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UK staff bargaining perspectives: HE employers’ view

Helen Fairfoul
Deputy Chief Executive
Universities & Colleges Employers Association

What we do:

• Employment legislation and practice:
  – Information and advice in a UK HE context
• Reward and Pensions
  – Negotiations (national level) on pay
  – Intelligence about what HEIs are doing
  – Representation and consultation
• Seminars and training
• Research and surveys
• Lobbying and representation
UK Higher Education: some context

• 500,000 staff employed in HEIs

• 168 HEIs
  Range of UCEA members:
  – University of Manchester – 11,700 staff
  – Bishop Grosseteste - 260 staff

• Funding sources
  – Public sources
  – Students’ fees
  – Range of dependence on state
National pay bargaining

- The HE unions
- A strong tradition
- Prone to disputes?
- A journey: where are we going?
From 2001…

- many tables
- many pay scales

- Pressures for change:
  - European Equal Pay legislation
  - Desire for equity and transparency
  - Ability to respond to market pressures
  - Ability to reward high performance
  - Remove unhelpful (unlawful) demarcations
2004 Framework Agreement

• All-HE unions agreement
• Commitment to local delivery through partnership

• A national single pay spine
• Locally (HEI) determined common grades
• Underpinned by job evaluation in each HEI
• Some core expectations:
  – Schemes for determining / reviewing market pay
  – Schemes for rewarding contribution
  – Some progression on experience (for all grades)
  – Derivation of hourly rates
• Implementation by August 2006
The single pay spine in HE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spine point</th>
<th>Value at August 2007 (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>38019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>39159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>40335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>41545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>42791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>44074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>45397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>46759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>48161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>51095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Common grades: an example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU 9</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>40,335</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU 9</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>32,795</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU 8</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>29,139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26,666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU 7</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>25,889</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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And since then...

• 134 HEIs completed to date (some backdating)
• Will be 168 different pay and grading schemes
• Harmonisation of other conditions

Legacy:
• Resource intensive processes
• Distraction
• Turbulence / some discontent ("red circles")
• High cost to employers
• National vs. local deals
• Improvements for lowest grades
2006-09 pay deal

- Followed a dispute led by academic union(s)
- 3 year deal – some respite – at least 13.1%
- HE Finance & Pay Data Review (reports autumn 2008)
- Commitment to reform national machinery (JNCHES):
  - Streamlined
  - Single table
  - A timetable
  - Disputes procedure
Where HEI employers are now

- Single table seen as a necessity
- Attracted to “something for something” bargaining
- Strong employee relations embedded (in the main)
- Conditions a local issue – not for national table
- Concern over pay costs, including pensions
- Funding diversity concerns
- Regional employment market concerns
- 20% of academic staff are “off SPS”

- Majority want collective (national) bargaining for SPS – at least short- to medium-term
- Some may be ready for (and prefer) local bargaining
- Caveat is required reforms to JNCHES
Where unions are now?

• All committed to wanting national bargaining (for present)
• All unions, except UCU, signed up to reforms
• UCU position right now…a vote to reject by 10,000 members
• What next?
• Employers and unions having to prepare for a variety of scenarios
Paris or London?

EASTER RISINGS: A TALE OF TWO CITIES

WHAT DO WE WANT?
PARITY OF PENSION PROVISION FOR ALL!
WHEN DO WE WANT IT?
ON A PHASED BASIS BUT PREFERABLY BEFORE WE RETIRE!