

ADDENDUM - FEBRUARY 2019

Summary of findings from the consultation process



The PPCR contained the following key components in terms of consultation:

- Submissions from key external stakeholders and individual submissions
- Focus groups
- Deloitte jurisdictional benchmarking
- Mercer work value assessments

PPCR consultation component	Key themes
Key stakeholder submissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salary levels • Relativity of teacher positions • Differentiation within the structure • Recognition of school complexity • Range of rules
Individual staff submissions	<p>Individual submissions consistently identified that a future classification structure should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide fair and reasonable pay reflecting the work value of the position • make sure equity with other positions is evidenced by work value • maintain a separation between promotional positions and classroom teachers • reflect the complexity of diverse community factors experienced within schools and that impact greatly on the work of staff members in promotional positions. <p>Responses from staff most often identified the complexity of promotional positions is directly related to school community factors, i.e. student diversity and background.</p>
Focus groups (Term 2, 2018)	<p>Common themes from PPCR focus groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in complexity over the past 10 years • Increases in accountability • Relativity within the structure – the main points discussed about the relativity within the structure were around deputy principals and principals in different school contexts • The view of most participants, including many from secondary schools, was that differentiating between deputy principals based on the school type in which they operate was not appropriate, as work value of the roles are similar, but work load may not be. Hence the structure should not differentiate between deputy principals, but differences in the allocative model between school types should continue. • Relativity to other structures – initial view of almost all participants was that the comparative work value of lead teachers and promotional positions should ensure promotional positions receive higher remuneration. Participants also raised the relativity of other Band 11/executive principals and public servants (i.e. assistant regional directors and regional directors). The general consensus among participants was that principals could, and should, be remunerated higher than public servants given the accountability that sits with the principal. • Role descriptions – head of curriculum and head of department participants raised concerns about the role description for their roles. Participants felt that their role descriptions were too generic. While this sits outside of the scope of the PPCR, it is an important issue that needs to be addressed. • Transfer system/relocation/recruitment processes – many participants, particularly from outside the south east corner, felt the transfer/relocation system for promotional positions was not operating efficiently and effectively for all staff members. There was a perception that rural and remote area experience is not valued by schools in the south east corner, and advertised promotional positions are most often filled by lower-level staff already located within the south east corner, often from the same school. This is outside the scope of the PPCR, but these views were still captured. • Attraction/retention – attraction and retention of promotional positions within rural and remote schools.

ADDENDUM - FEBRUARY 2019 - CONTINUED

<p>Jurisdictional benchmarking</p> <p>Deloitte Access Economics was contracted by the department to do this.</p>	<p>Position and duties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparisons were impacted by the level of flexibility in resourcing, as principals can exercise more discretion over duties • Even in systems with prescriptive resourcing models, there are material differences in the teaching load over duties (i.e. QLD and NSW) <p>Resource allocation models</p> <p>Key dimensions impacting on comparisons of promotional positions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility – centralised and decentralised systems • Complexity – some schooling systems rely solely on student enrolments in determining staffing enrolments, while others incorporate student and contextual factors in determining resourcing • Relativities – each resource allocation model may make different allocations of senior and middle leadership positions. <p>Deloitte suggested that QLD state schools have a more centrally determined staffing structure than most other jurisdictions, and that Queensland provides more administrative release time in proportion to classroom teachers than NSW (with such modelling not possible at a whole-of-system level for Victoria, SA and WA).</p> <p>Progression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incremental progression is common, but NSW and SA don't have increments. <p>Remuneration</p> <p>In comparing remuneration, Deloitte focussed on two main aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The salary ranges for promotional positions • Individual school level comparisons. <p>Salary ranges</p> <p>The salary range of Queensland state school principals is similar to the salary range of NSW principals. However, principals in NSW are generally positioned higher in the salary range than principals in Queensland for a school with the same number of enrolments (it should be noted that NSW classification structure is not based on enrolments but on resources managed).</p> <p>Individual school level comparisons (Deloitte uses a case study approach)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While NSW principals may receive higher salaries, there are more promotional positions in the same sized school. That is there are more overall resources available in a similarly sized Queensland state school than a comparable NSW public school. • Queensland schools have significantly higher administrative release time for the leadership team, especially if the head of curriculum is included. The substantial difference in administrative release time is due to the assistant principal role in the NSW school having no administrative release (i.e. they have a full-time teaching load). <p>Deloitte state that it is important to consider, in any classification structure, whether the additional administrative support available within the school offsets the salary difference of the principal. The QTU is very clear that it is a workload argument and out-of-scope of the review. Moreover, it contradicts the fundamental basis of the job evaluation.</p> <p>Cost of living</p> <p>The report concludes that differences in cost of living in other jurisdictions do not explain differences in remuneration levels between states.</p>
--	---

ADDENDUM - FEBRUARY 2019 - CONTINUED

<p>Work value assessments</p>	<p>Mercer was engaged by the department to carry out the work value assessments. Mercer, previously Cullen Egan Dell, owns the work value assessment methodology, JEMS, used for assessing all public service positions within the Queensland Government.</p> <p>In preparing work value assessments, Mercer identified a number of common themes from these discussions in regard to the challenges faced by promotional positions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student characteristics – changes in student characteristics as a primary driver for the increasing complexity of their roles, e.g. SWD, lower socio-economic status backgrounds. • Statutory and reporting requirements – a notable increase in statutory reporting requirements, such as child protection reporting and student and school performance reporting, which have now become a key part of promotional leadership roles’ responsibilities. • Performance monitoring – promotional positions identified performance comparison and reporting mechanisms, such as MySchool and NAPLAN, has raised the requirement for development of innovative strategies and programs. • Increasing parental expectations – responsibilities that were previously deemed to rest with parents are increasingly expected to be delivered by schools. • Mental health/wellbeing of staff and students – increasing incidences of mental health and wellbeing issues among staff and students, often related to situations outside the “school gate” • Regional and remote – challenges identified by regional and remote promotional positions related to not having access to resources and difficulty attracting or retaining the required staff to the school. • Smaller schools – principals from the smallest schools identified they are responsible for the curriculum, teaching, school management, and other specialist activities for which larger schools would have specialist positions. • P-12 and P-10 schools – promotional positions within multi-campus schools had to plan an emphasis on establishing a ‘one-school’ culture, which requires significant ongoing commitment to implement and maintain where campuses are not co-located. • Special education schools – promotional positions within special schools identified a shortage of teachers with special education qualifications, leading to more on the job training and supervision of staff.
-------------------------------	---