 more than if they had stayed in the U.K.”

When challenged, Deputy Bryans simply repeated this untrue assertion –

“They walk out of college and into a job here paying £38,296, whereas a teacher’s starting pay in the U.K. is £22,244, rising to an inner London rate of £27,819”

Further on in the debate, he asserted that he was not misleading the Assembly, but offered no evidence to justify the basis for false comparison between MPS 3 figures and MPS 1 figures (for the full exchange please see attached **Appendix**).

As a result of the Minister’s repeated assertions, and his refusal to give way, I was forced to circulate the following information for Members so that they could identify the lack of accuracy of the Minister’s statements as follows –

The Minister for Education yesterday presented a comments paper in response to my amendment to the MTFP, which was (unintentionally, no doubt) misleading.

Central to his argument was the statement that “*Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) starting work in Jersey currently earn up to £16,000 or 70% more than their counterparts in the U.K.*”. This claim was repeated on page 2 of the comments.

In order to achieve such extreme figures, one has to compare U.K. and Jersey salaries from different levels of the respective salary scales as shown below. Proper comparison of like with like reveals a lower, albeit still significant, incentive for NQTs to come to Jersey.

	<i>Jersey</i>	<i>Inner London</i>	<i>England & Wales</i>	<i>E&W adjusted for Cost of Living Jersey/U.K. (20%)</i>
Entry Point	£	£	£	£
U	30,400			
1	33,900	27,800	22,200	26,600
2	36,000	29,300	24,000	28,800
3	38,200	30,800	26,000	31,000

Furthermore, the statement that removal of £8,000 would leave the starting salary for Jersey “*still 9% higher than the rate for teachers in inner London*” is also untrue. Removal of £8,000 takes the starting salary **below** that for inner London.

When salaries are adjusted for the Jersey-U.K. relative consumer price levels for goods and services (final column) the removal of £8,000 even takes salaries below the price-adjusted rate for England and Wales. This removes any incentive for NQTs to come to Jersey.

However, the damage had been done. Some Members were misled by the false use of Jersey entry point 3 with the U.K. entry point 1. Once the inaccurate and misleading figures are put into the debate, they become very difficult to displace. Here are 3 of the speeches from influential members. All 3 depend on the acceptance of the so-called facts presented by Deputy Bryans –

Connétable of St. Martin

“I suppose the basic question that we have to ask ourselves, are newly-qualified teachers paid too high a starting salary?..... £16,000 more than U.K. counterparts in England and Wales, that is the £16,000 more than the starting figure for England, 70 per cent more.”

Senator Sir P.M. Bailhache

“A newly appointed teacher in England and Wales is paid £22,467; in inner London £28,098; in Guernsey, our neighbour, £29,247; but in Jersey £38,296. The discrepancy and the disparity is extraordinary. Is there any advantage that the Island gets from essentially overpaying newly-appointed teachers?”

Senator P.F.C. Ozouf

“The starting salary in Jersey for teachers with a 2.2 degree is £38,000; in England it is £22,000; inner London £28,000 and Guernsey £29,000. Now, people can shake their heads, but those are the facts, those are the actual facts and those are facts –”

Other speakers also used the false figures as part of their contributions to the debate. The end result, despite the attempts by myself and others to persuade Members that false figures had been used by the Minister to build an exaggerated picture of the differentials between Jersey and the U.K., was that my amendment was defeated by 27 votes to 17, with 2 abstentions. I am convinced that some of these votes were the result of the misinformation spread by the Minister.

Following this result, I sought to clarify the position of the Minister in seeking to change the pay structure for teachers, and asked written question 9641 at the next meeting on 11th October. Both question and answer are reproduced here –

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION
BY DEPUTY G.P. SOUTHERN OF ST. HELIER
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 11TH OCTOBER 2016**

Question

Will the Minister inform Members whether his statement in the debate on Newly Qualified Teachers’ (NQTs) salaries, (P.68/2016 Amd.), that “NQTs starting work in Jersey currently earn up to £16,000 or 70% more than their counterparts in the U.K.” compared teachers employed on a like-for-like basis at the same entry point and, if not, on what basis that comparison was made; and will he complete the following table to show the different levels of starting salary available to NQTs here and elsewhere?

	Jersey		Inner London		England and Wales		England and Wales adjusted for comparison with the Jersey cost of living
Entry point	£		£		£		£
U							
1							
2							
3							

Answer

	Jersey	Inner London	England and Wales	England and Wales adjusted for comparison with the Jersey cost of living
Entry point	£	£	£	Not available
Unqualified	30,411	17,368	16,298	
1	33,900	27,819	22,244	(£26,600)
2	36,097	30,795	24,002	(£28,800)
3	38,296	32,400	25,932	(£31,000)

Question

What evidence does he have to support his assertion that reducing NQTs' starting salaries by £8,000 would leave such salaries "still 9% higher than the rate for teachers in Inner London"?

Answer

In practice, all newly qualified teachers in Jersey start on entry point 3, which is £38,296. This is the actual starting wage. Points 1 and 2 have not been used for more than four years because of the requirement for our teachers to have a degree at the 2:2 grade or above.

Reducing this actual salary to £30,296 would mean it is 9% higher than the inner London starting wage, which is entry point 1 or £27,819.

Question

What monetary incentive does he intend to offer to Jersey NQTs compared to U.K. NQTs, given the difference in price levels between the two jurisdictions (as shown in the final column of the table)?

Answer

This will be subject to the forthcoming consultation and negotiations between the States Employment Board and the teachers' unions.

The Minister is now engaged in discussions with one of the teachers' unions, and we find that he still repeats his misleading figures, telling ITV news recently that "*the wage (of new teachers) will be higher than those in the U.K., at around £33,000*". As shown above, using the Minister's own figures, and comparing like with like, removing £8,000 from the NQT salary would produce a figure of £30,296, compared with the equivalent in London of £32,400.

The Minister's answer also shows his ignorance of the Jersey Statistics Unit's work "Jersey-U.K. Relative consumer Price Levels for Goods and Services" published in 2013 which showed that Jersey's cost of living is 20% higher than the average in the U.K.

The answer to this question reveals once again the Minister's insistence on comparing figures which are not comparable. His own data, when comparing like with like, shows that the removal of £8,000 from the Jersey NQT salary takes our rates below that of inner London by over £2,000. The application of a 20% cost of living difference even takes Jersey salaries below the U.K. average.

The inadequacy of the Minister's logic is revealed by the following passage from Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade's oral question on 11th October –

Deputy M. Tadier:

“Does (the Minister) accept that the information he has given in the written question suggests that he is not comparing like to like when saying that Jersey compares well with the starting wage for inner London?”

He says in that written answer that Jersey effectively starts all teachers on level 3 because of the requirement for all teachers to have 2:2 grade degree or above but yet he proceeds to compare the figures to the level 1 figures in inner London rather than the level 3 comparable figures which would be much higher than the starting wage for Jersey.

So could he explain why he is being very selective with his use of figures which may unintentionally mislead Members of this Assembly and the public?”

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

“Yes, I think I have tried to explain this a few times. Since, I think it was 2000, wages were inflated to deal with a recruitment problem back then and they have never been tackled since that point.

Over the last 4 years the starting salary for a teacher in Jersey has been £38,000; that is what I was relating to. So it is comparable in the sense that if you are starting in the U.K. you start on level 1 but here you start on a level 3.”

Deputy G.P. Southern:

“Is it not the case that in the majority of parts of the U.K., including inner London, a newly qualified teacher will enter the salary point at 3 if they have a 2:2, an Honours degree, or above? Is that not the case elsewhere as well as Jersey and should the Minister not be comparing like with like and comparing entry point 3 with entry point 3?”

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

“The Deputy is quite correct. If there is an opportunity for students on a degree level to go in at a certain point that is what happens in the U.K. What I was trying to illustrate is exactly what happens in our schools at this moment in time.”

This passage could not be clearer. NQTs with a good degree do indeed enter the pay scale at entry point 3, whether here or elsewhere in the U.K. Any comparison between Jersey and the U.K. must be “like with like” to be valid.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

“Does the Minister accept that he was unintentionally misleading the House when he did not compare entry point 3 with entry point 3?”

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

“No, I was not misleading the House. What I was trying to explain to the Assembly, and I have done it several times and will keep doing it, the situation we have in Jersey is that when degree students enter the Jersey education system; over the last 4 years we have nobody, not one person, who has entered on a newly qualified teachers level as coming in anything lower than 3.”

The Minister continues to repeat his assertion that after a cut of £8,000 in salary, NQT teachers would be better off in Jersey than in inner London. This, in answer to a further question on 1st November –

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

“I think if this particular student were to come back she would still be delighted at the consideration. The amount that we will be paying would be considerably more than inner city London”.

One has to wonder why the Minister persists in maintaining this falsehood. The facts are that £30,296, the proposed Jersey NQT salary is not “considerably more” than the inner London equivalent of £32,400; it is a little less.

Perhaps the Minister wishes to maintain the fiction that there would still be an incentive for NQTs to come to Jersey in the face of secondary teacher shortages in the U.K. We do not have, and have never had, a problem with primary teacher recruitment.

5.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Education regarding the recruitment of specialist secondary school teachers:

“What evidence, if any, does the Minister have that the challenges to secondary school teacher recruitment in the United Kingdom in many specialist areas have eased, and if none, what incentives are there in place to attract such teachers to come and work in Jersey?”

Deputy R.G. Bryans of St. Helier (The Minister for Education):

*“Thank you to the Deputy. The school workforce census (SWC) is the main source of information of school staffing in England and its latest figures: **“Show there are reasons to be cheerful”**, that is a quote from them. **Teacher numbers are up overall and there was a slight increase in the number of recruits.** The number of teachers in History, English and P.E. (Physical Education) is buoyant.”*

This sounds very positive. Can it be that the crisis in teacher recruitment and teacher numbers in the U.K. is over? Is there now a surplus of specialist secondary teachers nationally such that we no longer need to offer incentives for NQTs to come to Jersey with its high cost of living and high removal costs?

The quote selected does indeed sound positive. However it is enormously partial. The school workforce census takes place annually in November, and the results are published in the following June. This quote therefore refers to November 2015 data, published by the U.K. Department of Education and the Office of National Statistics in June 2016. Page 5 of their report does contain the statement that “Overall teacher numbers have increased further, by 0.4% but it is swiftly followed by the following –

“Within the secondary phase, the total number of FTE teachers decreased by 2.5 thousand... a 1.2% decrease.”

Analysis of the full figures, conducted by Dr. Parameshwaran in July 2015 and published in “Schools Week” in October 2016, contained the following –

“There are reasons to be cheerful; teacher numbers are up, for starters. But the School Workforce Census for last year shows that recruiting and retaining a top quality workforce is still a major challenge”.

The article notes that most of the increase in FTE staff is in the primary sector, and goes on to say of the secondary position –

“Unfortunately, the bad news outweighs the good. The biggest concern is the number of teacher vacancies. There were 1,030 vacant posts in November 2014 compared with 750 in November 2013, so even though there are more teachers, there are relatively more unfilled posts.

A further 3,210 full-time posts (0.9 per cent) were being temporarily filled by a teacher on a contract of at least one term but less than one year, almost 1,000 more than in 2013.

Finding appropriately qualified staff is more difficult in secondary schools, with fewer English, maths and science teachers holding relevant post A-level qualifications for the subjects they teach. This has led to fewer lessons in these core subjects taught by teachers with relevant qualifications.”

This poor picture of the state of teacher numbers and training was reflected in the Daily Telegraph in June 2016 –

“As schools are busy [recruiting staff for the next school year](#), once again they are faced with a shortage of specialist teachers, especially in subjects such as physics and design technology where as few as one third of advertised posts are filled.

Although the official government view is that there is no shortage of teachers (and this, [despite recruitment targets having been missed](#) for the past four years and an expected roll surge of some 600,000 pupils to cater for in the next five years), more schools are having to make do with teachers teaching in non-specialist subjects or by using supply teachers to cover classes.”

Financial and manpower implications

There are no financial or manpower costs for the States arising from this proposition.

APPENDIX

2.5.2 Deputy R.G. Bryans:

“As I explain our response to this amendment, I hope to give the Assembly a clear understanding of how all our decisions were reached for this M.T.F.P. **I want to provide a foundation of factual information** that will show the depth and breadth of consideration given to every element of the plan that affects the education of this Island’s children. I want to start off by saying how impressed I have been by the teachers I have met when I have visited schools. It is absolutely clear to me that a good teacher can make an enormous difference to the children in their care. It is said that teaching is the profession that creates all other professions. I am sure everyone in this Chamber can remember their favourite teacher, the one who inspired them and helped them believe in themselves. It may seem counterintuitive for a Minister for Education to be proposing this. I can understand that point and I want to explain why this change makes sense and how this small piece fits into the overall plan. When I took office, it was obvious to both myself and the new director that we needed to take stock, ensure the system is fair, amplify concerns and create new initiatives. We wanted a clear vision that would provide focus and that everyone could understand and appreciate. We also knew that some of what we contemplated would dictate a shift in direction of ideas and resources and would not be appreciated by some of those it could affect. One of the largest draws on our budget is teachers’ pay, which you might expect, but in some schools it accounts for over 90 per cent of the budget, leaving head teachers little room for manoeuvre, much less than the U.K., to adapt their schools. This has been caused, in part, by a generous pay deal some time ago when teachers were in short supply and money was plentiful. Everyone received a pay rise, including newly qualified teachers. **As a result, their starting salary was raised and it now stands up to £16,000 more than if they had stayed in the U.K.**”

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Sir, could I interrupt the speaker? I believe he is misleading the House.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, would you like to seek a point of clarification if the speaker is prepared to give way? It is a matter for the speaker.

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

I am prepared to give way.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Thank you. The reference to £16,000 more than the U.K. is only achieved by comparing M.P.S. 3 rates of pay in Jersey with M.P.S. 1 rates of pay in the U.K. So that is inaccurate. It is an oranges and lemons comparison. It is not like for like. Please, I would ask the Minister to reconsider his continued use of that £16,000. It is not true. He is misleading the House.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, I think that is a point of clarification of your speech, which is perfectly acceptable.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Can he clarify this is like for like?

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

Yes, I will go on to clarify as I go through the speech and if the Deputy is still concerned I am sure he will rise again. They walk out of college and into a job here paying £38,296, whereas a teacher's starting pay in the U.K. is £22,244, rising to an inner London rate of £27,819. Of course, the financial picture has changed and so has the availability of teachers. There are still concerns about the shortages, but there are signs in the U.K. that the shortfall is being addressed and numbers of new recruits are rising. For Jersey, there is no shortage of high quality local primary teachers. The Deputy made reference to this earlier. In fact, there are more candidates than jobs, which is a nice position to be in. However, we share the national problem when it comes to specialists at secondary level, and that is what we need to address. We find ourselves in the position of having inherited a pay scale that includes the old premium that is something that we no longer need. It would surely be foolish for anyone in any circumstances to continue paying an inflated price for something. This amendment asks us to keep spending more than we need to. Surely that cannot be good financial management.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Can I have another point of clarification, Sir?

The Deputy Bailiff:

It is up to the Minister whether he wishes to give way or not.

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

If I could just carry on, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

If the Minister does not wish to give way, then I am afraid, no, you cannot. Of course, you do have a right to respond at the end, Deputy.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

It is very awkward to listen to somebody who is misleading the House.

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

I do not believe I am misleading the House.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

The figure you just quoted was £22,000, was it not, in the U.K.?

The Deputy Bailiff:

No, please could this be directed through the Chair? To stand up and suggest that someone is misleading the House is obviously a serious allegation, Deputy.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

Yes, it is.

The Deputy Bailiff:

I am assuming that you are meaning unintentionally because you have been seeking points of clarification. Standing Orders provide that if the Minister is not prepared to give way, then there is no way of seeking a point of clarification. Of course, you are in the unique position of having a second speech, which is at the end, in which you can clarify matters as you see fit.

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

I am not misleading the House at all. Can I continue?

The Deputy Bailiff:

I have to ask you, Deputy. To say the House is being misled, I have to assume that you are saying unintentionally misled.

Deputy G.P. Southern:

It appears to me that the Minister is quoting from salary scales, which are in front of me, when he refers to £22,000, which is definitely level 1, not level 3. I know he is using level 3 for his £38,000.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The position is ...

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

That is correct. You are correct in that assumption. I am using ...

Deputy G.P. Southern:

You are not comparing like with like.

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

No, I will move on to that and show you, explain to you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

No, this cannot be an exchange between Members. This must be an exchange through the President.

Deputy R.G. Bryans:

Sorry, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The position is that you have made the point that you believe that the figures in front of you do not support what the Minister is saying. I think we can take the matter no further forward. The Minister has not given way. He can continue with his speech and you are in a position to correct it at the end if you feel that is necessary, Deputy.