

## Summary: Intervention & Options

<b>Department /Agency:</b> <b>DCSF</b>	<b>Title:</b> <b>Impact Assessment of Regulations and Guidance under Section 154 of the Education and Skills Act 2008.</b>	
<b>Stage:</b> Final Proposal Stage	<b>Version:</b> 2	<b>Date:</b> 24 March 2010
<b>Related Publications:</b>		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www.>

**Contact for enquiries:** Tim Youlden

**Telephone:** 020 7340 8314

**What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?**

Section 154 of the Education and Skills Act 2008 enables schools to direct pupils off-site for behaviour related training. However, there is a risk that this power is used by schools to keep difficult pupils out of mainstream school. Therefore, Government intervention is necessary to prevent indefinite referrals. This will ensure equitable treatment for all pupils.

**What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?**

The objective of the regulations is to ensure that the power in section 154 is used appropriately as a tool to improve behaviour and not just a way of removing pupils from the school. Alternative provision that is aimed primarily at behaviour improvement may not have enough of an academic element for pupils to progress and gain qualifications, so prolonged use of it will worsen the likely outcomes for pupils rather than improve them, potentially leading to an increase in the number of young people not in education, employment or training.

**What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.**

To provide the power to governing bodies without any safeguards, although this would not meet commitments made in Parliament. The safeguards were introduced during the passage of the Bill in response to concerns that pupils would be left indefinitely in off-site provision and that pupils with special educational needs could be particularly disadvantaged by section 154.

**When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects? We will seek to evaluate the impact of this legislation in late 2013, after the guidance and the legislative duty has been in place for 3 years.**

**Ministerial Sign-off** For consultation stage Impact Assessments:

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the policy and the benefits justify the costs.

Signed by the responsible Minister:

*Vernon Coaker* ..... Date: 30 March 2010

## Summary: Analysis & Evidence

<b>Policy Option:</b>	<b>Description:</b>
-----------------------	---------------------

<b>COSTS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COSTS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups' We have considered four scenarios that reflect the different number of meetings <b>per year</b> that we could expect ( <b>costs over 10 years</b> ) – See Evidence Base sector: 1) 3,150 meetings (costs = £3.6m), 2) 19,200 meetings (costs = £16.8m), 3) 36,300 (costs = £31.2m), 4) 57,600 (costs = £50.4m)
	One-off (Transition) £	Yrs 1	
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	<b>Total Cost (PV)</b>		
Other <b>key non-monetised costs</b> by 'main affected groups'			

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>ANNUAL BENEFITS</b>		Description and scale of <b>key monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' As follow, the number of pupils that have to benefit effectively ( <b>each year</b> ) from this intervention to cover the costs associated to each scenario in the most likely situation in brackets percentage of the pupil population in PRUs: 1) 19 pupils (0.2%), 2) 90 pupils (1%), 3) 170 pupils (2%) and 4) 265 pupils (3%)
	One-off £	Yrs	
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	<b>Total Benefit (PV)</b>		
Other <b>key non-monetised benefits</b> by 'main affected groups' This intervention is likely to reduce the pupil's average stay in alternative provision and, therefore, reduce costs since the cost of educating a child in alternative provision is around £15,000 compared to £4,000 per year in mainstream school. Yet this reduction in costs has not been quantified due to the lack of data.			

**Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks** Assume there will be no increase in the number of pupils referred off-site; that pupils will benefit from the provision and not be disruptive when they return to class.

Price Base Year 2008	Time Period Years 10	<b>Net Benefit Range (NPV)</b> £	<b>NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)</b> £
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	England only				
On what date will the policy be implemented?	September 2010				
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	N/A				
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?	£ N/A				
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	Yes				
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	No				
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?	£ N/A				
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?	£ N/A				
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?	No				
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Micro</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Small</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Medium</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Large</td> </tr> </table>	Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Micro	Small	Medium	Large		
Are any of these organisations exempt?	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">No</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">No</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">N/A</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">N/A</td> </tr> </table>	No	No	N/A	N/A
No	No	N/A	N/A		

<b>Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline</b> (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)
Increase of	£ N/A	Decrease of £ N/A
<b>Net Impact</b>		£ N/A

Key: Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices (Net) Present Value

## Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

[Use this space (with a recommended maximum of 30 pages) to set out the evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Ensure that the information is organised in such a way as to explain clearly the summary information on the preceding pages of this form.]

1. A school governing body already has the power under section 29(3) of the Education Act 2002 (as amended by the 2005 Act) to “*require [registered] pupils at the school to attend at any place outside the school premises for the purposes of receiving any instruction or training included in the secular curriculum for the school*”. This power was intended to enable schools to send pupils to other schools or FE colleges to take academic or vocational subjects that their own school could not provide, and it also enables the school to send a whole class on a field trip or similar activity. Legislation already gives parents responsibility for their child’s attendance at such off-site provision.
2. In addition to this, Ministers decided to introduce a power for governing bodies to refer their pupils to off-site provision specifically aimed at improving their behaviour and introduced an amendment to this effect to section 29 of the 2002 Act as section 154 of the Education and Skills Act 2008.
3. During the passage of the Education and Skills Act 2008 through Parliament, concerns were raised that the new power would mean that governing bodies would be able to remove pupils from the school indefinitely, without regard to the needs of the pupil and whether those needs were being met by the off-site provision. There were particular concerns about the effect this would have on pupils with special educational needs. Were the power to be used in this way it could have the effect of a permanent exclusion, without the governing body having to comply with the statutory exclusions procedures and with the pupils and their parents having no right of appeal. Ministers therefore amended the relevant clause to introduce safeguards for pupils who are referred off-site by governing bodies using the new power, to address the concerns raised by the opposition. Some of these safeguards are on the face of the primary legislation, while others are included in the regulations and others will be in forthcoming guidance.
4. The regulations set out the detail of how the power under section 154 should be exercised by governing bodies. They should ensure that the power will be used appropriately as a measure to address behavioural problems before they escalate to a level where exclusion becomes necessary, and not just as a way of removing pupils from the school because they are a problem to deal with. The safeguards set out in regulations and the potential benefits of each of them are:
  - *The governing body must give written notice of the requirement for a pupil to attend offsite provision not less than 2 school days before the requirement comes into effect. The notice must specify the address of the offsite provision, the number of days for which the requirement will be imposed, details of the person at the offsite provision to whom the pupil must report on first attending, the reasons for and objectives of imposing the requirement to attend offsite provision and the times of the sessions at the offsite provision.*

This ensures that the requirement cannot be imposed without notice to the pupil and their parents. It is only reasonable to provide sufficient notice to the pupil and their parents, so that they can make travel arrangements. And any placement is likely to be more successful if the parents are supportive, so it is important that they are fully informed. This notice also ensures that the governing body is clear about what they want the placement to achieve and that the pupil and their parents are aware of it. It ensures that the governing body must be able to justify any decision to refer pupils offsite and that the placement is genuinely designed to address the pupil’s behavioural problems.

- *The governing body cannot require a pupil to attend offsite provision beyond the last day of the academic year in which the requirement is imposed.*

This ensures that a governing body cannot simply refer a pupil to offsite provision and leave them there indefinitely, regardless of the benefit or otherwise to the pupil. This is designed to prevent a governing body from using offsite provision as a way of removing a pupil from the school without having to go through the exclusion process.

- *The governing body must hold a review meeting every 30 days from the date that the requirement to attend offsite provision is first imposed. The regulations also specify the people who should attend the review meetings and that the outcome of each review meeting, and the reasons on which that outcome is based, should be sent to the pupil's parent (or the pupil themselves where they are 18) and, where the pupil has a statement of special educational needs to the local authority that maintains the statement, within six school days of the review meeting.*

This requirement will ensure that governing bodies consider whether a pupil needs further time in the off-site provision to improve their behaviour. If not, the pupil can be reintegrated to school. If the governing body decide that the pupil could benefit from further time in the provision, they will have to state in writing their reasons for this decision. It also gives the governing body a chance to consider whether the offsite provision is being effective or whether some other provision might better meet the pupil's needs. Once again, this ensures that the power under section 154 is used for the right reason, that the pupils referred to offsite provision do not stay there any longer than necessary and that the provision is the best one for the pupil.

5. The guidance to accompany the regulations may be subject to change as a result of responses to the consultation. A copy of the final version of the guidance is not therefore ready at this time. This Impact assessment covers the regulations only.
6. The case for introducing the new section 154 power was made in the comprehensive impact assessment prepared for the introduction of the Education and Skills Bill. That stated that it was expected that the new provision would be cost neutral but because of the changes made to this section of the Act during its passage through Parliament and the commitments made by Ministers to include further safeguards in the regulations, there will now be cost implications. This impact assessment is only concerned with the regulations made under the Bill, rather than the complete case for a new power, and therefore includes estimates only for costs imposed by the safeguards imposed by the regulations.

#### *The Consultation*

7. The Department consulted on both the regulations and the guidance from 10 December 2009 to 4 March 2010. There were 32 responses; 38% from local authorities, 19% from school governors, 9% each from teaching unions or associations and national organisations and 6% from school staff, including head teachers. 65% of the respondents considered the regulations and guidance helpful or very helpful, while 21% thought it not very or not at all helpful. The remaining 14% considered them neither helpful nor unhelpful.
8. One of the consultation questions asked what proportion of pupils are likely to be referred under these regulations, in order to try to gauge how big the impact of the regulations is likely to be. 24 out of the 32 responses answered this question in some way (some declined saying they were not a school so could not comment, some simply left the response form blank for this question). Of those who did answer it, some gave no estimate at all but simply reiterated their view (good or bad) of the regulations. The responses that provided estimates were mixed:
  - 'very low'; 'very few'; 'minimal impact';
  - 'few at first' but increasing;

- '1%';
- '8'(pupils);
- '2 per class per year';
- '2.5% but could be higher';

As can be seen from the above, most of those who did reply with an estimate of the proportion likely to be referred said they thought it was likely to be a small proportion of pupils. Because of the small number of responses, we do not have a statistically viable basis for making any changes to the cost calculations. The costings used in this Impact assessment are therefore the same as in the one for the consultation.

9. As a result of the consultation the regulations have been amended to include:
  - a. the local authority as one of those who must be notified of a placement when a pupil has a statement of special educational needs; and
  - b. the provider of alternative provision as one of those to be invited to review meetings.
10. The first of these changes will have minimal impact and it is likely that governing bodies would notify the local authority anyway in these cases – there seems little point in them being invited to attend the pre-meeting but then not notifying them of the result. For the latter change, the provider may factor any cost for attending the review meetings into their charge for the provision – in which case it would be a cost to the school (i.e. the governing body) or the provider may decide to meet the cost themselves.

## **Costs and benefits of Regulations and Guidance under Section 154 of Education and Skills Act**

### **Costs**

There were 8,430 pupils dual registered in January 2006, 9,004 in January 2007 and 9,200 in January 2008 (**Source: School census**). Therefore, we will be assuming that there are 9,000 pupils at any one time.

A school year is 190 days, usually spread out over three terms – 29 school weeks, so approximately 10 weeks per term.

Very few pupils will be directed to off-site provision within the first term of an academic year – the guidance that will accompany the regulations makes clear that a direction should normally only be used where other interventions have been tried and failed, so it is unlikely that directions will be issued until the second term of an academic year. Therefore, we are looking at the 20 last weeks (two last terms)

### **Meetings**

We expect each meeting to last an hour and involve:

- The head teacher (cost £38.59 per hour<sup>1</sup>)
- LA representative where SEN pupil (cost £24.53 per hour<sup>2</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> See Tables 2 and 3 below – Head teachers in secondary schools

<sup>2</sup> The salary of the LA representative could vary among LAs, so we decided to take the top decile of the average earnings from the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2009.

- SENCO where SEN pupil (cost £22.90 per hour<sup>3</sup>)
- School governor (cost £24.53 per hour<sup>4</sup>)
- Provider (cost £22.90 per hour<sup>5</sup>)

Total cost where a non-SEN pupil is involved (head teacher and school governor) = £86.02  
 Total cost where SEN pupil (head teacher, LA representative, SENCO and school governor) = £133.45.

A reviewing meeting has to be held every 30 days

### **Review meetings (All pupils)**

1. **Scenario 1** – None of the 9,000 pupils stays in alternative provision (AP) longer than 29 days. Therefore no meetings are needed and no cost involved.
2. **Scenario 2** – 2/3 of the 9,000 pupils stay in AP less than 30 days (no meetings, no cost). 1/3 of the 9,000 pupils stay 30 or more days. In this case there will be a meeting every 30 days (approx. 4 weeks). Number of meetings 3,000 x 5 (one meeting every 4 weeks means 5 meetings over 20 weeks) = 15,000 meetings per academic year.
  - a. Non-SEN (86% of 15,000 = 12,900). Cost £1,109,658
  - b. SEN (14%<sup>6</sup> of 15,000 = 2,100). Cost £280,245
  - c. **Total cost £1,390,000**
3. **Scenario 3** – 1/3 of the 9,000 pupils stay in AP less than 30 days (no meetings, no cost). 2/3 of the 9,000 pupils stay 30 or more days. In this case there will be a meeting every 30 days (approx. 4 weeks, 5 meeting over the 20 weeks of the last two terms). Number of meetings 6,000 x 5 = 30,000 meetings per academic year.
  - a. Non SEN (86% of 30,000 = 25,800). Cost £2,219,316
  - b. SEN (14% of 30,000 = 4,200). Cost £560,490
  - c. **Total cost £2,780,000**
4. **Scenario 4** – All pupils stay in AP 30 or more days. Number of meetings 9,000 x 5 = 45,000 meetings per academic year.
  - a. No SEN (86% of 45,000 = 38,700). Cost £3,328,974
  - b. SEN (14% of 45,000 = 6,300). Cost £840,735
  - c. **Total cost £4,170,000**

### **Pre- placement meetings (only SEN Pupils)**

SEN pupils have to have a pre-placement meeting.

We know that 14 % of those 9,000 pupils dual registered are SEN pupils, i.e., 1,260 pupils. However, in order to work out the number of meetings that will have to be held every year we would need to know their turnover. We do not have evidence regarding the time spent in alternative provision, so we decided to set up four different scenarios:

<sup>3</sup> See Tables 2 and 3 below – Classroom teachers in secondary schools

<sup>4</sup> School governor is an unpaid post, however there will be a cost of opportunity associated to attending these meetings. To determine the average opportunity cost of attending these meetings we drew on the top decile of average earnings from the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2009.

<sup>5</sup> We do not have an estimate of providers' hourly rates. Therefore, we drew on secondary school teacher hourly rate as the best estimate to our knowledge (see tables 3, 2009 with on-costs).

<sup>6</sup> Based on 2009 National Pupil Dataset.

1. **Scenario 1** – If they stay (on average) 8 weeks, that will mean 1,100 meetings every 8 weeks for new comers, i.e.,  $1,260 \times 2.5$  (20weeks/8) = 3,150 meetings

**Cost: 3,150 meetings x £133.45 each meeting = £420,367**

2. **Scenario 2** – They stay (on average) 6 weeks  $1,260 \times 3.33 = 4,200$  meetings.

**Cost 4,200 meetings x £133.45 each meeting = £560,490**

3. **Scenario 3** – If they stay (on average) 4 weeks,  $1,260 \times 5 = 6,300$  meetings per year

**Cost 6,300 meetings x £133.45 each meeting = £840,735**

4. **Scenario 4** – If they stay (on average) 2 weeks that will mean 1,260 meetings every two weeks, so  $1,260 \times 10$  (20weeks/2) = 12,600 meetings per year

**Cost 12,600 meetings x £133.45 each meeting = £1,681,470**

### **Overall (review meetings + pre-placement meetings)**

**1. Minimum number of meetings** (Scenario 1 review meetings + Scenario 1 pre-placement meetings) = 3,150 meetings. Cost (Scenario 1 + Scenario 1) = £420,367 per year.  
**Costs over ten years (3.5% discount rate) = £3.6m.**

**2. Scenario 2 + Scenario 2** = £1,390,000 + £560,490 = £1,950,490.  
**Costs over ten years (3.5% discount rate) = £16.8m.**

**3. Scenario 3 + Scenario 3** = £2,780,000 + £840,735 = £3,620,735.  
**Costs over ten years (3.5% discount rate) = £31.2m.**

**4. Maximum number of meetings** (Scenario 4 + Scenario 4) = 56,000 meetings. Cost (Scenario 4 + Scenario 4) = £4,170,000 + £1,681,470 = £5,851,470.  
**Costs over ten years (3.5% discount rate) = £50.4m.**

## **Benefits**

### **Benefits to pupils**

Although we expect this new regulation to have a positive impact on pupils, it is difficult to quantify these benefits.

As an indicative guide we carried out the following break even analysis: we calculated the number of pupils who will have to benefit from this new regulation in order to cover costs - benefits estimates are based on the lifetime productivity gains that pupils are expected to obtain as a result of achieving the grades stated in table 1.<sup>7</sup> ..

### **Break even analysis**

**Table 1**

---

<sup>7</sup> Internal DCSF analysis using LFS 2008/09 data, ASHE 2007 data, Mcintosh, S. (2007) 'A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Apprenticeships and Other Vocational Qualifications.' Research Report No 834; and Jenkins, A. Greenwood, C. & Vignoles, A. (2007) 'The Returns to Qualifications in England: Updating the Evidence Base on Level 2 and Level 3 Vocational Qualifications.' Centre for the Economics of Education

	Costs over ten years (to the closest ,000)	No. of pupils moving from no qualifications to 5+A*-C GCSEs per year to cover costs. In brackets as percentage of the 9,000 pupils dual registered.	No. of pupils moving from no qualifications to 1-4 A*-C GCSEs per year to cover costs. In brackets as percentage of the 9,000 pupils dual registered.	No. of pupils moving from (vocational) Level 1 to Level 2 per year to cover costs ( <b>most likely situation</b> ) <sup>8</sup> . In brackets as percentage of the 9,000 pupils dual registered.
1. Minimum number of meetings	<b>£3.6m</b>	2 (0.02%)	5 (0.05%)	19 (0.21%)
2. Scenario 2 + Scenario 2	<b>£16.8m</b>	10 (0.11%)	22 (0.24%)	90 (1%)
3. Scenario 3 + Scenario 3	<b>£31.2m</b>	19 (0.21%)	40 (0.44%)	170 (1.9%)
4. Maximum number of meetings	<b>£50.4m</b>	31 (0.34%)	65 (0.72%)	265 (3%)

To show the likelihood of the impact we have quoted the percentage of pupils (of the 9,000 dual registered) who have to achieve the stated level of attainment to cover costs.

### Benefits to LAs and DCSF

Table 1 refers to benefits to pupils. However, there will be also benefits to LAs and government since this regulation is bound to reduce the average stay in off-site provision and, therefore, the cost to LAs and DCSF – the average cost of off-site provision is £15,000 compared to £4,000 in mainstream school per year. Yet as we pointed out above we do not know the average time pupils spend on off-site provision nor to what extent this policy will reduce this time. As a result, to monetise this benefit was not feasible. We will use the consultation to collect information on these points. This will help to evaluate the effect of the policy in 3 years time.

The outcome the Department wants for the new Regulations is that schools intervene early to resolve behavioural problems before they escalate. We will be reviewing whether this outcome is being achieved in 2013. Indicators that the legislation has been successful will be:

- an increase in the number of pupils placed in alternative provision by schools;
- whether pupils are being referred at an earlier age - one of the findings of the last alternative provision surveys (2005) was that alternative provision was used most often for pupils in Key Stage 4 but 'Back on Track' encourages schools and local authorities not to wait until then to intervene when a pupil's behaviour is causing concern; it is often too late by KS4. So an increase in the number of pupils being referred in KS3 and below will be a clear indication that the power is being used for the intended purpose;
- whether there is a fall in the number of exclusions, both fixed period and permanent.

There are a number of factors to take into account when reviewing the impact of the legislation. The Department will monitor the data on numbers of exclusions from now until 2013, and may commission a further survey of alternative provision in 2013 to see how often the power has been used. Further decisions will be made in 20103 in relation to whether any other steps are needed in order to ensure operation of the power is monitored effectively.

<sup>8</sup> We think this is the most likely situation given that pupils in PRUs seem to be less academically oriented. Thus, according to the GCSE and Equivalent Results in England, 2008/09 SFR (<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000880/index.shtml> - table 5) only 1.2 percent of KS4 pupils in hospital schools and PRUs achieved 5 GCSEs at grades A\*-C or equivalent; 13.1 per cent achieved 5 or more grades A\*-G; and 63.7 per cent achieved any pass. This compares with 45.6%; 90.6% and 98.8% for all schools.



**Table 2**

<b>Teachers' Workloads</b>		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Primary							
	Heads	55.5	55.6	52.9	53.5	54.2	55.2
	Deputy He:	56.4	55.7	55.7	53.4	51.4	52.8
	Classroom	51.8	52.5	50.9	50.1	51.5	52.2
Secondary							
	Heads	60.9	60.8	62.6	65.1	57.6	59.5
	Deputy He:	56.5	54.1	58.1	61	53.6	58
	Heads of F	52.7	51.6	51.2	51.5	50.2	52.9
	Classroom	50.8	49.9	49.3	49.1	48.7	49.9
Special							
	Classroom	47.6	46.3	45.6	43.9	45	48.3

Angle, H., Gilby, N., Fearn, A., Sasssett, C., Elston, D. and S. McGinival (2008) "Teachers's workloads  
<http://www.ome.uk.com/review.cfm?body=7>

**Table 3**

Source: School Workforce in England - <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000813/index.shtml>

<b>2007</b>		<b>Annually</b>	<b>Weekly*</b>	<b>Daily**</b>	<b>Hourly***</b>	<b>Average number of hours per day</b>
<b>Head</b>						
	Nur/Pri Head	50,000	1,282.05	256.41	23.74	10.8
	Sec Head	69,500	1,782.05	356.41	29.46	12.1
<b>Dep/asst Head</b>						
	Nur/Pri Dep Head	42,100	1,079.49	215.90	20.56	10.5
	Sec Dep Head	50,000	1,282.05	256.41	22.30	11.5
<b>CT</b>						
	Nur/Pri CT	30,400	779.49	155.90	15.28	10.2
	Sect CT	33,400	856.41	171.28	17.48	9.8

\* 39 weeks of work per year

\*\* 5 days a week

\*\*\* Based on average 2006, 2007 and 2008 (see Teachers' Workloads)

2009 = 2007's data uplifted by 2.45%<sup>1</sup> and 2.3%<sup>†</sup> to account for 2008 and 2009's pay raise respectively

<b>2009</b>		<b>Annually</b>	<b>Weekly*</b>	<b>Daily**</b>	<b>Hourly***</b>
<b>Head</b>					
	Nur/Pri Head	52,762	1,353	270.57	24.88
	Sec Head	73,339	1,880	376.10	30.87
<b>Dep/asst Head</b>					
	Nur/Pri Dep Head	44,425	1,139	227.82	21.55
	Sec Dep Head	52,762	1,353	270.57	23.37
<b>CT</b>					
	Nur/Pri CT	32,079	823	164.51	16.02
	Sect CT	35,245	904	180.74	18.32

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/docbank/index.cfm?id=12833>

<sup>†</sup> <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/docbank/index.cfm?id=14150>

\* 39 weeks of work per year

\*\* 5 days a week

\*\*\* Based on average 2006, 2007 and 2008 (see Teachers' Workloads)

<b>2009 With On-Costs (+ 25%)</b>		<b>Annually</b>	<b>Weekly*</b>	<b>Daily**</b>	<b>Hourly***</b>
<b>Head</b>					
	Nur/Pri Head	65,952	1,691	338.22	31.10
	Sec Head	91,674	2,351	470.12	38.59
<b>Dep/asst Head</b>					
	Nur/Pri Dep Head	55,532	1,424	284.78	26.94
	Sec Dep Head	65,952	1,691	338.22	29.21
<b>Classroom Teacher</b>					
	Nur/Pri CT	40,099	1,028	205.64	20.02
	Sect CT	44,056	1,130	225.93	22.90
<b>Supply Teacher</b>					
<i>Data for permanent teachers more suitable due to quality of supply teacher data (see separate sheet)</i>					

\* 39 weeks of work per year

\*\* 5 days a week

\*\*\* Based on average number of hours per day 2006, 2007 and 2008 (see Teachers' Workloads)

## Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Use the table below to demonstrate how broadly you have considered the potential impacts of your policy options.

**Ensure that the results of any tests that impact on the cost-benefit analysis are contained within the main evidence base; other results may be annexed.**

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	No	No
Small Firms Impact Test	No	No
Legal Aid	No	No
Sustainable Development	No	No
Carbon Assessment	No	No
Other Environment	No	No
Health Impact Assessment	No	No
Race Equality	No	No
Disability Equality	No	No
Gender Equality	No	No
Human Rights	No	No
Rural Proofing	No	No

