

Durham E-Theses

“The movement for a teachers’ council 1949-70, with special reference to the work of the main committee for the proposed teachers’ general council: an administrative and political study

Ian George Booth

How to cite:

Booth, Ian George (1971) “The movement for a teachers’ council 1949-70, with special reference to the work of the main committee for the proposed teachers’ general council: an administrative and political study. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9874/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

"THE MOVEMENT FOR A TEACHERS' COUNCIL 1949 - 70,
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE WORK OF THE MAIN
COMMITTEE FOR THE PROPOSED TEACHERS' GENERAL
COUNCIL : AN ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLITICAL STUDY"

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Master of Education
of the University of Durham

by

Ian George Booth

Bede College

Durham

December 1971

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract of the thesis	1
List of Appendices	ii
Introduction	1
Chapter One	11
Chapter Two	40
Chapter Three	56
Chapter Four	79
Chapter Five	104
Chapter Six	146
Chapter Seven	192
Chapter Eight	213
Postscript	221
Appendices	240
Bibliography	285

A B S T R A C T

The teaching profession's wish for a measure of self-government is a long standing one. It arises from two major factors. Firstly, teachers have seen other professions acquire a measure of self-government and the prestige it confers. Secondly, teachers have accepted that one way to raise their professional and social status, and consequently their political and economic status, is by achieving some control over entry into the profession.

After outlining the pre-1949 attempts to obtain self-government, and the reasons for failure of, and loss of interest in the movement, the purpose of the study is to describe the main movement for a Teaching Council during the period 1948 - 70 in its administrative and political context. The major sources of discontent with the status of the profession, which form the background to the development are analysed. The origin of the post-1944 revival of interest in a Teaching Council is traced. Special emphasis is given to the work of the Teachers' General Council Main Committee which was formed in 1960, and which helped to clarify and co-ordinate the ideas of the teachers' associations during this period. The inherent administrative and political problems in the events leading to the establishment of the Official Working Party by Mr. Short in 1969 are examined. The proposals of the Working Party, "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" are analysed, and the subsequent attitudes of the teachers' associations to the Report are described.

It is concluded that the present proposals are likely to be shelved, and many administrative and political problems in the establishment of a Teaching Council still need further clarification. Nevertheless, the movement for a Teaching Council is likely to remain an issue in teacher politics.

APPENDICES TO THE TEXT

		Page
One	Memoranda presented by the Associations at the Second Committee Meeting of the Main Committee, 3rd March, 1961.	240
Two	Press Release of the Main Committee, May 1962.	246
Three	Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions. Conditions for Registration of Teachers in Further Education (649/19263)	247
Four	Letter from A. Grosland to R.J.Cook 17.10.66.	254
Five	News Release : for publication at 14.00 Hrs on Tuesday 1st November, 1966.	256
Six	Letter from R. J.Cook to Denis Howell 4.11.68.	258.
Seven	Report of a Speech made by Mr. Edward Short at Bede College, Durham, 21.2.69.	262
Eight	Outline of Proposals for a Teaching Council.	264
Nine	Outline of Proposals for a Teaching Council. (As amended by the Main Committee).	267
Ten	A Possible Framework for a Teaching Council for England and Wales. (This appears as Appendix 1 in "A Teaching Council for England and Wales").	270
Eleven	A Teaching Council for England and Wales. Part IV. Chapter X pages 31 - 36. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations.	273
Twelve	A Teaching Council for England and Wales. A Commentary by the Council of the College of Preceptors.	282

INTRODUCTION

"THE HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS"

A measure of self-government and control of entry to a profession is regarded by some sociologists as an important feature of professional status.^{1.} In February 1970, an Official Working Party appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science published its Report on "A Teaching Council for England and Wales," containing proposals for the establishment of a council through which teachers in England and Wales could exercise a measure of self-government.^{2.}

The teaching profession's wish for a measure of self-government is a long standing one. It arises from two major factors. Firstly, teachers have seen other professions acquire a measure of self-government and the prestige that accompanies the control of entry to a profession. Secondly, teachers have accepted that one way to raise the professional and social status, and consequently the political and economic status, of the profession is by achieving some control over entry into the profession.

The teachers' dissatisfaction with their status was sounded as early as October 1855 in the "School and the Teacher"; "It is no strange thing that men who, in education, tasks and habits, have all the qualifications of 'gentlemen', should regard themselves as worthy of something very much higher than the treatment of a servant and the wages of a mechanic what, in short the teacher desires is that his 'calling' shall rank as a 'profession', that the name of 'schoolmaster' shall ring as grandly as that

1. See for example E.Hoyle, "The Role of the Teacher" Pages 82 and 83 (Students Library of Education : Routledge and Kegan Paul : 1969 : Paperback Edition). J.P.C. Roach. "The Teaching Profession : Some Reflections on a Century of Development" : Inaugural Lecture, University of Sheffield, 1966. M. Lieberman. "Education as a Profession", Pages 3 - 5 (Prentice Hall, 1956). G. Millerson. "The Qualifying Associations," Chapters 1 - 3 (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964).

2. "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" (London, H.M.S.O. 1970).

of 'clergyman' or 'solicitor'." ^{1.}

In 1858, the General Medical Council was established by an Act of Parliament, and this encouraged teachers to press for a similar body. ^{2.}

A Scholastic Registration Movement had been suggested at intervals during the first fourteen years of existence of the College of Preceptors. In 1860, Mr. Barrow Rule, concerned at the growing number of private teachers who lacked either sufficient educational qualifications or adequate training, revived the idea of a Scholastic Council to register qualified schoolmasters and represent the interests of education and educators. He suggested that the College of Preceptors should initiate a campaign to secure a Scholastic Registration Act analogous to the Medical Registration Act of 1858. ^{3.} Originally, the movement was intended to raise the status of the middle-class educators, but it soon gained the support of the certificated teachers who not only recognised its 'intrinsic merits, but saw it as a means of uniting the different grades of their profession. ^{4.}

After ascertaining the views of the profession, ^{5.} in 1863 the College of Preceptors formed a "Scholastic Registration Association" representing

1. Quoted in H. Ree "Teaching - A Profession". Page 16 (New Society 14th Oct. 1965).
2. For the general movement see G. Baron, "The Teachers' Registration Movement", (Pages 133 - 144, British Journal of Educational Studies, May, 1954). For the story in documentary form, see J. Vincent Chapman, "The Movement for Registration in the Teaching Profession 1861 - 1966" (College of Preceptors). This account also appears in "Education Today", January/February, 1968 Vol. 18 No.1.
3. Special Report from the Select Committee on the Teachers' Registration and Organisation Bill (1891), Minute of Evidence No.320.
4. See speech by Mr. Dee at the Annual Conference of the General Associated Body of Church Schoolmasters in England and Wales, December 1862. English Journal of Education, 1863.
5. The College put forward its case in the "Educational Times" (January 1862, Page 219) inviting comment. This resulted in meetings of teachers all over the country. Such a meeting in York (Educational Times, May 1862, Page 31) unanimously adopted a motion "That an association of private and public schoolmasters be formed" to secure a Registration Bill.

both the elementary schoolteachers and the middle-class teachers. The former, who already had a form of certification hoped the movement would raise their social status; drive the unqualified teacher from the profession; represent the profession as a whole; act as an advisory council to the government on educational policy; promote the science of education and teacher training; and induce men of a higher class to enter teaching. Furthermore, the child would be defended against untrustworthy teachers. The latter had no uniformly recognised certificate of efficiency and their expectations of the movement were limited to the hope that it would secure government sanction to create their own professional qualification.^{1.}

The Association drafted a Bill, "very closely copied" from the Medical Council Act, to set up a General Council representing educational bodies with powers to determine the conditions of registration and the certificates, degrees and diplomas which were to be accepted, and with powers to strike off for unprofessional conduct.^{2.} This scheme provided for registration of teachers in all schools, private, endowed, and 'schools for the industrial classes.'^{3.}

The Bill was discussed by the Schools' Inquiry Commission, and the subsequent Endowed School Bill provided for a Register of Teachers in Endowed Schools, registration to depend on either a University degree or the gaining of a Certificate granted by the Council composed of representatives of the Privy Council, and of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and London, It should be noted that registration was to apply to teachers

1. A. Tropp. "The School Teachers" page 100 (Heinemann, 1957).
2. Report of the Schools' Inquiry Commission, (1868) v, 204 - 5, Minute of Evidence No. 10,926.
3. Special Report from the Select Committee on the Teachers' Registration and Organisation Bill (1891) Minutes of Evidence Nos. 327, 332 - 5, 353.

in the Endowed Schools only, and not to all teachers. In the event, however, opposition resulted in the withdrawal of the clauses relating to the Registration Council.^{1.}

In 1873-4 the Scholastic Registration Council ceased to exist, but the agitation for a council was continued by the College of Preceptors which now became committed to a policy of obtaining a Register for teachers in the Endowed Schools only.^{2.} The College made further Parliamentary attempts to secure its objectives in 1879 and 1881 with private members' Bills sponsored by Sir Lyon Playfair and Sir John Lubbock respectively.

In 1890, the College of Preceptors once more brought forward its Bill backed by Sir Richard Temple, Sir Lyon Playfair, Viscount Lynton, and Sir Albert Rollitt.^{3.} The College's monopoly of action in this sphere, however, was challenged by the Teachers' Guild which supported a rival and wider measure backed by Arthur Acland. Its proposals included that the Teachers' Guild, the Headmasters' Conference, the Headmistresses' Association and the National Union of Teachers should be represented on the controlling council.^{4.}

The Government set up a Select Committee on the Teachers' Organisation and Training Bills to examine both Bills. The Select Committee, in effect,

1. Baron, "The Teachers Registration Movement" Page 134. Baron states that in effect these clauses were designed to bring the secondary school-teacher under state control.
2. For a comment on the College's policy, see "The Educational Times", March 1877, page 294.
3. "The Educational Times", April 1890, Page 181.
4. "The Educational Times", May 1890, page 223 gives a brief account of the Guild's proposals, and makes the point that the Guild's proposals included "representatives of all grades of education". It is interesting to note that the "Educational Times", January 1891, Page 29, considered that because such proposals were so comprehensive (and included teachers in Scotland and Ireland), they were foredoomed to failure.

merely served to highlight the social divisions between the elementary schoolteachers on one hand, and the private and secondary schoolteachers on the other. The Committee avoided recommending either Bill, although it agreed that some form of registration was desirable, and its failure even to make reference to the elementary teachers left their inclusion still in question.^{1.} In 1895, however, the Royal Commission on Secondary Education recommended that there should be a register open "to all teachers in whatever class or kind of school they may be engaged or seeking engagement".^{2.}

The Board of Education Act of 1899, which followed closely the recommendations of the Royal Commission provided for a register of teachers, both primary and secondary. Indeed, the establishment of a Board charged with the superintendence of both primary and secondary education necessitated universal registration should registration be desired at all.^{3.} It was not until 1902 that the Teachers Registration Council was formed consisting of twelve members, six of whom were appointed by the President of the Board, whilst the remaining six consisted of one member from each of the following:- the Conference of Head Masters; the Incorporated Association of Head Masters; the Association of Head Mistresses; the College of Preceptors; the Teachers' Guild of Great Britain and Ireland; and the National Union of Teachers.^{4.} The membership structure of the Council weighted heavily in favour of the secondary organisations, the provision of the two column register with Column A for the elementary teachers, and Column B for secondary teachers,^{5.}

1. For a critical comment on the Special Report of the Select Committee on the Teachers' Registration and Organisation Bills see "The Educational Times", September 1891, Page 397. The paper calls the Report a "curiously halting, weak, and inconsistent series of statements".
2. Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education (1895), l. 319.
3. For a discussion on this point see "The Educational Times", October, 1899, page 407.
4. Order in Council of 6th March, 1902, and printed in full on Page 134 of the Educational Times, March 1902.
5. The 1899 Education Act had directed a single alphabetical list.

and the fact that secondary teachers who had no qualifications but had taught for a specified period were eligible for registration, rendered the council unacceptable to the National Union of Teachers.^{1.}

By 1905, the Educational Times was bemoaning the disappointing results of the Council,^{2.} and the new Liberal Government of 1905 used the hostility of the National Union of Teachers as an excuse to try to relieve the Board of Education of the responsibility for continuing the register.^{3.}

The feeling that the teaching profession should be self-governing strongly persisted among the teachers' organisations. A rapprochement between the elementary and secondary which had grown up since 1902 to counteract the increased control over education being exercised by the bureaucracy prevented the disintegration of the movement for registration. Consequently, the Headmasters' Conference and the National Union of Teachers continued to press for registration, but on a "one column basis". The teachers, with the support of the House of Lords, were able to get accepted an amendment to the 1906 Bill to provide that, whilst the Board should be relieved of all responsibility to frame, form, or keep a register," it should 'be lawful for His Majesty by Order in Council to constitute a Registration Council representative of the teaching profession' to set up a register of one column only.^{4.}

1. See article by B. Webb, The New Statesman, Special Supplement, 2 October, 1915.
2. "The Educational Times", July 1905, page 283. The Times saw the attempts of the Consultative Committee to reorganise the council as hopeless, and pointed out, "in our opinion, no piecing or botching will preserve the old garment, and we need a new scheme framed with different objects and on different principles".
3. Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill 1906 Clause 36.
4. Hansard, Lords, 4th Series, Vol. 165 (21 Nov. 1906) Cols. 773 -774. The amendment became S.16(2) of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act 1907 (7 Edw. 7c.43) and stated that a registration council, representative of the teaching profession, may be constituted by Order in Council, with the duty of forming and keeping a register of teachers who satisfy the conditions imposed by the council and apply for registration. The register is to contain the names and addresses of all registered teachers in alphabetical order in one column, with the date of registration, and such further statement of their attainments, training and experience, as the council determine S.16(3) provided that any such order may be revoked, altered or added to by any subsequent order.

The following years to 1911 witnessed a complicated series of negotiations between the teachers' organisations themselves, and between the teachers and the officials of the Board. It was evident that Morant, the Permanent Secretary at the Board of Education, was very much against the formation of a Registration Council for he feared that the Council would be dominated by the elementary teachers.¹ Although Morant eventually had to give way to the teachers' demands, it was not until February 1912, eight months after Morant had left the Board, that the new Teachers' Registration Council was established by Order in Council. The new Council consisted of eleven representatives of the elementary teachers, eleven of the secondary teachers, eleven of the specialist teachers, and eleven of the universities. The Council had no powers to compel registration, nor could it close the profession to those it did not recognise since the Board refused to give any form of official standing to the rulings of the Council.²

Thus, the new Council proved no more effective than the first in conferring status upon those who registered. Although by 1922 applications had risen to 73,359, the attention of the teachers' associations and their leaders had turned to such issues as securing national salary scales. In 1926 the

1. Tropp, *The School Teachers*, Ibid Page 198. For a full account of Morant's policy of obstructionism, see Baron, *The Teachers' Registration Movement*, Ibid pages 139 and 140.
2. See Morant's comment. Cd. 5726(1911). Further papers relating to the Registration of Teachers and the Proposed Registration Council. Page 40. When Morant was asked if the Board would make its grants conditional upon a Governing Body or a Local Education Authority requiring a substantial proportion of its teachers to be registered, he pointed out that the Board was responsible to Parliament alone; and the terms upon which grants of public money were made available could not be made dependent on the rulings of an independent professional body.

basis of representation underwent a radical change raising the membership to 50 and giving 12 representatives each to the same four groups of teachers who, except in the case of the University teachers, were to be elected by direct vote of the teachers in each group, and not appointed by teachers' associations.¹ This stimulated the Council to renewed activity and in 1929 the whole body of registered teachers became the Royal Society of Teachers.² The Teachers' Registration Council became, in effect, the governing body of this Society, and the members had the right to use the professional designation of M.R.S.T. (Member of the Royal Society of Teachers).

The Council, by force of circumstance, was obliged to recognise as eligible for registration those who were employed by the State and important teaching bodies. Thus it registered not only certificated teachers but graduate teachers and others who had not received training. But not only did the Council fail to bestow status upon its members, it also failed to assert its right to lead in the field of education dominated by the Board of Education, the Local Education Authorities and the teachers associations.

The 1944 Education Act did not even mention the Council, and the Primary and Secondary Schools (Grant Conditions) Regulations, 1945,³ which recognised the power of the Minister of Education to grant the status of qualified teacher to those who had followed an approved course of training or given proof of long and efficient service finally dispelled any remaining aspirations of the Royal Society of Teachers to assume control over the conditions of entry to the profession.

1. Teachers Registration Council Order, 1926, S.R. and O. 1926 No. 1588.
2. The Journal of Education and School World, July 1929, page 558.
3. The Primary and Secondary Schools (Grant Conditions) Regulations, 1945, dated May 29, 1945, made by the Minister of Education under Section 100 of the Education Act, 1944 (7 + 8 Geo, 6. c. 3), Part 2 "Conditions Applicable to Maintained Schools". Sections 15 and 16.

In 1949 the Royal Society of Teachers was terminated by an Order in Council,¹ although "the rights of existing members" were safeguarded by making suitable provision for the purpose under an Educational Trust. The fact that the funds in hand amounted to a mere £100 was an indication of the dwindling interest in the society.

The failure of the movement to secure a degree of self-government can be attributed to different factors at different times in the movement's history. Before 1902, the major difficulty was that different sectors of the profession wanted the registration council for different reasons. The headmasters of the private schools and the endowed grammar school teachers saw it not only as a means of achieving professional status, but as a means to reorganise and control secondary education. But when it became apparent that the state would take control over secondary education, the secondary associations saw the Council as an "obvious instrument for reinforcing the distinctive position of those whom they represented"² and sought to exclude the elementary teachers from a registration council. The elementary teachers, on the other hand, hoped the establishment of the Council with membership open to secondary and elementary teachers would raise their status to the level of the secondary teachers. The difference in the objectives of the elementary and the secondary teachers was reflected in the dual column register set up in 1902,³ which by its very nature was bound to fail.

The 1912 Registration Council promised to be more successful. It is true that registration was not made a compulsory condition of entry to the

1. Teachers' Registration Council Revoking Order 1949, Statutory Instrument 1949, No. 604.
2. Baron, The Teachers' Registration Council, Ibid Page 143.
3. As Tropp points out (The School Teachers, Ibid Page 169, footnotes 18), that there was a fundamental difference in the social class origins of the secondary teacher and the elementary teacher. The former generally came from a middle class background, whilst the latter came from a working class background. This tended to lead to a bitter class hostility between the "cultured" middle-class secondary teacher and the "uncultured" elementary teacher.

profession, but at least there seemed to be a degree of unity in the profession that augured well for the future. In the event, however, the promised progress was not realised. Two years after the formation of the Council, the country and the profession were disrupted by four years bitter warfare. After the war, the teachers' status was raised by other means,^{1.} and the teachers' associations' energies were absorbed by other activities, especially over salaries and superannuation.^{2.} Thus there was a decline in the interest shown in the movement for registration.

Other factors also contrived to act as a brake on the progress of the Registration Council. The establishment of three Burnham Committees to deal with the salaries of teachers tended to divide rather than unite the profession. The continued presence in the profession of a large body of untrained teachers, although this was diminishing, made it necessary for the Board of Education to retain control over the entry qualifications to the profession. Furthermore, there was a fundamental difference between teachers on the one hand, and doctors and lawyers who were among the first professions to gain a degree of self-government. The members of the legal and medical professions were traditionally self-employed, whilst the largest proportion of teachers were employed by the State.^{3.}

Finally, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when

1. As indices of the rising status of teachers, Tropp cites :- the growing number of teachers chosen as candidates for municipal or parliamentary office; the increasing number of teacher magistrates; favourable press reports; the ability of the profession to preserve its salaries almost intact in a period of falling prices; the freedom of teachers from mass unemployment; the change in the background of the majority of the profession; the increasing proportion of trained teachers; the growing influence of the N.U.T. in Parliament, in the L.E.A.s and at the Board of Education. (Tropp, *The School Teachers*, Ibid pages 227 and 228)
2. For example, the bitter strikes to secure that all authorities paid Burnham rates in the early twenties, and the campaign against the May Committee proposals of 1931.
3. For an interesting comment on the position of the doctors and the foundation of the General Medical Council, see paragraphs 46 and 47 of Cmnd . 2066, "The Teaching Profession in Scotland" (Edinburgh, H.M.S.O. reprinted 1966).

the teachers' associations were in their formative years, the registration movement was an important political issue which they could not ignore. It seemed to offer the teachers' associations a means of obtaining greater political influence as well as prestige. Once, however, the teachers' associations had secured greater recognition and prestige for themselves in the 1920's, they became the means by which teachers could exercise greater political influence to improve the conditions and status of the profession. The registration issue was one that never greatly interested the majority of teachers who were more concerned with salaries, pensions and conditions of service. Once the teachers' unions had become established, it was natural for the teachers to look more and more to their professional associations which were concerned with such issues. This had the effect of stressing sectional interests rather than professional unity.¹ Thus the restructuring of the Council in 1926, and the renaming of the Council, the Royal Society of Teachers, in 1929 failed to impress the majority of teachers.

Evenso some teachers continued to regard professional unity and self-government as important and desirable not only for their intrinsic merit, but for their political significance. Indeed, as will be shown, it was not long after the Royal Society of Teachers had been terminated that the idea of a British Teachers' Council was revived, and political aspirations were to prove to be an important motivating factor.

1. An outcome of this growing development of sectional interests within the profession was the formation of the National Association of Schoolmasters. The N.A.S. came into being in 1919 largely due to the endeavours of ex-Service schoolmasters who had become distrustful of the policies and leadership of the N.U.T. For the first few years of its existence the N.A.S. acted as a 'ginger group' inside the N.U.T. and attempted to obtain sympathetic recognition of the special and economic problems facing men forming a minority of 22% of the teaching service. The frustrating experience of this men teachers' organisation within an organisation in which men were hopelessly outnumbered by women members persuaded the N.A.S. conference in 1923 to secede and form an independent association capable of pursuing its distinctive policies, designed to safeguard the position of men teachers. (Minutes 2 and 3 of the N.A.S. Evidence to the Royal Commission on Local Government : Written Evidence of Professional Organisations, Oct. 1968, Page 236).

CHAPTER ONE

"MAJOR SOURCES OF DISCONTENT IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION
BETWEEN 1949 - 69"

In the nineteen fifties some sections of the teaching profession began to show a renewed interest in the formation of a Teachers' Council. It was not until after 1960, however, when the Main Committee for the proposed Teachers' General Council was formed that the majority of the teachers' associations took an active part in the campaign to establish a Council.

The concept of a Teachers' Council with a measure of self-government is inextricably linked with status. In the nineteen twenties, thirties and forties, when the status of the teaching profession was improving, and the teachers' unions were gaining increasing recognition,^{1.} the need for, and interest in, a Teachers' Council to safeguard and promote the status of the profession diminished. Since the early nineteen fifties there has been a growing concern in the teaching profession that its status has failed to improve,^{2.} Consequently there has been a growing discontent with the political, social, economic, and professional status of the profession.

Political Discontent

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, consultation and negot-

1. A. Tropp, *The School Teachers*. (Heinemann 1957). Pages 227 - 228. Also see A. Tropp, "The Changing Status of the Teacher in England and Wales" pages 143 - 170 in the *Year Book of Education 1953* (Evans Bros : 1953).
2. In the *Year Book of Education 1953* (Evans Bros : 1953) Ronald Gould noted that whilst the status of the teachers had risen, "those who are concerned about the future of education, and not least the teachers themselves, are determined to raise that status even higher". (page 135). This was a clear indication that teachers would become pre-occupied with their status should it not improve, or, if it should diminish.

iation between the government and interested parties have always been regarded as important in the making of national educational policy.^{1.} The extent to which consultation and discussion has taken place has varied according to the issues involved, the government in power, and the existing relationships between the interested parties. In the immediate post second world war years, it appeared that teachers were to play an important role in the formation of educational policy together with the government and local education authorities. The practice of establishing National Advisory Councils (e.g. on "The Training and Supply of Teachers") was seen as an indication of such a development. Indeed the rebuilding of the educational system, the fact that both teachers and administrators tended to share the same social idealism, and the acceptance of the need for co-operation by the men who succeeded to leadership positions^{2.} tended to give rise to the concept that a "partnership" existed between teachers, the local education authorities and the government in educational policy decisions.^{3.} The 1944 Education Act, however, left no doubt who was to be the senior "partner" since it placed the "control and direction" of educational policy firmly in the hands of the Minister of Education.^{4.}

1. R.A. Manzer : "Teachers and Politics" (Manchester University Press : 1970) Page 22. G. Baron : "Society, Schools and Progress in England" (Pergamon Press : 1965) Pages 74, 75, and 76.
2. R.A. Manzer, Ibid. pages 22 and 23.
3. Sir. W.P. Alexander : "Education in England" (Newnes : Second Edition 1964) page 4 includes teachers along with the Ministry and L.E.A.s in his concept of the "partnership" that was purported to have existed in educational administration. Baron, "Society, Schools and Progress" (Pergamon Press : 1965) page 57, and Sir Griffiths Williams, "The First Ten Years of the Ministry of Education" (British Journal of Educational Studies 111, May 1955,) Page 112, only include the Ministry and L.E.A. in the "partnership", and both note that such a concept should be accepted with reserve. Manzer, Ibid, page 23 takes the same viewpoint as Alexander.
4. The Education Act, 1944, 7 : 8 Geo. 6, c31. Section 1, para. 1. For a discussion on the changing powers of the Minister see G. Taylor and J.B. Saunders, "The New Law of Education " (Butterworth; sixth edition 1965) pages 4 and 5.

The acceptability of this situation to the teachers' leaders was dependent on the extent to which the Ministers were prepared to use their statutory powers and the extent to which they were prepared to enter into negotiation and discussion with teachers and take notice of the teachers' advice. Since the mid-1950s, however, the successive Ministers have assumed in a variety of ways the powers to which they are entitled under the 1944 Education Act. This has been achieved very often at the expense of consultation and discussion not only with the teachers' associations, but also the local education authorities. Thus the teachers' leaders have felt that on a growing number of issues affecting teachers directly or indirectly, there has been inadequate discussion and consultation before policy decisions have been taken. The superannuation issue of 1954 - 56; the controversy over the change to the Block Grant in 1957 - 58; the failure of Mr. Crosland to reconvene the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers; and the government changes in the structure of the Burnham Committee after the 1963 settlement, are examples of the conflict that has arisen due to the feeling that there has been inadequate discussion.^{1.}

Many factors have contributed to the successive Ministers using more fully their statutory powers. The Ministry of Education has become more important in the hierarchy of Ministries. This importance has been accentuated since 1964 when it became the Department of Education and Science with the added responsibility for scientific research councils, higher education, and the sports and arts. Consequently, politicians of repute such as Hogg, Boyle, Crosland and Stewart have succeeded to the office of Minister, or Secretary of State for Education, and have tended to exercise considerable personal influence over policy. Furthermore, the growth in expenditure^{2.}

1. This does not mean that the Ministers' policies were necessarily inappropriate, but that if consultation is regarded as important, frustrations can arise if it is ignored, or considered to be ignored.
2. Between 1960 - 61 and 1967 - 68 government expenditure on education rose from £881.8 millions to £1891.1 millions (Report on Education : Department of Education and Science : February 1969 : Number 53).

of the Department has given politicians who have occupied the post of Minister, an opportunity to build up their reputations for holding even higher offices of state.^{1.} The acceptance of the concept of education as an investment,^{2.} as well as a consumption, good has tended to concentrate power in the hands of the Secretary of State for Education.

But not only have teachers' associations felt that there has been a decrease in their influence with the Department of Education and Science, they have recognised that their influence on government policy as a whole has diminished. The teachers' unions were not consulted over the Labour Government's National Economic Plan in 1965, for example, and Sir Ronald Gould commented, "If the Government is really in earnest about consultation and consent, it should establish consultative machinery for bodies like the dentists, doctors, lawyers, architects, accountants and surveyors, as well as for the N.U.T., the Joint Four, the A.T.C.D.E., and many others inside and outside the teaching profession, who, for various reasons, are not members of the T.U.C. and who consequently have no means of influencing events."^{3.} Furthermore, the changes in the nature of cabinet government with the increasing concentration of power in the hands of the Ministers and the Prime Minister,^{4.} and the growing influence of the Civil Service makes it more difficult to influence policy decisions through the normal

1. For example Michael Stewart became Foreign Secretary in 1964; and Antony Crosland was promoted to the Board of Trade in August 1967.
2. The growing interests of economists in education had led to the acceptance of the concept that expenditure on education is an investment. See for example:-
John Vainey, "The Economics of Education" (Faber and Faber, 1962) Chapter 2.
M. Blaug (Edit), "Economics of Education 1" (Penguin 1968) Pages 13 - 64 .
"Higher Education Report" (Robbins) (H.M.S.O. Reprint 1968) pages 204 - 206.
3. See address by Sir Ronald Gould, "National Planning and the Education Service" (College of Preceptors) (undated) page 16 op.cit.
4. R.H.S. Crossman's introduction to Walter Bagehot's, "The English Constitution" (Fontana Library, 1963).

parliamentary channels which the teachers' associations have tended to use.^{1.}

While much of the conflict between the teachers and the successive governments has arisen from the increase in the use of the statutory powers by the successive Ministers of Education and the change in the nature of Cabinet Government, it must be added that in part the conflict has arisen from the fact that the educational system has shared in the more general change in society's social attitudes. There has been a reaction in favour of more "conservative" policies, which have stressed competition rather than co-operation, external rather than internal incentives, the importance of material rather than non-material ends, and the individualistic rather than the collective nature of social life.^{2.} This has not only been reflected among teachers by a rising discontent with the material conditions of the profession, but it has encouraged a greater polarisation in the attitudes of interested parties on the controversial issues of educational policy. In addition, it must be pointed out that whilst the teachers have been able to stress the educational aspects of policy, the Minister always has to weigh these against other aspects of government policy.

But not only have teachers become discontent with their role in national politics, they have also become discontent with their role in the formation of policy at local level. In 1959, John Vainey pointed out the growing discontent of teachers with local policies. He pointed out that the whole basis of the teachers' campaign against the "Block

-
1. S.H. Beer, "Modern British Politics" (Faber and Faber, Second Edition 1969) pages 109 and 110.
 2. William Taylor, "The Secondary Modern School" (Faber and Faber, 1963) Page 40.

Grant"was that they did not trust local authorities and governing bodies. Vaizey felt that the teachers' distrust of local authorities was hardened by the habit, in some authorities of introducing far reaching changes in schools without warning, let alone consultation. He argued that teachers should be strongly represented on local education authorities and governing bodies.^{1.} In 1968, Margerison and Elliott found that teachers thought that they should have more say in the formation of educational policy.^{2.} Whilst it is true that Education Committees are ~~enabled~~^{enabled} to appoint teacher representatives with the same powers as other members of the Committee, many authorities severely limit the powers of the teaching members. This they do either by an overstrict interpretation of normal disqualification of members who have a "direct or indirect pecuniary interest" in matters under discussion, or by excluding teachers from membership of sub-committees. There are cases on record of secondary teachers being excluded from membership of the Secondary Sub-Committee and prevented from speaking in almost every debate on secondary education on the grounds of indirect financial interest.^{3.}

1. See the two articles by John Vaizey, "Teachers Under Authority", page 41 and page 71 in Times Educational Supplement, 9.1.59. and 16.1.59. Also see the "Leader" article "Freeing Schools", Page 79, Times Educational Supplement 16.1.59.
2. C.K.Elliott and C.J. Margerison. "Split down middle on question of pay". (A survey of teacher attitudes, conducted in the autumn of 1968). Times Educational Supplement, 4th April, 1969, page 1095. Elliott and Margerison found that of those interviewed, 86% of the men and 89% of the women thought that in the present educational set up teachers do not have sufficient say in educational policy.
3. "Into the 1970's", (National Union of Teachers, April 1969) pages 20 and 21, para. 82. Para 81 calls for greater participation by teachers in policy decisions as being "necessary for the efficient management of schools. With the rapid development of teaching techniques and school organisation that has taken place in recent years schools have become incomparably more complex, and only people fully conversant with their internal organisation can be competent to judge the full effect of policy decisions".

The teachers' discontent in this sphere is not only directed at the education committees, but also at the administrators. At the National Union of Teachers' Conference in 1965, Sir Ronald Gould delivered a bitter attack on administrators at all levels.^{1.} Again, Margerison and Elliott found that teachers considered that the administrators were too remote from the classrooms, should spend some time in teaching, and would only accept teachers' grievances if teachers took militant action. Margerison and Elliott attribute these attitudes of teachers towards administrators to the fact that the administrators have control and power, "over a professional group, the teachers, who tend to regard themselves as superior in qualifications, status and knowledge."^{2.}

The controversial nature of many issues in recent years has tended to aggravate the teachers' feeling that they have insufficient power at local level, and to create conflict rather than co-operation. The reorganisation of secondary education, methods of promotions, the Durham dispute and "work-to-rule", the strikes over salary at the end of 1969, are examples of this conflict. The shortage of funds to finance new equipment and new methods has tended to heighten the feeling of frustration in the profession, and at times this shortage has been unjustly attributed to the incompetence of administrators. Meanwhile the Maud Report on the "Management of Local Government,"^{3.} and the Mallaby Report on the "Staffing of Local Government,"^{4.} which pointed out that it was difficult to attract a sufficient number of

1. Gould's speech as reported in "The Teacher" Vol. V. No.17, April 23, 1965, page 3.
2. Margerison and Elliott, page 1095, Times Educational Supplement, 4th April 1969 : of those interviewed, 87% men and 93% women thought the administrators were too remote from the classroom; 95% men and 95% women considered that administrators should spend some time in teaching; and 62% men and 53% women believed that the administrators would either sit on or reject their grievances unless some form of militant action was taken.
3. "Management of Local Government" (Maud Report : H.M.S.O. 1967).
4. "Staffing of Local Government" (Mallaby Report : H.M.S.O. 1966), paras. 158 - 164.

able people either as elected members or permanent officials has convinced the teachers' leaders that they ought to have more say in local policy, and indeed they point out, "the complexity of present day school organisation requires the expert knowledge of teachers to be available at all stages of educational decision taking, including decision taking in the education committee".^{1.}

Social Status, Public Image and Changing Role.

A cursory glance through the educational press and journals over the past twenty years will soon show how teachers have been pre-occupied with their social status and public image. There has been a persistent concern in the profession that its social status and public image have deteriorated in spite of the fact that society has generally paid lip service to the increasing importance of education to the nation's social and economic welfare.^{2.} Such a concern would seem to be justified by research which has shown little or no improvement in the status of the teachers in the public eyes. Generally, teachers have been given an intermediate status between the semi-skilled workers and the traditional professions. It is true that different classes of teachers have been accorded different levels of social status, but the profession as a whole tends to be judged by the largest sector, the primary or elementary sector, which is held in the lowest esteem.

In the five social classes used by the Registrar General in the 1951 Census of England and Wales, for the classification of occupations, teachers were placed in Class two. Class one included the occupations generally regarded as "professional" - administrative civil servants, managers in various

1. "Into the 1970's". (N.U.T. 1969) op. cit. para. 81. page 20.
2. See for instance pages 14 and 15 of "A Survey : Why Teachers are Underpaid". (National Union of Teachers : January 1969). These pages include quotations from Harold Wilson, Lord Butler, the Labour Government's National Plan, and Sir William Alexander on the important contribution education makes to the life of the nation.

highly paid posts, company-directors, judges, magistrates, barristers, doctors, clergymen, professional engineers, architects, authors, editors, publishers, commissioned officers in Her Majesty's Forces, and so on. Teachers appear in the second class with farmers, the executive civil servants, auctioneers, mid-wives and superintendents of police. As Dr. Bamford notes, Class one contains occupations which carry "considerable responsibility and many of them are specialist in nature with a basic knowledge brought about by long years of study and practice that is far beyond the reach of the ordinary, even the well educated man".^{1.}

The London School of Economics social mobility study in 1949 using the Hall-Jones scale showed the only type of teacher included in Class one, "professionally qualified and high administrative", was the headmaster of a secondary school or preparatory (independent) school. Class two "managerial and executive (with some responsibility for directing and initiating policy", included two types of teacher, the headmaster of an elementary or primary school, and the teacher in a secondary or public (independent) school. Teachers in elementary or primary schools appeared in Class three, "inspectorial, supervisory, and other non manual (higher grade)".^{2.} This intermediate position has prompted one writer to ask:- "Are (teachers) the worst paid profession, or the best paid skilled workers? Are they a profession at all?"^{3.}

In recent years reports seem to confirm this status level and public

-
1. See the article by Dr. T.W. Bamford entitled "Professional Implications in Status and Training", pages 75 - 91 in "The Professional Education of Teachers" : Aspects of Education, Three. (Journal of the Institute of Education; the University of Hull, December, 1965).
 2. D.V. Glass (ed) : "Social Mobility in Britain", (Routledge, Kegan Paul, 1954), Chapter 2.
 3. John Vaisey : "Britain in the Sixties : Education for Tomorrow" (Penguin Special, 1962) Page 84.

image. A report presented in 1967 to the National Association of Schoolmasters by the Economist Research Unit stated :- "It appears to us that the status of the school teacher in the minds of society as a whole and in those people considering teaching as a career, is still declining"¹. Even more disturbing were the findings of the Research Services Psychology Unit in late 1968/69, commissioned by the National Union of Teachers to ascertain the views of a sample of people who influenced teachers' salaries. "Open-ended" interviews were carried out with 40 people from elected members of education committees, salaried officials of local education authorities, industrialists and businessmen, academics, careers advisers, local newspapermen, trade union officials and members of Local Associations for the Advancement of State Education. Although there were tributes paid by some respondents to the work of the teachers, the majority of comments were far from flattering. In a pamphlet² published by the National Union of Teachers on the findings, the Union states :-

"The bulk of the comments made by the majority of the respondents interviewed gives a picture of the teaching profession which one can only describe as a grotesque caricature of reality. In essence, it seems to amount to this : that teachers are seen as men and women who take up their careers for no better reason than family tradition or because they seek

1. Quoted by E.B. Castle in "The Teacher", page 198. (Oxford University Press : 1970, paperback edition).
2. A Survey : Why Teachers are Underpaid. (National Union of Teachers, January 1969). Among the responses were the following:-
 "Teachers are making no effort to improve productivity",
 "Teachers are often those who do not have the drive to take their academic knowledge into other fields".
 "Teaching is seen less as a highly skilled job, which depends heavily on difficult, long and expensive training, plus experience, than as something anybody can do, given only certain inborne or hereditary characteristics, like tolerance, patience, friendliness".
 "You can get in without qualifications". "There is no disciplining body. There is no system of vigilance of maintaining standards within the profession itself".

safety and security, or at worst, because they are capable of nothing else; that to do their job they have little need of training or expertise; and that once in their profession they and their colleagues make no attempt to maintain professional standards and no effort to improve their productivity",^{1.}

It is likely that the Labour Government's campaigns in the sixties encouraging married women teachers to return to teaching, and the use of part-time teachers have encouraged the impression that teaching is a "part-time" profession. This view is no doubt confirmed by the fact that many young women only remain in the profession a few years, that teachers enjoy long school holidays, and that teachers apparently work short hours. The concept of a "part-time" occupation is far removed from that of a profession.

In addition to the concern for the public image and social status of the profession, many teachers have felt themselves under pressure from the growing confusion over the role of the teacher in society. As society has become more complex and undergone rapid changes, the expectations raised by a continuous process of adaptation to meet these changes vary greatly between different groups. Thus teachers, parents, pupils, heads, school governors, local education authorities, the press, society at large, and the government all have different ideas about the contemporary role of the teacher, and, moreover, express them publicly. It used to be accepted that teaching consisted of the "formation of a certain type of character, rather than the cultivation of a rarefied intellect",^{2.} today, however, the teacher is seen as "more than a mere transmitter of knowledge, (but as one who) must cultivate a spirit of enquiry".^{3.} The teacher is also expected, inter alia, to prepare

1. Ibid, page 3.

2. Bryan R. Wilson, The Teacher's Role, British Journal of Sociology, March 1962, p.17.

3. Bryan R. Wilson, op. cit., p.18.

the child for a society in which social mobility is at a premium; to prepare the child for the various types of social selective mechanisms in operation; to be an active agent in these social and occupational selection processes; to remedy any deficiencies in the child's home environment; to maintain an air of dedicated belief in moral standards (although there is confusion as to these moral standards), and to act as a model for future society. Moreover, this diffuseness in the role of the teacher contains ambiguities and sources of conflict.¹

Changes in educational technology and teaching techniques, the different values held by the varying age ranges in the profession, and the changing attitudes to authority in society have created additional frustrations and uncertainties in the profession.

It is not surprising then, that given the social status and public image of the profession, and the confusion over the role of the teacher in contemporary society, there has been a growing frustration and lack of confidence within the profession,

Economic Discontent

Teachers are not the only occupational group who have been concerned about their wages during the past twenty years of slowly rising real national income, rapid inflation, and the "stop-go" policies of successive post

-
1. For further consideration of the problems involved in defining the role of the teacher, see :-
 "The Role of the Teacher", E. Hoyle (Students Library of Education : Routledge and Kegan Paul 1969).
 "The Teacher's Role", Bryan Wilson, British Journal of Sociology, March 1962.
 "The Role of the Teacher", Educational Research, Vols. 9 and 10, 1967, L.J. Westwood.
 "English Primary Education", Vol.1, W.A.L. Blyth pages 168 - 174 (Routledge and Kegan Paul 1965).
 "Definition of the Teacher's Role", J. Kob in Education, Economy and Society edit. A.J. Halsey, Jean Floud, and C. Arnold Anderson (Free Press of Glencoe; paperback edition, Second Printing, May 1966).

second-world war governments. Evenso, the concern of teachers for their economic position has become one of the major sources of discontent in the profession. Teachers have complained that not only has the absolute value of their salaries declined in real terms in comparison with pre-war salaries (and they point out that they were underpaid in the pre-war era), but there has also been a relative decline in their salaries in comparison with other professions.

A study of salaries since the war and published in the Economist would seem to show that on the whole teachers have not done as badly as they contend. The study shows that between the period 1938 and 1956 teachers' salaries did not increase sufficiently for teachers to maintain their pre-war standards of living. After 1956, however, this relative decline was reversed, and with the important exception of qualified men at the bottom of the scale, teachers maintained and even improved their relative standards of living between 1956 and 1964.¹

Again, comparison of teachers' salaries with the earnings of other professions show that the relative decline in standards of living between 1938 and 1956 was not limited to teachers. It was shared by other salaried workers. Furthermore, when the 1964 salaries were compared with the 1956, every type of salary earner considered in the "Economist's" analysis had at least maintained their 1956 standards of consumption; and many like the teachers had even improved their share in the country's higher standard of living.²

1. The Economist, May 30, 1964, pp. 926 and 927.

2. Economist. Ibid pp. 926 and 927.

Even more recent research would seem to confirm these findings.¹ Nevertheless, this has not prevented teachers from feeling that they have been unjustly treated in salary settlements; a view no doubt encouraged by the fact that the teachers tend to ask for unrealistic increases and consequently their actual increases seem small against their requests. Furthermore, teachers' salaries are generally negotiated for a two year period, and hence, the more frequent settlements in other occupations seem to indicate that these workers are making more rapid increases in their standards of living.

The salary structure with its differentials between graduates and non-graduates, and between various age levels of children, the system of graded posts and the uneven opportunities for promotion in the different sectors of education have heightened this discontent. So has the growing dissatisfaction with the Burnham negotiating machinery.

The discontent among teachers with their salaries, however, cannot be completely explained by the economic level of the salaries and the differential impact on sectional interests in the profession. Part of it is due to the fact that there is a deep-rooted feeling in the profession that society is not giving the teachers their due in terms of status and prestige. That society ought to take more account of the value of teachers' work when assessing salaries was stressed by the McNair Report in 1944 in one of its specified four tests for teachers' salaries; "they (the salaries) should

1. See the digest prepared by the National Association of Schoolmasters of the Economist Intelligence Unit Report "The Economic Status of the Schoolmaster" in 1967, page 3 which states "Average earnings in the teaching profession have risen at a faster rate than in the salariat as a whole over the past decade, and also at a faster rate than all but one of the broad groups differentiated in the Minister of Labour statistics. This is largely due to the rapid increase in the earnings of female teachers but even the average earnings of male teachers have risen slightly faster than the average". Also see "Salaries in the Seventies : Teachers and the rest", A.W.J. Thomson (Times Educational Supplement No. 2855, 6th February, 1970, page 4.)

make possible the kind of life which teachers of quality required ought to be enabled to live."¹ In 1956, Ronald Gould echoed the same idea; "The employers are guided by what they consider the salary level necessary to attract sufficient recruits of the right quality to the profession; the teachers do not dissent from this, but they place more emphasis on a salary level which would reflect the high regard in which the profession should be held, and which is comparable with that seen to be obtainable in other professions."²

A joint International Labour Organisation/United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation meeting of experts on the status of teachers at Geneva in 1966 returned to this theme and laid down the following three conditions for teachers' salaries.

"Teachers' salaries should:-

- a) reflect the importance to society of the teaching function and hence the importance of teachers as well as the responsibilities of all kinds which fall upon them as from the time of their entry into the service;
- b) compare favourably with salaries paid in other occupations requiring similar or equivalent qualifications;
- c) provide teachers with the means to ensure a reasonable standard of living for themselves and their families as well as to invest in further education or in the pursuit of cultural activities thus enhancing their professional qualifications."³

1. "Teachers and Youth Leaders" (McNair Committee) (London, H.M.S.O., 1944) p.32.
2. Ronald Gould, "Factors Affecting Teachers' Salaries in England and Wales" in Robert King Hall and J.A. Lauwerys (eds), Yearbook of Education, 1956 (Education and Economics) (London : Evans 1956), p.456.
3. "Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers", adapted by the Special Intergovernmental Conference on the Status of Teachers, Paris, 5th October (Circular 5/68, Department of Education and Science, Curzon Street, London, W.1.), page 28.

The implications of these statements is that teachers' salaries should be determined politically and be based on the social value of teachers' work. Whilst this is not the place to enter into discussion on the validity of such statements, a few of the inherent problems may be pointed out. Why, for instance, should teachers' salaries deserve special consideration? How is the social value of teachers' work to be evaluated? Who, ultimately, should decide on the value of the teachers' work; teachers, the government, the electorate, or local education authorities? Furthermore there is the problem of the comparability of the teacher's certificate. (Indeed, probably much of the discontent of the teachers with their salaries arises less from the comparison of their salaries with other professions, than from a comparison with the new found working-class affluence). It might well be argued that as it is the teachers' salaries are not completely determined by market factors, albeit these play an important part, but contain an element of value judgement on the part of the Secretary of State and local education authorities as to what teachers deserve (at least, within the limitations of what the government can afford).^{1.} A private survey carried out for the National Union of Teachers at the beginning of 1959 found that the general public thought that teachers' pay was reasonable enough.^{2.} Again, the 1968 survey would seem to suggest that the public still consider teachers are adequately, if not more than adequately, paid.^{3.} While this suggests that the social value placed on teachers' salaries by the government and local education authorities reflect the public view, the teachers claim that they

1. It has been argued by some economists that teachers' salaries should be more open to the influence of market factors. For example, very high salaries might be offered in those sectors of education or fields of study that have a high shortage of teachers, e.g. mathematics and science.
2. Quoted in R.A. Manzer : "Teachers and Politics" (Manchester University Press : 1970) page 119.
3. A Survey : Why Teachers are Underpaid. (National Union of Teachers, January 1969).

do not reflect their own view of their social value. Clearly there can be no satisfaction for teachers until the government's and people's view of the social value of teachers accord to those of teachers. In the mean time, the teachers go on believing that they are undervalued by society.

Other Major Sources of Professional Discontent.

There have been many other sources of professional discontent during the period 1945 - 69, but the major sources have been the performance of dinner-duties; the low status attributed to the initial teaching qualification; the continued existence in the profession of untrained and unqualified teachers; and dissatisfaction with the courses of teacher training.

School Meals

The dissatisfaction with the performance of dinner duties and the campaign to be relieved of this task was as much directed against the teachers having to perform many non-teaching duties as against the dinner-duties themselves. It is not a post-second-world war phenomenon and was present in the nineteen twenties and thirties. Although the 1921 Education Act, Section 85, specifically stated that teachers should not have to supervise school meals, it was quite clear that their help was essential. When the 1944 Education Act was under debate, this issue came up. Teachers were already resentful that the war had given them a large number of additional non-teaching tasks. The National Union of Teachers took the line that to do additional work without additional pay was against the Trades Union Congress's principles (although the Union was not a member). It was promised that salary negotiations after the war would take into account all these additional tasks. Teachers were not agreed amongst themselves as to the performance of the duties. Some teachers believed that

the teachers' job was the care of the whole child, and this included meal supervision. Others believed that the School Meals Service was not the work of teachers. The 1944 Act omitted Section 85 of the 1921 Act. This alarmed teachers, but they were finally persuaded that they must take a wider view of their duties, although they insisted that the burden should not be excessive. Supervision should not exceed one day a week, time off should be given as compensation, and duties should be limited to supervision, were the demands of the teachers. Evenso, teachers generally disliked the requirements and began to press for the regulation to be withdrawn.

In April 1953 the Minister began to discuss dinner duties with staff and headteachers but all that emerged was that school meals were a school function, additional ancillary staff could be appointed, the Headmaster was in charge, registers should be simplified, and teachers must continue with supervision.

Negotiations were re-opened in 1963, and again it was agreed that the amount of non-teaching supervisory assistance should be increased and that reliance could be placed on enough teachers voluntarily supervising school meals to ensure the proper conduct of children during and after the meal. The regulation about teachers' supervision was not, however, withdrawn, and in practice teachers felt obliged to undertake supervision.

It was not until Friday, 16th August, 1968, the Milk and Meals Regulation was amended by the Secretary of State to remove the power previously conferred on the local authorities to make the supervision of school meals by teachers compulsory, although the headteachers retained the overall responsibility for the conduct of pupils during the mid-day break. Thus, although the government withdrew the compulsory element in mid-day supervision, it replaced this with a moral element of obligation. Since teachers shared in the corporate responsibility to support the head, of necessity they therefore

shared in the conduct of pupils during the meal break. Although the Unions urged teachers to support their heads,¹ many teachers withdrew from the schools' meal service arguing that it was the duty of local education authorities to provide the head with sufficient ancillary help. Since this help was not forthcoming, there was a crisis in some schools, and while this has been solved, the bitter acrimony between heads and teachers in some schools still remains. Furthermore, it is by no means certain that the issue has been finally settled.

The Teacher's Certificate, Untrained Teachers, and the Teacher Training Courses

Concern has been expressed frequently at the low status of the teaching certificate. The certificate's historical antecedents, its inferior status academically to a university degree, and the recognition of graduates without a teacher training qualification as qualified teachers on the basis of serving a period of probation, have contributed to the public holding the teacher's certificate in low esteem. Furthermore, Colleges of Education and University Departments of Education are essentially vocational institutions and therefore share in the "general disapprobation which afflicts all vocational education in England".² The Colleges are often regarded as inferior institutions to universities, and this view is encouraged by the fact that potential university students regard Colleges of Education as a "second-choice" should they fail to gain admission to a university. The acceptance of this viewpoint, usually based on academic criteria, however, ignores the essential difference in the

1. For example, in its Circular on School Meals Supervision, the N.A.S. stated:- "The Report recognises that some teachers will wish to take no part in mid-day supervision. Those members who choose to leave the school premises should give notice to the head of their decisions. No reason need be given, and if coercion is attempted the Association will resist it. On the other hand, it would be inconsistent with the Report for groups of members to make a collective decision to withdraw". (N.A.S. School Meals Supervision, July, 1968).
2. R.F. Goodings, "The B.Ed. and After", (Cornmarket : Higher Education Review, Summer 1969) page 62.

function of the universities and colleges.

To counter-act this situation, teachers have argued that the teaching qualification should have greater academic respectability,¹ and that this should be achieved by a longer course of training with the final qualification being of equivalent status to the degree. But in the period since 1944 only slow progress has been made towards these objectives. One of the problems has been the persistent shortage of teachers. Thus teachers have been torn between the need to raise the supply of teachers and therefore achieve such objectives as smaller classes, and their ambition to improve their professional status by longer courses and higher qualifications.²

The lengthening of the teacher training course to three years was proposed as early as 1919 by a Committee of Principals of Training Colleges, and the three year course was included in the McNair Committee's recommendations of 1944. The inclusion of the teachers' associations (although there were notable exceptions) on the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers augured well for an early acceptance of the three year course but it was not until the late 1950's, and after continuous pressure from the Area Training Organisations, that it was decided to lengthen the course from two to three years, and then the decision was only taken because the supply situation appeared to be easing.³ In the event, from the middle nineteen fifties onwards, the falling age of marriage increased the number of children being born, and at the same time aggravated the wastage rate of women teachers. This in turn aggravated the supply problem creating a crisis

-
1. As Goodings points out (Ibid, page 63) in the context of the B.Ed., the movement towards academic respectability is design to help "teachers as a profession rather than as practitioners". And he adds, "But there is little evidence that the correlations between academic training and classroom performance is high and some that it is very low".
 2. W. Taylor, "Society and the Education of Teachers" (Faber and Faber, 1968) page 32. R. A. Manzer, "Teachers and Politics" (Manchester University Press, 1970) page 97.
 3. Ministry of Education, National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. "Three Year Training for Teachers" (5th Report; London : H.M.S.O., 1956).

in the Primary Schools. The government was too far committed, however, to go back on its policy to lengthen the training course.^{1.}

In recent years, although teachers have lost an official outlet for their advice on teacher training through the failure of successive Secretaries of State for Education to reconvene the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, the profession, in its quest for an "all-graduate" status has received encouragement from the Robbins' proposals for the establishment of the Bachelor of Education degree in Colleges of Education.^{2.} But even this has proved to be a source of discontent. The varying classifications of the degree at different Universities (with the implications for salaries), the fear that Bachelor of Education graduates will be better placed than non-graduates; the fact that the present proposals only allow for approximately 10% of the students of Colleges of Education to take the degree; the comparison of the status of the degree with other Advanced Diploma courses in Education; the failure, as yet, of the government, local education authorities, and area training organisations to establish a clear policy for serving teachers to obtain the degree; and the debate over whether the degree should be mainly an academic or professional qualification, have created further dissatisfaction in the profession.

Together with this quest for a better initial teaching qualification has been a movement by teachers to exclude both unqualified and untrained teachers from schools. The N.U.T. pamphlet on "The Training of Teachers", for example, laid down that there should be "a four year course of education

-
1. For the story of the struggle for the "three year course" see:-
 W. Taylor, "Society and the Education of Teachers" (Faber and Faber, 1968) pages 104 - 108.
 R.A. Manzer, "Teachers and Politics" (Manchester University Press : 1970) pages 100 - 101.
 R. Layard, J. King, and C. Moser, "The Impact of Robbins", (Penguin 1969) Page 65.
 2. "Higher Education Report" (Robbins Report) (London. H.M.S.O. : reprint 1968), Chapter 9, pages 112 - 116.

and training, including either, graduation or a comparable qualification".^{1.} Again, however, the continued shortage of teachers has proved a major stumbling block. This, together with the fact that under the 1944 Education Act the Minister has the power to determine the qualifications for recognition of qualified teacher status and can employ certain categories of unqualified teachers, has resulted in the continuation of the employment of both untrained graduates and unqualified persons in the schools. The Minister tightened his control over teachers even further by the introduction of the "Quota Scheme" in 1956^{2.}, whilst the Schools Regulations, 1959, confirmed the Minister's controls.^{3.} In recent years, with the easing of the supply situation, there has been signs that both untrained graduates and unqualified teachers are to be phased out. Circular 15/68, the administrative memorandum 10/68, and the Schools (Amendment) Regulations 1968^{4.} outlined the first moves to be made in this direction. After the 31st August 1968, the Secretary of State would not approve any fresh applications for the employment of temporary teachers. Furthermore, persons employed as occasional teachers before 1st September, 1968, would only be employed in an emergency or to meet the special needs of a school up to 31st August, 1970, but not thereafter. Pre-war uncertificated and supplementary teachers would be allowed to continue in service but would be given qualified teacher status on the completion of twenty years service. The temporary teacher category was to be replaced by one of student teacher and restricted to persons genuinely seeking places at training colleges, who

-
1. National Union of Teachers. The Training of Teachers : statement of Executive policy on the training of teachers adopted by Conference, 1951, (N.U.T. 1951, para. 5).
 2. For an account of the "Quota System", see "The Distribution of Teachers", Reports on Education, January 1968, Number 42 (Department of Education and Science).
 3. Schools Regulations, 1959, Statutory Instruments, 1959, No.364, sections 16, 17 and 18.
 4. Statutory Instruments 1968, No.1281. The Schools (Amendment) Regulations 1968.

would not be appointed to take full teacher's responsibilities. The occasional teacher category would be replaced by a new class of instructor to cover specialist subjects provided that no qualified teacher with the necessary expertise was available. Teachers whose only qualification was a degree would have to do two years probation instead of one. This is to apply to "untrained" graduates with degrees from universities in the British Isles; graduates in the same category with degrees awarded by the Council for National Academic Awards, and teachers who have been trained outside the United Kingdom. The ruling also applies to teachers in certain special subjects such as art, handicraft, music and domestic science or technology subjects who do not hold a degree or a teacher's certificate, but are accepted for the time being as qualified teachers on the strength of other qualifications.

The policy was carried a stage further in October 1969 when Mr. Short announced that he intended issuing a circular in the near future announcing that no student graduating from university after 1970 would be able to teach in primary schools unless he had completed a course of professional training. The same ban would apply to graduate teachers in secondary schools after 1973.¹

It would seem then that in the near future a teacher training requirement will be obligatory on all recruits to the profession, with few exceptions. Nevertheless, the slow progress made towards this objective, and the fact that the Minister can rescind or amend these regulations in a way that would once more open the entry into the profession to a large number of unqualified and untrained teachers has been a salutary warning to teachers that they need

1. Reported in the Times Educational Supplement, No. 2837, 3.10.69. page 8.

greater safeguards to retain the progress that has been achieved, and a more influential voice in future policy.

The other major source of discontent has been with the courses provided for teacher-trainees in Colleges of Education and University Departments of Education. During the last two years this discontent has become even more widespread and vocal, especially since, at least superficially, teachers have become more insistent upon being trained than at any time in the past. The formation of the Society for the Promotion of Educational Reform and Training of Teachers illustrates this growing body of criticism. The criticism is present among all the ranks of teachers, experienced, young and trainees. The three major areas of complaint are that the Colleges do not provide teachers with adequate training in the techniques of classroom management; that insufficient attention is given to the intending teachers' knowledge of the subjects he will be required to teach; and that insufficient attention is given to the skills and techniques required to teach such basic subjects as reading.¹ The validity and justification of such criticisms are open to question; nevertheless this does not alter the fact that they are widely held both within, and outside the profession.

The teachers' criticisms do not stop at the courses. The structure of control is also questioned. At present, the control of teacher-training courses is partly the responsibility of the Department of Education and Science, partly the responsibility of the Area Training Organisations, and partly the responsibility of the Colleges and Departments of Education themselves. The teachers' leaders felt that they had some influence on training,

1. See, for example, "The Teaching Profession and the Education of Teachers", E. Britton, pages 180 - 189 in Colston Papers No. 20, Towards a Policy for the Education of Teachers (London, Butterworth 1969). also, "The Future of Teacher Education" (National Union of Teachers July 1969).

however small, when the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply existed, but the demise of the Council after 1965 effectively removed this channel of influence. It is true that teachers are represented on Area Training Organisation but their influence is minimal and varies from area to area. It is also true that some Colleges employ "tutor-teachers" to help with the supervision of teaching practice, and that the Weaver Report recommended that teachers from grant-aided schools should have two representatives on the governing bodies of Colleges of Education. But it is the larger and more general issues of policy about courses that teachers wish to influence, and not the minutiae of individual courses. Thus it has become increasingly apparent to the profession that it needs a body to put forward its views on teacher training, and more importantly, the body needs to have sufficient status to ensure its recommendations are effectively influential.

Conclusion

The growing dissatisfaction with the political, economic, social and professional status of the teaching profession has become a feature of the profession since the late nineteen fifties. The teachers' leaders are convinced that there is a vicious circle operating which tends to perpetuate the situation. The low status of the teaching and the declining public image of the profession leads to low salaries. This in turn, together with the changing structure of government, is seen as a cause for the decline in the political influence of teachers. This leads once more to low status and salaries. As one way of breaking this circle, some sections of the profession have stressed the importance of professional self-government, although they have not been in agreement how this should be achieved.

One interesting proposal advocated the formation of an "Institute of Teachers".¹ The aims of such an Institute would be to : "encourage the

1. "Teaching - a Profession?" A proposal for an Institute of Teachers : Clifford Eveleigh and Martin Kyrle. (New Orbits Publication 7 : Second Edition, January 1968.

study and practice of teaching in all its aspects; be responsible for the maintenance of professional standards to be determined by the Institute; publish annually a register of teachers; represent the profession in negotiations with or in the making of representatives to the Government; engage in negotiations with similar bodies in other countries, where such exist, upon matters of professional interest, and maintain an advisory service for the benefit of teachers."¹ The Institute would have the powers to : "confine the practice of teaching to those suitably qualified; restrain, by legal proceedings if necessary, any unqualified person who teaches for payment or reward; regulate the admission of candidates for the grades of Member, Associate or Fellow of the Institute of Teachers, or such other qualifications as the Institute may decide to bestow; remove from the register of teachers offenders against certain prescribed sections of the professional and criminal codes, and thereafter to take such legal action as may be necessary; (and) maintain an up-to-date and confidential record of the career, qualifications, and known character of every teacher."²

Another interesting set of proposals for a "British Council of Teachers" was formulated by the Conservative and Unionist Teachers' Association.³ The purposes of the proposed Council were "to raise the Status of the Teaching Profession; to define and establish the standards of qualifications and to be responsible for the Registration of Teachers; to be responsible for the enforcement of professional standards and to be the

1. Ibid. page 8.

2. Ibid. page 9.

3. Conservative and Unionist Teachers' Association Report on Professional Status : Approved by the National Advisory Committee on 13th May, 1961.

body to which all members of the Teaching Profession can turn concerning their status; to draw up and provide model contracts of employment; to maintain and enlarge the fundamental freedoms in Education; to be available to advise the Government on Educational policy; to secure representation of members of the Teaching Profession on all important educational bodies; including those concerned with external examinations; ultimately to co-ordinate all branches of the Teaching Profession; (and) to provide in due course central premises in London for Social and Cultural purposes."¹

There has also been some disagreement amongst the main teachers' associations on how the Council should be achieved. The National Union of Teachers has tended to stress the need for an "all-in-one-union" which would have statutory powers and combine professional and union activities. The Union has argued that it is impossible to create the impression of a united profession if teachers appear to be united on some issues whilst they engaged in bitter sectional feuds on others.² Other unions have argued that since sectional interests do exist, and these are mainly confined to union matters, it is only realistic to face up to them. These unions are convinced, however, that teachers should be represented by one body on professional matters, and this can best be achieved through a "Teachers' Council" which would respect the autonomy of unions in union matters.³ In view of this fundamental disagreement, it is remarkable that the Main Committee for the Proposed Teachers' General Council formed in 1960 should have progressed as well as it did, eventually securing the establishment of an Official Working Party in 1969.

1. Conservative and Unionist Report, *ibid*, section iv, "Purposes, Powers and Functions".
2. Professional Unity - A memorandum to be submitted by the Executive to Conference, 1960 (N.U.T. Document, February 1960), pages 2 and 3
3. The National Association of Schoolmasters has been one of the most "vocal" associations for this line of approach. For example, in its pamphlet "Professional Status through a Teachers' General Council". (N.A.S. document No. 140/B), the Association states of the N.U.T. proposal, "it deliberately ignores the fact that although teachers share some common interests there are other important professional issues where their interests diverge and sometimes conflict".

It must be noted, however, that at times teachers have indulged in actions that have not helped their cause. The refusal of the teachers' associations to accept ancillaries into the classroom (which would in fact raise the status of teaching by stressing the importance of teaching skills); the National Association of Schoolmasters' work to rule in Durham County; the industrial action over pay at the end of 1969; and the affiliation of the National Association of Schoolmasters, the National Union of Teachers, and the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions to the Trades Union Congress all square oddly with the concept of professional self-government. Indeed, it might well be argued that at the end of the nineteen sixties, there were signs that teachers were becoming more interested in securing objectives by industrial action.^{1.}

1. The National Association of Schoolmasters' "work-to-rule", and the strikes at the end of 1969 and the beginning of 1970 were the first indication of this movement. The Young Teachers' Section of the N.U.T. at their Conference in September 1969, explicitly stated that they were not in favour of a Teachers' Council, but were interested in Unionism. Reporting on the conference, the Teachers' World (19th Sept. 1969) describes the debate which rejected the Council as "angry"; and goes on to state that speakers described the Council as 'a piece of psuedo-democracy designed to divert teachers' control of their own profession into a harmless by-way. Teachers were urged to choose the path of trade unionism rather than that of "professionalism." There were signs in the opening months of 1970 that "industrial action" would continue to play a part in teacher politics. In March, the N.U.T. were once again threatening militant action against local authorities that did not bring school classes down in size to 35 children each (See Times Educational Supplement 20.3.70., No.2861 page 7). In July, as a result of Mrs. Thatcher's withdrawal of Circular 10/65, and the threatened retention of the 11+ examination by some l.e.a.s., some N.U.T. members threatened to withdraw from marking 11+ papers (Times Educational Supplement, 10.7.70. page 1). In this growing climate of militancy, even the head teachers made the first cautious proviso for strike action. The Times Educational Supplement (29.5.70., No.2871, page 7) reported, 'a heavily amended resolution passed on Saturday in private session told the association leaders to "take action in the interests of members including the organisations of the withdrawal of members' services in whole, or in part, and the setting up of a sustentation fund to support such action. All action taken under this rule shall be subject to the prescribed set of standing orders as approved by national or special conference." The results of a card vote, taken after a challenge to the chairman's ruling were : in favour, 5052; against, 4,905 - a majority of 147.' The acceptance of union values continued throughout the summer with the A.T.T.I. and N.U.T. Young Teachers' Section debating the idea of establishing a "closed shop" for all serving teachers. The fact that there was an element of militancy in the profession is not surprising, but the way it rapidly spread to the more conservative sectors of profession is remarkable. Some teachers from these ranks were so per-turbed by these developments that in September 1970 they formed the professional Association of Teachers whose membership was pledged never to strike or take part in classroom militancy. (See Education, 25th Sept. 1970. Vol. 136 No. 13. P.280).

CHAPTER TWO

"THE REVIVAL OF INTEREST IN A TEACHERS' COUNCIL AND
PROFESSIONAL SELF-GOVERNMENT"

It seemed that the 1949 Order in Council^{1.} terminating the Royal Society of Teachers also marked the end of the teachers' interest in a Teaching Council and self-government. The Minister not only held the power to determine the qualifications for the status of qualified teacher, and in the post-war period of critical teacher shortage it might well be argued that this was essential, but he also possessed the power to employ certain categories of unqualified teachers.^{2.} Nevertheless it seemed that the teachers' claim to a voice in policy decisions on the training and qualifications of teachers, even if only in an advisory capacity, was to be recognised by their membership on the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers formed in 1949.

Events, however, were to show that teachers had not lost interest in the establishment of a Teachers' Council and in professional self-government. The period 1949-60 witnessed both the National Association of Schoolmasters and the National Union of Teachers formulating their policies on this issue. Interest was also shown by others, notably the College of Preceptors, Sir William Alexander, and John Vaisey.

The National Association of Schoolmasters' Policy

The National Association of Schoolmasters was the first Association in the post second world war period to attempt to establish a Teaching

1. Teachers' Registration Council Revoking Order 1949, Statutory Instruments 1949, No. 604.
2. The Primary and Secondary Schools (Grant Conditions) Regulations, 1945 dated May 29, 1945, made by the Minister of Education Under Section 100 of the Education Act, 1944 (7:8-Geo.6.c.31); paras. (3a) and (3b).

Council. This Association not only realised the political and economic value for all teachers that would follow from the establishment of the Council, but it also saw the Council as a means of challenging the hegemony of the National Union of Teachers in teacher politics.

In 1954 the Association prepared a report on "Professional Status" which was adopted at the Association's Annual Conference at Porthcawl.^{1.} The report stated that the Association was concerned because the Minister held the power to alter the qualification requirements for recognition as a qualified teacher and to employ unqualified teachers. The Association feared that this power was a potential threat to the professional status of teachers since it could lead to dilution in professional standards in periods of teacher shortage. Thus, the Association believed that teachers needed a "British Teachers' Council charged with ensuring a minimum standard of academic and teaching qualification, the necessary personal qualities for so vital a service, and with a large measure of control over the whole profession."^{2.}

Clearly, the Association thought there were great advantages to be gained from having a professional council, and was at great pains to point out that many other professions had acquired professional self-government,^{3.}

1. National Association of Schoolmasters document "Report on Professional Status" (N.A.S. reprinted in 1961).
2. National Association of Schoolmasters document "Report on Professional Status", page 1 (N.A.S. reprinted in 1961).
3. Ibid pages 4, 5 and 6. The document gives a very brief resumé of the following professional bodies and their struggles for professional status :- Barristers, Solicitors, Doctors, Dentists, Nurses, and Veterinary Surgeons. Pages 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 give an outline of history of the teaching profession's attempts to secure a Council.

The document suggested the following outline of a Constitution for the proposed Council:-

1. There shall be a British Teachers' Council.
2. It shall consist of - members made up thus :
 - Two members (non-teachers) appointed by the Privy Council.
 - "A" members appointed by the Universities.
 - "B" members appointed by the training departments (Institute of Education and Training Colleges).
 - "C" members appointed by teachers other than those in categories "A" and "B".

(For the purpose of "C", a teacher is a person who is engaged in full-time teaching in a school recognised as efficient by the Minister of Education).
3. The Council alone shall have the power to license teachers.
 - It shall have the power to lay down minimum requirements.
 - It shall have the power to withdraw the licence.
4. On qualification the teacher shall pay an initial sum of X pounds to register and thereafter Y annually; the registration to lapse if the annual supplementary fee be not paid.
5. On the appointed day all existing qualified teachers to pay X pounds to register. After the initial registration date no teacher shall be recognised unless duly licensed.
6. On and after the initial registration date it shall be forbidden for any but registered teachers to use the official name of "teacher" or to pose as filling the functions of a 'teacher'.
7. On and after the official inception date it shall be forbidden for anyone to employ as a teacher any but those licensed." 1.

1. Ibid, page 11.

These proposals were far reaching and would have involved legislation since they necessitated the transfer of statutory powers from the Minister to the Council. It is noticeable, and indeed surprising, that the proposals included no provision for the local authorities to be represented on the Council.^{1.} The local education authorities helped to finance (and hence control) teacher training, were the teachers' employers and were responsible under the 1944 Education Act for the quality of educational provision.^{2.} Thus, of necessity, the authorities were interested in the quality of teachers. It would have been a good public relations act on the part of the Association had they offered the authorities only a token representation on the Council as an acknowledgement of their interest in teacher training.

The Association's Conference instructed the Executive to make approaches to the Ministry.^{3.} In July 1954 the implications of the proposed Council were discussed with a Parliamentary Secretary, but the outcome of the discussions failed to realise a Council.^{4.}

If the Association was disappointed by the set-back, it did not give up its aspirations of establishing a Council. In 1958, the Association's General Secretary was instructed by its Executive to make further representations to the Ministry. Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd was now the Minister of Education, and no doubt the Association hoped to succeed with Mr. Lloyd where it had failed with Miss Horsbrugh in 1954. On the 20th October 1958, the Association's general secretary, Mr. Rushworth, wrote to Mr. Lloyd requesting

-
1. Theoretically, a L.E.A. member could have been nominated by the Privy Council.
 2. The Education Act, 1944 7 & 8 Geo. 6, c.31. Section 8.
 3. Report on Professional Status, Ibid page, 12.
 4. The meeting between the Association and the Parliamentary Secretary is mentioned by Morrell in his letter of 5th November, 1958. See overleaf.

that a "British Teachers' Council" should be established with a condition based on the one suggested at Porthcawl in 1954,¹ but with one important modification. The teacher members were to be appointed by the Teachers' Associations and not by teachers.² Furthermore the latter made the specific request, "My Association hopes that it would be consulted on any negotiations which take place on the formation of such a Council."³ Clearly, the Association's request for the establishment of the Council was not as altruistic as it seemed. The Association saw the Council as a means of achieving greater recognition for itself in teacher politics, and as a platform to voice its policies on certain issues. Such objectives were important to the Association since it was neither represented on the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers nor on the Burnham Committee.⁴

On the 5th November, 1958, Mr. D.H.Morrell, the Minister's Private Secretary replied:-

"Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd has now been able to consider your letter of the 20th October, about the establishment of a British Teachers' Council and he has asked me to reply on his behalf.

The idea of a Teachers' Council has, as your Association is aware, a very old history and some of the present implications of such a suggestion were discussed by Mr. Pickthorn, when Parliamentary Secretary, with representatives of your Association as recently as 7th July, 1954.

1. Report on Professional Status. Ibid page 12.
2. The suggested outline states ' "C" members appointed by teachers other than those in categories "A" and "B".' But Rushworth's letter states "(d) Members appointed by Teachers' Associations."
3. Ibid, page 12. Report on Professional Status.
4. The National Association of Schoolmasters was first represented on the Burnham Committee in 1961, and on the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers after the eighth report.

A Teachers' Registration Council in fact existed from 1912 (after a previous attempt in 1900) until 1949 and various efforts were made during this period to endow the Council with powers of the kind referred to in the second paragraph of your letter. However, the Council never succeeded, for a variety of reasons in fulfilling the purpose for which it was established.

The 'licensing' of teachers for service in maintained schools is in effect already carried out by the Minister by the award under arrangements made by him of qualified teacher status and by the requirement that teachers employed in such schools (except for temporary or occasional teachers) shall be qualified teachers. The Minister is therefore already responsible for the maintenance of professional standards and for regulating the supply of teachers for the profession. In carrying out these duties the Minister has the benefit of advice from the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers which as you know is a body representative of various parts of the teaching profession and of the local authorities.

These existing arrangements appear to work well and the Minister is not aware of any important grounds for replacing them with arrangements of another kind. Moreover there does not appear to exist any general demand for such a change.

In these circumstances the Minister does not feel there are sufficient arguments for bringing about the changes that your Association propose.¹

On the 6th November, 1958, Rushworth replied to the Minister of Education:-

"I shall place your Private Secretary's letter of the 5th November before my Executive.

I note in particular that 'The Minister is therefore already responsible for the maintenance of professional standards and for regulating the

1. Report on Professional Status, Ibid page 13.

supply of teachers for the profession..... These existing arrangements appear to work well and the Minister is not aware of any important grounds for replacing them with arrangements of another kind.' I am sure my Executive both from its knowledge of the actual staffing position in the schools and from its study of your report (Education in 1957 : Command 454) will not be likely to agree with your contentions. The presence of over 70,000, over-crowded classes in the schools and the inclusion amongst teachers in maintained primary and secondary schools of 5,661 non-qualified teachers, apart from occasional teachers, and of 23,307 'qualified' but untrained teachers, would appear to be sufficiently important grounds to indicate the need for the establishment of a British Teachers' Council in order that the teaching body could become professional, in that entry would be limited by that Council to trained teachers, with consequent benefits to the service of education." 1.

Nevertheless, it was apparent from Morrell's letter of the 5th November that the Association was not large enough, not representative enough, nor influential enough to secure the formation of a Teaching Council by its own efforts. It needed the support of the other Teachers' associations, and especially the National Union of Teachers, and this support from the latter was not forthcoming.

The Policy of the National Union of Teachers.

At the 1956 Annual Conference of the National Union of Teachers, a resolution was passed instructing the Union's Executive to present to Conference a report upon the possibility of organising the teaching profession² as a self governing body. It soon became clear that the Union's Executive was only

1. Ibid page 14. It should be noted that in Circular 173 (1948) the Ministry of Education had envisaged that all graduates seeking qualified teacher status would, after 1951, have successfully undertaken an approved course of teacher training. A shortage of graduates in science and mathematics prevented the implementation of this policy.
2. The Schoolmaster (Journal of the National Union of Teachers) April 13, 1956 page 292.

interested in "self-government" if it could be achieved on the basis of an "all-in-one" union with statutory powers. The Executive realised that it had little to gain from the type of Council proposed by the National Association of Schoolmasters. If anything, the Executive felt that it could only lose from the establishment of a Teachers' Council which might challenge the Union's supremacy of power in the field of teacher politics. Furthermore, the Executive believed that if the Council was a federal body of representatives from the teachers' Associations, it would be used as a medium for competitive recruitment by the Association.¹ Thus, the Executive tended to stress the importance of entry in the profession before self-government could be attained.

This attitude was embodied in the reports to the Union Conferences in 1958 and 1959, and again re-iterated in a memorandum on "Professional Unity" presented to the Blackpool Conference in 1960. It was shown in the resolutions proposed and adopted at the 1958 and 1959 Conferences.

In 1958 the adopted resolution read as follows :- "This Conference believes that unity is essential for the full development of the status of the teaching profession and that this unity can only be expressed by one professional organisation through which competitive recruitment has been abolished and in which all teachers can find a full expression of their sectional and professional interests. It approves the negotiations already carried out and instructs the Executive to develop them as quickly as possible."²

1. The National Union of Teachers' Executive seemed to be opposed to any kind of "Common Council". See "Professional Unity" - a memorandum to be submitted by the Executive to Conference, 1960. (N.U.T. pamphlet, 1960), pages 1 and 2.
2. "Professional Unity", Ibid page 1.

Again, in 1959 the adopted motion read:- "Conference declares that unity of professional organisation is essential for the full development of the professional status of all teachers. Conference believes this can ultimately be achieved but that it will demand from all teachers' organisations some subordination of sectional interests to the common good, some sacrifice of established tradition and practice, and great goodwill. Conference supports the negotiations to this end reported during the past two years, and instructs the Executive to continue to develop them in the spirit of these reports."¹.

The 1958 report on "The Teaching Profession" which had been prepared by the Union's Education Committee dealt with the organisation of the profession as a self-governing body but only made passing reference to the problem of achieving a united professional organisation. It contended that teachers would expect from a self-governing council the power to raise the standard of entry and training, and to bar unqualified persons from the schools. It stated that legislation would be necessary so that the new body would have real control over the profession with a consequential reduction in the power of the Government in regard to matters affecting the training of teachers. It pointed out that it was hardly possible to say that any profession was completely self-governing and that those professions which had achieved a measure of self-government were those whose members had, in the main, been engaged in private practice. On the other hand, the education service was the responsibility of the central and local governments which financed it. It was felt that in these circumstances there was no possibility of the government relinquishing its powers in regard to the provision and training of teachers for schools. The Union

1. Ibid page 3.

believed, however, that through the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, the teachers had a considerable voice in the making of decisions in this field, and the Union pointed to the introduction of the three year training course as an illustration of the influence wielded by teachers.¹

The Memorandum on Professional Unity in 1960 pointed out that the way to progress was through a single professional organisation, and supported this claim with five reasons:- A single professional organisation was needed to

- "(a) To ensure that advice given to the Government, to Parliament, to the Local Authorities, or to the public at large, is clear and not contradictory.
- (b) To ensure that in all negotiations on salaries, on conditions of service, and on all educational matters, a common teacher policy is concerted and advocated.
- (c) To ensure that a single code of professional conduct can be applied to all members of the profession.
- (d) To ensure a faster development of the historical process by which the teaching profession is acquiring the same freedom of its professional expertise as is possessed by other learned professions.
- (e) To ensure that if and when a Government delegates quasi-statutory powers in education to a body comparable, say, to the General Medical Council, there shall be in existence a representative

1. "The Teaching Profession" - Statement of Executive Policy adopted by Conference 1958 (N.U.T. pamphlet, 1958).

1.

body able to receive such powers."

The memorandum then went on to outline the constitutional problems which would be involved in the creation of a federal type of united professional organisation in which all the important sectional interests were protected by some limited internal autonomy. A possible constitution for such a body was outlined, but the Union stressed that this was not its final word, and it was prepared to negotiate on any point. The report also proposed certain changes in the Union's constitution which would make possible affiliation to the Union nationally, as Central Associations of the Union, certain specialist bodies, some of whom had expressed the desire to collaborate in building up professional unity.

2.

The National Union of Teachers had analysed the difficulties in attempting to form a Teachers' Council with powers of self-government clearly and realistically. The Union was also right to stress that unity within the profession would help in the quest to raise the status of the profession. The idea, however, that a professional association performing both union and professional functions, and including all existing Associations could be established was over optimistic, and minimised and to some degree misinterpreted the existing sectional differences in the profession. The *raison d'etre* of the existing bodies was that there were sectional interests; indeed, the National Association of Schoolmasters was formed in 1921 and seceded from the National Union of Teachers in 1923 because the National Union of Teachers did not adequately cater for these interests in union matters.³ It was

-
1. "Professional Unity" - A memorandum to be submitted by the Executive to Conference, 1960, pages 2 and 3.
 2. Ibid, pages 3, 4 and 5. It should be noted that the "sectional interests" envisaged by the National Union of Teachers were those associated with different levels of education, e.g. Schools Section, a Further Education Section, and a section for Training Colleges and University Training Departments. Clearly, the Union was hoping that its proposed "educational association of England and Wales" would remove the existing "sectional interests" of graduate and non-graduate, between men and women, and between secondary school teacher and primary school teacher, on which the existing professional associations were based.
 3. Minutes 2 and 3 of the N.A.S. Evidence to the Royal Commission on Local Government: Written Evidence of Professional Organisations, Oct. 1968. p.236

unlikely that the major Associations would give up their autonomy. In these circumstances, it would have been more realistic for the Union to have supported the National Association of Schoolmasters' efforts and received unity for the profession in professional matters. Then it could have attempted to use this degree of unity as a basis for achieving a united profession. At least, this method of approach would have enabled the Union to make a start in its attempts to achieve unity, whereas the "all-in-one" policy was bound to meet resolute opposition from the major Associations, and in particular the National Association of Schoolmasters. The Union's faith in the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers would also seem to have been misplaced. It was the easing of the supply situation (although in the event this proved to be false) rather than the influence of the Advisory Council that led to the establishment of the three year course of training.¹ Moreover, the Advisory Council had no independent statutory existence. It was created by the Minister, and could be terminated by the Minister at any time and with little difficulty. Furthermore, its membership was too large for it to develop much in the way of an effective initiative in opposition to the Departmental line, and it contained too many conflicting interests.

Other Sources of Interest in a Teaching Council and Self-government.

The National Association of Schoolmasters and the National Union of Teachers were not the only bodies formulating their policies on the Teacher Council issue during the fifties. The College of Preceptors too was reviving its interest in the formation of a Teachers' Council. The College had been closely associated with the attempts to form a Council in the nineteenth century. It was most anxious to gain representation on a Council, if one should be formed and by doing so hoped to gain greater recognition for its activities and qualifications.

1. For interesting variations of the struggle for the "three year course", see:- W. Taylor, "Society and the Education of Teachers" (Faber and Faber, 1968). Pages 104 - 108. R. A. Manzer "Teachers and Politics" (Manchester University Press: 1970) pages 100-101. R. Layard, J. King and C. Moser, "The Impact of Robbins" (Penguin 1969) page 65.

On March 9th, 1957,¹ the College convened a meeting, which was attended by over 200 teachers, to discuss what should be done to raise the professional status of teachers. The speakers included Mr. Selwyn Taylor who spoke about the medical profession; Mr. Raeburn who spoke about the legal profession; and Sir Ronald Gould who spoke about the teaching profession. Sir Ronald Gould argued that not only was full professional status desirable and essential for teachers, but that they had gone a long way towards achieving it. He pointed out that it would take time to persuade the government and local authorities to let teachers impose their own discipline and run their own internal professional affairs.

Mr. Raeburn was more optimistic and suggested bringing in a bill setting up a General Council of Teachers. One speaker from the floor, and no doubt to the delight of the College, suggested that the College of Preceptors could perform the function of the Council. The meeting closed with the passing nem. con. of a resolution calling for "a meeting of representatives of teachers' organisations to explore the possibility of setting up or receiving a professional organisation to include all teachers". Furthermore, the College of Preceptors was given the task of exploring the possibility of carrying out the resolution.

As far as the College was concerned, the meeting had achieved its purpose. It had shown that the College was still interested in the issue, and it gave the College renewed support for its efforts in this field.

Later in 1957, the idea of a "Teaching Council" was given a wider interpretation by Dr. William Alexander (now Sir William Alexander). Speaking at a Conference at Ormskirk, Dr. Alexander pointed out that professional status was something awarded by Society. The two conditions

1. "The movement for Registration in the Teaching Profession 1861-1966" J. Vincent Taylor (College of Preceptors), pages 61 to 65; also see Times Educational Supplement, No.2182, 15.3.57, page 352.

which society required were a guaranteed standard of qualification and a code which all members accepted in the exercise of their work. Dr. Alexander stated that both of these were absent in the teaching profession, for it embraced the uncertificated teacher of 18, straight from school, as well as the trained graduate who had spent six years at the university. Moreover, untrained graduates were admitted. Thus it was necessary to require all graduates to train, and immediately the third year course became operative in training colleges, to press for a fourth year and graduate status.

But, Alexander pointed out, it was also necessary for the members of the profession to impose internal standards. He argued that this could best be achieved by a Council representing a "profession of education" instead of merely the "teaching profession". Teachers, administrators, and inspectors would all be included. He believed that the Minister of Education might reasonably be expected to hand over some of his powers to the resulting joint body. It must be noted that such a Council would have been very different from most of the other then existing Councils.¹

Interest in professional self-government for teachers was also being shown by other interested commentators on the educational scene. John Vaizey, for example, writing in the Times Educational Supplement in January 1959 was concerned at the low status of the teaching profession, and saw

1. Times Educational Supplement, No.2208, 13th Sept.1957, page 1200. Alexander was later to develop this concept of an "all-embracing" profession of education in his pamphlet, "Towards a new Education Act" page 52 (An Education paperback: Councils and Education Press:1969). He then advocated this idea at a series of informal meetings between the Teachers' Main Committee, the Local Authority Associations' Secretaries, the permanent officers of the Department of Education and Science, and the Parliamentary Under Secretary, Mr. Howell in December 1968/January 1969 (see Chapter Five).

this as a reason for teachers' inadequate representation and participation in the control of education. He pointed out that in the Health Service, the main authorities were ad hoc bodies quite outside the sphere of local government, and the committees of service were composed to a considerable extent of members of the professions who worked in it. On the other hand, in education, the local authorities were in control and the extent of teacher participation in control was limited to a few representatives on some authorities and divisional executives, and a number of advisory committees.

Vaizey pointed^{out} that professional status and professional self-government tended to go together. He quoted the example of the University teachers as being largely self-governing, and related this to the high status of their job. In contrast, the teaching profession ranked fairly low in the hierarchy of professions, and a manifestation of this was that teachers were treated as employees. Consequently, he thought that self-government was essential if teaching was to rank as a profession.¹

Conclusion.

Although the period 1949 to 1960 saw a revival of interest in professional self-government, there were differences of opinion on how this should be achieved. Consequently, there was no coherent movement for the establishment of a Teaching Council. Dr. William Alexander wanted a Council representing the "profession of education" and including administrators and

1. Times Educational Supplement : See the two articles by John Vaizey, "Teachers Under Authority", page 41 and page 71 in the Times Educational Supplements 9.1.59 and 16.1.59. For further development of this theme by Vaizey, see his book "Britain in the Sixties, Education for Tomorrow", pages 92 to 96 (a Penguin Special : 1962).

inspectors as well as teachers. The National Union of Teachers' Executive was diverting the attention of the rank and file away from self-government and emphasising the need for "Unity" in the profession. It was only prepared to accept professional self-government if this was exercised through an "all-in-one" union with statutory powers, which in effect it would control. It saw a separate "Teachers' Council" as a possible threat to its hegemony in teacher politics. The National Association of Schoolmasters, on the other hand, was convinced that self-government could only be exercised through a "Teachers' Council" consisting of a federal body of all professional associations. It believed that "unity" on every issue was illusory. The College of Preceptors, too, saw the need for a "Teachers' Council". Both the College and the National Association of Schoolmasters wanted the Council as much for its political value to them, as for the status it would confer on the profession. Nevertheless, there seemed to be a growing dissatisfaction in the profession with the status of the profession, although the National Union of Teachers was more optimistic about this than some sectors of the profession.

Meanwhile, the Minister was tightening his control over the teaching profession. In 1956 at a conference of representatives of local authority and teacher associations, it was agreed that positive steps were needed to improve the distribution of teachers. It was recommended that the Ministry should issue guidance about the staffing policies local authorities should adopt and what staffing levels would be appropriate. Each local authority was to be given a quota, i.e. the local authorities were given the maximum number of teachers to be employed, expressed in terms of the total number of teachers who should be employed in their primary and secondary schools.¹ In 1959, the Schools Regulations, sections 16, 17 and 18 confirmed the Minister's powers to set the standards required for recognition as qualified teachers, and more importantly, to employ certain categories of unqualified teachers.²

1. "The Distribution of Teachers", Reports on Education, January, 1968, No. 42 (Department of Education and Science).
2. Statutory Instruments, 1959, No. 364, Schools Regulations, 1959.

CHAPTER THREE

" THE FORMATION AND WORK OF THE TEACHERS' GENERAL
COUNCIL MAIN COMMITTEE 1960-64".

The Formation of the Main Committee

In 1960 the Main Committee of the Teachers' General Council movement came quietly into existence unnoticed by the press.^{1.} In the May of that year, the National Association of Head Teachers convened a meeting of representatives of eight professional associations to discuss, in general terms, the setting up of a General Council for the teaching profession similar in concept to those already existing for doctors and lawyers and other professions.^{2.} The professional bodies represented were: the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education; the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions; the Headmasters' Conference; the Joint Four Associations; the National Association of Schoolmasters; the National Union of Teachers; the National Association of Head Teachers; and the National Union of Women Teachers.^{3.} The Association of University Teachers, however, declined to send a representative. The meeting decided to form a Main Committee to explore ways by which a Teachers' General Council could acquire:

- "(i) Control over entry into the teaching profession, including control of standards of entry into training.
- (ii) The sole right to grant recognition as a 'qualified teacher'.
- (iii) Control over professional discipline. " 4.

-
1. Although in the introductory remarks to the Second Meeting of the Teachers' General Council Meeting, the Chairman spoke of this first exploratory meeting as "unique and historic" (Minute 1, Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Main Committee, 1961), no mention was made of the formation of the Main Committee in the press.
 2. Letter from R. J. Cook, secretary of the Main Committee for the Proposed Teachers' General Council, to I.G. Booth dated 16th December, 1969.
 3. The Proposed Teachers' General Council; a historical document issued by the Main Committee, May 1966: Page 1.
 4. Historical document, *ibid*, page 1.

The Associations were fully aware of the difficulties that lay ahead. Their objectives involved the securing of legislation to transfer the existing controls from the Ministry, the Universities, and the Area Training Organisations to the proposed Council. Furthermore, it was recognised that there were varying interests among the representative organisations, thus it was agreed that no organisation would be committed to the decisions of the "Committee"¹.

The formation of the Main Committee was of great importance to the movement for a Teaching Council. It gave the movement coherence, and moreover it brought together all the major organisations, with the exception of the Association of University Teachers. The failure of the National Association of Schoolmasters' approaches to the Minister in the fifties had made it abundantly clear that it would need a concerted effort by all of the largest teachers' organisations if self-government was to be achieved.

Towards a definition of a 'Qualified Teacher'.

It was agreed at the first meeting that all questions relating to the actual membership and constitution of the proposed Council should be left to a later stage of negotiation. As a first step it was decided to discover what agreement could be reached on the definition of "qualified teacher". The inherent difficulties soon became apparent at the second meeting of the Main Committee when each organisation submitted a memorandum on the subject.² From the widely varying contributions, two major viewpoints emerged. One viewpoint argued that a "qualified teacher" should be defined without reference to the type of institution in which the teacher was to be engaged. Membership to the Council would be restricted to such teachers. "Associate" membership would be available to all "untrained" teachers in Further Education and the Universities. The

1. In spite of the varying interests of the Associations, Cook reports that the meetings of the "Main Committee" were "conducted in a real spirit of harmony". Letter from Cook to Booth, 16th December, 1969.
2. See Appendix One.

other viewpoint argued that it would be wiser to consider separately the various main fields into which the educational system was divided, e.g. the Schools' Field, the Youth Service, the field of Further Education, and to attempt to agree on a suitable definition of "qualified teacher", field by field. ^{1.} There was general agreement that to separate teachers in the Schools' Field from their colleagues in colleges and universities could only lead to an inferior status for school teachers. ^{2.}

Seven of the eight organisations agreed that no definition of a qualified teacher in the Schools' Field would be acceptable unless it included a requirement for professional training. The dissenting member was the Headmasters' Conference. ^{3.} This was to be expected since many teachers in the Independent Sector had no professional training. Indeed, the Headmasters' Conference's representative insisted that professional skills could best be acquired through serving a period of "apprenticeship" in schools. Thus he proposed that a period of "in-service training" for graduates under the supervision of Headteachers, with qualified status being granted or refused on the Head's recommendation should be included as an alternative to formal training in a recognised institution. Clearly this was unacceptable since it would have debased the value of the concept of professional skill and training. Its acceptance would have indicated the apparent acceptance that there was no rationale behind teaching skills apart from that acquired by practical experience.

Despite the difference of viewpoint, it was unanimously agreed to set up a sub-committee of one member from each organisation, to define the term

-
1. For the inherent difficulties within the field of further education, see the contribution of the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, Appendix One.
 2. Historical document, *ibid*, page 2.
 3. See the contribution of the Headmasters' Conference, Appendix One.

"qualified teacher" in such a way as to define at the same time, the group or groups to be admitted to membership of a Teachers' General Council.

The Definition of a Schoolteacher.

It was at the second meeting of this sub-committee^{1.} that agreement was reached on the definition of a qualified teacher in the Schools' Field. A paper submitted by Mr. Powell-Davis (National Union of Teachers) provided the basis of the definition which read as follows:- a qualified teacher was,

- "(1) A person who, after the age of 18, shall have successfully completed a minimum course of three years' duration, approved by an Area Training Organisation in a recognised Training Institution, or,
- (2) have successfully completed a course leading to a degree of a British University, or, to a degree in a Commonwealth or Foreign University which is approved by the proposed governing body of the profession, and also have completed a course of professional training approved by an Area Training Organisation of not less than one year in respect of training in England and Wales, or,
- (3) have successfully completed courses approved by the proposed governing body, leading to a qualification recognised as equivalent to a degree, and also have completed a course of professional training of not less than one year, approved as in (2) above, or,
- (4) have successfully completed courses approved by the proposed new governing body, in specialist subjects such as Art, Music, Technical subjects etc., and have completed a course of training of not less than one year, approved as in (2) above." 2.

1. Held on 10.1.62.

2. Minutes of the Teachers' General Council Sub-Committee 10.1.62. Minute 2. See also the Historical Document, pages 3 and 4.

The definition, however, was subject to the two following conditions :-

- "a) That all teachers recognised as qualified under the School Grant Regulations at the date when the power to license such status shall pass from the Minister of Education to the proposed new licensing body shall continue to be regarded as qualified teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools.
- b) That the definition given below shall be regarded as the minimum qualification only until such time as the conditions of supply of teachers make possible a raising of the qualification so that in the given definitions:
- (1) the stated period of 'three years' shall read 'four years'.
 - (2) the content of all such four year courses shall be such as to lead to graduate or graduate equivalent status." 1.

Thus, the sub-committee anticipated that the proposed Council would raise the status of the teaching profession by pressing for better entry qualifications into the profession, including the concept of an "all-graduate" profession. The proposals were evidently formulated with the supply situation very much in mind. The proposals sensibly included recognition for membership of all those already recognised under the School Grant Regulations, and thus avoided the supply problem which would have been created if the proposed Council

1. Minutes of Sub-Committee, 10.1.62, Minute 2.

had sought to exclude the existing untrained graduates from the schools. The proposals also show that, as in the nineteen fifties, the teachers' Associations were faced with the dilemma of raising the status of the profession by extending the courses of training at the expense of creating further problems for the supply situation.

The sub-committee was not able, however, to reach an agreement on the definition of a "qualified teacher" in the "Further Education Field". The basis of discussion on this topic was a letter from Mr. E. Britton of the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions. This pointed out that whilst it was desirable that teachers in Further Education should receive professional training, the one year post graduate training pattern was not the most desirable form because of variations in the recruits to technical colleges. The position was aggravated by the "supply situation", and further complicated by part-time teachers who were an essential part of the system. The letter outlined three procedural steps to solve these problems.

Firstly, a period of experimentation was needed to ascertain the best type of training with variations for age, qualifications and type of post.

Secondly, on completion of experiments and agreement on type of training, it would be necessary to go through a period during which encouragement was the means by which the number of professional trained teachers in Further Education would be increased. Apart from anything else, this period of encouragement would be necessary in order to build up the necessary training college grant.

Thirdly, and finally, when a reasonable proportion of new entrants had undertaken voluntary training, it would then be possible to introduce

a training requirement in Further Education.^{1.}

One interesting outcome of the sub-committee meetings was the attitude of the representatives as to who should control the proposed Council. The committee was insistent that the power and control of the Council must be firmly in the hands of the teachers, and Mr. Powell Davis pointed out that his association, the National Union of Teachers, could not envisage supporting the idea of a Statutory Council on which teacher-representatives were not in a majority.^{2.}

It was clear that the teachers' associations were determined that the Council would not in effect be another government-controlled body rubber stamping government policy. It seems, however, that the committee had not considered the full implications of the Minister's responsibility for the supply of teachers, and the relationship of supply to the qualifications of teachers and the control over entry to the profession.

The sub-committee's definition of a "qualified teacher" in the schools' field was accepted by the Main Committee at its next meeting on the 3rd April 1962. There was some doubt expressed about the minimum admission standards, with some members stressing the difficulties that would result if too high a level was imposed. It was pointed out, however, that it was necessary that a high standard should be set at the outset even though certain reservations were needed at the time. The Headmasters' Conference representative was the only voice of dissent against the definition, and this was not surprising in view of the difficulties of the supply situation in the 'independent sector.'^{3.}

1. Ibid, Minute 3.

2. Ibid, Minute 3.

3. Minutes of Teachers' General Council. Main Committee, 3rd April, 1962, Minute 2.

In spite of disappointment with the progress, or rather lack of progress, made in the field of Further Education, it was decided to ask a sub-committee to take a further look at the problem. The sub-committee was to be composed of one or more representatives from each of the bodies with the power to co-opt people with specialised knowledge.^{1.} The Main Committee was obviously concerned to see any future Teachers' Council include the whole profession.^{2.}

The Main Committee also agreed to issue a Press Release giving a brief factual statement of the progress achieved.^{3.}

The Definition of a Qualified Teacher in the Field of Further Education

It was not until nearly a year later, on the 30th January, 1963, that the sub-committee on Technical and Further Education met,^{4.} and discussion centred on a memorandum^{5.} presented by Mr. E. Britton, the then General Secretary of the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions.^{6.}

1. Ibid, Minute 2.
2. This was in spite of the fact that some members of the Main Committee were somewhat pessimistic of the possible outcome of such a sub-committee. (Report on the Sub-Committee presented to Committee A, 10/11th May, 1963. Appendix B (6/63). National Association of Schoolmasters' Documents.)
3. Ibid, Minute 4. See also Appendix Two. I can find no evidence in the "educational press" to confirm that the press statement was released to the press.
4. Minutes of the Teachers' General Council, Technical and Further Education Sub-Committee 30.1.63.
5. See Appendix Three, Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions : Conditions for Registration of Teachers in Further Education.(646/19263).
6. In a report on the sub-committee meeting to his executive, Mr. H.J.Bell, (N.A.S.) stated, "From the outset the impression was created that the A.T.T.I. were prepared to go a long way towards helping to find a satisfactory designation acceptable to all parties. This is unusual and should be viewed with some reserve. It is worth noting that the memorandum was not forthcoming before the meeting to permit more thorough study. Also it was noted that the N.U.T. representative Mr. Powell Davies, appeared to have some prior knowledge of the memorandum. These observations are based on conjecture only". (Report of a Meeting of the Technical and Further Education Sub-Committee, Presented to Committee A, 10/11th May, 1963. Appendix B(6/63), N.A.S. documents). Clearly, the N.A.S. was distrustful of the N.U.T.'s and A.T.T.I.'s attitudes towards the proposed Council.

Although the document was not, as yet, the official policy of the Association, Britton expressed expectations that it would become so.¹

The document insisted that a teacher in Further Education required a knowledge of technology or mastery of a skill; the ability to teach; and a sufficiently high standard of general education. For the majority of teachers in Further Education, it would be possible to draw up a list of qualifications that would be acceptable for registration, e.g. a degree, higher national certificate, technological certificate of the City and Guilds etc. A number of cases could not be met because in some subjects no paper qualifications existed e.g. highly specialised industrial and commercial subjects such as rubber technology, bulk transport of liquids etc. For these, the memorandum proposed the setting up of a Qualifications Sub-Committee of the General Teachers' Council to adjudicate on other qualifications or upon the standard of subject knowledge of the individual teachers.

The document accepted that all teachers in Further Education should be trained. The standard and length of training would be open to discussion but on the basis of present practice it seemed reasonable that the length of the standard course should be one year full-time. As an alternative, it was suggested that there should be a sandwich course of two or three years to alleviate hardship in the case of mature entrants.

It was also noted in the memorandum that there were many part-time teachers not "essentially" teachers since they had other full-time occupations other than teaching. It was not anticipated, therefore, that part-timers should come within the scope of the General Teachers' Council.

1. Appendix B (6/63), N.A.S. documents; Bell noted that the points submitted in the A.T.T.I. document arose out of committee work within the A.T.T.I. "They have not received the general approval of the National Executive of that body so cannot be regarded as Association policy at this stage. It is confidently anticipated by the General Secretary, Mr. E. Britton, that Executive will approve these points when the matter is discussed.

But a part-time teacher would only be permitted to teach under the general supervision of a registered teacher.

Thus, the memorandum proposed that all teachers who had completed a specified period of full-time teaching in Further Education would automatically qualify for registration with the Council. Teachers who had not served this specified period would be subject to the following conditions of registration :-

- "(a) He must satisfy the Qualifications Sub-Committee of the Teachers' General Council that he has attained a suitable standard of subject knowledge for teaching in Further Education.
 - (b) He must have completed a year's full-time course, or an equivalent course, of teacher training recognised by the Area Training Organisation as suitable for the training of teachers in Further Education. No course would be recognised by the Area Training Organisation for this purpose that did not either by means of imposing entry qualifications or by other means, ensure that the teacher concerned had achieved a suitable standard of general education.
- From the operative date for the commencement of Registration or as soon after as may be practicable, an unregistered teacher would not be allowed to teach as a full-time teacher in Further Education for more than three years." 1.

The memorandum was also interesting in that it reflected the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions' feelings of being the "poor relation" in the field of tertiary education, and a determination to redress this situation. The memorandum pointed out that advanced work was

1. See Appendix Three; section 7, entitled "Definition".

being carried out in Colleges of Advanced Technology, Regional and Area Technical Colleges equivalent in standards to that done in Universities. Thus : "It would be unreasonable that teachers doing work of University standard in Technical Colleges should be expected to obtain registration qualifications as a necessary condition for retaining their teaching posts, whilst teachers in Universities and Training Colleges doing exactly the same work should not be under the same necessity. The corollary of registration for teachers in Further Education is therefore that a similar condition should be required from teachers in Universities and Teacher Training Colleges." 1.

Herein lay the essential difference between the "Schools' Field" and the "Field of Further Education". Whilst the Minister laid down the qualifications for employment of teachers in schools, there were no regulations relating to teacher qualifications in the field of further education. Thus, whilst it was accepted in the "Schools' Field" that teacher-training ought to be undertaken, there was no such assumption as yet in the field of tertiary education.

It would have been interesting to have had recorded the immediate reaction of the Association of University Teachers and the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education to such proposals. But former Association declined the invitation to send a representative to the meeting, and the latter's representative was absent.² Although the Sub-Committee resolved that Mr. Britton's memorandum be accepted as a basis for further discussion,³ the absence of the representatives from the Association of University Teachers and the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education meant that progress was at a standstill until their views could be ascertained.

-
1. See Appendix Three : Section entitled "University Level Work."
 2. Minutes of the meeting of the Teachers' General Council Technical and Further Education Sub-Committee, 30.1.63., minute 2.
 3. Ibid, minute 3.

A further meeting of the Technical and Further Education Sub-Committee was held on the 28th March 1963, immediately before the meeting of the Main Committee. Both meetings were attended by a member of the Association of University Teachers, although he was attending only in a personal capacity and not as a representative.^{1.} The Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education representative accepted the definition of the Sub-Committee for the field of further education agreeing that full professional training should be a necessity for registration in the Training College field. The University Teachers' member, however, only agreed to report back to his organisation to see how far it was prepared to come into the proposed Teachers' General Council. He intimated, however, that there was a general feeling in the Universities that they were the best judges of the fitness of man or woman for university teaching.

It was pointed out to the University member that the personnel of a "Qualifications Sub-Committee" was not intended to be static for all parts of the field of Further Education. In the case of the Universities the personnel would naturally come from the Universities themselves.^{2.}

It would appear, however, that the Universities were not impressed by these arrangements, for a letter from Dr. Urwin, the secretary of the Association confirmed that his Association did not wish to be a part of the Council, nor his members be required to register.^{3.} This is not surprising for the University teacher had little prestige to gain from membership of the proposed Council. There were no government regulations regarding the qualifications of University teachers, and the University

1. Historical Document, page 5.

2. Historical Document, page 5.

3. Minutes of the Teachers' General Council Special Sub-Committee, 3rd July, 1963. This viewpoint was confirmed by a further letter from Dr. Urwin in 1965; see Minute 4, Minutes of the Teachers' General Council - Main Committee, 20.12.65.

teachers were virtually a self-governing and autonomous body. Furthermore, association with a Teachers' Council with its emphasis on vocational training would have been regarded as a lowering rather than a raising of their status, especially since many University teachers regarded their research function as important, if not more important than their teaching function.^{1.}

The meeting of the Main Committee of the 28th March accepted the findings of the sub-committee and once more turned its attention to publicity. It was agreed to set up a sub-committee to draw up a draft statement showing the difficulties that had been overcome, and the progress that had been made. However, just as discussions began on the compiling of this document, a report was published by the Wheatley Committee which had been appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland to make recommendations concerning the setting up of a Scottish Teachers' Council.^{2.}

1. In 1964, the "Report on the Committee on University Teaching Methods" (H.M.S.O. 1964) was published. Universities were asked whether any training or instruction in teaching was given to members of staff, and the answers showed that any such instruction was limited to informal advice and guidance, given on a departmental level (para. 339). Although a good deal of discussion on the desirability of giving members of staff training or instruction took place, it appeared that this rarely resulted in action (para. 341). The Report believed that relatively little experiment in methods of university teaching had so far been carried out in this country because there was little to tempt a university teacher to give to a study of teaching methods time which inclination and self-interest would lead him to give to research in his own subject (para.393). The Committee was convinced that any proposal to make a full-time course of training lasting, for say, a year a necessary qualification for a university appointment would receive no support at all. Any arrangements which were obligatory, and which occupied much of the time of prospective or newly-appointed university teachers, might act as a serious deterrent to the recruitment by universities of people whose primary interest was in scholarship or research. But the Report pointed out, that the present arrangements were more haphazard than was desirable and resulted in much university teaching being less effective than it should be (para.342).
2. "The Teaching Profession in Scotland" Cmnd. 2066 (H.M.S.O., Edinburgh : reprint 1966).

The Wheatley Report

At various times in the past, teachers in Scotland had indicated that they wished to govern the teaching profession in Scotland. The events, however, which led to the setting up of the Wheatley Committee had their origin in a strike of Glasgow teachers in 1961, which was organised by the Glasgow Local Association of the Educational Institute of Scotland and lasted for a week. The strike had a "traumatic effect on both parliamentarian and public opinion,"¹ and when subsequently the Institute approached the Secretary of State for Scotland and suggested that a fresh start be made it found him more than willing to meet the Institute halfway.

The result was the setting up of committees of enquiry into the state of the teaching profession in Scotland. The main committee, under the chairmanship of Lord Wheatley, was given the following terms of reference :-

"To review, on the light of the requirements of the education service and the practice in relation to other professions, the present arrangements for the award and withdrawal of certificates of competency to teach, and to make recommendations regarding any changes that are considered desirable in these arrangements and any consequential changes in the functions of teacher training authorities."²

The Wheatley Committee came to the unanimous finding :-

"Our survey of the present arrangements in this field in teaching

-
1. Letter from Thomasson, Depute Secretary, Educational Institute of Scotland, ref. RHKT/EK, dated 10.2.69, to Booth. Also see article by Thomasson, "Home Rule for Teachers?", New Society, 25th Sept. 1969 pages 476 & 477.
 2. Cmnd. 2066, Ibid, page 1.

and in other professions has led us to the unanimous opinion that new machinery should be devised for the teaching profession and that there should be established a General Teaching Council for Scotland, broadly similar in scope, powers and functions to the Councils in other professions.¹

The main recommendations were :-

- a) that the Council should be made up of 44 members, of whom 25 would represent registered teachers, and of these 25 there were to be 9 primary (5 heads and 4 assistants) and 9 secondary (5 heads and 4 assistants) teachers. These members were to be elected by direct election and not appointed by associations. Of the other 19 members, 15 were to be appointed by other interests and 4 were to be nominees of the Secretary of State;
- b) the Council should have advisory powers over the standards of admission to training and qualifications. The Council may initiate recommendations in this field and should the Secretary of State accept them he can implement them by the negative procedure. Where, however, the Secretary of State wished to introduce regulations which were not accepted by the Council, he should be required to use the affirmative resolution procedure;
- c) there should be legislation to transfer the power to license from the Secretary of State to the Council, but the Council must accept for registration students recommended by the colleges of education;

1. Ibid, page 2.

- d) the Council should establish and maintain a register of qualified teachers including a provisional and final section. Registrations should be obligatory on all teachers;
- e) the present system of probation would continue and the decisions taken would be binding on the Council;
- f) the Council should have disciplinary powers over registered members;
- g) the Council should appoint some members to the Departmental Committee on the Supply of Teachers;
- h) all existing qualified teachers and new entrants would be required to pay a fee fixed by regulation which would be deducted from the teachers' salary payments and remitted direct to the Council.^{1.}

The Main Committee's Reaction to the Wheatley Report

The Teachers' General Council Main Committee convened a special sub-committee on the 3rd July 1963 to discuss the Wheatley Report.^{2.} The Report received a mixed reception. Mr. Bell, National Association of Schoolmasters, pressed for an immediate approach to the Minister. He argued that the Scottish Council, as recommended, was the kind of body that was required in England. It was a distinct step forward. Although the Scottish Council's system of representation was not what they required, Mr. Bell stressed that the Scottish Council did possess a predominance of teacher members, and the attainment of powers now held by the Secretary of State for Scotland.

-
1. For a fuller summary of the Wheatley recommendations see Cmd. 2066, pages 58 - 62.
 2. Minutes of the Special Sub-Committee 3rd July, 1963.

The majority view was contrary to this, and was in favour of giving time to the various member organisations to study the document in detail to see in what ways it could be used to further their own ideas of a Teachers' General Council. It was felt that the Scottish plan had many drawbacks. The proposed Scottish Council had only just a majority of teachers and had no more power, in fact, than the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. The report gave the "tough end" of the disciplinary powers to the Council, and yet the Council had no power of control over entry into the profession. There was also a difference between the situation in England and Scotland, namely that the Scottish teachers had better minimum qualifications. Thus it was concluded that the Main Committee's aims were right and should not be changed. Whilst the Scottish document was valuable as a source of reference, it was pointed out that it would be a bad time to approach the Minister since the approach would be closely associated with the Scottish Report.¹

-
1. The varying attitudes of the English Teachers were reported in the Times Educational Supplement 5th July, 1963. The report noted that the English Teachers welcomed the Wheatley report's proposal for a General Teachers' Council in Scotland but did not think, for different reasons, that the report's recommendations should or could be applied to the letter in England. A spokesman of the N.U.T. said that in England they were starting from the other end by trying to get agreement between the teachers' associations on acceptable minimum qualifications. The Union wanted teachers to have complete control over entry which the Wheatley report denied them in Scotland. The T.E.S. report went on to point out that Mr. T. Casey, secretary of the National Association of Schoolmasters also welcomed the Wheatley Report, and hoped it would produce a similar move in England. However, he feared that if the proposals were translated into English terms, the N.U.T. would control every elected position on the Council. On the other hand, Mr. A.W.S. Hutchings, secretary of the A.A.M. said the report was a "very useful document", and teachers in England should be in a stronger position to determine conditions of entry and exit. But the composition of the Council recommended for Scotland would not work in England.

At the next meeting^{1.} of the Teachers' General Council Main Committee held on the 25th September, 1963, the National Association of Schoolmasters' representative, Mr. Bell again moved that an approach should be made to the Minister of Education with a view to him setting up a working party to consider the teaching profession in England and Wales, on the lines of the Wheatley Committee which had reported on the teaching profession in Scotland and had advocated a General Teaching Council for Scotland. Again this idea was rejected,^{2.} and after two hours' discussion it was decided to ask a Special Sub-Committee to consider possible terms of reference of a proposed working party in the light of the views of the constituent organisations on the type of Teachers' General Council the various bodies wished to see established.

A Wider View of the Proposed Council.

The Sub-Committee met on October 14th 1963, and many interesting points were raised in the discussion.^{3.} It was suggested that the Teachers' General Council should be equivalent in position to the Imperial General Staff being at the apex and close to the seat of Government. It would be at the head of the teaching profession as a whole unifying policies and opinions, giving advice from the whole of the profession, and so would be a good deal more important than anything that existed in teacher

1. The account of this meeting is based on a report presented to the N.A.S. Officers, 1st/2nd November, 1963; reference Appendix O (12/63).
2. The N.A.S. officials were disappointed by the response of the other Associations to their suggestion. Mr. Ronald reported to his officials, "The attitude of other members of the Main Committee to this suggestion was pathetic. The representatives of the H.M.C., N.U.T., A.T.C.D.E., A.T.T.I. and Joint Four put forward a variety of reasons why such a step should not be taken and one could only conclude that the organisations named have no real desire to make progress in the establishment of a Teachers' General Council. Mr. Bell challenged them on this point and the lack of indignation indicated only too closely that apart from the N.A.S. and the N.A.H.T. no other organisation has its heart in this venture". Appendix O (12/63) N.A.S. papers.
3. Note on the Teachers' General Council : Sub-Committee Oct. 14th 1963.

politics. It would be partly an advisory and partly an executive body, thus unlike the Scottish Council which was purely advisory. Moreover it would have a wider perspective than that suggested by the Wheatley Report for the Scottish Council.

7. Although it would have research functions similar to the Schools' Council, specialist research would be outside its resources. The Council would, however, give evidence to such Committees as Newson and Robbins, and it was hoped that this would carry more weight than that of the individual organisations.

It was suggested that the advisory functions of the Council should include giving advice on supply (although the sub-committee could not decide on the relationship between the Teachers' General Council and the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers); giving advice on staffing, conditions of service, and qualifications and training; and advising specialist committees. The executive functions would include power to set the standards required for entry to the profession; power to recognise and control recognition of courses of study in Colleges; power of registration; and power for disciplining registered members.

It was proposed that the Council should have a majority of teacher representatives, and these should be appointed by the Associations rather than elected by direct election. The representatives could then be called to task by their Associations. Furthermore, it was thought that if representatives were appointed by the Associations, the election of representatives with a "teacher-politician" background would be ensured.

It was suggested that the existing system of probation should continue; that it would be an offence to teach in state schools unless

registered; and that the cost of the Council should be chiefly borne out of Public Funds, although an initial fee might be charged.

The point was also made that the teacher shortage was due, to a large extent, to the failure of the government to provide adequate Training College places. It was hoped that the Teachers' General Council would not accept a low standard of entry to get teachers as the Government had done.

As a result of the development of the discussion, the Sub-Committee formulated the following questions which a Working Party would need to explore.

1. Should the T.G.C. take over the National Advisory Council or continue side by side with it?
2. Should the T.G.C. be a body with a wide perspective looking well into the future and having research facilities as well as power to advise the Minister?
3. Should the Training Colleges be responsible for the arrangement of courses, their control and their standards, with the T.G.C. being able to recommend the length and type of course?
4. Should the T.G.C. take over the Minister's power to license teachers and continue to accept the Training College recommendations of students?
5. Should the T.G.C. establish a register of qualified teachers including a provisional, and a final section when probation is completed?
6. Should the probationary period continue as at present with the Head Teachers and H.M.I.s assessing the teachers?
7. Should registration be obligatory on all teachers and should it be an offence for an unregistered person to be employed teaching?

8. Should the T.G.C. keep in review the problem of teacher supply so as to be able to advise and assist the Minister?
9. Should the T.G.C. exercise disciplinary control? If so should there be an established code of professional conduct?
10. Should the membership of the T.G.C. be broadly representative of the educational world and have a majority of teachers on it?
11. Should representation be by "individual" or by association?
12. Should the expenses of the T.G.C. be shared between the teaching profession and public funds?
13. Should teachers be required to pay an initial and annual fee for registration?"¹.

It is clear from the discussion in, and the questions posed by the sub-committee that it envisaged that the proposed General Teachers' Council for England and Wales would be more powerful than the proposed Scottish Council, especially as regards to the control of entry to the profession. But paragraph 47 of the Wheatley report had pointed out that teachers, who were employees, could not be treated in the same way as members of the Medical and other professions who, in the main, had been or were self-employed persons. Thus it was necessary for the Secretary of State to safeguard the public interest as regards to teacher supply, which necessitated the Secretary of State for Scotland retaining reserved powers in the field of entry to the profession.² This being so in Scotland, it is difficult to see why the sub-committee should have expected the Secretary of State for Education in England to take a different view.

1. Note on the Teachers' General Council : Sub-Committee Oct. 14th 1963.

2. The Teaching Profession in Scotland (Wheatley Report) Cmnd. 2066 para. 47. (Edinburgh : H.M.S.O. Reprinted 1966).

It is also clear that the sub-committee intended that the Council would in effect be controlled by the Unions, and the representatives would to a large extent give voice to the policies of the Unions on professional matters.

After further meetings, the Main Committee eventually agreed at its meeting on Friday, July 10th, 1964, to the following statement:-

"(1) A Teachers' General Council should be created with definite powers conferred upon it by legislation.

These should include -

- a) Power to determine the qualifications necessary for registration of teachers working in Primary, Secondary, Further and Higher Education.
 - b) power to administer professional discipline and to keep a register, including the power to remove names from the register.
- (2) The Council should be broadly representative....., with some non-teacher members, with limited powers of co-option, but with registered teachers in the majority, such teachers to be nominated by associations.
 - (3) From a date to be determined, no further teachers should be appointed to schools recognised as efficient by the Secretary of State for Education and Science unless registered.
 - (4) Consideration will be given to the possibility of working out an acceptable form of registration for teachers in Further and Higher Education.
 - (5) The Council should be self-supporting. An initial fee should be payable." 1.

An immediate approach to the Secretary of State for Education and Science was recommended asking him "to set up an official working party to consider and report upon the establishment of a Teachers' General Council, with power to administer professional discipline and power to keep the register, including the power to remove names from the register," and requesting him to receive the Main Committee to discuss the matter at an early date.^{1.}

This meeting of July 10th, 1964, was important in as much as it marked the beginning of a new phase in the development of the movement for a Teachers' General Council. Up to this date, the Main Committee had concentrated on achieving internal agreement among its members on such fundamental issues as the definition of a teacher in the various sectors of education.^{2.} The Main Committee was now to turn its attention to gaining recognition for its objectives from the Department of Education and Science and Parliament.

1. Ibid.

2. The Main Committee had met with considerable success in bringing the Unions together, and in 1964, the N.U.T. Executive placed a report - establishing a self-governing teaching profession, a report on the proposals for a professional council of teachers to be presented to the Blackpool Conference 1964 - before the 1964 N.U.T. Conference recommending the acceptance of the functions of a Council as proposed by the Main Committee. This outward success, however, concealed some of the tensions within the Main Committee. The N.A.S. regarded the "Blackpool Report" with some scepticism. In a report to the N.A.S. Executive (N.A.S. Papers 2/64, Appendix Z), Mr. H.J. Bell was suspicious of the N.U.T.'s motives and feared that the N.U.T. might be making a "take-over" of the proposed Council. It is clear both from the N.U.T. Blackpool Report and Mr. Bell's report that the structure of the proposed Council and the method of representation (including the achievement of a balance of interests between the teachers' associations) would become problematic for the Main Committee and an Official Working Party. Indeed, discussions between the N.U.T. and N.A.S. during the period 1960 - 1962 had already indicated this would be the case. (See Professional Unity: A Interim Report; N.U.T. pamphlet No. 243, March 1962, pages 5 and 6).

CHAPTER FOUR

"THE UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS OF THE MAIN COMMITTEE TO SECURE
AN 'OFFICIAL WORKING PARTY', 1964 - 68"

The next three years were to prove frustrating and disappointing to the Main Committee. It soon became clear that the Department of Education and Science was against the idea of a Teachers' Council, and the period 1964 - 68 witnessed a series of unsuccessful attempts by the Main Committee to persuade the successive Secretaries of State for Education to set up an "Official Working Party".

The Approach to Mr. Hogg.

On the 13th July, 1964, the Secretary of the Teachers' Main Committee, Mr. Glossop, wrote to Mr. Hogg indicating the points on which agreement had been reached in the Main Committee.¹ The letter then went on to say:-

"The Working Party therefore recommends that the Secretary of State for Education and Science be asked to set up an official working party to consider and report on the establishment of a Teachers' General Council with power to determine the qualifications necessary for registration of teachers working in Primary, Secondary, Further and Higher Education, power to administer professional discipline and power to keep the register, including the power to remove names from the register."²

Mr. Hogg replied to the letter requesting time to consider the matter. But in spite of frequent verbal reminders from the Main Committee's

-
1. "The Proposed Teachers' General Council" : Historical Document page 7.
 2. Ibid, page 7 of the Historical Document.

secretary, Mr. Glossop, by the time the Conservative Government fell in October, 1964, no further reply had been received.

Nevertheless the Committee was not deterred by the apparent non-co-operation from Mr. Hogg. Evenso the election of a Labour Government, on a manifesto that promised to give priority to the teacher supply problem, must have been viewed with mixed feelings by the members of the Main Committee since part-time teachers and a "crash programme" of recruitment seemed to be heavily emphasized, and no mention was made of improving standards of entry.^{1.} The fact, however, that a considerable number of teachers were elected to Parliament must have given the Main Committee high hopes of progress.^{2.} But by early November, still no communication re the letter of the 13th July, 1964 had been received from the Department. The Main Committee concluded that this may have been due

1. Labour Party Manifesto 1964 : "The New Britain" reported in the Times, Sept. 12, 1964, page 6.
"Finally - and most important - since everything depends on teachers, Labour will give to teacher supply a special priority in its first year of office, negotiating a new salary structure including a super-annuation scheme favourable to part-time and elderly teachers, encouraging more entrants to teaching and winning back thousands of women lost by marriage. The whole future of our education depends on the success of a crash programme for teacher recruitment which appeals not merely to boys and girls at school but to adults with experience of practical life that will give an edge to their teaching".
2. 25 members of the National Union of Teachers or its affiliate, the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, were elected, and Mr. Michael Stewart, a former teacher, albeit a university teacher, became Secretary of State for Education : R.A. Manzer, "Teachers and Politics" (Manchester University Press : 1970) page 18. Manzer also points out "As a result of the election of October 1964 the N.U.T. suffered the novel experience of seeing all its spokesmen in the Labour Party disappear into the Government, as Michael Stewart became Foreign Secretary : Edward Short, Chief Whip; Dr. Horace King, Deputy Speaker; and George Thomas, Under Secretary at the Home Office." This, of course, committed them to the collective responsibility of the Cabinet on Cabinet policy.

to the fact that a number of outstanding items from the old administration, including its own letter, were not receiving priority attention. Consequently, it was decided to re-submit the original letter to the new Secretary of State.^{1.} Mr. Michael Stewart, however, was not to remain at the Department for long, and in January 1965, after only spending two and a half months at the Department, he replaced Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker as Foreign Secretary. Mr. Antony Crosland became the new Secretary of State for Education.

The Main Committee's Meeting with Mr. Crosland

Eventually on the 3rd March 1965, Mr. Glossop received a reply from Mr. Crosland regretting the tardiness of his reply but offering the excuse that he was new to the office. Mr. Crosland invited the Main Committee to send a delegation to the Department.^{2.} The meeting between the Secretary of State and the delegation took place on the 31st March 1965. The delegation presented the full teachers' case for the establishment of a Teachers' General Council concerned not only with primary and secondary education but with further and higher education. It was pointed out that all the constituent bodies fully supported the proposals, and that the Council would do much to raise the status of the teaching profession in the eyes of the general public. The delegation stressed that what was desired was a really worthwhile Teachers' General Council - one with executive as well as advisory powers vested in it.^{3.}

The delegation left the Department with their hopes considerably raised. At last it seemed that they were making real progress. After a reasonable time had elapsed with no communication from Mr. Crosland, the

-
1. Letter from the Secretary of the Teachers' General Council Main Committee to T.A. Casey 17.1.65.
 2. Letter from Crosland to Glossop 3rd March 1965.
 3. Historical Document, *ibid*, page 8.

Main Committee began to become impatient, and its secretary pressed for a reply.^{1.} This was finally sent on the 18th November, 1965, eight months after the meeting between Crosland and the delegation. In this reply, Crosland re-iterated that there was nothing between them on the long term aim of raising the status of the teaching profession and "any practicable development that would further the aim deserves study". But the letter went on to state - "Your deputation made clear to me that the changes they had in mind would be very radical indeed, involving transfer to the proposed Council of the control over certain fundamental matters, such as standards of entry to the profession, which now rests with the Government. I have come to the conclusion that the locus of control of these matters could not be altered during a period of teacher shortage like the present and that the Department's representatives would inevitably have to maintain this view throughout the discussions of an official Working Party, were one set up. I think therefore that it would be fruitless and in the end frustrating to all concerned to have these ideas explored any further at this stage. In any event a scheme of the kind you have in mind could not be implemented without legislation and there seems to me to be other more urgent calls upon the legislative programme. In these circumstances I am afraid I cannot see my way to adopt your suggestion of an official working party on the subject".^{2.}

Ostensibly the letter seemed to suggest that the shortage of teachers and the lack of parliamentary time were the chief obstacles in the way of progress. In a speech at Lincoln in March 1965, Mr. Crosland had indicated that the country needed 55,000 teachers to achieve the 1944 Act's goal of class sizes of 40 children in primary, and 30 children in secondary schools.

-
1. Minutes of the Proposed Teachers' General Council - Main Committee 20.12.65. Minute 2.
 2. Ibid. Minute 2.

The Government's concern over the supply problem was illustrated by its campaign to recruit part-time teachers, and encourage married women teachers to return to the profession with posters displaying the slogans, "If you were once a teacher are you thinking of coming back" and, "It's time to teach again".^{1.}

It is also probable that the Union's attitudes towards auxiliaries also influenced Crosland in his decision not to proceed with an official working party. At the National Union of Teachers Conference in April 1965, Crosland had intimated that he was considering introducing auxiliaries into schools to ease the supply situation. He pointed out to Conference; "Provided your own professional responsibility is safeguarded, as it certainly must be, you would only gain in standing and esteem if you were equipped, as a matter of course, with proper assistance in your basic tasks, both inside and outside the classroom".^{2.} Conference, however, was not convinced and passed a motion rejecting the employment of auxiliaries.^{3.} This rejection was based on three grounds. Firstly, there was no accepted division of functions in teaching, as there was in other professions that employed auxiliaries, thus there was a fear that auxiliaries might lead to dilution. Secondly, it was believed that auxiliaries were synonymous with "child-minders". Thirdly, it was argued that supervision would tend to fall on the youngest and most inexperienced members of the teaching profession.^{4.} But the National Union of Teachers was not alone in rejecting auxiliaries;

-
1. See a report of Mr. Crosland's speech in the Times Educational Supplement Friday, March 12, 1965 page 761.
 2. The Teacher, Vol. V April 23rd, 1965, page 1.
 3. Times Educational Supplement, No. 2605, 23rd April 1965, page 1246.
 4. R.A. Manzer, "Teachers and Politics" (Manchester University Press : 1970) page 104.

the National Association of Schoolmasters adopted the same policy.^{1.}

It is therefore probable that Crosland feared that the proposed Council would also adopt such traditional attitudes.^{2.}

It seems clear also that the Secretary of State was concerned with the loss of power that would have resulted from the transfer of his control over qualifications, discipline and registration to the Council. The loss of power would have lowered the status of the Department vis a vis other government departments. It is not surprising then that since the Labour Government was a new Government, and the in-coming Ministers were anxious to build up rather than diminish their fields of power, Mr. Crosland was reluctant to part with any of his functions. It must be pointed out, however, that the 1944 Education Act held Mr. Crosland, as Secretary of State for Education, responsible for the promotion of the education of the people,^{3.} and it could be argued that this necessitated him retaining control over the supply and qualifications of teachers since

-
1. Times Educational Supplement, No. 2605, 23rd April 1965, page 1246.
 2. In his speech at the National Union of Teachers Conference at Douglas, 1965, Mr. Crosland offered teachers a two-way agreement. "We have the same objective - to give a better education to the children while improving the status of the teachers. I am determined to do both; but I cannot do the second unless you help me to do the first. For in the end my final responsibility is to the children." No doubt Crosland considered that the teachers by rejecting his idea of auxiliaries, were not co-operating with him in his objective of giving a "better education to the children". Furthermore, since he strongly favoured the idea of auxiliaries, he was annoyed by the teachers' attitudes, and this probably influenced his decision not to establish an official working party.
 3. 1944 Education Act 7 " 8 Geo. 6, c.31 Section 1.

these were inextricably mixed. But it is known that members of the permanent staff of the Department were also against the idea of a Council,^{1.} since they too did not want to lose any prestige and status that might have followed from a diminution in the functions of the Department. Thus the Department's permanent officials advised Crossland not to accede to the request for an Official Working Party.

The concern of politicians to preserve their powers was being illustrated in the field of educational politics by the concurrent events in Scotland. The Teaching Council (Scotland) Act, 1965, emphasized the Secretary of State for Scotland's power to refuse to accept the advice of the Scottish Teaching Council by making it easier for him to do so than by the procedure proposed by the Wheatley Report. The Act stated that if he refused to make regulations in accordance with the advice of the General Teaching Council, or if he wanted to make regulations against the advice of the General Teaching Council, he must publish a full statement of all the circumstances, thus giving the General Teaching Council and the profession a full opportunity to muster their forces and organise a campaign against him in the country and in Parliament.^{2.} But, the Act omitted the Wheatley Report recommendation that if the Secretary of State wished to introduce regulations against the advice of the General Teaching Council, he should proceed by regulations subject to the affirmative resolution procedure.^{3.} This would have meant that the Secretary of State would have been required to state and defend his policy twice in moving in each House of Parliament the approval of the regulations; it would also have meant that the regulations would not have come into operation until they had been approved by both Houses. In effect, then, the

-
1. "Report on an informal meeting to discuss proposals for a Teachers' General Council", by T. A. Casey to the N.A.S. Executive, dated 19th December, 1968.
 2. Teaching Council (Scotland) Act, 1965, Section 7.
 3. The Teaching Profession in Scotland (Wheatley Report), Cmnd.2066, (Edinburgh:H.M.S.O. reprinted 1966), para.104, page 33.

Act confirmed that the ultimate power as regards to qualifications still firmly rested with the Secretary of State who was responsible to the House of Commons, as in normal circumstances, for his policy.

Although the Scottish teachers pressed for the Wheatley recommendation to be included in the Bill, Government spokesmen maintained that it would be unconstitutional, since Parliamentary procedure would be determined by the discussions of a body outside Parliament.^{1.}

Further Opposition to the Council.

Mr. Crossland and the Department were not the only opposition to the Council at this time. A writer in the "A.M.A." did not accept that the Council would raise the public esteem of teachers, nor did he believe that the proposed functions of registration, discipline and supervision of qualifications were predictable. Furthermore, he pointed out that the "sad story of the Royal Society of Teachers clearly showed that there is no grass roots demand for this self-important bureaucracy".^{2.} John Vaisey, who had supported the idea of self-government in the nineteen fifties, too was having second thoughts. He now feared that a council might try to restrict entry: "but we cannot restrict entry, we can only insist that those who come in are well-trained, and worthy of respect".^{3.} Harry Rée, writing in New Society, pointed out that in a time of teacher shortage the best that the teachers could hope for would be the mere "trappings of professional associations". He added that should teachers achieve a professional council, it was essential that the council "be realistic, expansionist and forward looking", and concentrate on such issues as "non-teaching duties and auxiliaries, with alternative training programmes and qualifications, and with overall teacher efficiency". He feared, however, that the establishment of the council might

-
1. "The facts about the G.T.C." (Educational Institute of Scotland, January, 17, 1969) page 5.
 2. "A Fair Cow" - George Pattison (A.M.A., October 1964)
 3. J.A. Vaisey, "The Control of Education" (Faber & Faber, 1963) Chapter 10, pages 212 to 223.

achieve nothing. "If it leads to restrictive practices and a search for old-fashioned professional respectability it will prove barren; for professional status in the second half of the twentieth century is not to be had merely for the asking".^{1.}

The Main Committee's Second Approach to Grosland.

Inevitably the Main Committee was disappointed by the reply from Mr. Grosland.^{2.} Nevertheless the Committee refused to give up hope. Its first reactions were that alternative means of progress needed to be found such as a propaganda campaign. It was decided to circulate the original publicity statement, together with the recommendations sent to the Secretary of State, to the constituent bodies inviting their comments. These comments would then form the basis of the propaganda campaign.^{3.}

The following meeting of the Main Committee on the 14th February, 1966 found the representatives in a militant mood. They had had further time to consider the Secretary of State's letter. It was generally agreed that the Secretary of State had misunderstood their request. This merely called for a working party and did not imply immediate legislation or an early change in the method of control of entry into the Teaching Profession. It was felt that the misunderstanding arose from the fact that Mr. Grosland had not understood the historical background of the last six years. It was pointed out that Grosland had indicated sympathy with the movement to raise the professional status of teachers but was using the teacher shortage and the pressure on the legislative programme as reasons to decline their request. The Main Committee was also concerned with supply and the reduction of class sizes, and did not wish to aggravate the supply situation. But it was felt that the real danger of the over-concern with supply was

-
1. "Teaching - a Profession", Harry Ree. (New Society, 14th October 1965) pages 16 and 17.
 2. Minutes of the Main Committee, 20.12.65. Minute 2.
 3. Ibid, Minute 3.

with the establishment of a Council with the disadvantages of the Scottish scheme. It was generally felt that the Secretary of State was reluctant to accept advice, and his refusal to reconvene the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers was evidence to support this view. 1.

It seems, however, that the Main Committee had missed one of the major points of the Secretary of State's letter, that of the transfer of power. The Secretary of State had rightly seen the implications of the proposed Council. He was determined to retain his powers over qualification and control of entry to the profession, and this was a fundamental point of conflict between the two parties. It is surprising that the Main Committee should have expected to succeed where the Scottish teachers had failed. It is true that the Main Committee had only requested a Working Party. But it was doubtful that a Working Party would have agreed to the demands of the English teachers when the Scottish teachers' demands had been refused. It would have been more rewarding for the Main Committee to have reviewed the nature of its demands and modified them, rather than to have persisted with its apparently inflexible proposals.

The Committee agreed to press on with its campaign and urgently seek a meeting with the Secretary of State. Consequently, it was decided to delay the propaganda campaign, and it would only be put into operation if the Secretary of State refused to see them, or if he refused to set up a Working Party. On the 16th February 1966, the Main Committee's new secretary, Mr. Goffe, wrote to the Secretary of State indicating the feeling of the meeting. 2.

Although no reply was forthcoming, the planned propaganda and publicity campaign was postponed because of an impending general election. In a letter to the Associations, Goffe pointed out that it was likely that

1. Minutes of the Main Committee, 14.2.66.

2. Letter from Goffe to Crosland, 16 February, 1966.

Crosland would not be prepared to meet a deputation during the pre-election period, and he might no longer be the Secretary of State for Education after the election. Furthermore, Goffe considered that it would be unfair to launch a propaganda campaign in the situation, although he saw no objection to individual bodies approaching Members of Parliament.^{1.}

The decision to postpone the propaganda action in this situation seems extraordinary. Whilst it might be argued that it represented a degree of "statesmanship" that befitted a professional body, on the other hand it seemed to indicate a curious lack of appreciation of the political process. The election would have provided an ideal opportunity for the Main Committee to bring the issue to the notice of Members of Parliament and exert pressure on the potential Government. After the election the Main Committee would then have been able to concentrate on the other approaches of pressure groups such as lobbying and getting Members of Parliament to ask questions in the House.

As it was the Council seemed to receive little publicity during the election campaign. The most important occasion on which it received attention was at a Labour Party Press Conference to launch the Party's manifesto. Mr. Wilson indicated that it was his intention to raise the status of teachers, and that he always treated teachers as members of a professional organisation. But when asked why Mr. Crosland had refused the teachers' request for a Teachers' General Council, Mr. Wilson replied that Mr. Crosland had already given the reasons.^{2.}

After the election, Mr. Crosland was still Secretary of State for Education. A further letter was sent to him by the Main Committee's new secretary, Mr. Cook, pressing for a reply to Goffe's letter of the 16th February. A reply was received on the 22nd April 1966 from Crosland,

-
1. Letter from Goffe to all member associations, 8th March, 1966.
 2. Times Educational Supplement, 11th March 1966, page 734.

stating:-

"I have given a lot of thought to the letter and memorandum that Mr. Goffe sent me on the 16th February on behalf of all the associations that have been meeting to discuss the possibility of establishing a Teachers' General Council in England and Wales. You will understand, I am sure, that the intervention first of illness and then of the General Election has delayed my reply, but I have taken the matter up again immediately on my return to the Department".

Mr. Goffe wrote that the associations felt that I might perhaps have misunderstood their intentions when I received a deputation a year ago. I have accordingly studied the statement he sent me most carefully to see what is new in it that might affect what I wrote to Mr. Glossop on 18th November. But although the statement discusses some important and difficult questions (such as the practicability of raising the standards for qualified teacher status in the schools and of introducing the concept of qualified teacher status into higher education) I have found no arguments in it relevant to the case for establishing a Teachers' General Council which were not already in my mind. Indeed, the statement confirms that the changes the associations are seeking would involve a transfer of control over the fundamental matters of teacher recruitment from the Government to the proposed Council. I still see no possibility of the Government's accepting this proposal during the present period of acute teacher shortage. It therefore seems to me that it would serve no useful purpose - indeed it might create a dangerously false impression - to establish an official Working Party to investigate the matter further at the present time".^{1.}

It was clear that Mr. Crosland and the Department were determined not to have a Teachers' General Council. Indeed, Crosland's policy seemed to be aimed at stifling the movement before it could gain influence and momentum in the political field.

1. Minutes of the Teachers' General Council - Main Committee, 28th April, 1966. Minute 3.

The Main Committee, however, far from accepting Mr. Crosland's letter as the final word on the matter, was determined that six years' work should not be abandoned, and resolved to press on with its cause. At the Main Committee meeting of the 28th April, 1966 which discussed Crosland's letter of 22nd April, 1966, it was decided that the Main Committee's demands should not be modified, for it was felt that a Council without "teeth" was useless. A compromise, as in Scotland where the Council had no control of standards or entry, was to be avoided.¹

Again the Main Committee turned its thoughts to other means of securing its objectives. The suggestion that an independent body should be set up by the teachers was considered impracticable. Another suggestion was that the teachers should again press for the recall of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. It was contended that this might provide them with a body to contest the lowering of standards, to discuss the supply issue, and eventually to "pave the way" towards the establishment of a registration Council. This view did not meet with full support as it was felt that the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers was only an advisory body and its constitution did not contain the power which the Main Committee was seeking. Nevertheless the following resolution was approved:-

"That having considered the refusal of the Secretary of State for Education and Science to investigate further at the present time our request for the establishment of a Working Party, and having noted that he has also not as yet seen fit to reconstitute the National Advisory Council for the Training and Supply of Teachers, the Main Committee recommends to the Executives of Councils of its constituent bodies that approaches be made to Members of Parliament seeking to mobilise support for the creation

1. Ibid.

of some form of machinery which will enable the teaching profession to exercise its influence in the formation of policy relating to the supply of teachers and their qualifications, as an interim step towards the setting up of a self-governing Teachers' General Registration Council."¹.

The Main Committee decided to recommend further:

"(a). that, subject to approval of a draft by constituent bodies, the Chairman should reply to the Secretary of State for Education and Science expressing our discontent and profound disappointment at the terms of his latest letter. This letter should also contain further reference to the remarkable degree of agreement which had been reached by the represented bodies after a protracted period of discussion and negotiations, and our annoyance that the result of six years' work should be rejected, especially when it is quite clear in our own minds that we are not seeking immediate legislation or measures that would aggravate the supply problem.

(b). that subject to the agreement of the constituent bodies to the launching of a parliamentary campaign, press publicity be sought by the calling of a Press Conference at the commencement of the campaign at which the agreed statement (brought up to date by the Chairman) be issued, and preceded by the release of a concise Press statement".².

The letter was eventually sent to Crosland on the 15th July.³

In the meantime the Main Committee had set to work to draft a publicity statement. At the next Main Committee Meeting on September 19th, 1966,

-
1. Minutes of the Main Committee, 28th April, Minute 3.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Teachers' General Council - Main Committee, 29th September, 1966. Minute 3.

it was reported that apart from an immediate acknowledgement, no reply had been received from the Secretary of State, in spite of a telephone reminder. The Committee felt that this was most unsatisfactory and agreed that the secretary should send a reminder to Crosland.^{1.}

The Main Committee was now agreed on a press campaign whose objective would be to persuade the Secretary of State to set up a Working Party to investigate the establishment of a Teachers' General Council and not to set up the Council immediately.^{2.} It seems that the Main Committee had discarded the idea of pressing for an advisory body on supply and training as an interim measure.

Although the absence of a reply from Mr. Crosland was considered to be sufficient justification for launching an immediate press campaign, once again the Main Committee showed a reluctance to take this kind of action by deciding to await Crosland's reply before calling the Conference. Indeed, if the reply was negative, this was to be used as the reason for calling a Press Conference. To gain the maximum amount of impact from the press conference, should it be necessary, it was decided to hold it on a date that would avoid a clash with the beginning of the Parliamentary session and party political conferences.^{3.}

The awaited reply from Mr. Crosland came on the 17th October. Crosland reiterated the point that he had made in previous replies. He pointed out:-

"..... what the teachers' associations have in mind is that the proposed Council should have absolute control over the qualifications to be required for registration as a teacher (in further and higher education as well as in primary and secondary) and that, from some future date, there

-
1. Minutes of the Teachers' General Council - Main Committee, 29th September, 1966. Minute 3.
 2. Ibid, Minute 5.
 3. Ibid.

should be a definite bar on the appointment of unregistered teachers. Moreover, the representatives of the associations with whom I discussed the matter at a meeting on 31st March, 1965, made very clear that they were not interested in the establishment of a Council with any lesser powers. I think it is right for me to say equally frankly that the Government find the teachers' proposals unacceptable at the present time. In these circumstances it would not be useful to set up a Working Party to continue discussion of it."¹

The Press Conference and its Results.

On account of the negative nature of Mr. Crosland's reply, a press conference was called for 2.00 p.m. on Tuesday, 1st November, 1966. A news release was issued setting out the Main Committee's request and the action taken so far. It was pointed out that, "There was great disappointment at the Secretary's refusal to set up a Working Party but this sense of frustration was rendered more acute by the fact that the National Advisory Council for the Training and Supply of Teachers had not met for over eighteen months - the only other means at the disposal of teachers for letting their views on this subject be expressed by a single body".² The letter from Mr. Crosland was also circularised.

The conference was a big disappointment. Although £100. was spent on the Conference, the returns in the form of publicity were meagre. Out of 192 invitations issued, only 14 reporters attended the Conference and the publicity only "amounted to a few paragraphs in the press".³ Most papers that carried the story reported the bare facts without any comment. Typical of such coverage was the report in the Times Educational Supplement.⁴

-
1. Letter from Crosland to Cook, dated 17th October, 1966. Appendix Four.
 2. Press Release : Appendix Five.
 3. Minutes of the Main Committee, 21.12.66. Minute 3.
 4. Times Educational Supplement, November 4th, 1966. page 1088.

The November issue of "New Education",^{1.} and a report in the "Yorkshire Evening Post",^{2.} of the 10th November 1966, commented in favour of the formation of a Teachers' Council.

"New Education" described Mr. Crosland's actions as the "noise of a door slamming shut on a great opportunity". The report stated:-

"Yet what is impressive in this programme is the unity of resolve reached by such widely differing interests as the A.T.T.I., the N.A.S., the Headmasters' Conference and the N.U.T. And what they are asking at this moment is not the acquiescence of the Minister, but merely that he should set up 'an official working party to consider a report upon the establishment of a Teachers' General Council'.

This Mr. Crosland has refused to consider. Before him looms the prospect of such a Council imposing unrealistic qualifications at a time of national shortage. Secondly, it would demand a change of control weakening the power of the local authorities, the universities and the government, and placing that power in the hands of the teacher.

There are certainly difficulties, but they are by no means insurmountable. The questions Mr. Crosland has to answer are these: Does he really want a united teaching profession? For this is one way to achieve it. Does he really want to improve the status of teachers? This is the way to do it.

If he objects to an official working party, let him have an unofficial one. If he is concerned about such a Council making unrealistic demands, let him write safeguards into its constitution. If he is concerned about the timing of its formation, let him suggest a gestation period long enough to bring it to birth.

-
1. New Education : November, 1966.
 2. Teachers' General Council - Main Committee, 21st December, 1966. Agenda, Item 3.

Whatever the problem, this is not a time for slamming the door".

The Yorkshire Evening Post stated:-

"Nationally there is more concern with the refusal of Mr. Crosland, Secretary of State for Education and Science, to set up a working party to investigate the proposals to control entry to the teaching profession which have been made by the seven principal teachers' associations. The teachers are enlisting support for the creation of a Teachers' General Council which would 'be responsible for the control of entry to the teaching profession, determine the standards of those entering, and have the power to administer professional discipline'.

Whatever the demerits of this proposal - and they would seem slight compared with the many points that can be said in its favour - it is surely worth going into. Moreover the fact that these recommendations have the backing of all the major teachers' organisations (who are not normally in accord) lends further support to the idea that they are reasonable. Mr. Crosland indicated that his grounds for refusal were the teachers' requests for 'absolute control over the qualifications to be required for registration as a teacher' and for a 'definite bar on the appointment of unregistered teachers' at a future date.

It thus appears to the observer that he is more concerned with keeping up the quantity of supply rather than maintaining high standards. We have seen only too clearly how this principle has been applied to the reorganisation of secondary education. Now it seems we need quantity of teachers rather than quality. Surely the Minister is aware that the teachers themselves are as concerned with staffing shortages as he is. If they are concerned to control entry to the profession at the possible risk of prolonging staff shortages in the schools, then it is only proper that their views should be listened to. That is all that they are at present requesting. They are not seeking immediate legislation, but merely asking

that a working party be set up. Mr. Crosland has refused. If this is his attitude, then it is time he made it absolutely clear what sort of a teaching profession he hopes to have in the nation's schools in the future".

The Main Committee's Final Approach to Mr. Crosland.

Although disappointed with the results of the press conference, the Main Committee decided to make one more direct approach to Crosland requesting him to receive a delegation. Should this receive a further negative answer, or alternatively no reply at all, a letter was to be sent to all Members of Parliament enclosing a copy of the historical document. The letter would mention the most recent correspondence with Mr. Crosland, and inform the Members of Parliament of the existing "stalemate". Furthermore, it was planned that each constituent body would recommend to its local associations to take joint action to secure an interview with local Members of Parliament.¹

On the 17th January, 1967, the Main Committee's secretary wrote to Crosland :-

"The Joint Committee of representatives of the seven teachers' organisations, which has been meeting for the past six years to consider the establishment of a Teachers' General Council, held another meeting shortly before Christmas to consider your letter of 17th October 1966.

They noted that your reason for refusing to allow a Working Party to be set up was that in the memorandum which was sent to you on 16th February 1966 the Main Committee had expressed the following views:-

- (i) That a Teachers' General Council should be created, with power to determine the qualifications necessary for registration of teachers working in Primary, Secondary, Further and Higher education, and

- (ii) That from a date to be determined, no further teachers should be appointed to schools recognised as efficient by the Secretary of State for Education and Science unless registered.

The fact that a representative committee of teachers' organisations considers that a Teachers' General Council should be set up, and that it should be vested with certain specified powers would hardly seem to be a valid reason for not setting up a Working Party to give the matter detailed consideration. Nobody can predict what decisions a Working Party might reach. Your refusal presupposes that a Working Party would make the same recommendations as we have made but there is no guarantee that it will. Even though the teachers' organisations are unanimous in the expression of their wishes in this matter, a Working Party would ask for evidence to be submitted not only by the teachers' organisations but by a number of other organisations and individuals. Your refusal to agree to the setting up of a Working Party, to examine our request and the whole question of a Teachers' General Council, seems to us to be quite illogical.

You say in your letter that the Government find the teachers' proposal unacceptable at the present time. A Working Party might agree with us in this matter, or it might agree with you. There is the third possibility that it might agree with neither of us and might put forward some alternative suggestions. But these are no grounds for refusing to allow the matter to be investigated by a Working Party.

The unreasonableness of your "reason" is further illustrated by what has happened in Scotland, where the request of the teachers' organisations for a Working Party to be set up was granted. By your refusal to agree to our request you are denying to the teachers of England and Wales something which has already been granted to the teachers of Scotland.

I have been asked to convey these views to you on behalf of the Main Committee and to express the earnest hope that you will allow us the opportunity of presenting our case to an independent body for consideration." 1.

Meanwhile the Main Committee itself was beginning to feel the strain of maintaining a united front in such unpromising circumstances. In a letter to Cook, Mr. A.G. Nokes, the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education representative, questioned the advisability of rigidly adhering to their objectives. He believed that the educational scene had changed since the Main Committee had formulated its original policy, and he pointed out that his own Association "was somewhat nervous about retaining an indefinite commitment" to the Council after the publication of Robbins and the coming of the Weaver Report. He believed that there had been similar significant developments in further education and the schools' field. Consequently, he suggested that they should take a fresh look at the Scottish scheme since it seemed that a worthwhile start had been made on professional responsibility in Scotland. Furthermore, several warm tributes had been paid to the early days of the Scottish General Teaching Council in the Times Educational Supplement.²

The main Committee's attention was diverted from this suggestion by a reply from Mr. Crosland on the 11th May 1967 which again showed that under no circumstances would he be drawn into further consideration of the teachers' request. He still refused to set up a working party; indeed, he took issue on the Main Committee's concept of a working party.

-
1. Letter from R.J. Cook to A. Crosland dated 17th January, 1967. Teachers' General Council - Main Committee, Agenda item 3, Document B. (6th June 1967).
 2. Letter from A.G. Nokes to R.J. Cook dated 27th March, 1967. Teachers' General Council Main Committee 6th June, 1967, Agenda item 5 Document E.

He pointed out :- "A working party,, comprises representatives of different interests who are trying to work out something in detail within a framework of principles agreed amongst those whom they represent. In the present case, we would find that your representatives on the working party holding to their views, and my officials holding to mine, would have insufficient ground in common to enable the working party to succeed." Furthermore, he asserted that the Scottish Teachers' Council was suggested by a "Committee under an independent chairman" and not by a working party.¹

The Main Committee seized on this distinction between a "Working Party" and an "Independent Committee" to protract the dialogue with the Secretary of State. A further letter was sent to Crosland on the 15th June requesting him to meet their representatives to discuss the implications of setting up a committee with an independent chairman, and in particular to decide on such points as the composition of the committee and its terms of reference. As a result of this extension in the communications it was decided to hold in abeyance the proposed publicity campaign.²

The letter brought a quicker response than usual, and indicated the Secretary of State's growing impatience with the matter. In this reply of the 23rd June, he pointed out that the Government was not able to accept the teachers' proposals at the present time hence a committee would serve no useful purpose.³ Thus it seemed that Mr. Crosland was determined to block indefinitely all progress.

At its meeting on the 21st July, 1967, the mood of the Main Committee was more militant than had been seen on any previous occasion.⁴ The members were, however, particularly interested in the wording of the reply which

-
1. Letter from Crosland to Cook 11.5.67.
 2. Minutes of the Main Committee 6.6.67. Minute 4.
 3. Letter from Crosland to Cook 23.6.67.
 4. "The Proposed Teachers' General Council : Historical Document" Addendum Side 2.

appeared to indicate that the decision was a Government decision and not solely, nor necessarily, Crosland's. It seems strange that the Main Committee should have taken an interest in this terminology at this stage. The letter of the 17th October, 1966 had been expressed in similar terms. Furthermore, the terms "Minister's policy" and "Government's policy" must be synonymous or the Minister must resign or withdraw his policy. As Baron points out, "The main task of the Minister is to carry out the policy of the Government, as agreed by the Cabinet and, of course, to play a substantial part in the formulation of policy. Once this is determined he is responsible for its execution, but the Cabinet is still intimately concerned with its success or failure, because at least in theory, a single defeat on a major policy ^{issue} can bring down a government. It is, indeed, important to bear in mind that the terms 'policy of the Minister' or 'policy of the Department' can be misleading. There is properly speaking government policy only. Naturally, of course, when a Minister is an individual of strong character his personal 'policy' may be accepted by his Cabinet colleagues but, once they have accepted it, it becomes theirs." ¹.

Once again, it seemed that the only alternative open to the Main Committee was a propaganda campaign. Mr. Barlow of the National Association of Head Teachers felt that Members of Parliament in general were unaware either of the request made by the teachers' associations or of the Secretary of State's refusal to allow the matter to be discussed by an independent committee. Sir Ronald Gould considered that the Govern-

1. G. Baron, "Society, Schools and Progress in England" (Pergamon : 1965) pages 67 and 68. For a discussion of some of the implications, and a more detailed analysis of the position of the Minister in relation to Parliament and the Cabinet, see G. Marshall and G.C. Moodie "Some Problems of the Constitution", (Hutchinson University Library; revised edition 1961) pages 67 to 87.

ment were vulnerable on the point that the Secretary of State was refusing to allow in England and Wales something which had been allowed in Scotland.^{1.}

A three point plan of action was evolved. Firstly, it was decided to write to all Members of Parliament stressing Gould's point. Secondly, it was agreed that the local associations of the various teachers' organisations should request interviews with Members of Parliament in their constituencies. It was thought that this was likely to be more effective than demonstrations outside the House. Thirdly, the rank and file members were to be brought more fully into the picture.^{2.}

The campaign was planned for the Autumn of 1967. Letters were to be sent to Members of Parliament at the end of September just before the beginning of the new Parliamentary session, and local meetings with Members of Parliament were to take place as soon as possible after the despatch of the letters. The Autumn Term, however, brought with it a crisis in the school meals situation as teachers in certain areas withdrew from school meals' supervision following the impasse in June in the salary negotiations in the Burnham Committee. The Teachers' General Council issue had to be neglected as far as time was concerned as the Secretary of State began talks almost immediately with the teachers and the local authorities. By the end of October the Secretary of State and the authorities had proposed to set up three working parties; one within the Burnham to examine the salaries superstructure, a second to consider the supervision of school meals, and the third to report on the position of the unqualified teacher.^{3.} Consequently, the campaign was never initiated

1. Minutes of the Main Committee, 21st July 1967, minute 4.

2. Ibid.

3. R.A. Manzer : "Teachers and Politics" (Manchester University Press : 1970) page 14.

and the Main Committee did not meet again until May 1968. The abandoning of the campaign would seem to indicate that teachers were far more concerned with the immediate practicalities of everyday school life and the material aspects of the profession, rather than the wider issues of professional status. "Scrutiny" in "New Education" regretted this, pointing out:-

"To continue their campaign for a professionally supervised Teachers' Register would earn them (the teachers) a good deal more credit with the public at large than to play around with school dinners".^{1.}

During this period of inactivity for the Main Committee, there were changes at the Department of Education and Science. In August 1967, Mr. Crosland was transferred to the Board of Trade, and Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker became Secretary of State for Education. The Secretary of the Main Committee seized on the opportunity to make an approach to Mr. Walker, but Mr. Walker took the same standpoint as Mr. Crosland, "the Government was not able to accept the teachers' proposals at the present time".^{2.} Mr. Walker, however, did not remain in office long. In April, 1968 he was replaced by Mr. Edward Short as Secretary of State for Education.

-
1. "Paths to Professional Unity". Scrutiny - New Education (Corn Market Jan 1968).
 2. "The Proposed Teachers' General Council", Historical Document, ADDENDUM side 2.

CHAPTER FIVE

TOWARDS THE FORMATION OF AN OFFICIAL WORKING PARTY

The demise of Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker and the promotion of Mr. Short to the office of Secretary of State for Education and Science proved to be of great consequence for the Main Committee in its attempt to secure an "Official Working Party". Teachers generally welcomed Mr. Short, a former classroom and head teacher, as someone who understood and was sympathetic towards their problems : as the Times Educational Supplement put it, "Teachers will be delighted to have in Mr. Edward Short a new Secretary of State for Education and Science who knows how to write on the blackboard."¹ The Main Committee greeted his arrival at Curzon Street with even greater delight when he declared his interest in raising the status of teachers. It had become apparent to the Main Committee that the Department of Education and Science's permanent officials were against the formation of a Council,² so the Main Committee's only hope lay in persuading a Secretary of State to implement their request against the advice of the Department. Although the Main Committee had failed to influence Crosland and Walker, it soon became clear that it might succeed in persuading Mr. Short to take action on their request. Moreover, it was soon recognised that Mr. Short was a strong reformer, determined to push ahead with his own policies.³

The Early Communications between the Main Committee and Mr. Short

At both the National Association of Schoolmasters' Conference and the National Union of Teachers' Conference at Easter 1968, Mr. Short

-
1. Times Educational Supplement, No. 2760, 12th April 1968, page 1.
 2. Report on an informal meeting to discuss proposals for a Teachers' General Council, given by T.A. Casey to the N.A.S. Executive, 19.12.68.
 3. Education Today (College of Preceptors' Journal), March/April, 1968, pages 3, 4, and 5.

indicated that he might be interested in the formation of a Teachers' Council. In his platform speech at the former, he stated:-

"To me the teacher is the principal factor in education. I have made it one of my principal aims to do everything possible in any way open to me to enhance the professional status of the teacher. This is not just a matter for me. This places great responsibilities on the teachers themselves, and I hope you will also applaud when I say if we are to make any significant advance along these lines the teachers have got to come together somehow, federation-wise or in some other way to speak with a united voice. I pledge myself to do anything and everything I can to make teaching a profession in fact as well as in name, but I need your help and the help of all professional organisations as well."¹.

The secretary of the Main Committee, seeing the reports in the press of Mr. Short's interest in professional status and the professional unity of teachers, seized on the opportunity to write to Mr. Short. Mr. Cook described the work of the Main Committee, the refusal of previous Secretaries of State to form an official Working Party, and the situation in Scotland.

1. Reported in the *New Schoolmaster*, Vol. 45 no 4, April/May 1968, page 3. Welcoming Mr. Short's statement, Mr. Casey wrote on page 4 of the same edition :- "On the matter of "Professional unity" - on which he has been widely quoted and misunderstood - he evoked a warm response from the NAS Conference. He did not come as a salesman for the spurious "all-in-Union" idea; his knowledge of teacher politics is too deep to allow him to try that on the NAS. He spoke of the need for some kind of federation which could assure genuine professional status. In making this gesture to teachers at this time, Mr. Short is holding out the prospect of something worthwhile. He is also reversing the negative replies given by Mr. Crosland when he was approached several times by a joint committee of all the teachers' organisations. I wonder if Mr. Short realised this? For the past five years or so the teachers' unions have met about twice a year to discuss how best we might realise the professional aspirations of the great majority of teachers : all the obstacles in the past two years have come from the Department of Education and Science. Mr. Short's invitation can be accepted. Practical discussions on the formation of a Teachers' Council can begin at once, and the making of a federation for this purpose is not merely feasible, but eminently desirable as far as the N.A.S. is concerned".

He also enclosed a copy of the historical pamphlet. Cook requested the Secretary of State to meet a delegation of representatives from the Main Committee to discuss the proposal that a Working Party be set up to examine the possibilities for having a Teachers' General Council for England and Wales. He pointed out, "I am prompted to make this approach to you by what has seemed to me your obvious interest in ways of enhancing the status of the teaching profession. We believe that improved status would do much to overcome the problem of teacher shortage."¹

Mr. Short replied :- "Thank you for your letter of the 19th April and for the document you sent me about a proposed Teachers' Council which I shall read with interest. This is an important matter and I must clearly take some time to think it over. I do not think that an immediate discussion would help but I will certainly keep your offer in mind."²

When the Main Committee was reconvened on the 20th May 1968, the report of Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker's refusal to set up a Working Party³ was overshadowed by the news of Mr. Short's correspondence. In addition to Cook's news of the exchange of letters,⁴ Mr. Powell Davies (National Union of Teachers) and Mr. Casey (National Association of Schoolmasters) reported briefly on the informal talks they had with Mr. Short at their Annual Conferences. These had indicated that the Secretary of State might be willing to take a fresh look at the situation.⁵ The Main Committee felt that there was at least a chance of obtaining discussions with the new Secretary of State albeit in an informal way. Thus Cook

-
1. Letter from the Secretary of the Main Committee to Mr. E.Short, 19th April 1968; Document B and Agenda Item 5 of the Main Committee Agenda 20.5.68.
 2. Letter from Mr. Short to the secretary of the Main Committee, 30th April, 1968. Document B and Agenda item 5 of the Main Committee Meeting 20.5.68.
 3. Minutes of the Main Committee 20.5.68., minute 4.
 4. Ibid, Minute 5.
 5. Ibid, Minute 6.

was instructed to seek a personal meeting with Mr. Short with a view to arranging a meeting between Short and a Steering Committee. It was stressed that this proposed meeting should be informal in tone, and the Secretary of State should be invited to put forward his personal ideas on the subject. Furthermore, the Main Committee was eager not to lose this new found initiative that promised progress. Consequently, it was decided that the Main Committee should review its objectives, should not be too rigid on the conditions for setting up a Working Party, and should be prepared to be more flexible in its approach and demands.^{1.} It appears that the Main Committee now accepted that progress could only be made if the Committee was prepared to make concessions.

On Monday 24th June 1968, Mr. Short met Mr. Cook, and on the 25th June, Cook was able to circulate some "promising information" of the meeting to the Main Committee. It appeared that Mr. Short was holding a meeting of the officers of the Department on the 25th June to discuss the proposed Teachers' General Council, and the historical document would form the basis of discussion. Furthermore, Mr. Short had indicated that he would be calling a meeting of interested organisations in the near future to discuss with him, and possibly the officers of the Department, the general idea of a Teachers' General Council, and he used the term "Working Party" in referring to this meeting.^{2.}

The promised progress towards the formation of an Official Working Party began to gain momentum. Mr. Short indicated to the House of Commons his intentions to set up a body to raise the status of the teaching profession. In a reply to Mr. G. Longden (South West Herts; Conservative) who wanted to know when the National Advisory Council was to be re-activated,

1. Ibid, minute 7.

2. Letter from the Main Committee's secretary to Mr. Casey, 25.6.68.

Mr. Short said, "I am considering this in the wider context of the status of the teaching profession." When Sir Edward Boyle (Birmingham Handsworth; Conservative) pointed out that the time had now come for setting up a council of a wider kind, Mr. Short commented, "I am aware of that, and of the difficulties of the old council. I hope we may set up something even wider and more comprehensive than Sir Edward Boyle has suggested."¹

Mr. Howell's Letter

On the 22nd July, Mr. Denis Howell, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State wrote to Cook stating that he (Howell) had been delegated with the task of pursuing the matter of setting up a "General Teachers' Council". He indicated that he had had an informal chat with Sir Ronald Gould who had agreed with the suggestion that the views of the individual associations might be ascertained through Cook, and furthermore these associations might wish to make additional suggestions to those contained in the historical document. Mr. Howell then went on to make the three following conditions to any discussions :-

"I am assuming that there would be general agreement that arrangements should be such as not to interfere with the proper function on the one hand of the teachers' unions and on the other the Secretary of State whose discharge of general responsibilities laid upon him by the Education Acts should not be impaired.

The second is that I should like to assume that we should start thinking in terms of a council which would be concerned with teachers in primary and secondary schools.

1. Reported in the Times Educational Supplement, No. 2771, June 28th 1968, page 2130. See Hansard Fifth Series, Commons, Vol. 766. Oral Answers 20th June 1968 column 1293, section 22.

The third is that I am not expecting you or your colleagues to commit yourselves on any of the points I am putting to you."

Mr. Howell wanted to "refine a bit further" the following points :-

"(i) Is it your idea that the Council should be in part executive and in part advisory? If so —

(ii) Would its executive functions relate to some or all of the following : registration; control of qualifications; professional discipline; probation?

(iii) Is it the view that registration should be compulsory?

(iv) Would the control of qualifications include the determination of qualifications of overseas' students?

(v) Had you in mind that, as in other major professions, the council's decisions on discipline should by legislation be made subject to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council?

(vi) Would the council's advisory functions extend in whole or in part to (a) supply (b) the training of teachers? Have you in mind any other advisory functions?

(vii) How would the Council's activities be financed on a continuing basis?

(viii) What are your views about the total composition of the council and about the way the teacher members should be chosen e.g. by election or by nomination by teacher organisations, or by some mixture of the two methods?" 1.

It was not until the 20th August 1968 that Cook circulated Howell's letter to the individual associations asking for comments on the points raised by Howell. This brought a quick response from the General Secretary of the National Association of Schoolmasters. He wrote to Cook

1. Letter from the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State to Cook 22.7.68.

by return post pointing out the danger in Mr. Howell's approach to individual organisations. He stressed the need for unity of approach, and that Howell should be made to deal with the Main Committee as a whole. It is probable that Casey was annoyed by the reference to Gould, but he had a strong suspicion that the National Union of Teachers might be seeking an opportunity to canvass its own idea of an "all-in-one" ^{1.} union with statutory powers. Thus Casey pointed out to Cook, "I have no doubt that some of your colleagues have already told you that the National Union of Teachers were never very keen about a Teachers' General Council of the kind we envisaged. They would prefer an all in union which was given statutory powers. On this matter the National Association of Head Teachers and the National Association of Schoolmasters are at one, and I think it would be no bad thing if you and I had an informal chat to see how best we can ensure that the wind of change blowing in Curzon Street, blows the right way."^{2.}

Cook agreed that they did not want a "divide and rule by Ted Short," nor did they "want a one-big-union for everyone instead of the Teachers' Council."^{3.} A meeting was arranged between the two to discuss strategy. Although Cook did hold a series of meetings with the constituent bodies singly, a meeting of the Main Committee was convened to draft a reply to

1. In the new Schoolmaster April/May 1968, Vol. 45 no. 4, page 4, Terry Casey delivered a bitter attack on the idea of an "all-in-one" union which he argued would merely be a "bigger N.U.T." He pointed out, "Teachers share some common interests. But in some important matters their interests diverge and sometimes conflict. The practical problem facing teachers is to find a way of acting concertedly on those matters where there is a genuine identity of interest while frankly recognising that there are other important questions - salaries is an obvious one - where we must differ." Casey went on, "The N.U.T. take the view, however, that it is not possible to take effective common action on one professional matter while differing fundamentally on another. For them it is all or nothing. The unity they propose is the unity of the lion and the lamb - one inside the other".
2. Letter from T.A. Casey to Cook, 22.8.68.
3. Letter from Cook to Casey, 23.8.68.

Mr. Howell.

At the meeting of the 28th October, 1968, Mr. Murray of the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions expressed concern that Mr. Howell had stipulated that the Working Party would begin by thinking of a Council concerned with teachers in primary and secondary schools only, and requested that the position of teachers in Further Education should be borne in mind.¹

The specific points raised by Mr. Howell were discussed. The Main Committee was concerned about the possible effects of the Council exercising an advisory function. It was thought that there could be a danger if a body of the standing of a Teachers' General Council was expected to give advice on such matters as teacher supply. The Teachers' General Council should be primarily concerned with uncontroversial issues. An advisory body ought to be free to oppose the Minister if it disagreed with his views. Thus it was considered that advice would come better from a body whose functions were different from those of the Teachers' General Council e.g. the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers or its successor. It was agreed, therefore, that the first step was to press for executive powers in certain clearly defined fields. There was no doubt that advice would be sought from the Council, but this was different from the Council having to play an advisory role at all times.

The Main Committee considered that the executive powers should extend to Registration, Control of Qualifications, Professional Discipline, and Probation. Registration would be at two levels, viz. provisional

1. Minutes of the Main Committee 28.10.68., minute 3.

for those teachers who had not completed their probation, and full, for those who had satisfactorily completed their probation. Control of qualifications would be by approving a list of "registrable" qualifications including overseas' qualifications.

No agreement was reached about the machinery for disciplining teachers although concern was expressed that the difficulty which the General Medical Council faced on being unable to award intermediate penalties less severe than the striking a man off the register should be avoided. The Main Committee accepted the procedure of other major professions that the Council's decisions on discipline should by legislation be made subject to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But it was pointed out that the provision of intermediate penalties would probably help to reduce the number of appeals, since not all decisions would have the same finality as the removal of a teachers' name from the register.

The Committee agreed that the Council should be concerned with the conditions under which probation was carried out, but not with the conduct of probation. The Council would, however, recognise the satisfactory completion of probation.

The question of "compulsory registration" aroused considerable discussion. Every qualified teacher would be eligible for registration; indeed, it was pointed out that existing primary and secondary teachers were, in effect, registered with the Department. It was felt that there would be no problems with new entrants to the profession. Before entering a College of Education, they would be aware that "registration" was a condition of employment. Thus the Committee was favourably disposed to legislation that would ensure that teachers qualifying in the future

should be registered and thereby authorised to teach.

The Main Committee was not so clear in its attitude to the compulsory registration of existing teachers. Whilst the Main Committee believed that it would be highly desirable for all existing qualified teachers to register with the Council, doubts were expressed about the Council's power to compel teachers to register. It was evident that the members were concerned with the consequences of "compulsory registration" as a condition of service on those existing qualified teachers who refused to register through reasons of conscience or other factors. This would have resulted in the creation of a group of teachers who were "qualified", but since they were not "registered", would not be able to teach. The Main Committee was most anxious not to see colleagues deprived of their livelihoods, and was, no doubt, disturbed by the situation in Scotland.¹ The members of the Main Committee were aware, however, of the dilemma this would create, since non-compulsory registration would interfere with the exercise of the Council's disciplinary powers.

Besides not wishing to give advice on supply, it was also considered that the Council should not be concerned with the minutiae of teacher

1. Although the Teaching Council (Scotland) Act 1965 did not make registration compulsory, the Teachers (Education, Training and Registration) (Scotland) Regulations 1967 enacted that (a) certification of teachers by the Secretary of State for Scotland would cease on 31st March 1968; and (b) from the 1st April 1968 only those teachers who had registered with the General Teaching Council would be entitled to hold permanent posts in education authority or grant aided schools in Scotland, and to receive remuneration in accordance with the relevant Salaries Regulations. This placed many teachers who had refused to register with the Council for various reasons in a difficult position. In particular, it presented a dilemma to the Scottish Schoolmasters' Association which had advised its members not to register with the Council, on the grounds that the Council was not representative, that it was only an advisory body, and it did not fulfil the functions of a professional council. No doubt some of the opposition was inspired by rivalry among the professional organisations. Nevertheless, in spite of the Regulations, the Association continued to recommend to its members not to register, and threatened strike action should any of its members be dismissed for failing to register.

training, and that in any case interference would be regarded as an infringement of the rights of the Colleges of Education. Whilst the Main Committee was insistent that the Teachers' General Council should not be charged with the duties of the former National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, it insisted on the rights of the Teachers' General Council, "by its own volition" to offer advice or comment on current policies in regard to the provisions for the education of teachers.

It was felt that the question of how the Council would be financed could not be resolved until a costing exercise had been carried out based on the estimates of the initial size of the Register, the annual rate of new entry, and the estimated size of the administrative machinery. Registration fees would produce the main revenue and a preference was expressed for a "once-for-all" fee at registration rather than an annual payment since this would involve fewer administrative problems. It was hoped that the Government might make an initial grant or loan to the Council as a pump-priming operation, especially as the Council would be saving the Department expenditure by taking over its disciplinary functions.

Consideration of the composition of the council raised the problem of teachers being members of the organisations that were disciplining them, and the nature of the machinery for making appeals. But it was agreed that the Council should be made up from nominations of the teachers' organisations, and these nominations should contain both primary and secondary teachers. Whilst other parts of the education service might also be represented, it was agreed that teachers should be predominant.^{1.}

On the 4th November, 1968, a letter was sent by Cook to Howell incorporating these findings.^{2.} In regard to "compulsory registration"

-
1. The preceding paragraphs dealing with the discussion of the Main Committee on Mr. Howell's letter are based on minute 3 of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Main Committee 28.10.68.
 2. See Appendix 6.

the letter was at variance with the discussion in the Main Committee. The discussion seemed to suggest that the Main Committee might be prepared to accept registration for existing qualified teachers on a voluntary basis, and on no account had the Main Committee opted definitely for "compulsory" registration for qualified teachers. But the letter gave no indication of this, and stated categorically; "We felt that registration must be compulsory and that it should include all existing teachers 'registered' with the Department of Education and Science".¹

Meanwhile progress was being made on several fronts. In August 1968, Circular 15/68, Administrative Memorandum 10/68, and the Schools (Amendment) Regulations 1968 outlined and put into operation plans to phase out unqualified teachers, and extend the probationary period for untrained graduates. This in effect emphasized the importance of training.

Mr. Short showed an increasing interest in the idea of a Council, and Mr. T.E. Brown, National Association of Head Teachers was able to report to the Main Committee that Mr. Short had remarked to him that he was "determined to make progress" towards the establishment of a Teachers' General Council.² More important and significant was Mr. Short's commitment in the House of Commons to the formation of a Teachers' Council. When asked by Mr. Van Straubensee (Wokingham : Conservative) when he intended to set up a General Teachers' Council for England and Wales, Mr. Short replied that the Under-secretary of State was undertaking exploratory talks with interested parties. Mr. Van Straubensee welcomed these talks and stated that until the profession was organised in a self-disciplining, and self-governing body, it would not have the status it demanded. Mr. Short replied, "I quite agree and I am grateful for that

1. Ibid (iii) Registration.

2. Minutes of the Main Committee 28.10.68, minute 2.

support. That is why we have initiated these talks."¹.

Further apparent encouragement was to follow in November when the National Union of Teachers reversed their decision taken at the 1968 Conference to join the Trades Union Congress. It is probable that this was interpreted by some observers that teachers were more interested in "professional" as opposed to "union" matters. Such a conclusion, however, was unjustified. The decision not to join was taken on the basis of a referendum of all members, but the distribution of the votes was more interesting and revealing than the decision. The results were : in favour of affiliation 31,499; against 43,222; not voting 165,229. Thus with approximately two thirds of the membership not voting, it was probably apathy and conservatism rather than a strong preference for professional values that defeated the movement for affiliation. As one observer remarked, "A lot of people just do not give a damn about the T.U.C. "Given the large female and non-militant minded element in the Union, this seems likely."².

On the other hand, November 1968 saw the affiliation of the National Association of Schoolmasters to the Trades Union Congress. This might be interpreted as a shift in the attitudes of men teachers from an emphasis of securing their objective by professional to union activities. The extent to which this was true within the ranks of the National Association of Schoolmasters is difficult to ascertain since the decision was taken by the Executive of the Association and not based on a referendum. It might be well argued that it seemed strange that an Association that had been so adamantly in favour of a Teachers' Council should join the Trades Union Congress. The

-
1. Reported in the Times Educational Supplement, No 2788, October 25th 1968, page 893. See Hansard, Commons, Fifth Series - Volume 770, column 562, section 17. (Oral Answers).
 2. Times Educational Supplement, No. 2792, 22nd November 1968, page 1154.

National Association of Schoolmasters certainly did not consider the matter strange. They saw no conflict in belonging to the Trades Union Congress and a Teachers' General Council. Indeed, their support for the type of Teachers' General Council which was proposed was based on the assumption that there was a distinction between professional and union matters; and the Unions ought to concentrate on union business and the Teachers' General Council on professional matters. As the Association's general secretary, Mr. Casey, pointed out, "Much of the misunderstanding about trade unions and some of the superciliousness shown by teachers towards the T.U.C. stems from the failure of teachers' organisations to recognise themselves as trade unions Of course, we perform functions in addition to the normal trade union ones : we are concerned with educational and professional problems, but these in no way conflict (or they ought not to be allowed to conflict - verb.sap.) with the primary job of looking after our members' bread and butter."¹

Formulating the Framework of a Council.

Mr. Short, however, did not seem to be unduly disturbed by these events. The theme of a "Teachers' Council" had become a feature of many of his speeches, and he seemed to have adopted the cause of establishing

1. The New Schoolmaster Vol. 45 no. 9, December 1968, page 4. In search for more money, the affiliation to the Congress undoubtedly confirmed the Association's realistic approach to union politics. But it would seem that Mr. Casey had avoided the issue of a clash between union and professional matters by the use of "verb sap". Whilst he might argue that professional and union matters ought not to clash, events were soon to show that in fact they often do conflict. Moreover membership to the T.U.C. with its values and code of ethics, and to a professional council with a formulated professional code of ethics was likely to aggravate and heighten such conflicts.

a Council as his own. December 1968 and January 1969 saw a series of three exploratory and informal meetings to formulate a framework of a Teachers' General Council to serve as a basis of discussion for an Official Working Party.

The first of these meetings took place on December 17th 1968 at Richmond Terrace, Whitehall. It was attended by Mr. Howell, officers of the Department of Education and Science, and representatives of all the teachers' organisations. The latter saw this meeting as a "landmark in the history of the movement to secure a Teachers' General Council for England and Wales."¹ Mr. Howell took the Chair, and the Department was represented by Messrs. Weaver, Donovan and Sloman. The Main Committee was represented by its Chairman, Mr. Watts, its secretary Mr. Cook, Sir Ronald Gould (National Union of Teachers), Messrs. Casey (National Association of Schoolmasters), Cammish (National Association of Head Teachers), Birkbeck (Headmasters' Conference), Nokes (Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education), Hutchings (Association of Assistant Masters), and Miss Wood (Association of Assistant Mistresses).²

It was clear from Mr. Howell's opening remarks that the Secretary of State was determined to have a Working Party and that progress towards establishing a Council should be rapid. The opening discussion concentrated on the size of the Working Party, and it was emphasized that this should be kept small to facilitate progress, in the hope of securing legislation in the then present parliament. Suggestions were made as to the composition of the Working Party, and Mr. Casey suggested that as a starting point the existing "main committee" should be used. But it was pointed out that whilst the Secretary of State would take note of these, he would appoint

-
1. Historical Document : Addendum side 2.
 2. This account of the meeting is based on a report written by Cook for the Proposed Teachers' General Council Main Committee, dated 2.1.69.

the representatives to the Party by name and association.^{1.}

The greater part of the meeting was spent in discussing the Main Committee's reply to Mr. Howell's questionnaire. The advisory and executive functions of the Council, control of qualifications, discipline, probation and composition of the Council were all discussed. From the discussion it became apparent that a great deal of clarification of concepts and terminology was still needed.

The Main Committee's position on advisory and executive functions was questioned. Whilst it was noted that the Main Committee would have liked the executive functions to be established first and the advisory functions added later, it was pointed out that it was on the advisory as much as the executive functions that the composition of the Council would depend. If the Council were to advise on the Supply of Teachers, then the local authorities would want heavy representation; if on the Training of Teachers, then the training organisations would want heavy representation.

1. In a report to his Association dated 19.12.68., Casey, the National Association of Schoolmasters' secretary describes the "composition incident" in greater detail. He writes, "The Secretary of State will invite the organisations concerned to nominate representatives for the Working Party. Mr. Weaver urged that this be kept as small as possible if the work was to be accomplished before the end of the summer term. The suggestion that those people at the meeting along with nominees from the L.E.A. bodies should comprise the Working Party, placed Sir Ronald Gould in an embarrassing position although he did not protest. I seized on his embarrassment to point out that it would be invidious to have only one representative from the N.U.T. when there were three from the N.A.H.T. (The Chairman and Secretary being present ex officio) and three from the Joint Four (Hutchings and Miss Wood representing the Joint Four and Birkbeck representing the H.M.C.) I pointed out that the teachers' main committee comprised only 20 odd people and they were very knowledgeable on this matter since it had occupied us over a long period of years. The L.E.A.s might wish to appoint only half-a-dozen people. I particularly mentioned the part played by Maurice Langdell in these discussions and hoped it would be possible for him to be included. Denis Howell thought the Secretary of State might be persuaded to appoint "two each from the two unions" obviously the N.U.T. and N.A.S. and one each from the other bodies....." Even at this preliminary discussion, it appeared that the size and composition of a Working Party might prove a stumbling block to progress.

The Main Committee's proposed executive functions were closely analysed. On the point of "registration" whilst it was agreed that this should be compulsory, Mr. Weaver pointed out that this was open to varying interpretations. It could mean that teachers were compelled to apply for registration, or the Council was compelled to accept them; or even that the Minister would be compelled to employ them. Furthermore, there was the question of "registered for what", and whether registration was the only way of getting a job in state-aided schools, or whether it was an Act of Parliament that obliged the teacher to register.

The concept of registration also altered the existing legal situation. It was pointed out that in the present circumstances the Department of Education and Science regarded a teacher as "qualified". The existence of a Council would change this to a situation in which the Council recognised a teacher as being "registered". It was suggested then that the Council would register and the Department would decide on employment.

The difficulty involved in this position was quickly pointed out by the Main Committee which stressed that registration and the powers of the Minister to determine employability could not be divorced. Whilst it was recognised that a situation could arise in which there was a surplus of teachers creating teacher unemployment, this was not the same as unemployment. Thus it was agreed that the Minister would have to accept the consequences of registration.

The question of the control of qualifications also raised problems. Reference was made by Casey to the ineffectiveness of the Scottish Teachers' Council in this sphere due to the fact that the Council's functions in Scotland were advisory and not executive. It soon became clear that the Department was anxious to retain reserve powers in this sphere, and it was

pointed out by the Department's representatives that the Wheatley Committee had appreciated the fact that in the end the authority of Parliament must be supreme. It was agreed that provision must be made for the decisions of the Council to be submitted to Parliament in certain circumstances, but it was accepted that good will and close consultation between the Council and the Department would be adequate in most situations. Furthermore, it was accepted that in certain circumstances, the Secretary of State, with the backing of Parliament, would be able to say certain non-registered persons could be employed. The whole question of machinery to resolve disputes between the Council and the Secretary of State was obviously a topic for the proposed Working Party.

The proposed executive function of exercising discipline over the profession was also subjected to rigorous analysis. The suggestion that there should be a gradation of penalties raised the issue of changing moral attitudes. It was pointed out that some aspects of behaviour that were now acceptable in the adult world would not be condoned in the context of the school world. Mr. Howell considered that the existing system did provide a middle way between exclusion and exoneration with a whole range of admonitions from warnings to reprimands, and from severe reprimands to limited exclusions. It was agreed that a disciplinary committee needed to be allowed considerable discretion, and the problem of "de-registration" and employability would need further discussion, as did the composition and powers of the committee.

Associated with the problem of discipline was the relation of the "Private Sector" of education to the Council. Such points as whether teachers in the "Private Sector" needed to be registered; whether teachers in this sector would be subject to the Council's disciplinary rules; and whether a teacher who had been de-registered in the public sector might seek employment in the "Private Sector", needed further clarification by a Working Party.

As to the composition of the Council, the Main Committee stressed that the teachers' interests must be preserved. Whilst accepting this, Mr. Howell and the Department's officials were anxious that the Council should have a certain amount of independent representation.

The meeting lasted nearly three hours, and as far as the Main Committee was concerned, proved to be most affable,¹ and the meeting ended with an expression of thanks to Mr. Howell from the Main Committee representatives for meeting them, and for giving so much encouragement to their hopes. That the meeting had gone so well came as a surprise to the Main Committee since it was common knowledge that the representatives of the Department of Education and Science, and in particular, Mr. Weaver, were against a Teachers' General Council. It was true that some of the Main Committee's ideas had been subjected to rigorous analysis, but its representatives felt that progress had been made. Mr. Howell, himself, had said that the meeting had been most useful. The formation of an official Working Party had been accepted. It had been agreed that the Department of Education and Science would be responsible for determining Overseas qualifications; that Her Majesty's Inspectorate would maintain its probationary functions although the Council would determine the length of probation, and part-time teachers would be in the same position as full-time teachers in regard to the need for registration. The problem of finance had been discussed and while no decision had been taken on fees, it had been agreed that a costing operation was needed. Not only had the Department offered to undertake this, they had also offered to check on the

1. Casey's report to the N.A.S. executive, dated 19.12.68. Commenting on this, Casey states: "On the whole it was a most affable meeting, lasting nearly three hours I was constantly asked questions relating to the Scottish situation and made no bones about our support of the SSA in resisting the Scottish G.T.C. Several times I made the point that we must learn from the errors made in Scotland. No offence was taken to my forthright stand on this matter."

existing numbers of teachers. Moreover, the Main Committee's proposed executive functions appeared to have been accepted in principle.

Finally, Mr. Howell had indicated that he hoped that progress would be rapid, and that agreement would be reached on the main headings by mid-1969, and that the Secretary of State would get the matter in the 1969-1970 legislative programme.

The meeting of Mr. Howell, the Department officials, and the representatives of the local authorities was the second meeting in the series, and took place on the 16th January, 1969. Whilst no report of this meeting was available, it would seem from a memorandum issued by the Department on the 23rd January, 1969, that the authorities had put forward a different concept of a Council. Instead of a "narrow" council concerning only teachers, the authorities wanted a "broad" Council, concerned rather with education or the educational service (viewed as a single profession) than with teaching as such, with membership open to all professionally employed in education. The authorities were probably influenced in this request by Sir William Alexander, since it corresponds with an idea he put forward as early as 1957,¹ and which he re-iterated again in his booklet, "Towards a New Education Act".² Such a Council would have been very different from existing models in most other professions, but it would have given the authorities an influence in the deliberations of the Council. It is possible that the authorities saw in the proposed Teachers' General Council

-
1. Times Educational Supplement, No.2208, 13th September, 1957 page 1200.
 2. Sir William Alexander, "Towards a new Education Act". (An Education paperback : Councils and Education Press Ltd., 1969) pages 51 and 52. Alexander writes of a "general education council" with a membership including; "it should include all those professionally qualified, some of whom may well be engaged in other work within the education service".

the emergence of another power block in education politics to the detriment of their own declining position. They were also concerned about the possible implications for the supply of teachers by such a Council.

When the third and final meeting of the series took place, attended by the representatives of the Main Committee, the authorities, and the Department, there was some possible ground for agreement already established, but some matters needed further clarification.

It had been agreed that the Council would have a measure of control over qualifications subject to reserve powers held by the Secretary of State; would maintain a register of qualified persons; control professional discipline, subject to appeal to the Privy Council; speak for the profession on professional matters; and be self-financing.

The major matters for clarification were whether the Council should be "narrow" or "broad"; the scope of the council; its mechanism; the method of finance, the constitution of the Council; and the control of probation.

The memorandum of the 23rd January, 1969, which was to be the basis of the discussion was of interest in itself. On the scope of the Council, it pointed out the difficulties that lay in the extension of registration beyond the maintained primary and secondary schools to the independent schools, colleges and universities. By implication the memorandum suggested that the Council might start small, covering schools only, with a possible extension of scope at a later date.¹

The memorandum outlined two possible, but interesting approaches on the mechanism of the Council. It was suggested that the Secretary of State could provide in the Schools', and other Regulations that only registered teachers could be employed in maintained or in grant aided

1. D. E. S. Memorandum, dated 23.1.69, "Proposed Teachers' General Council", sections 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12.

institutions, thus putting the onus on the employer. Alternatively, the Act could say that no-one who was not a registered teacher could work as a teacher (in maintained schools or in all schools). This pattern, which was the general one in most professions, would put the onus on the employee.^{1.}

As far as finance was concerned, the memorandum pointed out that the Government would be prepared to make an initial subvention, but would not accept the idea of a continuing one.^{2.}

The final point of interest in the memorandum was its suggestions re the constitution of the Council. It suggested two methods of election of the teacher members. Firstly, it was suggested that teacher members might be appointed by nomination by the teachers' associations concerned. This, however, might cause difficulties over disciplinary proceedings. Alternatively, it was suggested that the teacher members might be elected by direct election.^{3.}

Thus the memorandum gave the final meeting on the 27th January, 1969,^{4.} much to discuss. On the question of whether the Council should be a "broad" or "narrow" council, the Main Committee representatives insisted that the only workable Council at that time was one with jurisdiction confined to teachers in maintained primary and secondary schools in the first instance, although there was nothing ~~to~~^{to} prevent the widening of its scope in the future. In addition to the teacher members of the Council, non-teacher members would be required. The authorities, on the other hand

1. Ibid, Section 13.

2. Ibid, Section 14.

3. Ibid, Section 15.

4. Note of a meeting with officers of the Local Authority Associations and representatives of the Teachers' Main Committee to discuss the proposed teachers' council held in the Department of Education and Science, Carzon Street, 27.1.69.

insisted that it would be easier to start with a "broad" Council than to build up to it later, but they were prepared to concede the point if an additional body to control the supply of teachers was established.^{1.}

This position was accepted by all three parties, but Mr. Howell pointed out that the Secretary of State for Education and Science would only accept an advisory body on the supply of teachers if it did not suffer from the ills of the former National Advisory Committee on the Training and Supply of Teachers. The Authorities believed that the Council on Supply, and the Teachers' Council would be complementary, and, furthermore, if the Teachers' Council and not the Unions appointed the teacher members to serve on the Supply Council, much of the disharmony that had existed in the past might be avoided.^{2.} It is clear that the Authorities saw the proposed Council on Supply as a counterbalance and check to the proposed Teachers' Council since the Council on Supply would also need to exercise some influence in the sphere of entry qualifications.

The Main Committee's members emphasized that teachers would not be satisfied unless the proposed Council had more control over the profession than teachers had at the present. The Department, however, insisted that the Secretary of State must retain reserve powers in order to safeguard the public interest on the supply of teachers. It was pointed out that these powers could be used at the stage of registration (by insisting that people with certain qualifications should be eligible), or at the stage of employment (by allowing some unregistered persons to teach). The latter was considered to be more logical since the Council's natural concern was with the registration and the Secretary of State's with employment. Conversely, a reserve power operating at registration might

1. Ibid, Paragraph 2.
2. Ibid, Paragraphs 3 and 4.

involve less risk of tension developing than if there were a public confrontation of the Council and the ministers, and if registered and unregistered teachers were to be sitting in the same staff room. It was agreed, however, that the Secretary of State would have to give reasons for the use of any reserve powers. ^{1.}

As regards to teacher training, the Main Committee indicated it would like the Council to have sufficient status for the Area Training Organisation to have to take notice of it. ^{2.}

Although the meeting did not discuss all the issues raised in the memorandum, it was obvious from the discussion that there was sufficient common ground between all parties to warrant the setting up of an "Official Working Party". It was agreed that after Mr. Short had consulted with his colleagues, the Department would issue a memorandum giving the outline of the proposals for a Teaching Council which would form the basis of discussion for the Working Party.

"The Durham Affair".

On January 28th, 1969, the National Association of Schoolmasters set in motion a policy of action that threatened the formation of the

-
1. Ibid., Paragraphs 5 and 6.
 2. Ibid., Paragraph 9.

Working Party, and raised the issue of whether teachers really wanted professional status.¹ On that date, the National Association of Schoolmasters gave warning to a number of authorities that it intended to start a "work to rule" in some schools under their jurisdiction. This was intended to underline the Association's dissatisfaction with the distribution of salary increases at the Burnham Committee meeting on 17th January, 1969. Two schools were chosen in the County of Durham for the protest action along with schools in other parts of the country.

The "work to rule" was to include the strict observance of the class sizes as laid down by the Schools' Regulations 1959 (S.I. 1959, No. 364), Regulation No. 6., and adherence to normal timetable duties even if a member of staff were absent. The Association maintained that the "work to rule" involved no breach of contract. They considered that any action taken against their members by local education authorities should

-
1. For an interesting comment on the "Durham Affair" and the formation of the "Teachers Council", see an article by Timothy Raison in the Newcastle Evening Chronicle, March 15, 1969, page 6. Raison points out that judged by the traditional yardsticks of the so-called learned or qualifying professions, teaching at the moment is not a profession nor is it regarded as one by the public at large. Furthermore, the most publicised actions of teachers seem to be at least like those of professional people. Much of this adverse publicity stems from the struggle within the profession between the young teachers who want better pay from the start, and the older teachers who want a better salary structure. Raison argues that to a large extent this is the underlying conflict between the National Association of Schoolmasters and the National Union of Teachers which helps to spoil the teachers' image. Nevertheless, Raison believes that "there is a serious desire among many teachers to move towards genuine professional standing. "The good teacher is, after all, highly dedicated to the interest of his client, the child; he is backed by an increasing body of theory and knowledge, and he will before long be required to have a professional qualification before he can teach". Raison points out that a teachers' council would raise the professional skill and the responsibility of teachers. But he sees certain "snags" in the formation of such a council. He believes some teachers are not ready for such a Council. Furthermore, the teacher is not independent but a public employee, and the Department of Education and local authorities might be reluctant to lose some of their control, over teachers. Nevertheless, Raison is in favour of a teachers' council, pointing out "you can only expect truly professional standards from people if you treat them as professionals".

be limited to supervision, as provided for in their individual contracts of service and the national collective agreement covering "Teachers' Tenure". Under the terms of both of these agreements, teachers who are suspended are entitled to full pay for the period of suspension, if and when they are re-instated.

Some of the local education authorities involved took no action against the teachers who "worked to rule". Others followed the procedure for suspension. In most areas the "work-to-rule" lasted about a fortnight and came to an end with little strife. The Durham Authority, however, took the view that the teachers' action amounted to a fundamental breach of contract which released them from the terms of their agreement with the teachers concerned and the provisions of the national collective agreement. They therefore felt free to "exclude" teachers who "worked to rule" in Durham and did not consider they were liable on re-instatement to pay them for the period of "exclusion".

This resulted in an escalation of the conflict within the County in which 19 schools and 165 teachers became involved. As the conflict dragged on for over six months, the real issues became obscure and both sides became more obstinate as they found themselves in positions from which retreat meant a loss of prestige. The professional standing of teachers diminished as children's education suffered. Eventually it took the findings of a Committee of Inquiry to settle the dispute.

It is likely that had not the Secretary of State been committed to the idea of forming a Teachers' Council, the "Durham Affair" would have had very serious repercussions for the formation of the Working Party, and could have resulted in its abandonment. As it was, Mr. Short continued to include the issue of the Teachers' Council in speeches.¹

Mr. Short was concerned, however at the growing militancy of

1. For instance, Mr. Short included the topic of a "Teaching Council" in a speech at Bede College. See Appendix Seven.

teachers, the Durham dispute, and the teachers' demands for a "charter" setting out clearly the conditions of work. He made speeches to this effect both at the National Union of Teachers' Conference at Douglas,¹ and the National Association of Schoolmasters' Conference at Eastbourne. At both conferences he stated that he hoped that there would be legislation before the end of the next Parliamentary session to establish a Teachers' Council, but he warned the teachers that they would soon have to make up their minds whether they wanted to be considered as a profession or if they wanted a "rule book" and the status of industrial workers. Speaking at the National Association of Schoolmasters' Conference dinner, Mr. Short stated that the demands upon teachers had increased, some certainly to an unreasonable degree, and that it was small wonder that the temptation for them to follow the methods of other workers in the demands for their rights was strong. "But", he said, "the real dilemma facing the teaching profession is not one of tactics. It is the far more fundamental one of how far an honoured profession should go along this line to establish its own position". Phrases such as 'industrial action' had, for him, an odd ring against the background of the teachers' past record of service and their claim to professional status. Questioning the effect of such phrases and the actions accompanying them, he said, "We can hardly expect pupils not to draw conclusions about what constitutes responsible behaviour towards the communities of which they form a part and to act on them". Mr. Short asked whether teachers really wanted a rule book instead of a contract of service. "Have you thought", he asked, "where this may lead?" Is a once dedicated profession marked by its intense pastoral concern for its children to be controlled by the rule book?" Mr. Short conceded that the role of the teacher in society needed re-examining

1. Daily Telegraph, 9th April 1969, page 26.

and that relief from some duties was overdue, but he reminded the teachers that in his view their pay and prospects depended upon the esteem of the public. ^{1.}

"Outline of the Proposals for a Teaching Council".

Meanwhile on the 6th March, 1969, the secretary of the Main Committee, Mr. Cook, had been able to circulate the promised memorandum from the Department of Education and Science to members of the Main Committee. The memorandum was entitled "Outline of Proposals for a Teaching Council".^{2.} After pointing out in the introduction that the proposals had "emerged in informal exploratory discussion with the 'main committee' set up by the teachers' associations",^{3.} and officers of the local authority associations, and a 'few major points and a large number of minor ones' remained to be settled, the memorandum went on to outline the functions, scope, constitution, procedures for admission to the register, and methods of financing the register.

The Main Committee met on the 20th March 1969 to consider the memorandum.^{4.} Mr. Campbell of the Department of Education and Science arrived at the meeting with an allegedly "revised" memorandum to present to the Main Committee. On examination, it was found that this memorandum was the same as the one prepared by Mr. Fordham which had already been circulated. Mr. Campbell explained that he had only recently taken over from Mr. Fordham, but that he would be prepared to answer questions on the

-
1. New Schoolmaster, Vol.46, No.4. April/May 1968, page 3.
 2. See Appendix Eight, "Memorandum prepared by Mr. Fordham of the Department of Education and Science".
 3. Ibid.
 4. Minutes of the Main Committee, 20.3.69.

Memorandum. He also indicated that he would like, if possible, to take back to Mr. O'Donovan, at the Department, the Committee's comments on the document as it was hoped to present the memorandum to the Secretary of State, and to other Departments for observations in the near future.¹ Mr. Campbell was allowed to stay at the meeting during the preliminary discussion on the functions of the Council, but it was decided that the Main Committee should discuss the document in detail in private. Thus Mr. Campbell was asked to leave, but the Main Committee promised to communicate their decisions to Mr. Campbell or Mr. Donovan.²

On studying the memorandum,³ the Committee accepted without alteration, "Paragraph 1 - Introduction", "Paragraphs 2 and 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ Basic Concepts", and "Paragraph 6 - Constitution".

On "Paragraph 4 - Function and Scope", the Main Committee considered the statement 4(a), that the Council would "represent the views of the teaching profession" to be misleading. It was thought that two "pitfalls" needed to be avoided. One was any idea that the Council should be consulted instead of the individual associations. The other was any suggestion that the Council was assuming the functions of the N.A.C.T.S.T. Thus it was agreed to recommend the re-wording of "Paragraph 4(a)", and that it be transferred to the end of the section in the amended version in order to reduce the importance of the advisory aspects of the Council's functions. This became 4(e) in the amended version and read; "To present to the government, local authorities, universities etc., whenever it wishes to do so, the views of the Council on all matters that come within its terms of reference"⁴

1. It is interesting to note that the Main Committee was given the opportunity of discussing the memorandum, and making suggestions for amendments to it before it was circulated to other interested parties, including the L.E.A.'s.
2. Minutes of the Main Committee, 20.3.69, Minute 3.
3. Appendix Eight. The discussion on the memorandum is based on Minute 3 of the Main Committee, 20.3.69.
4. Appendix Nine.

In considering "paragraph 4(b)"^{1.} the Committee felt that the emphasis should be on the good sense of the teaching profession in the matter of standards and supply, thus recommended the deletion of the reference to the "government's reserve powers". This paragraph became 4(a) in the amended version.^{2.}

It was felt that the reference to "sections" in the register in paragraph 4(c),^{3.} was misleading, since this could refer to the stages of education, or the maintained schools and others, or to arbitrary distinctions. It was felt that the value of the register lay in its existence as a register and it was therefore agreed to recommend the deletion of the words "in one or more sections". This paragraph became 4(b) in the amended version.^{4.}

In Section 4(d)^{5.} which became 4(c)^{6.} in the amended version, it was agreed to replace the word "and" after the phrase "to strike off the register", by "and/or". In view of the impossibility of the Council itself supervising teachers' probation, it was agreed to recommend that the word "supervise" be replaced by "approve".

The Main Committee regarded "paragraph 5"^{7.} as summarising the position regarding registration, but recommended the words "outside maintained schools" should be omitted and replaced by the word "all" at the

-
1. Appendix Eight.
 2. Appendix Nine.
 3. Appendix Eight.
 4. Appendix Nine.
 5. Appendix Eight.
 6. Appendix Nine.
 7. Appendix Eight.

beginning of the final sentence.

The Main Committee was far from satisfied with the wording of "paragraph 7". It was felt that if the Council was to be effective, it needed to have real powers, and if the standards of the teaching profession were to be maintained, a firm stand needed to be taken with regard to registration. Departures from the standards set by the Council needed to be seen clearly as governmental, or parliamentary decisions. Thus it was agreed to recommend the deletion of the reference to the Council's standards being seen as a reason for teacher shortages, and that the paragraph be re-worded:-

"7. From the start registration would be a necessary condition of employment in maintained primary and secondary schools. It is generally recognised that arrangements should be made between the Council and the government to safeguard the supply of teachers for the public system. It has been suggested that the government should retain reserve powers which could be applied either at the stage of registration or at the stage of employment. 'The Main Committee' consider that there must be further discussion to determine the procedure to be followed in the event of any conflict of policy arising between the council and the government"¹.

The Committee also decided to delete the opening words "in any event" in paragraph 8.²

Finally, after studying "paragraph 9" on "Finance", it was noted that this paragraph made no reference to any continuing grant, and it was felt that a continuing grant should be included in view of the proposal that the Council would be taking over some of the functions exercised by the Department of Education and Science. Thus the Main Committee recommended the re-wording of the second sentence to:-

1. Appendix Nine.
2. Appendix Eight.

"The question of contributions from the public fund (e.g. on a pump-priming basis or on a continuing basis in respect of functions to be taken over by the Council) is for further discussion".^{1.}

A revised draft of the memorandum was then sent to Mr. Campbell at the Department of Education and Science.

Some of the amendments were accepted and appeared in the final draft which was submitted to the Secretary of State as "A Possible Framework for a Teaching Council for England and Wales",^{2.} and this became the basis of discussion for the Official Working Party. A study of this document will show that "paragraph 4" was reorganised on the basis suggested by the Main Committee. The clause about "probation" is altered to make the same sense as the wording in the Main Committee's amended version but is incorporated in "paragraph 4(a)". The amendment of the clause re the advisory functions of the proposed Council was not accepted and the phrase that appeared in the original draft as "4(a)" now appears in the final document as "4(d)". The Main Committee's re-phrasing of "paragraph 7" was not accepted but the offending second sentence in the original draft is omitted in the final draft. The amendment to "paragraph 8" was included, but the refusal of the Department to accept the amendment to "paragraph 9", showed that the Department only anticipated the Government making an initial subvention.

The final draft of the memorandum was circulated to all of the interested parties on the 10th April, 1969, together with a letter from Mr. Sloman of the Department of Education and Science. The letter

-
1. Appendix Nine.
 2. See Appendix Ten. This appears as "Appendix 1" of the Working Party's Report "A Teaching Council for England and Wales". (London, H.M.S.O., 1970).

stated:-

1. "As you know, and as indeed you will have seen from recent newspapers, the Secretary of State has much sympathy with the teachers' long-standing concern to improve their professional status. They see as an important step in this process the establishment of a council to control a professional register, and compulsion to register as an essential feature for the teaching profession as it is for others.
2. The Parliamentary Under-Secretary last year initiated informal exploratory discussions with, among others, the 'main committee' of teachers' associations which has been for some time engaged on working out broadly formulated proposals for a teaching council. These discussions suggest that there is a reasonable prospect of broad agreement among the various educational interests mainly concerned for the establishment of a teaching council for England and Wales. The attached paper summarises the main features which might underlie such agreement.
3. The Secretary of State suggests that the next step should be to establish a working party of representatives of all interests concerned to work out detailed proposals, as the Wheatley Committee did in Scotland. The purpose of this letter is to invite your Association to be represented on such a working party.
4. If, as the Secretary of State thinks important, the working party is to make quick progress, it is essential that it should be kept small. All the bodies affected will of course have the opportunity to give full consideration to any report before they are committed to accepting the proposals in it. I have therefore asked the local authority associations to agree to nominate only one member each and I hope that your Association will feel able to agree to nominate one member. The number of bodies which he is inviting has been deliberately limited." 1.

1. Letter from Sloman to the Teachers' Associations. See also Association of Education Committees Executive Committee Minutes for Friday May 16th, 1969.

The bodies invited to nominate a representative were: County Councils Association, Association of Municipal Councils, Association of Education Committees, Welsh Joint Education Committee, Inner London Educational Authority, National Union of Teachers, Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, Joint Four, National Association of Headteachers, National Association of Schoolmasters, Universities Council for the Education of Teachers, Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education, Headmasters' Conference, and the Association of University Teachers.

The A.E.C. Education Advisory Committee accepted the proposal to establish a Working Party and agreed to appoint its Secretary to represent the Association. It expressed some doubts, however, as to the suggested functions of the proposed body, particularly with regard to the training and supply of teachers. ^{1.}

The National Association of Schoolmasters also took issue with the proposals. On the 5th May 1969, the Association's secretary, Mr. Casey, wrote to Sloman at the Department of Education and Science pointing out that the statement made in "paragraph 6" of the Memorandum, viz., "The Method of selecting the teachers to serve on the Council needs further discussion" appeared to ignore the unanimous decision of the teachers' organisations embodied in the Memorandum sent by Cook to the Secretary of State to the effect that teacher representation must be through the teachers' associations. ^{2.}

On the 7th May 1969, Sloman replied:- "Thank you for your letter of 5th May about the teaching council. It did not escape us in the Dep-

-
1. A.E.C. Executive Committee : Minutes of the Meeting of May 16th, 1969.
 2. Letter from Casey to Sloman, 5th May 1969, ref. 1/5/GF/1.

artment that the teachers' main committee was unanimous that teacher representation on the teaching council must be through the teachers' associations. Other parties, however, including the Secretary of State, who would presumably have to pilot any legislation through Parliament, may have views on this. You know that, at present, the Scottish Council members are chosen by direct election, though the operation of that Council is now under review by the Scottish Secretary of State. We, for our part, are sure that the matter will have to be discussed in the working party."¹

These sources of disagreement were of minor significance, however, compared with the trouble that arose from the allocation of one representative to each of the Teachers' Associations.

The Representation Issue.

At first it appeared that the Teachers' Associations had accepted the terms of Sloman's letter of the 10th April, 1969. A further letter was sent by Mr. Campbell of the Department of Education and Science to all the associations participating in the Working Party, with the agenda of the first meeting of the "Working Party on a Teaching Council for England and Wales" to be held at Curzon Street House on the 21st May. Attached to the agenda were the terms of reference and the membership of the Working Party. This read:-

"1. The Secretary of State has approved the following terms of reference:

'Within the context of the attached memorandum to formulate, for submission to the Secretary of State for Education and Science and to the bodies representing the other interests concerned, proposals for the establishment and operation of a council through which teachers in England and

1. Letter from Sloman to Casey, dated 7th May, 1969.

Wales can exercise a measure of professional self-government; and for national arrangements by which advice can be made available to the Secretary of State on matters relating to the training and supply of teachers'.

2. The membership of the Working Party is:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. T. R. Weaver	D.E.S.
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. E. Britton	N.U.T.
	Mr. T. Driver	A.T.T.I.
	Mr. A. W. S. Hutchings	Joint Four
	Mr. M. J. Cammish	N.A.H.T.
	Mr. T. A. Casey	N.A.S.
	Mr. L. W. K. Brown	C.C.A.
	Mr. L. J. Drew	A.M.C.
	Sir William Alexander	A.E.C.
	Sir William Houghton	I.L.E.A.
	Mr. B. Andrew Davies	W.J.E.C.
	Prof. J. W. Tibble	U.C.E.T.
	Mr. F. Garside	A.U.T.
	Mr. A. G. Nokes	A.T.C.D.E.
	Mr. R. J. Pitts Tucker	H.M.C.
<u>Secretary:</u>	Mr. A. Campbell	D.E.S. "

It seemed that at least the hopes of the Main Committee had been realised, and the meeting arranged for the 21st May would prove a historic landmark in the teachers' quest for self-government. But as it happened, the meeting proved to be a non-event. On the day before the meeting, the 20th May, Mr. O'Donovan of the Department of Education and Science, 'phoned the members of the Working Party to inform them that the National Union of Teachers was insisting on leaving three members on the

Working Party.¹ Consequently, instead of the Working Party meeting as such on the 21st May, the representatives met briefly to discuss the membership of the Working Party. The outcome of this meeting was that Mr. Weaver had to report to the Secretary of State that it had not been possible to reach an agreement on the basis for nominations to the working party by the teachers' associations.²

The Times Educational Supplement commented; "The desultory negotiations for a Teachers' General Council have run into trouble of a predictable kind as the unions begin to disagree about representation on Mr. Denis Howell's working party".³

Indeed, the disagreement was of a "predictable" nature. What was surprising, however, was that the National Union of Teachers took so long to voice its opposition to the basis of representation. The suggestions concerning representation made at the meeting of the 17th December, 1968 at Richmond Terrace had been somewhat embarrassing to Sir Ronald Gould,⁴ and it was somewhat surprising that the Union did not quickly reject the proposals regarding membership contained in Sloman's letter of the 10th April, 1969. Nevertheless, it is not surprising that once the National Union of Teachers had put in a claim for increased representation, the National Association of Schoolmasters should also seek to raise its representation.

-
1. N.A.S. papers: telephone memorandum, dated 20th May 1969.
 2. Letter from Sloman to the Main Committee, 9th July 1969. Ref:R.S.13/3/31 Para.1.
 3. Times Educational Supplement, No.21820, 6th June 1969. page 1873.LEADER
 4. See Casey's Report of the meeting to the National Association of Schoolmasters' Executive, dated 19.12.68. See also Cook's account of the meeting dated 2.1.69(Proposed Teachers' General Council Main Committee Papers). Cook writes on the size and composition of the Working Party, "Various suggestions were put forward, e.g. one per association, two per association. Mr. Howell said that the members of the Working Party would be appointed by the Secretary of State, by name and association. Mr. Casey proposed that as a starting point the existing "main committee" should be used. One could then see the reaction of the local authority associations. Mr. Howell said he would put this suggestion to the Secretary of State."

The Teachers' World saw the outlook as "not particularly encouraging". It went on to analyse and adjudge the rival claims of the National Union of Teachers and the National Association of Schoolmasters to increased representation: "On the basis of membership figures, the National Union of Teachers clearly has a just claim to more seats on the working party, and eventually on the Council itself, than its rival organisations. At the same time, it is certain that if the N.A.S. - as now seems likely - points out that the proposed T.G.C. is to be concerned with professional values, and challenges the N.U.T. to weed out its career members from those less concerned with professionalism, than with protection, there is force in this argument which cannot be denied". The Teachers' World, however, feared that the concept of a Teachers' General Council might "breakdown, as in Scotland into a series of concentric squabbles in which everything except the question of which organisation has the loudest voice will be forgotten".^{1.}

Anna Sproule writing in the Times Educational Supplement was just as pessimistic about the prospects of forming a Teachers' General Council. Commenting that Mr. Short hoped that some compromise with the N.U.T. might be found fairly quickly, she noted that 'Speculators have no difficulty in remembering the prolonged row over working party representation that blew up last year between the Union and the National Association of Schoolmasters. It started in the Spring and lasted well into the Summer. They may also be forgiven for wondering whether this council-to-be is going to get off the ground at all.' Comparing the situation in England with the situation in Scotland, she added; "The N.U.T.'s latest move will certainly have caused many teachers to think of the appalling mess their Scottish colleagues have got into with their own General Teachers' Council. Strife, strike

1. Teachers' World, 6th June 1969.

threats, and heartfelt denunciation of Mr. William Ross, Scotland's Secretary of State, have been the rule over the border. And at the heart of the trouble observers say, is the same old question of representation. Teachers have so far been represented on the council on a regional, not an organisational basis.¹ Smaller teacher groups - like the Scottish Association of Schoolmasters - are not represented at all since their numbers are comparatively thin on the ground". She saw further difficulties for the English Council from the sectional interests represented by the differing unions. Thus she pointed out; "The English Teachers' General Council is aimed at promoting a united profession. But the teachers represented on it will belong to different organisations and hold different views on many questions. The Scots' experience has shown what happens when no provision is made for different viewpoints to be officially heard on the Council. And yet, in England, official representation of the various unions already looks like proving a thorny question. The teachers may pay lip-service to the idea of a united profession; Mr. Short may beam approval; the local authorities may sigh relief at the signs that teachers do not really want to line up with the dustmen after all; but Mr. Howell and his working party have a long way to go before they can answer one key question: 'Are the interests of all teachers everywhere really reconcilable?'"²

Although Mr. Cammish, the National Association of Head Teachers' delegate expressed the hope that the hold up would "not be of serious or

-
1. Although the Scottish situation was similar to the English situation in that "representation" was an issue of conflict, the nature of the issue was different in the two countries. In Scotland the issue centred around the fact that certain associations were not represented on the Council because of the system of elections. In England, the unions were agreed that representation of the Council must be through the teachers' associations(although this had yet to be formally agreed by the proposed Working Party). It was the size of representation of the unions on the working party that was at issue.
 2. Times Educational Supplement, No.2820, Friday, June 6th, 1969. page 1867.

lasting consequence",¹ the squabble between the teachers' associations continued throughout June. In an attempt to break the deadlock, Mr. Sloman of the Department of Education and Science wrote to the individual teachers' associations on July 9th, pointing out that "the timetable for any eventual legislation on this subject is now extremely tight, and the Secretary of State has accordingly asked me to invite to a first meeting of the working party of 16th July, nominees of the associations on the following basis, which modifies the membership set out in TC(69)1 (the paper circulated as part of the agenda for the proposed meeting of the working party on 21st May, which in the event proved abortive): - N.U.T. - 4, A.T.T.I. - 1, Joint Four - 2, N.A.H.T. - 1, N.A.S. - 2, C.C.A. - 1, A.M.C. - 1, A.E.C. - 1, W.J.E.C. - 1, I.L.E.A. - 1, U.C.E.T - 1, A.U.T. - 1, A.T.C.D.E. - 1, H.M.C. - 1."² Furthermore, it appeared that the Secretary of State would be prepared to accept even further alterations of the basis for representation for Sloman went on to point out; "For the sake of speed I am putting forward the basis for nominations set out in para. 2 above without prejudice to the Secretary of State's consideration of any recommendations which the meeting may decide to make to him".³

The Main Committee met on the 16th July immediately before the meeting of the working party. Mr. Sloman's letter of the 9th July, 1969

-
1. Reported in "Education", 30th May, 1969, page 719.
 2. Letter from P. T. Sloman of the Department of Education and Science, dated 9th July, 1969, reference RS 13/3/31. para. 2.
 3. Ibid, para. 4.

was discussed, and the Joint Four, the National Association of Schoolmasters, the National Association of Headteachers, the National Union of Teachers, and the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education, put forward claims for increasing their representation beyond the figure indicated in Mr. Sloman's letter. After considerable discussion it was agreed that the National Union of Teachers should have 8 members, the National Association of Schoolmasters 3 members, the National Association of Headteachers, 2, the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education 2, the Headmasters' Conference 1, the Association of Headmistresses 1, the Association of Assistant Mistresses 1, the Assistant Masters Association 1, and the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions 1.¹ It would appear that this formula was accepted at the first meeting of the Working Party.²

Thus, on July 16th 1969, the Working Party began its task "to formulate, for submission to the Secretary of State for Education and Science and to the bodies representing the other interests concerned, proposals for the establishment and operation of a council through which teachers in England and Wales can exercise a measure of professional self-government; and for national arrangements by which advice can be made available to the Secretary of State on matters relating to the training and supply of teachers".³ Considerable credit must go to Mr. Short

-
1. Minutes of the Main Committee for the Teachers' General Council, 16th July 1969. Minute 3.
 2. This would seem to be indicated by the fact that there was no further delay in the proceedings.
 3. A Teaching Council for England and Wales (H.M.S.O., London 1970) page 1.

for the fact that the Working Party ever actually started its work.

In spite of the growing militancy among teachers and the inter-union strife over representation, the Secretary of State was resolved to go ahead with the formation of a Council.^{1.}

-
1. Indeed, throughout the troublesome months of January to June, The Secretary of State continued to affirm his support for the Council in spite of deteriorating relationships between the unions and the local education authorities, and unions and unions. Typical of his continuing support for the Council was in a statement in the House of Commons on April 24th, 1969, that he intended to set up a Council during the following year. (Reported in Times Educational Supplement, 2.5.69, No.2815, "Questions in Parliament", page 1430. Also see Hansard, Commons, Vol.782. 1968-69. Oral answers, 24th April, 1969, col. 636.

CHAPTER SIX.

"THE REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY"

Background of Teacher Politics

The Working Party carried out its task against an unpromising background. It had barely begun its work when in August 1969, the "McCarthy Report" ^{1.} was published which was hailed by the National Association of Schoolmasters as a "Victory in Verbiage". ^{2.} This was followed in September by an outright rejection of the proposed Teachers' General Council by the "Young Teachers" section of the National Union of Teachers. November heralded the first of a series of strikes by the National Union of Teachers and the National Association of Schoolmasters in support of their interim pay claim. This growing militancy and industrial action certainly seemed odd vis a vis the teachers "claim" to a greater degree of professional self-government and professional status. Meanwhile, in Scotland, the functioning of the Scottish General Teaching Council continued to be a source of friction rather than unity, in spite of the "Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council", ^{3.} published in October 1969.

The McCarthy Report

In an attempt to end the dispute between the National Association of Schoolmasters and the Durham Local Education Authority, the Department

1. Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Dispute between the Durham Local Education Authority and the National Association of Schoolmasters : Cmnd. 4152 : August 1969 (H.M.S.O. London 1969).
2. "The New Schoolmaster" Vol. 46 no. 6. Sept. 1969. page 4.
3. "Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council" : Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Scotland (Edinburgh, H.M.S.O. 1969).

of Education and Science and the Department of Employment and Productivity appointed, on July 8th 1969, a Committee of Inquiry to "inquire into the causes and circumstances of the dispute between the Durham Local Education Authority and the National Association of Schoolmasters; and to report."¹ Dr. W.E.J. McCarthy was the Chairman of the three men committee which reported in August 1969. The Committee criticised both sides. The inquiry found that the Association's work to rule (refusing to teach classes of more than statutory size) was not a proper work to rule.² The inquiry pointed out : "It seems to us that as the Durham L.E.A. suggested, the intention of the statutory instruments is to lay down certain guide lines. They are primarily directed at education authorities and inform them that, within the constrictions facing them at any time, they should strive to achieve the objective of smaller classes."³ Furthermore the inquiry asserted that the so-called work-to-rule was a "doubtfully effective means" of protesting against the current methods of negotiating teachers' salaries. "The N.A.S. argued that they chose the tactics that they did because it was best designed to 'minimise the impact on the children's education' and 'maximise favourable publicity', We are not convinced. It is not clear, for example, why a one day strike should be more disruptive or less popular. In terms of the effect on a child, a one day stoppage is much less damaging than a refusal to teach for three weeks or so."⁴

The Committee of Inquiry also considered the authority's action unjustified. "They became over-committed too soon to the merits of one

-
1. McCarthy Report : Cmnd. 4152 page 3 para 1.
 2. Ibid page 25 paras 73 - 80.
 3. McCarthy Report : Cmnd 4152 para.79.
 4. Ibid. para. 107.

disputed and, in industrial relations terms, doubtful view of their rights. They failed to consider all the alternatives available to them in the case under consideration. They neglected to involve the N.A.S. in the action they contemplated."¹.

Perhaps of more significance than the censuring of both parties was the Committee's acceptance that industrial action would play an increasing role in teacher politics. Consequently, the inquiry commented on the inefficiency of the regulations governing the dismissal or suspension of teachers. It emphasised that "the provisions of Section 5 of the 1968 Teachers' Conditions of Service agreement appear to be inadequate to deal with disputes of this kind," and suggested its early revision. "For, by its failure to provide formally for trade union involvement in disciplinary questions, and by failure to spell out the constitutional alternatives available to employers, it helped to keep the parties apart and add to their confusion and resentment."².

The reinstatement of the Association's members without loss of salary, service or pension rights, as recommended by the inquiry, was regarded as an outright victory by the National Association of Schoolmasters. Moreover, the Association was prepared to accept only in word and not in spirit that "after due consideration, and in the light of the report, their tactics were

1. Ibid para. 96.

2. Ibid para. 117. See paras. 114 - 117. See also the article by Anne Corbett in *New Society*, 28th August 1969, page 325. She emphasises, 'The point about the report which gives it an interest outside Durham is its criticism of the present "half-way house" of the teachers' collective bargaining machinery. The dismissal procedure for teachers is at present framed in the expectation that they can only be dismissed for rape or for some other equally personal misbehaviour. But increasingly teachers stop work because of Union action. Yet there's no agreed procedural timing, no provision for reference to a third party, no formal reference to the role of the unions. Teachers are in an awkward position. On the one hand they're exhorted towards professional status - on the other they are, realistically, becoming more involved in industrial action. But at the moment neither they nor the local authority associations have got industrial procedure straight. If they can do that then, as this report clearly shows, there are alternatives to the sort of militancy that the N.A.S. showed in Durham and the sort of toughness with which the authority retaliated.'

not a "work-to-rule" in the customary sense."¹ Indeed, writing in the September issue of the Association's journal, Mr. Casey, the National Association of Schoolmasters' general secretary stated: "We have never asserted that the form of our protest was 'customary'; quite the contrary, it was unique. We accepted before the Inquiry that we had no Union Rule Book to work to, nor had our employers set out any rules for us to observe. We claimed simply that Parliament had prescribed a set of regulations, No.6 of which (The Schools Regulations, 1959) laid down maximum class sizes for primary and secondary schools. Ours was a 'work to Regulation' if it wasn't a 'work to rule'. But what's in a name?" Omitting to mention the censure of the inquiry, Casey went on to state: "We did not admit what we had done was wrong, nor were we asked to admit this. We were asked to admit this. We were asked to admit that we had given our form of industrial action the wrong name, and this we accept." ²

It would seem, however, that the Association had fully realised the implications of the acceptance by the inquiry that industrial action would become increasingly important in the activities of teachers' unions to secure their objectives. Furthermore, the Association was now convinced that "industrial action" could be used with success and was preparing "to do battle

-
1. McCarthy Report : Cmnd. 4152 para. 127.
 2. The New Schoolmaster Vol. 46 no. 6. September 1969, page 4. Casey's article "Victory in Verbiage" is piece of clever political opportunism. He quotes "The Times Educational Supplement's" leading article's (29.8.69.) condemnation of the report as being "incredibly weak." "It is almost unbelievable that three intelligent men could be found to put their names to such a feeble document. It stands as an indictment not merely of Durham and the N.A.S. but also of the conventional wisdom about industrial relations. If this is an example of the level of discourse, it is hardly surprising that attempts at trade union reform by legislation or self-discipline produce only cynicism and cant." He then uses this as support for his own attack on the McCarthy Report.

again in our effort to obtain an interim salary increase." ¹ Consequently the Association was determined to forestall the criticisms that strike action by teachers was irresponsible because it adversely affected children. To this end, Casey successfully persuaded the delegates to the annual Trades Union Congress in Portsmouth to endorse, without dissent, a proposition from the National Association of Schoolmasters that teachers' unions had the same rights as other unions to impose sanctions in times of dispute. ²

The Rejection of the Proposed Teachers' Council

The National Association of Schoolmasters was not the only section of teachers moving towards increasing militancy. At the "Young Teachers' section of the National Union of Teachers' Conference" held in September 1969, the young teachers were urged to choose the path of trade unionism rather than that of professionalism.

The case for having a Teachers' General Council was strongly put by Mr. R.M. Cay (Herts) who argued that until teachers gained control, their future would be uncertain. Miss J.M. Blyde (S.W.Herts) seconding the proposals to join argued that the council was not submitted as an alternative to T.U.C. affiliation, but she believed that professional unity was possible through the council and that this was not incompatible with T.U.C. affiliation. ³ Although the supporters of the proposed Council stressed that it would raise the professional status of teachers, the young teachers were not convinced. Opponents saw the Council as a piece of psuedo-democracy designed to divert teachers' control of their own

1. Ibid.

2. Times Educational Supplement, No. 2833, 5th Sept. 1969, page 22.

3. For a full report of the debate see "The Teacher", 19.9.69. page 8.

profession into a harmless by-way.^{1.} Furthermore, they considered it to be a clear attempt to divert energy away from the fast-growing militant movement in the profession.^{2.} Mr. Eric Peagram, a Wandsworth teacher, asked : "Do we want to regard ourselves as superior to the parents of the children we teach? We have waited long enough for this professional status and we have paid enough for waiting."^{3.} While further opposition was expressed by Mrs. Jane Porter (East London) who said : "We are asking Mr. Short to provide us with some sort of organisation to control us. I joined the N.U.T. as a trade union. I did not ask to join a professional organisation."^{4.} Consequently the Young Teachers decided by a "substantial majority that they did not want professional status or a teachers' general council like that which governs the medical profession."^{5.}

In a letter to the 'Teacher', Mr. Peagram, a member of the National Young Teachers Advisory Committee, and a young teacher who had spoken against the Council in the debate, reiterated the young teachers objections to the Council. He was most anxious to point out that the Young Teachers' objections were not merely based on a dislike for Mr. Edward Short, lack of information or inability to pay the subscription fees for membership to such a Council, as the report in the "Teacher" of the 19th September seemed to indicate. Thus he wrote :-

"What I believe the delegates at Manchester saw very clearly was that there can be no benefit whatever to the mass of teachers from this quest

-
1. Teachers' World, 19th Sept. 1969. Newsdesk.
 2. Times Educational Supplement, No. 2835, 19.9.69., page 12.
 3. Ibid.
 4. "The Teacher", 19.9.69. page 8.
 5. Ibid.

for an illusory professional status, and perennial exhibition of a desire to be regarded as somehow better than other people who work for a living. We have seen how this capacity for self-delusion has allowed us to be led time and again into blind alleys rather than declare ourselves ready to act as a trade union.

Of course we are suspicious of Mr. Short's enthusiasm for a T.G.C. Do not his repeated exhortations to teachers to think professionally indicate that for perhaps the first time the Government is alarmed by the rising militancy within the N.U.T.? He is surely only confirming our view that he will give us nothing that we cannot achieve for ourselves by, dare I say it? industrial action. As for control of the profession, have the Scottish teachers achieved that? There can, moreover, be little comfort for those who believe in professional unity to be obtained from the Scottish T.G.C., they have just experienced an inter-union dispute on an unprecedented scale as a result of one union not being prepared to join - do we imagine the situation will be any different here?

As young teachers we cannot afford a Teachers' General Council, not just because it will mean another outlay from an already meagre salary, but because its effect must inevitably be to divert the N.U.T. from the militant role we believe it must adopt. We do not see the N.U.T. as merely an association of professionals acting as a pressure group on the Government, but rather as a trade union prepared to fight effectively for the policies we know to be necessary to achieve the salaries and conditions we want, and the education system our children deserve." 1.

Towards Strike Action.

The Teachers' World considered the rejection of the Council by the

1. The Teacher, October 3rd 1969, page 5.

"Young Teachers" as "a serious but not disabling blow"^{1.} to the movement for a Teachers' General Council. Nevertheless, there was a growing emphasis on militancy in the profession and an apparent movement away from professional objectives. Even the relatively conservative main body of the National Union of Teachers was becoming more and more restive. The Union was particularly disturbed in July 1969 at the dismissal of part-time teachers in Coventry, and on July 9th members of the Inner-London Teachers' Association took part in a protest march in support of the Union's pay demand. Furthermore with newly qualified teachers facing the prospect of not attaining employment in the September, the Union warned the Minister that it was considering to refuse to teach primary school classes with more than 40 children and secondary school classes with more than 30. Low salaries, large classes, administration of school meals, the dismissal of a number of part-time and married women returners and excessive extra-curricular duties were seen as the cause of this growing discontent.^{2.} It is clear that teachers were becoming increasingly unwilling to accept the prospects of professional status as a sop for their deteriorating material situation. It is not surprising then that October 1969 witnessed a mass lobby of M.P.s by members of the National Union of Teachers in support of their interim Burnham claim for £135 per head, and some of the main teachers' associations began to turn more and more attention to a teachers' charter.^{3.}

1. Teachers' World, 19th Sept. 1969.
2. See Daily Express July 8th 1969 - article by Colin Mackenzie.
3. Times Educational Supplement, No. 2840, 24th Oct. 1969 page 1. The T.E.S. described the term "teachers' charter" as "a grandiose term to describe a statement on teachers' conditions of service less formal than a contract, yet setting out a common understanding of the general duties of the assistant teacher." But, the T.E.S. pertinently added: "What remains to be seen is how this accord will fit into the discussion of a professional code within a proposed Teachers' General Council. It is evident that the professional relationship of the teacher with the child and with his fellow teachers and the relationship between assistant teacher and head are bound to impinge on any charter defining the teacher's obligation to his employers."

Nevertheless, it was not until November that the true extent and depth of the discontent in the profession was revealed following the meeting of the Burnham Committee of the 10th November. At this meeting the management panel made what the teachers considered to be a derisory interim pay offer, and this was followed by spontaneous strikes by teachers all over the country. These lightning walk-outs were only the beginning of a long campaign that lasted throughout December and January, and that united the two major unions. The action included one day stoppages; half-day strikes; and withdrawal of labour in schools in selected areas for periods of a week, eventually resulting in a victory for the teachers.^{1.} The lesson of the action for the teachers appeared to be abundantly clear; strong united militant action could succeed.

Events in Scotland

If the advocates of the General Teaching Council and enhanced professional status could find little cause for rejoicing with the background events in England, the situation over the border in Scotland proved to be just as gloomy. Here there was still considerable dissatisfaction with the General Teaching Council, in spite of the fact that it had been established for three years, with the result that the Secretary of State instituted a review of the Constitution and Functions of Council in March 1969.^{2.} Even the Educational Institute of Scotland which had been an ardent supporter of the Council was critical about its effects. In his address to the Institute's annual general meeting, the retiring president,

1. For an account of the events in the form of newspaper extracts, see Education Today, "The 100 days War" Sept/Oct, 1970 Vol.20 No.5.
2. In January, 1969, Scottish M.P.s were urging an early review of the Council as some teachers refused to register and four authorities refused to dismiss their unregistered teachers (Daily Telegraph January 29th 1969). Although Mr. Ross, the Secretary of State for Scotland had hoped that this would not be necessary for another year, after pressure from the three main teachers' associations, he initiated the review on the 6th March, 1969 (See Introduction to "Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council" (H.M.S.O. Edinburgh 1969).

Mr. James Carmichael felt that the past year had done more to lessen public respect for the profession of teaching than any in their long history. He considered that the chief cause of this was the disputes among teachers and their organisations on the General Teaching Council for Scotland. He said that some teachers were opting out of professional obligations by non-membership of any organisation because they were sickened by the brawling of factional interests.^{1.}

The "Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council"^{2.} which was begun in March 1969, and appeared in the form of a memorandum by the Secretary of State for Scotland in October 1969, helped to crystallise some of the criticisms of the Council. A wide range of bodies representing teachers from all sectors of education, from local authorities and the Teaching Council itself^{3.} were invited to let Mr. Ross have their views and their proposals for change on the following matters :-

- "(1) the composition of the membership of the Council, and the methods of election or appointment;
- (2) the relationship between the Council and the Secretary of State;

1. Times Educational Supplement, June 20th 1969, No. 2822.
2. "Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council" (H.M.S.O. : Edinburgh : 1969).
3. Ibid page 23. The Bodies that submitted observations were :- General Teaching Council; Educational Institute of Scotland; Scottish Secondary Teachers Association; Scottish Schoolmasters Association; Scottish Counties of Cities Association; Association of County Councils in Scotland; Association of Directors of Education; Universities (except Strathclyde and Heriot-Watt Universities); Central Institutions (except North of Scotland College of Agriculture, Leith Nautical College; Edinburgh College of Domestic Science; Glasgow School of Art; West of Scotland College of Agriculture and Scottish College of Textiles); Colleges of Education (except Jordanhill, Hamilton and Dunfermline Colleges); Association of Principals of Colleges of Education; Association of Lecturers in Colleges of Education; Association of Principals of Technical Institutions; Scottish Further Education Association; Church of Scotland; Headmasters Association of Scotland; Association of Teachers Action Committees; Scottish Union of Students; Edinburgh Women Graduate Teachers Association, J.S.Malloch., Headmaster, Drumlanrig-St.Guthbert's Primary School, Hawick; Scottish Trades Union Congress.

- (3) registration of teachers, including exceptional admission to the register; and
- (4) the disciplinary provisions." 1.

On the composition of the Council two major criticisms were made : Firstly, it was argued that the number of teachers other than Heads were insufficient; and secondly, that the proportion of teachers to the total membership was too small. To remedy this, the Secretary of State indicated that there was no need to maintain the present requirement that elected members shall include a specific proportion of head teachers. Furthermore, he proposed to increase the number of teachers in each of the primary and secondary categories from 9 to 10 and to reduce the number of his own nominees from 4 to 3. Thus the total number of members of the Council would be 45 (instead of 44) including 27 registered teachers, of whom 23 would be elected by the profession at large.^{2.}

Most of the bodies assumed that the method of election to the Council would remain unaltered.^{3.} The Scottish Schoolmasters Association, however, advanced the view that Teacher members should be appointed by the main teachers' associations on a numerical basis determined by the Secretary of State. Furthermore the Teachers' Associations should be free to appoint any registered teacher from their membership, and have the right to substitute members when necessary. The Association argued that this "would remove the necessity for election, avoid a considerable amount of unnecessary administration, save money, achieve the best possible balance within the teacher membership, increase the confidence of teachers in the Council, and,

1. Ibid, page 5.

2. Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council, paras. 28 and 30.

3. Ibid para. 29.

most important of all, make the teachers' associations the official channels of communication between the Council and teachers."¹ Clearly, the Association was very concerned by the fact that the present method of election gave the smaller association little chance to gain representation on the Council. The Secretary of State, however, was not prepared to accept these views or make changes in the method of election.

Whilst it was generally accepted that the Secretary of State must have the final decision on proposals regarding teacher training, there was criticism about the procedure to be adopted in the event of a disagreement between the Council and Secretary of State which did not meet the recommendations of the Wheatley Committee. It was still felt by many bodies that in event of a disagreement as a result of which the Secretary of State proposed to make regulations otherwise than in consequence of a relevant recommendation from the Council, the Secretary of State should use the affirmative procedure. The Secretary of State, however, still believed that his objections to the "affirmative procedure" which he put forward in 1965 were still valid.² Consequently, he felt that he could not accept alterations in the present procedure.³

Registration also had given rise to difficulties. Some teachers had been reluctant to register either because they were dissatisfied with the constitution of the Council, or because they disliked the requirement to register and pay a fee when in fact they possessed a certificate of competency to teach. Some authorities found it hard to adjust themselves to annual registration, being used to certification as the mark of the qualified teacher, and were reluctant to require proof of registration

1. Ibid para. 29, and pages 26 - 27 :- Scottish Schoolmasters Association's "Observations".
2. For these objections see paras. 19 and 20 Ibid.
3. Ibid para. 33.

from teachers. Furthermore, some teachers deliberately neglected to register knowing that education authorities were not likely to take immediate steps to dismiss, thus the process of registration has lengthened in some cases.^{1.} Although most bodies accepted that registration and the payment of a fee would continue on an annual basis, the Association of Lecturers in Colleges of Education suggested that this might be replaced by a "once-for-all" payment. Since the Wheatley Committee had been opposed to 'once-for-all' registration, the Secretary of State did not feel disposed to ask the General Teaching Council to consider altering the registration rules in this sense.^{2.} The Secretary of State, however, considered that there ~~were~~ grounds for looking into the suggestions that the annual fee should be deducted from teachers' salaries by the employing authorities on either a voluntary, mandatory, or compulsory basis.^{3.}

Although there was no general criticism of the disciplinary procedures, indeed as yet no teacher had been struck off the list, there was criticism that the terms set out in Schedule 2 of the 1965 Act,^{4.} that in certain circumstances, evidence inadmissible in legal proceedings in Scotland would be acceptable to the Disciplinary Committee. This was liable to prejudice the interests of an accused teacher. But the Secretary of State argued "that the rules of procedure and evidence of the Disciplinary Committee of the Council must be approved by the Lord President of the Court of Session; that the Disciplinary Committee are required to appoint a legal assessor to advise them on questions of law arising in proceedings before it and this assessor must be an advocate or solicitor of not less than 10 years' standing;

1. Ibid para. 34.

2. Ibid para. 36.

3. Ibid para. 37.

4. Teaching Council (Scotland) Act 1965, Section 10, Schedule 2, para.2, section (f).

that the decision to admit the evidence can be taken only after consultation with the legal assessor; and finally a teacher has a right to appeal to the Court of Session against the decision of the Disciplinary Council. It is also relevant that the disciplinary codes of other professions include similar provisions for the admission of evidence that would not be admitted in criminal proceedings."¹ The Secretary of State consequently took the view that the provision was justifiable to safeguard the interests of children.

It was also suggested to the Secretary of State that the Council should control the employment of unqualified persons. But since this would involve the Council establishing standards and requirements for such persons hence giving them a measure of recognition, the Secretary of State took the view that such an arrangement would be undesirable and lead to confusion.²

Finally, the Council was criticised for insufficient contact and consultation between the elected members of the Council and the teacher electorate. Whilst the Secretary of State recognised the importance of adequate consultation, he stressed that the Council must be free from outside control to discharge its functions, and that it was undesirable for the Council to be called to account for its every action. Consequently, he felt that the "freedom of action of the Council would be compromised by formalising arrangements for consultation between members of the Council and the interests they represent."³

The Review revealed that there was considerable support for the idea of a General Teaching Council for Schoolteachers among the bodies invited to submit observations, and that to some extent the criticisms of the

1. Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council para. 43.

2. Para. 45.

3. Para. 46.

Council were confined to technical problems in its functioning. There was also some evidence that the extension of the concept of a Teaching Council to the field of further and higher education would be welcomed,^{1.} although it was indicated that this in itself would create additional problems. Whilst the Secretary of State promised to tackle some of the issues raised in the Review, he could neither solve all the problems, nor satisfy all the bodies. The Scottish Schoolmasters' Association would continue to oppose that Council on the grounds that its composition failed to "achieve the best possible balance within the teacher membership,"^{2.} and the Association of Teachers Action Committees would continue to consider that the concept of a teaching council was "being distorted and devalued."^{3.} Consequently opposition to the Council would still figure prominently in teacher politics.^{4.}

1. Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council. See the observations of the Association of Lecturers in Colleges of Education and the Association of Principals of Technical Institutions, pages 40 and 41. The Robert Gordon's Institute of Technology and the Glasgow and West of Scotland College of Domestic Science, however, expressed reservations about any extension of registration (pages 39 & 40.)
2. Ibid page 26. Scottish Schoolmasters' Association.
3. See the observations of the Association of Teachers Action Committees in the Review, pages 33, 37, 41 and 45. The Association was very critical about the structure and functions of Council and proposed radical changes.
4. In his conclusions to the Review, page 22, paras 48 and 49, the Secretary of State pointed out "the success of the Council finally depends on the quality of its members and the leadership they give on the acceptance by the profession of the Council's authority as a body on which powers and duties have been conferred by Act of Parliament." Furthermore, if the Council is to succeed, it "will have to command and receive respect from the profession." It is clear, however, that even after the Review and alteration of the Constitution of the Council some sections of the profession would feel unable to "respect" the Council since it does not appear to represent their own viewpoints and interests. It might well be argued that such opposition comes from minority interests but this does not alter the fact that the opposition is felt intensely. It may well be that given the Wheatley Report on which the Council continues to be based, and the existing structure of teachers' unions and politics in Scotland, the Council will inevitably create friction in teacher politics, at least for some years to come.

The Working Party

Thus it was against this unfavourable climate of opinion to professional objectives that the Working Party began its task of formulating recommendations for the establishment of a Teaching Council. The Working Party was composed of twenty-nine members with additional members invited to attend on occasions, or serve on sub-committees.^{1.} The main body of the Working Party met six times, and was assisted by three sub-committees on finance, initial procedures, and discipline. The Working Party worked speedily and by December it was ready to make a draft copy of its report.^{2.}

The work of the Working Party was not unaccompanied by controversy. Although the Main Committee for the Teachers General Council had hoped that the teachers' organisations would maintain a united front, there was soon disagreement between them on the method of representation on the proposed Council. At a meeting on the 16th September^{3.} of the teacher members on the Working Party proposed that the teacher representation should be :- National Union of Teachers 10, National Association of Schoolmasters 3, Headmasters' Conference and Incorporated Association of Headmasters 1, Incorporated Association of Headmistresses 1, Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters 2, Incorporated Association of Assistant

-
1. For a list of the members see page ii "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" (H.M.S.O. London 1970).
 2. On December 11, 1969, Mr. Short was able to inform the Commons that the Working Party had, as a result of intensive work, reached provisional agreement on all the main issues before them and expected to consider a first draft of their report very early in the new year. (Times Educational Supplement, No.2848, 19.12.69. page 8). See Hansard Vol. 793 : 11th Dec. 1969 : Written Answers Column 162. See also reports by Anna Sproule "Blueprint for T.G.C.", Times Educational Supplement No. 2849, 26.12.69. page 3 : and Observer, 28.12.69. Barry Turner's "Teachers may get their own watchdog body". Both of these reports speculate on the content of the forthcoming Report, and the possible points of frictions.
 3. Letter from Cook to Casey 17th Sept. 1969, Ref. RJC/BGF/T.G.C.

Mistresses 2, Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions 2, National Association of Head Teachers 2, Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education 2. Apparently, however, Mr. Cook of the National Association of Head Teachers was far from satisfied with this formula. On the following day, 17th September, Cook wrote to Casey¹ of the National Association of Schoolmasters :-

"The thing that concerns me about yesterday's decision is the representation of interests. I feel that --

- a) an organisation representing heads and assistants of secondary and primary schools (men);
- b) an organisation representing heads and assistants of secondary only (men and women);
- c) an organisation representing heads only (men - women) of secondary and primary schools;

represent different but roughly equivalent groups of interest.

As such I would have thought 4 representatives per organisation, regardless of the organisation unless it was excessively small or excessively large would be reasonable. As the obvious small member of the trio, a reduction from 4 to 3 for (c) would have to be acceptable.

Would your people really accept that the interests represented by (a) are only half as important as those represented by (b) ?"

It is clear that Cook felt that his organisation was under-represented, and that his proposals were an attempt to rectify this situation. But Casey did not accept this position. In a reply to Cook's letter, Casey wrote that he could not agree with Cook on the delineation of groups. He pointed out that the "Joint 4" did not admit to being an organisation, except when it suited them, thus it would be hard to argue that their

1. Ibid.

four associations should not be represented on the Teachers' General Council. Nor did he accept that there was any material difference in the "professional" interests of teachers between heads and assistants, primary and secondary men or women, therefore he did not think that they should seek to suggest that all is not well unless these various categories should be directly represented. Furthermore, he believed that the Teachers General Council could only work if it enjoyed the confidence of all teacher organisations which meant the representation of all on the Teachers General Council. Finally, Gasey did not see how Cook could argue that the National Association of Head Teachers would be under-represented.^{1.}

The National Association of Headteachers' secretary and Casey had worked closely together on several occasions during the work of the Main Committee between 1960 and 1968, and it is evident that Cook had hoped to enlist the support of Casey. Since this support was not forthcoming, Cook apparently did not proceed with his proposals for the formula agreed at the meeting on the 16th September was eventually accepted by the Working Party.^{2.}

In September and October, a further controversy arose from the work of the Working Party. Towards the end of September, several papers carried reports on the Working Party's discussions. These disturbed the National Union of Teachers because it was felt that it might be assumed that members of the Working Party had accepted certain commitments, when in fact nothing said at the meetings bound members until they had accepted a report for transmission to the Secretary of State, and even then the report would not commit associations.

The Union's fears were realised when on October 23rd, the Times carried a report by the paper's education correspondent that the National Union of Teachers had agreed to a number of proposals concerning a teachers' general council.

1. Letter from Casey to Cook 18th Sept. 1971 ref. 1/25/GP/1
2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales (H.M.S.O. London 1970) page 24 Section 102.

The report was discussed at the Union's Executive Committee,^{1.} and it was decided to issue an official statement denying that the Union was committed to any of the statements in the Times. The statement read :-

"The N.U.T. wishes to make it clear that as yet it has agreed to no proposals, relating to a teachers' general council. Representatives of the Union are serving on a working party which is looking at all aspects of the establishment of a teachers' council, but it has been the understanding throughout that no organisation is committed to acceptance of any of the proposals formulated by the working party. It will be for each organisation to determine its attitude in the light of the working party's report."^{2.}

1. Reported in the Teacher 31.10.69. Vol. No. 18.

The subject was brought up at the Executive meeting by Mr. H.W. Vaughan (Wales) who referred to the report in the Times, stating that "almost all the obstacles to the establishment of the new Teachers' General Council have been removed," and forecasting the introduction of legislation to set it up. The report added, "If Mr. Short, Secretary of State for Education and Science and a former head teacher, can accept the conclusions of his working party he will be able to realise his dream to set up the council and to give teachers a genuine professional status comparable to that of doctors and lawyers". The report said that groups of teachers and leaders of education authorities set up to consider the questions of registration, representation and discipline for the council had reached agreement. But Mr. Vaughan pointed out to the Executive that when it had agreed to N.U.T. representation on the Working Party a number of members had asked how far the Union would be committed by its report. They had been assured that when the working party had finished its work, the report would be put before the Executive who would have the right to say 'Yea' or 'Nay'. Mr. Vaughan was concerned that the newspaper readers should not be left with a false impression. In fact, the statement was incorrect, and the N.U.T. had not even agreed to the setting up of a T.G.C. Mr. Max Morris (Extra Metropolitan) suggested that an official statement should be issued denying that the Union was committed to any of the statements in the Times. This suggestion seconded by Mr. Vaughan and approved by the Executive.

2. Teacher 31.10.69. Vol. No. 18.

The Union was so determined that its position should be clear that the "Leader" of the Teacher, October 31st, 1969, was also concerned with the topic of the Teachers' Council under the title, "A Century-old Dream". The article commented, as had the Times, on the stage of deliberations reached by the Working Party; "the pattern of their thinking is beginning to emerge. The present proposals are for a council of 40, of which 25 will be teachers, 10 of whom will be nominees of the Union. The main purposes of the Council will be to register all teachers; to make recommendations concerning the qualifications required for registration and hence for entry into the teaching profession; and to be responsible for discipline within the profession. The working party is at present engaged on the complex issue of how the council is to be financed, a matter that will not be easily resolved, for although some D.E.S. money may be available initially for a pump-priming operation, there seems to be a determination that the council, once in operation, will have to be self-financing". But the "Leader" was anxious to stress, "that the agreements so far reached within the working party are accepted by all parties concerned as being tentative. When the financial problems have been resolved, a report will be written and not until that has been done will the members of the working party be able to see the implications of their decisions as a whole. Many of their discussions are interlocking and some may even be self-cancelling. It was agreed at an early stage within the working party that no one was firmly committed to a decision until the picture could be seen as a whole. When the report has been agreed with the working party, it will be submitted to the Secretary of State, who will undertake negotiations with the various interested bodies. It will be at this stage that the associations of teachers and local authorities, together with anyone else concerned, will be required to accept or reject the proposals. This is still a long way ahead."

Two factors would seem to underlie the Union's anxiety to make its

position clear. Firstly, there was a growing element of opposition to the idea of the "Teachers' Council" within the Union's ranks, and especially among young teachers. It is clear that the Union did not want to alienate this section of its membership. Secondly, the Union had never been fully committed to the idea of a Teachers' Council on the basis as was being discussed by the Working Party. Thus the Union was anxious not to, and be seen not to, be committed to the proposals at this stage of development. The Union was soon to be faced with making a decision on the Council for in February, 1970, the awaited report appeared.

A Teaching Council for England and Wales : Report of the Working Party

The Report proposed the establishment of two bodies; a Teaching Council, and an Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers. Although the Working Party recognised that the work of the Council and Committee would be inter-related, it considered that the two functions required differently constituted bodies. The Council would be an organ of the teaching profession exercising the function of self-government thus would require a majority of teachers. But the Committee on Supply would need a broader basis of representation, with a balance between the interests of teachers, local education authorities and training interests.¹

The Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers

The function of the Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers (A.C.S.T.T.) would be "to advise the Secretary of State on policy matters referred by him connected with the supply and training of teachers for maintained schools and establishments of further education in England and Wales." But "the Body would not however be precluded from advising him

1. A Teaching Council for England and Wales (H.M.S.O. London 1970) para 9.

on its own initiative." 1.

Four models for a constitution were considered :-

- "A. Delegates of the organisations (perhaps including the Teaching Council) representing the main interests involved.
- B. Persons appointed by the Secretary of State on the nominations of the organisations, but still acting in a personal capacity.
- C. Individuals chosen by the Secretary of State for their personal qualities and experience, after consultation with the organisations.
- D. Members nominated by the Teaching Council, as spokesman for the teaching profession, and representatives of the other interests." 2.

It is known that teachers favoured B, but Sir William Alexander and Sir William Houghton favoured A, pointing out that B contained too many sectional interests. 3.

It was felt that if the Committee was to be effective, the members should be free to form personal judgements without continually referring back to their organisations, yet they must retain the confidence of their organisations. 4. These considerations ruled out models A and C. Model D was not favoured since it was not considered desirable that the Teaching Council should be the spokesman of the profession on all supply and training matters. Thus model B was chosen. This conformed to the proposals

-
1. Ibid para. 11.
 2. Ibid para. 14.
 3. Minutes of the Working Party Second Meeting, 13th August 1969, TC(69) minute 18.
 4. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid*, para. 15.

circulated by Mr. Crosland in 1965.

The Council was to consist of 29 members as follows :-

"Chairman appointed by the Secretary of State

'20 members appointed by the Secretary of State on the nominations of the following bodies :-

County Councils Association	2 members
Association of Municipal Corporations	2 members
Association of Education Committees	2 members
National Union of Teachers	2 members
The Universities	2 members
Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education	2 members
Inner London Education Authority	1 member
Welsh Joint Education Committee	1 member
The Joint Committee of the Four Secondary Associations	1 member
National Association of Head Teachers	1 member
National Association of Schoolmasters	1 member
Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions	1 member
Church of England Board of Education	1 member
Catholic Education Council	1 member

8 members appointed by the Secretary of State" ¹.

1. Ibid, para. 16.

The membership of this Committee provoked considerable discussion in the Working party. Although the basis of the constitution had been settled at the second meeting of the Working Party, the issue was raised again at the 5th Meeting TC(69) on 9th December 1969. Mr. Evans of the A.T.C.D.E. remarked that he had not been present at the second meeting, and he felt that the representation of teacher trainees was out of proportion to that proposed for the representation of other interests (at this stage, it was proposed that the A.T.C.D.E. should only have one representative). Professor Niblett pointed out that the U.C.E.T. had no representatives and suggested that four members should be appointed to represent university interests on the nomination of the Vice Chancellors and U.C.E.T. in consultation. But it was pointed out by the Chairman that the Department had an understanding with the Committee of Vice Chancellors that the latter were the appropriate body to decide who should represent the universities on national bodies. It would be open to this Committee to appoint two representatives from U.C.E.T. Moreover the Secretary of State would fill gaps in representation from his eight nominees. It was agreed, however, to raise the A.T.C.D.E. representation from 1 to 2 members (See Minutes 20 and 21).

If nominated members could not attend, alternates would be permitted.^{1.}
 The Committee would be reconstituted not less frequently than every five years, with members being eligible for re-appointment.^{2.} It was hoped that the Secretary of State would be informed of differing opinions when a unanimous view could not be reached. No organisation would be committed by any views expressed by its nominees, and the deliberations of the Committee would not replace the normal processes of consultation.^{3.}

It is clear that the Working Party was trying to rectify the faults inherent in the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. Experience with the N.A.C.T.S.T. had shown its membership was too large; that it seldom obtained a consensus of opinion on controversial issues; and that its established method of rendering its advice in published reports tended to be too slow.

The new committee was to be smaller consisting of 29 members in comparison to the 64 members who served on the Council that formulated the ninth report of the N.A.C.T.S.T. Again, it was hoped to minimise sectional interests by insisting that the members should be independent of their associations, and indeed, since the normal processes of consultation would continue it was hoped that this independence could be achieved. But even so, the extent that a member could remain independent and yet retain the confidence of his association is questionable. Thus any body that contained representatives from the associations was susceptible to sectional interests, and it must be noted that the members of the new committee would represent 14 organisations as opposed to 17 on the former N.A.C.T.S.T. 4.

1. Ibid para. 18.

2. Ibid para. 20.

3. Ibid para. 21.

4. See "The Demand for an Supply of Teachers 1963 - 1986" (H.M.S.O. London 1965).

Two further points can be made. The training institutions would certainly feel that their interests were under-represented in comparison with other interests. Secondly, whilst it is not possible to comment on the procedures of the new committee since these were still to be formulated by the Committee itself,^{1.} it is interesting to note that the Secretary of State wished to be informed of differing opinions in the Committee rather than be presented with a majority view when the Committee could not reach a unanimous decision. The consequences of such action, however, are not indicated.

The Teaching Council

As far as the "Teaching Council" was concerned, the main task of the Working Party was to work out how the proposed functions of the Council in controlling entry standards, keeping a register, exercising responsibility for professional discipline, and representing the views of the teaching profession on matters within the scope of the Council should be carried out.^{2.} The Working Party pointed out that the establishment of the Council should not replace or diminish the well-established processes by which the teachers associations expressed their views on general and administrative issues. Furthermore, the Working Party considered that the teachers associations should still continue to nominate members direct to other bodies.^{3.}

Reserve Powers of the Secretary of State

The Working Party saw two possible dangers in the establishment of a Teaching Council with unrestricted powers to control entry to the

1. "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" Ibid para. 21.

2. Ibid para. 24.

3. Ibid para. 25.

profession. Firstly, the Council might set the standards of entry too high so as to make it impossible to staff the public system. Secondly, this could interfere with the function of the Secretary of State who was responsible to Parliament for securing an efficient education service at a reasonable cost, and who had to take into consideration the broader responsibilities of the public system of education and the economy when considering educational issues.^{1.} Consequently, it was felt that whilst it was necessary to insist that only registered teachers could be employed, the Secretary of State, in the last resort, would be able to secure that the Teaching Council did not set its standards so as to exclude from registration teachers whom he considered to be needed for the effective running of the system.^{2.} Thus the Secretary of State would retain reserve powers to reject or modify recommendations of the Teaching Council in part

1. Ibid para. 31.

2. Ibid para. 32.

In a letter to the Working Party dated 26th July, 1969, Mr. Cammish, of the National Association of Head Teachers, pointed out :- "Unless only registered teachers are employable and unless the General Teaching Council has the power freely to determine standards of qualifications necessary for registration, then it has no real power." He went on, "the Secretary of State's reserve power must be such as to make a General Teaching Council aware of the dire consequences of any misuse of its power (and equally, use of the reserve powers should be an embarrassment to the Secretary of State if failure to ensure an adequate supply of teachers could be laid at his door)." But Cammish considered the reserve power must not be such as to enable "the Secretary of State to prohibit misuse of power by a General Teaching Council. "(Clearly a situation unacceptable to the Secretary of State). Thus Cammish proposed :-

- (1) The Secretary of State to have the power to rule that teacher supply is so imperilled that a state of emergency exists.
- (2) In the state of emergency the Secretary of State to have power.
 - a) to require the General Teaching Council to grant provisional registration to specified persons whose qualifications did not meet the General Teaching Council's regulations
 - b) to empower the L.E.A.s exceptionally to employ persons so registered.
- (3) Such period of a state of emergency to be of one year duration unless extended by a decision of Parliament."

or whole. But the Working Party stressed that the Teaching Council's recommendations about qualifications for entry to the profession, or to training, should be accepted unless there were overwhelming reasons to the contrary.^{1.}

The A.C.S.T.T. was also to be a further check on the policy decisions of the Council in this sphere. As a first step to implementing the Council's recommendations, the A.C.S.T.T. would be given an opportunity to express its views on those aspects which were relevant to its own field of interest. In some instances this would result in discussion, reconsideration and reconciliation before decisions could be reached.^{2.}

Where agreement was reached between the three parties, the Secretary of State would give effect to the recommendations by making and laying before Parliament a statutory instrument which would be subject to the negative resolution procedure.^{3.} In cases where the Secretary of State decided to give effect to a recommendation of the Council only in part, or subject to modification, or not to give effect to it at all, it was felt that the Secretary of State should publish, and inform Parliament, of his reasons for departing from the Council's recommendations. If an amendment of regulations were at issue, he would need to make and lay a statutory instrument before Parliament and which would be subject to the negative resolution procedure, and where he rejected a recommendation, he would still be obliged to publish, and inform Parliament.^{4.}

The possibility that where the Teaching Council and A.C.S.T.T. were in agreement with a recommendation the Secretary of State should be left with

1. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, para. 35.

2. Ibid para. 35.

3. Ibid para. 36.

4. Ibid para. 37.

no reserve powers was considered. But it was felt that it would be unreasonable to expect the government to abdicate its ultimate responsibilities in this way.^{1.}

In the case where the Secretary of State might himself wish to indicate a change in policy involving a modification or revision of existing regulations despite opposition from both, or either, the A.C.S.T.T. and Teaching Council, it was proposed that the Secretary of State's statutory instrument should be subject to the affirmative resolution procedure.^{2.}

It is interesting to compare the Working Party's position on the use of the "affirmative resolution procedure" with that of the Wheatley Committee.^{3.} The latter considered that where the Secretary of State for Scotland "finds himself unable, for reasons of Government policy or otherwise, to accept and act upon a recommendation of the Council or wishes to initiate any matter - were such ever to arise - where the Council declined to make any recommendation to meet a problem posed by him, we recommend that, in the event of disagreement between the Council and the Secretary of State, the latter should proceed by Regulations subject to the affirmative resolution procedure."^{4.} But this recommendation did not appear in the Teaching Council (Scotland) Act 1965 since :-

"The Committee's recommendations in this regard had represented an innovation in the field of relationships between professional bodies and

1. Ibid para. 38.
This suggestion was made by Mr. E. Britton at the second meeting of the Working Party, 13th August 1969, TC(69) minute 5. But Sir William Alexander thought that the Secretary of State must always have reserve powers, and particularly so if teachers were to have a majority on both councils (Minute 7).
2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, para. 39.
3. The Teaching Profession in Scotland : Cmd. 2066 (H.M.S.O. Edinburgh : reprint 1966).
4. Ibid para. 104.

the Government. Moreover, the subject - teacher training - on which regulations would fall to be made did not fit into any of the categories in respect of which it is customary to use the affirmative resolution procedure, for example, alteration or definition of the extent of a statute or the levying, application or management of public money. There was a further difficulty : the adoption of the Committee's recommendation would have made the procedure of Parliament in relation to teacher training regulations dependent on the decision of an outside body, namely the Council.^{1.}

When the review of the constitution and functions of the Scottish Teaching Council took place in 1969, the Secretary of State for Scotland maintained that these objections to the adoption of the "affirmative resolution procedure" were still cogent.^{2.}

The Working Party's proposals for the use of the "affirmative resolution procedure" were more modest than those proposed by the Wheatley Committee.^{3.} Nevertheless, it is surprising that the Working Party expected such proposals to be acceptable in the case of the English Council, when they were unacceptable in the case of the Scottish Council. Indeed, the arguments against the adoption of the "affirmative resolution procedure" were just as applicable in the case of the English as in the Scottish Council. One suspects that the Working Party anticipated a rejection of this proposal when they added ~~they~~ "are not experts on the procedure of Parliament" and hoped "to be absolved from the charge" that they were "seeking to dictate ^{to} it."^{4.}

1. Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council (H.M.S.O. Edinburgh : 1969) para.19.
2. Ibid para. 33.
3. The Working Party's proposals only extended to cases where the Secretary of State wished to initiate changes in policy in the face of opposition from either, or both, the A.C.S.T.T. and the Teaching Council.
4. "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" Ibid para. 39.

The Constitution of the Council

The Working Party suggested that the Council should be known as : "The Teaching Council for England and Wales". "Teaching" was preferred to "Teachers" since this conformed more closely with the names of most of the corresponding bodies in other professions and because its membership would include others than teachers. The word "General" was excluded to lessen the risk of confusion with the General Teaching Council for Scotland.^{1.}

The Council was to consist of 40 members appointed by the Secretary of State, of whom 25 would be nominated by the main teachers associations as follows :-

"National Union of Teachers	10
National Association of Schoolmasters	3
Headmasters' Conference and Incorporated Association of Headmasters (joint nomination)	1
Incorporated Association of Headmistresses	1
Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters	2
Incorporated Association of Assistant Mistresses	2
Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions	2
National Association of Head Teachers	2
Association of Teachers in Colleges of Departments of Education	2
15 members appointed by the Secretary of State." ^{2.}	

Thus teacher members were to be in a majority, as in Scotland, although it might be argued that the representation of training institutions

1. Other names considered were :- "Teachers' General Council", "Teachers' Council", and "Teachers Registration Council". (TC(U) 5th Meeting of the Working Party 9.12.64., minute 3).
2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales : Ibid para 102.

and interests was inadequate. The nomination of teacher members by the main teachers' associations was clearly aimed at avoiding some of the dissatisfaction in Scotland over the method of direct election to the Scottish Council.¹ The Working Party argued that appointment by nomination was more convenient; would ensure a reasonable balance in teacher interests; be cheaper; and be no less democratic than direct election.²

The Working Party pointed out that whilst the members of the Teaching Council "should speak with knowledge of the policies of the bodies by whom they were appointed, they should not regard themselves as delegates or as representatives".³ The position of the member of the Teaching Council was thus to be comparable to Edmund Burke's conception of a Member of Parliament.⁴ But it is difficult to ascertain to what extent the members could remain independent yet retain the confidence of their associations, particularly since the associations represented different interests and were, de facto, pressure groups. The "independent" position of non-serving teacher members who would be officers of the associations would be even more tenuous.

It was proposed that the Council should appoint its own chairman from its own members, and regulate its own procedure. The Secretary of State, however, would have the power by Order to make alterations in the

-
1. See "Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching Council" (H.M.S.O. Edinburgh; 1969), especially pages 15 and 26. It should be noted that Mr. Short had expressed regret that representation should be based on teachers' unions, but he accepted that this was the most practical way (Speech at Bede College, Durham, 21.2.69).
 2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid.* paragraphs 101 and 103.
 3. *Ibid.*, paragraph 105.
 4. See "Some Problems of the Constitution", G. Marshall and G. Moodie (H.U.L., 2nd Edition, 1961), page 143.

Council's constitution, either on recommendation by the Council itself, or, after prior consultation with the Council, on his own initiative. But no change could be made which reduced the proportion of members nominated by the teachers' associations unless agreed by the Council. ^{1.}

The Working Party proposed that the functions and constitution of the Council should be reviewed after three years of operation by a Working Party constituted similarly to the existing Working Party. ^{2.} The Council would normally be reconstituted every five years, although any member's appointment would be terminated on resignation or if he ceased to be an officer or member of the body by which he was nominated. ^{3.}

Control Over Entry to the Profession.

The Council's function of controlling the entry standards to the profession would involve the Council in the determination of conditions for entry to training; matters concerning courses of training; regulations for qualification and registration; and conditions for probation.

The Working Party proposed that the Secretary of State should, subject to his reserve powers, give effect to recommendations of the Teaching Council on conditions of entry to training. The training institutions would remain responsible for choosing between qualified candidates, and the area training organisations would remain responsible for approving exceptional admissions, and admissions to shortened courses. It was felt, however, that the Teaching Council should try to secure

-
1. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid.*, paragraph 107.
 2. *Ibid.*, paragraph 109.
 3. *Ibid.*, paragraph 104.

uniformity of policies and practices of area training organisations.^{1.}

The control of the availability, content and standard of courses in the training institutions by academic boards, governing bodies, area training organisations and the Secretary of State would remain unchanged. But the Teaching Council would have the power to make recommendations, either general or particular, on these matters to the appropriate bodies, which would be required to have regard to them in the exercise of their functions and to report back what action, if any, they proposed to take to give effect to them.^{2.}

Only registered teachers would be permitted by law to teach in a fully professional capacity in maintained schools, and the Council would accept for registration any person recommended by an area training organisation as having satisfactorily completed training.^{3.} Officers of the Department would continue to handle on behalf of the Teaching Council and within the Council's policy recommendations, the case work arising on admission to the register of persons with qualifications other than the normal ones. Qualified teachers not in maintained schools, and those eligible to become qualified, would be able to register voluntarily.^{4.} The various categories of persons without qualified teacher status employed in capacities permitted under regulations in force at the time would continue, but such new regulations would permit their employment in terms of their being unregistered teachers.^{5.}

1. Ibid. paragraphs 40 and 41.

2. Ibid, paragraph 42. It should be noted that the report does not make any provision for the procedure to be adopted should a dispute arise between the academic boards, governing bodies, and area training organisations with the Teaching Council over the Council's recommendations.

3. Ibid., paragraphs 45 and 46.

4. Ibid., paragraph 45.

5. Ibid., paragraph 45.

The above proposals were in line with the Government's proposals to phase out unqualified teachers and introduce a training requirement for graduates.¹ In addition they avoided any hardship that would have beset any unqualified teacher if the ~~more~~ proposals had demanded the immediate exclusion of all unregistered teachers.

Since probation is regarded as the last stage of entry to the teaching profession, the Working Party considered that the Teaching Council should exercise policy responsibilities in relation to the conduct of probation similar to those recommended to be exercised in relation to training and qualification. Although the probationary teacher would be continued to be treated as fully fledged in respect of conditions of employment and service, pay and superannuation, it was felt that only after he had satisfactorily completed his probation could he be regarded as a fully registered teacher. Thus it was suggested that the Teaching Council should establish two grades of registration: grade 1 for teachers who have not yet satisfactorily completed probation and grade 2 for those who have. Furthermore, since the system of probation existed only in maintained schools, voluntary registrants in other sectors would be registered only in grade 1, unless they could show that they had satisfactorily completed probation in a maintained school. It was proposed, however, that the Teaching Council should seek to extend the system of probation to cover service in the direct grant and independent schools.²

1. See Statutory Instruments 1968, No.1281. The Schools (Amendment) Regulations 1968; Circular 15/68; and The Schools (Qualified Teachers) Regulations 1969.

2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales; paragraphs 49-52.

It was felt that the existing procedures for probation as set out in the Department's administrative memorandum 10/68 should continue, although borderline cases should be referred for final decision to the Teaching Council. ^{1.}

Because some teachers would already be serving their probationary period, and be at various stages in this period when the Council was established, the Working Party recommended that no attempt should be made for the first two years or so, to record probationers already in service separately from those who had passed their probation. But existing teachers not in maintained schools on the appointed day who wished to register would go into grade 1, unless they could produce evidence of satisfactory completion of probation as well as of eligibility for qualified teacher status. ^{2.}

The proposals for greater participation by the profession in policy decisions on the probationary year were important. Both the teachers' associations and the Colleges of Education had expressed disquiet about the lack of uniformity in standards to be applied before a teacher could be passed, and at the kinds of supervision given to the probationers. ^{3.}

Eligibility for Registration and the Process of Registration.

On registration, the Working Party recommended that only qualified

1. Ibid., paragraph 53.
2. Ibid., paragraphs 55 and 56.
3. For comments and criticisms on the probationary year see: "Teachers in their first posts. The Probationary Year", (a document published jointly by the N.U.T. and A.T.C.D.E., 1961) For a fuller discussion and analysis of the problems involved, see "Students into Teachers" by Mildred Collins (Students Library of Education : RKP 1969) For recent criticisms, by a former chief inspector for schools in the West Riding, see "Young Teachers on Trial", by W. J. Craddock. (Education, 28th August, 1970, Vol. 136, No.9, page 171).

teachers (in the technical sense) should be eligible for registration, and student teachers, instructors, uncertificated and supplementary teachers should be excluded. This conclusion was only reached after considerable discussion. Some members of the Working Party had wanted some form of subordinate registration for ex-uncertificated and supplementary teachers, who may in time achieve qualified status after 20 years, but who had normal security of employment meanwhile. This would incorporate limiting conditions such as duration of employment in the case of student teachers, a restriction by type of scholar in the case of nursery assistants, and restriction of subject taught in the case of instructors. It was argued that if all persons engaged in teaching in schools were subject to registration, a Teaching Council would be well placed to control and improve standards of staffing, to effect improvements in these standards, and generally to enhance the standing of the profession. But the Working Party felt that it was not necessary to accept the premise that all engaged in teaching, including those who were not qualified should be registered with the Council, and the fear of loss of control over the profession could be over-stressed. Furthermore, it was pointed out that there were other ways in which the Council could control standards without having an all embracing register. It would, in practice, be open to the council to make recommendations on the standards of non-registered teachers, and to apply any necessary pressures. ¹.

The Working Party considered that the practice of a professional body publishing a register available for public inspection was ceasing to be regarded as an essential outward and visible sign of professional self-government. ². It was felt that registration was not primarily a piece of machinery, but a means to an important end, "to facilitate the

1. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid.*, paragraph 28.

2. *Ibid.*, paragraph 58.

the establishment and financing of a Teaching Council as the body established by statute to control entry to the profession and the professional discipline of its members".^{1.} In any case, a teachers' register would be very large, expensive to keep up to date, and few members of the general public were likely to use it.^{2.}

It was also felt that the secondary function of a register, as a means of communication between the Council and its members, was also inapplicable to the Teaching Council, because fees would be collected by the L.E.A.s, its reports would be published and made available to teachers through means other than individual correspondence, and there would be no election of members.^{3.}

In the light of the above considerations it was recommended that the Teachers' register should be as simple, cheap and efficient as possible. Thus the Working Party proposed that the Teaching Council should not be required to publish a register or to maintain a list of addresses of registered teachers, but information related to the registration of teachers should be kept as part of the Department's Main Mechanised Record of Teachers.^{4.} It was proposed, however, that there should be public access to this information.^{5.}

As regards to process of registration, it was suggested that since local education authorities often had to appoint teachers on a provisional basis (e.g. teachers leaving training colleges) before being satisfied that they were eligible to be qualified teachers, the proposed legislation

1. Ibid., paragraph 60.

2. Ibid., paragraph 58.

3. Ibid., paragraphs 57 and 59.

4. Ibid., paragraph 63.

5. Ibid., paragraph 66.

which restricted employment to registered teachers should be so framed as to allow, on a provisional basis and subject to proper safeguards, the employment of teachers whose registration was pending. Initially, the register would have two grades, grade 1 for probationers, and grade 2 for those who had completed their probation. Teachers in service at the time of the Council's inception would be registered automatically and their fees paid by the L.E.A.s out of their salaries.^{1.}

New teachers, however, would be required to take a positive step to secure registration. The Department would send to each newly qualified teacher, a letter and a form on which to apply for registration which would have to be returned to the Teaching Council.^{2.} Fees would be collected by the L.E.A.s, but if a teacher left his post before completing the payment of the fee, the teacher would no longer be regarded as registered. Non-registered teachers returning to teaching would be subject to the same procedures.^{3.}

All qualified teachers would have to register, and there would be no exemptions allowed on grounds of conscience or other principles. Teachers would have the right, however, to require their names to be removed from the register.^{4.}

Whilst it could be argued that the proposals that work in connection with registration should be undertaken by the Department of Education and Science through the Main Mechanised Record would be damaging to the prestige of the Council, when the special circumstances of the size, and nature of entry and egress to the profession are considered,

1. Ibid., paragraphs 64, 67 and 73.

2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid.*, paragraph 71.

3. Ibid., paragraphs 73 and 72.

4. Ibid., paragraphs 76 and 71

the Working Party's proposals were both practical and sensible. If the Council were to be established, there would be some 370,000 full-time and part-time teachers in maintained schools to be registered, in addition to the 60,000 teachers entering or re-entering the profession each year.

Again, should the teaching profession consider it desirable to establish a Council requiring the compulsory membership of all qualified teachers, the suggestion that teachers should be required "to take a positive step to register" is apt for two reasons. Firstly, it is consistent with the liberty of the individual, though if he decides not to register with the council he must accept the restrictions on his employment. The second is that it would impress upon the teacher the existence of the Council and the consequences of his registration with it. It is true that compulsory registration would create a distinction between those teachers who were "eligible to register", but who did not do so on grounds of conscience, and those who were registered. But this would be in the hands of the individual teacher since anyone who was eligible to register and not debarred for reasons of misconduct would have the right to become registered with the council (the teaching council would have a duty to register anyone who was eligible for registration and who had applied to be registered).

Disciplinary Procedures.

In accepting that the existing disciplinary powers^{1.} should be transferred from the Secretary of State to the Teaching Council, the Working Party pointed out that existing procedures worked well and those adopted by the Council should emanate out of these procedures. The Council would need to provide a review procedure under which a teacher

1. See paragraph 5 of the 2nd schedule to the Schools regulations 1959 (S.I. 1959 No.364) and para. 5 of the Schools(Amended) Regulations 1968. (S.I. 1968, No. 1281)

might apply for re-admission to the register after a period of time. Provision would also have to be made to enable teachers struck off the register to appeal to the High Court or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. ¹.

The Working Party, closely followed the provisions of the Teaching Council (Scotland) Act 1965, in proposing that the Teaching Council should set up two committees from its own members:

" a Professional Conduct Committee to which should be delegated the disciplinary function; and
a Complaints Committee which should facilitate the work of the Professional Conduct Committee by determining whether there was prima facie evidence that a case should be considered by the Professional Conduct Committee". ².

The Committees should have no members in common. The Professional Conduct Committee would include members nominated by the associations and members appointed directly by the Secretary of State, but paid officials of the teachers' associations should be excluded from either committee. ³. This was necessary since such officials might be required to represent teachers accused of misconduct. Thus it was inappropriate that in one instance they might be acting as a client's representative, and in another as a member of a judicial body.

The Professional Conduct Committee's powers would be restricted to warning offenders or removing their names from the register. Its

1. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid.*, paragraph 82.
2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid.*, paragraph 83.
3. *Ibid.*, paragraph 84.

decisions would be binding on the Teaching Council, subject to the teacher's right of appeal. The proceedings of the Complaints Committee and the Professional Conduct Committee would be held in private, although teachers could elect for the proceedings of the latter to be held in public. ^{1.}

The Council's procedural rules would be subject to approval by the Privy Council, and be published. ^{2.}

It was hoped that should the Council decide to continue the practice of requesting medical reports in certain cases of misconduct, that the Department's medical adviser would assist. Eventually, the Council would appoint its own adviser. ^{3.}

The Working Party stressed that continuity between the old and the new procedures was important, and suggested that the Department might second a senior official with experience in the field of misconduct cases to help the Council. But continuity was important for another reason. Whilst all teachers registered with the Council (regardless of the sector of education they taught in) would be subject to its disciplinary procedures, some teachers in further education, colleges of education, direct grant and independent schools would not be registered with the Council, thus the Secretary of State would still be responsible for their discipline. This would lead to three possible cases of overlapping jurisdiction:-

"Case A. Where the Secretary of State had jurisdiction over persons who were not eligible for registration (e.g. students and student teachers) but who might subsequently apply to the Teaching Council for registration.

1. Ibid., paragraph 85.

2. Ibid., paragraph 86.

3. Ibid., paragraph 89.

Case B. Where the Secretary of State and the Teaching Council exercised jurisdiction respectively over unregistered and voluntarily registered persons in the same institution.

Case C. Where the Secretary of State had to consider what action to take on the subsequent employment in an institution where teachers were not required to be registered persons excluded from the register by the Teaching Council." ^{1.}

In case A and case B, the Teaching Council and Secretary of State would have to try to ensure similar results in the case of registered and non-registered. There would need to be the closest possible change of information, and in particular the Secretary of State would need to inform the Teaching Council of complaints of misconduct on the part of a registered teacher which were brought to his notice, and vice versa. ^{2.}

In case C the question of partial exclusion is raised. The Working Party, however, was prepared to accept that the removal by the Teaching Council of a person's name from the register because of misconduct in a school need not automatically lead to his exclusion from employment from a college where he would be subject to the Secretary of State's jurisdiction. ^{3.}

The position of the independent schools complicated the issue. It was possible for a teacher excluded from state schools to obtain a post in independent schools, although he might become the subject of a complaint by the Secretary of State under Part III of the Education Act 1944. This would remain the case in the future in the case of a teacher removed from the Teaching Council's register. A case might arise in which the Independent Schools Tribunal questioned the decision of the Teaching Council.

1. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid* paras. 90, 91, and 92.
2. *Ibid* para. 93.
3. *Ibid* para. 94.

Although the Tribunal would be unable to pronounce on the re-instatement of the teacher on the register, it could express a view as to whether exclusion from the register was a proper reason for claiming that he was not a proper person to teach in any school. The Working Party considered that such a situation was unlikely to happen since a teacher would have the right to appeal to the Privy Council, and should the Privy Council support the Teaching Council, then the Independent Schools Tribunal would be likely to accept the Privy Council's decision.^{1.}

In the case of teachers excluded before the establishment of the Council, the Working Party suggested that the Teaching Council should accept the decision of the Secretary of State or Independent Schools Tribunal, and any conditions which had been laid down about the timing of a review of the case.^{2.}

Financing the Council

The Working Party estimated that the cost of the Teaching Council would be £200,000 in its first year and £150,000 p.a. thereafter. The main source of income would be registration fees. These would be collected by the local education authorities by deduction from salary. This would be a less costly method than if the Council had to collect the fees itself. Moreover, it would avoid some of the difficulties that had arisen in Scotland over the with-holding of the fee by individual teachers.^{3.}

Whilst the Working Party recognised that it was arguable that such compulsory deduction was an encroachment on the liberty of the teacher, they argued that the basic encroachment lay in the obligation to register which they accepted as reasonable.^{4.}

1. Ibid para. 95 and 96.

2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid* para. 97.

3. *Ibid* paras. 113, 114 and 115.

4. *Ibid* para. 74.

The Working Party considered that a small once-for-all fee was preferable to an annual or other recurrent fee. A once-for-all fee of £2 from every teacher was considered to be sufficient to cover the Council's cost. This would be payable by existing teachers as well as those entering the profession. The Working Party had discussed whether existing teachers ought to be exempt from payment of the fee, especially in view of the difficulties of dismissals that had arisen in Scotland. However, it was argued that if the great majority of teachers were to be exempt from the payment of a fee, it would be inferred that the profession as a whole was lukewarm in its support of the idea of a Council; that it was inequitable to ask young entrants to bear the whole cost of a Council which was designed to improve the status of the profession as a whole; that the government could hardly be expected to make a subvention which would appear to be needed to make good the loss of fee income from existing teachers; and that by charging a fee to existing teachers the Council would start its operations with a substantial capital sum behind it. Moreover, it was not right to think in terms of dismissals because since the fee was to be deducted compulsorily the choice for the existing teacher was not whether he should pay the fee but whether he should register, and the whole basis of the proposal was that if a teacher did not wish to register he could not be employed.¹

The Working Party also considered whether the fee charged to existing teachers already in a post in maintained schools should be the same as, or smaller than that required from new entrants to the profession. It was accepted that existing teachers on average would not gain benefit from the council for as long as new teachers and they would be asked to pay a fee to continue in a profession they had already entered. But

1. TC(69) 5th Meeting of the Working Party 9.12.69. Minutes 14 and 15.

against these arguments it was pointed out that existing teachers were asking for the Council to be set up; existing teachers were better able to pay the fee than were young teachers; and if the fee was at a flat rate, the fee would be smaller for all teachers and less difficult to collect.^{1.} Thus the Working Party proposed a flat-rate fee for all teachers.

The establishment of a Teaching Council was seen by the Working Party as a co-operative venture involving local and central government as well as the professions. Thus the Working Party recommended that :-

- "a. local education authorities should agree to waive charges for the compulsory collection of the Teaching Council's fees.
- b. the government should make available a pump-priming loan to enable the Teaching Council to start its operations; and
- c. the government should accept the obligation to make a continuing subvention to the Teaching Council related to the cost of the work^{of} which it would be relieved by the Council."^{2.}

In proposing b. and c. the Working Party was following the precedent that had been set in Scotland.^{3.}

Conclusion.

The proposals contained in the Report were not intended to be the final formula for a Council, although the Report did establish certain principles, and it is clear that Mr. Short considered the recommendations to be "a sensible and practicable model for the establishment of a

1. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid* para. 119 : and TC(69) 5th Meeting of the Working Party 9.12.69. Minute 16.
2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales, *ibid*, para. 131.
3. *Ibid*, para. 130.

Teaching Council."¹ Discussion on the document was not precluded, nor were the teachers' associations committed to the report. Indeed, the teachers' associations together with the local authority associations were invited to let Mr. Short have their comments on the report.²

The Report revealed, however, the complicated problems involved in establishing a Teaching Council. There was the problem of devising administrative machinery that would enable the Secretary of State to retain a reserve power, and yet give teachers the feeling that they had a substantial measure of control over entry into the profession. Furthermore, this teachers' control had to be exercised without infringing the sovereignty of Parliament. Then there were the problems of representation, finance and establishing a register for so large a profession. The extent to which the Report had solved these problems to the satisfaction of the interested parties was to be revealed during the next eighteen months.

1. Ibid, Foreword, page iii.

2. Ibid.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE ATTITUDES OF THE TEACHERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND THE
AUTHORITIES TO THE REPORT, "A TEACHING COUNCIL FOR
ENGLAND AND WALES"

The Report, "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" was approved by the Working Party in January 1970 and then submitted to the Secretary of State. Mr. Short found the recommendations "sensible and practicable", and "invited the teachers' associations, and also the local authority associations" to let him have their views.^{1.}

Although the report was not available to the public until early March, criticisms of the report began appearing in the press as early as January following an accurate summary of the Working Party's main recommendations in the Times Educational Supplement of January 23rd 1970.^{2.}

The proposed constitution of the Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers was the subject of criticism from the teacher-training interests. Whilst it was accepted that a new body on training and supply was essential, the teacher-training interests considered that they should have a far larger representation on such a body than that offered on the A.C.S.T.T. Dr. W.D. Wall, Dean of the University of London, Institute of Education, wrote to the Times Educational Supplement, that among the 29 members of the A.C.S.T.T. "all but four will have no day-to-day concern with or experience of teacher-training. The numerically

1. A Teaching Council for England and Wales (H.M.S.O. London 1970) Foreword, page iii.
2. Times Educational Supplement 23.1.70. No. 2853 page 6.

predominant group seems likely to be representatives of the local authority associations."¹ Dr. Wall wanted an independent advisory group made up of people not nominated by the interested parties. He considered that it was not possible for people to be nominated by bodies and then be independent.²

Professor Ross of the University of Lancaster was also in agreement with the need for substantial representation from the A.T.O.s.³ Alex Evans of the A.T.C.D.E. was also critical of the large representation of local education authorities in proportion to that of the profession. He pointed out that "the teachers are no less concerned that there should be an adequate supply of well-qualified entrants." He added that, "supply problems must always have a direct impact on the Institutes and on the organisation of the colleges." Consequently, "the people most directly concerned are the teachers and the people actually doing the job in the Institutes and Colleges. But the teachers are to be outnumbered by ten to six members. The trainers, directly and professionally involved in the second largest sector in higher education are to have only two representatives and none from the Institutes of education. This is an insult to teacher-training and therefore to the teaching profession. It is the authorities who control and tighten the financial strings around the colleges through the obsolete pooling system. They are now to have the major voice of a national body advising on the training of teachers. If this is to go through, then it will be a set-back to teaching as a profession. What other profession would tolerate an Advisory Committee on its training in which the practitioners had only six representatives

1. Times Educational Supplement 6.2.70. No. 2855 page 16.

2. The Teacher, 13.2.70. page 2.

3. Ibid.

out of 29, one of the most important elements had only two, and another had none at all?"¹.

The proposals for the A.C.S.T.T. did not satisfy Professor Pedley's criteria for a training and supply body. He feared that the new council would be little more than a "reshuffle of the old elements". He suggested that there was an alternative available "which would ensure equal representation of the main interested groups with freedom from political manoeuvring and much closer contact with grass-roots feeling and ideas in the regions." This, he maintained, could be achieved by using the 20 area training organisations into which England and Wales was divided. He pointed out that "each a.t.o. is responsible for

1. The Teacher, February 13, 1970. page 3.

See also report in The Teacher May 1, 1970. Mr. Alex Evans is reported to have complained to the Parliamentary Select Committee in teacher education that the working party had arrived at its recommendations for representation on the proposed National Advisory Council for the Supply and Training of Teachers not altogether democratically. Clearly, Mr. Evans was referring to the proceedings of the Working Party at its second and fifth meetings. Mr. Evans had been absent at the second meeting, and brought the matter up at the fifth meeting of the Working Party when he managed to secure an increase in A.T.C.D.E. representation, from 1 to 2 members on the A.C.S.T.T. During the meeting the following points were made :

- "a) it had been previously accepted that it was of paramount importance that the advisory body should be small;
- b) all bodies represented had accepted limited representation to achieve this;
- c) the proposed membership gave a reasonable balance among the major interests of teachers, trainers and employers." (See T.C. 69 Minutes of 5th Meeting 9.12.69., minutes 20 and 21.)

Mr. Evans and Professor Niblett might have been disappointed by the representation allotted to the training interests, and their disappointment was probably justified; but they were signatories to the Report and do not appear to have asked for a note of dissent to be added to the Report on this issue. Consequently, when Mr. Toby Weaver gave evidence to the Committee he could claim that "the report represented the unanimous view of the committee." But as he pointed out : this did not mean any association was bound to agree to what any of its members serving on that committee had assented to.

supervising and co-ordinating all teacher training in its area, and each has a governing body on which are represented the four main groups (other than D.E.S. itself) involved in teacher training : l.e.a.s., teachers, colleges of education, and university. At this level there is no factional strife between unions or associations." Thus, Pedley suggested that "each a.t.o. should elect from its membership one person in each of these four categories, and that these 80 members should (together with certain additional members nominated by the Secretary of State from within the D.E.S. and outside) form a standing conference which would meet once a year to consider the broad lines of policy. From the 80 elected members from the regions, the Secretary of State could select 20 as the nucleus of an advisory council, in such a way as to ensure that each a.t.o. had one representative and that five members were drawn from each of the groups : l.e.a.s., teachers, colleges, and universities. He could also nominate say 10 additional members, of whom up to five might be drawn from the D.E.S. itself, and five others might be people who, though not elected by an a.t.o. were considered likely to make specially valuable contributions."¹

On the other hand, Sir William Alexander, commented "The constitution was agreed by the working party and has my full support."²

The Teaching Council, also came in for some severe criticism. The Teachers' World considered the Report to be a "Cut-price charter".³ It believed that what emerged from the working party's proposals was something very different from the "idyll of self-government" which had been promised ever since the Teaching Council was proposed thirteen years ago. It seemed,

1. Times Educational Supplement, No. 2846, 5.12.69. page 2.
2. The Teacher, 13.2.70., page 2.
3. Teachers World 13.3.70., No. 3148, page 3.

to the Teachers' World, "that too many aspects of the setting-up and running of the Council have been sacrificed to convenience", and that throughout the report ran a "this is the best we can do" feeling.

Clearly, the Teachers' World did not like the thought of the Department handling the case-work arising on admission to the register and the use of the Department Main Mechanised Register.

The report went on, "Some teachers may think that the working party's approach to the register - a problem which, as has been demonstrated in Scotland is central to the whole Teaching Council - is to say the least, woolley. It is hardly helpful to the image of a self-governing profession to find that the self-governing body, in order to find out who are its subjects, is going to have to look over the shoulders of their ultimate employers." Furthermore, the Teachers' World complained that since the local authorities were to collect the fees, it would mean that teachers would have "a self-governing institution which is dependent upon both its employers - on one for the provision of its revenue, and the other for the maintenance of its records."

The Teachers' World was prepared to concede that the cost to the individual teacher was low. It was also pleased that cases of professional discipline would be examined by the Council, but it disapproved of the ideas that the Council should seek to preserve continuity of the Department's disciplinary policy, and should request the secondment of a "disciplinarian" from the Department "to get the Council's system going".

Nor did the Teachers' World see any hope that the Council would "inject some new ideas into the profession at the training end." Furthermore, since the members of the Council would be nominated, not elected, the teachers without an association would have no representative. The Teachers' World concluded that "Two pounds don't go far these days, and the working party's proposals don't go anything like far enough."

The National Union of Teachers and the Report

The Report received a mixed reception among the membership of the National Union of Teachers. Before the Report had been published, the politically motivated members had been forming pressure groups on the issue of the "Teaching Council". This was reflected in three motions submitted for the 1970 Annual Conference :-

"120. Conference reiterates the desire of teachers to become a self-governing profession and instructs the Executive to form a working party of the Union to investigate and prepare a report upon the problems of the Teachers' General Council becoming such a governing body, paying special attention to the amount of time spent by serving members of the profession, and the cost of administration related to the individual member. - E. Derbyshire, Liverpool."

"121. Conference rejects the attempt of the Department of Education and Science to form a General Teachers' Council and instructs the Executive to cease negotiations - Hackney : N.London."

"122. Conference instructs the Executive as a matter of great urgency, to seek the co-operation of all teaching bodies in the formation of a Teachers' Council which will fully establish the professional standards of teachers. It further instructs the Executive to report to the next Annual Conference the steps taken and the progress made in achieving this aim - Hailsham."¹

Thus it appeared that two major groups were forming in the Union's membership. One group supported the idea of a Teaching Council, and the other (supported by the Young Teachers' section) opposed to any form of Professional Council.

1. Supplement to The Teacher, January 9, 1970. Motions for N.U.T. Conference. Page 6.

The former group took the viewpoint that a Teaching Council would increase the status of the profession, raise the standard of entry to the profession, and raise the standards of teaching.^{1.} The latter group believed that "status" was not as important as a decent standard of living, and militancy was the only way in which this could be achieved.^{2.}

When it became known that the Report on the Teaching Council would be published in March 1970, the N.U.T. Officers and Executive members were quick to insist that it was unlikely that the 1970 Conference would be in a position to take a decision on the Report. It was pointed out that the local associations would need time to discuss the Report, as would the full Executive. Furthermore, it was suggested that it would be necessary to produce a document setting out the whole basis for any recommendation the Executive might make.^{3.}

Nevertheless, this did not prevent the topic from being discussed at the 1970 Conference, when the opponents of the idea of a Teaching Council proposed the motion, "Conference rejects the attempts of the Department of Education and Science to form a General Teachers' Council and instructs the Executive to cease negotiations." Supporting the motion, Mrs. A.P. Rosenberg (Hackney) argued that the Report's proposals were a diversionary tactic aimed "to woo us away from militant trade union action". She saw a "Big Brother" concept in the proposed roles of the Department in keeping

-
1. For some arguments in favour of a Teaching Council (but not necessarily the one proposed by the Report) see, articles by Owen Kelly (The Teacher, 20.2.70. page 3), and Mary Macpherson (The Teacher, 24.4.70. page 3). Also see The Teacher, 27.2.70. page 3.
 2. For arguments against a Teaching Council see, a letter by David Picton (The Teacher 27.2.70. page 5), an article by James Whyte (The Teacher, 24.4.70. page 3), and The Teacher 27.2.70. page 3.
 3. See The Teacher 27.2.70. page 6.

the records of teachers and the l.e.a.s. in collecting the fees. She believed that this was further reflected in the suggestion that the Council should not cause any sharp break in the continuity of disciplinary policy. She also objected to the fact that there would be no simple right of appeal against being struck off the register except through the distant High Court or the Privy Council. Furthermore, she pointed out, that the council would not directly control entry to the profession, and the Secretary of State would be able to reject or change its recommendations. Thus Mrs. Rosenberg concluded, "Any attempt to concoct a General Council is at best a spurious and useless endeavour, at worst it is harmful for us and dangerous."¹

It is difficult to ascertain how the membership reacted to the attack on the Report's proposals, for no decision was taken on the motion because the debate was stopped for Conference to be closed. The next few months, however, were to reveal that there was strong opposition to the Report within the Union, even from those teachers who favoured the establishment of a Council.

In May, the Lewisham Teachers' Association declared its opposition to the Report in a letter to *The Teacher*.² "It is clear from a reading of the working party's report that the teaching council will be a rubber stamp committee for the Secretary of State's (and therefore the cabinet's) policies. It will be dominated by non-N.U.T. nominees and controlled by the D.E.S. and bear no relationship except on discipline to the points made at the conference called by the College of Preceptors in 1957. These were : A council should have : 1. Control over entry into the teaching profession including control of standards of entry 2. Sole right to grant recognition as "a qualified teacher".

1. Reported in *The Teacher*, 10.4.70. page 8.

2. Letter from J. Finch, ex-president, Lewisham Teachers Association, page 4, *The Teacher*, 8th May 1970.

It is therefore understandable that the Lewisham Association's Committee at its last meeting passed the following resolution :

'This Association would welcome the establishment of a teachers' council in which the control of entry and sole right to grant a teacher recognition are vested in the profession and on the representation of the National Union of Teachers is adequate to safeguard the rights of members.' "

The Report was also criticised by a N.U.T. executive member, Mr. England. He believed the plan read well in parts, "but when you come to the fine print all is very far from well." The proposals did not give teachers adequate power to control entry to the profession, yet gave them the unpleasant responsibility for dismissal. Furthermore, he argued that the D.E.S. had not asked that the government through the Secretary of State should retain "sufficient powers to ensure that in the last resort its purposes were not frustrated by the action of the Teaching Council" : but this was given away freely by the Working Party itself.^{1.}

By the end of July, it was apparent, from replies received by the N.U.T. Executive from local branches in response to its enquiries about the Report, that some regarded the proposals as inadequate, whilst others appeared to be disillusioned by the whole affair. Only 100 branches responded out of 700 branches. From the replies that were received, two main criticisms emerged. Firstly, the teachers considered the Union's representation on the Council to be inadequate. Secondly, they felt that the role of the A.C.S.T.T., which would ensure that teachers did not raise

1. Reported in the Teachers' World 24th July 1970, No. 3167 page 5. Mr. England was incorrect in his assertion that the D.E.S. had not requested that the Government, through the Secretary of State, should retain ultimate reserve powers. It was accepted at the outset of negotiations that the Secretary of State would need to retain such powers, and in the preliminary meeting of December 17th 1968, the D.E.S. pointed out that in the last analysis the authority of Parliament must be supreme. See Chapter Five.

qualifications of entry to the profession so high as to prevent an adequate supply of teachers, was detrimental to the powers and functions of the Teachers General Council.^{1.}

The National Association of Schoolmasters and the Report.

Whilst the National Union of Teachers' membership seemed to be generally opposed to the Report, and the Union's Executive vacillated on the issue, the second largest teachers' association, the National Association of Schoolmasters, declared its full support for the Report at its 1970 Annual Conference.

The following motion was due to be debated at Conference :-

"This Conference declares that the proposed Teachers' Council shall be controlled by practising teachers independent of the Department of Education and Science and that they shall have the sole control of entry into and expulsion from the teaching profession."^{2.}

The motion had been drawn up and included for debate at Conference before the Report of the Working Party was issued. Consequently, the Executive proposed "that the question be not now put", which was accepted by Conference. In place of the motion, the Senior Vice-President, Mr.R. Cocking, presented a Report^{3.} to Conference on the proposals of the Working Party on a Teaching Council for England and Wales. Mr. Cocking admitted that the proposals would not set up an ideal Council but they

1. Reported in the Times Educational Supplement, 31.7.70. No. 2880, page 3.
2. The New Schoolmaster, Vol. 47 No. 4 April/May 1970, page 21.
3. Report of the Working Party on a Teaching Council for England and Wales. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations. (N.A.S. March, 1970). This document includes all the major conclusions and recommendations of the official Working Party.

represented a first move, though a substantial one, towards professional control by teachers. He defended the proposal to make registration compulsory and asserted that those who criticised the clauses giving the Secretary of State reserve powers were ignorant of the function of elected members of government. He pointed out that if teachers would only accept a Council if it was free, then little value would be placed on it. Consequently he accepted the need for a registration fee on a once-for-all payment basis.

In seconding the adoption of the Report, the National Treasurer, Mr. Smyth, contrasted the proposals for representation by association with the system in Scotland. In the ensuing discussion, Mr. J. Baxter (Teesside) objected to the inclusion of 15 representatives to be nominated by the Secretary of State. Mr. S.G. Allen (Scottish Schoolmasters' Association) referred to the long and bitter struggle in Scotland to obtain a satisfactory Council, and warned Conference that there could be a wide gap between what was hoped for and what was ultimately obtained. After an assurance by Mr. Cocking that the N.A.S. representation would include a class teacher, and in spite of the criticisms, the Report was adopted nem. con.

Thus the N.A.S. fully committed itself to a policy of securing the implementation of the Report on the Teaching Council, and the closing months of 1970 saw the N.A.S. urging the Secretary of State for Education and Science to set up a Teaching Council.

The A.T.C.D.E. and the Report

Although the A.T.C.D.E. was not very satisfied¹ with the constitution of the A.C.S.T.T., in general the Association welcomed the proposals to set

1. See the comments of Mr. Alex Evans, (who was then general secretary of the A.T.C.D.E.) earlier in this Chapter, and in *The Teacher*, 13.2.70. page 3.

up such a Teaching Council. It supported the principle that there should be no compulsion on teachers in the independent sector to register with the Council, although they may do so voluntarily. As an extension of this, the Association considered that the staffs of colleges of education should similarly be excluded from the need to register. The Association thought that many members of staffs of colleges would do so voluntarily, and many would come to colleges already registered as a result of recruitment from school staffs. Evenso, it was considered that the colleges should retain their freedom to appoint outside such a field, for example, retired H.M.I.s and others who may be eminent in their own fields of study or achievement but who had not come from schools.

The most disturbing recommendation, however, from the Association's point of view was that in paragraph 42, that the Teaching Council should have power to recommend "the availability, content and standard of courses in the colleges of education". The Association supported school teachers in their demand for academic freedom, but insisted that the colleges must have a similar degree of freedom in planning their curricula and content of courses. It was accepted, however, that there was a need for teachers to be more fully involved in the work of area training organisations and the colleges so that the teacher involvement would be developed in a partnership without any threat of a further element of control.^{1.}

The Joint Four and the Report

The Joint Four, too, welcomed the proposals of the Report. The Associations had reservations on certain of the proposals but believed

1. The information in this section was supplied to me by Miss A.M.Large, secretary to the A.T.C.D.E., in a letter dated 17th August 1971. It was included in a statement of policy sent to Mr. Short in the spring of 1970 and published in the A.T.C.D.E. "Newsletter".

that these could be resolved in subsequent discussions. Consequently, on the 24th July 1970, the Joint Four wrote to Mrs. M. Thatcher, Secretary of State for Education and Science :-

"In the foreword to the report of the Working Party on Teaching Council for England and Wales, your predecessor invited the teachers' associations to let him have their comments on the report.

The constituent Associations of the Joint Four have now given careful consideration to the Working Party's report and have brought their views to the attention of the Joint Executive Committee.

All four Associations give general approval to the proposals of the Working Party for a Teaching Council for England and Wales and for an Advisory Committee for the Supply and Training of Teachers. They strongly support this move towards the exercise by the teaching profession of a considerable measure of self-government and the setting up of a standing body to succeed the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers so that the Secretary of State may have advice from such a body at all times.

All four Associations regret that the constitution of the Advisory Committee recommended in paragraph 16 of chapter 3, allows only one representative for the four constituent bodies of the Joint Committee of the Four Secondary Associations. Despite the provisions of paragraph 19, the Joint Four would wish to see a greater guaranteed representation of assistant teachers on the Advisory Committee and would urge that the Secretary of State should ensure the inclusion amongst the members whom she appoints of a woman and of an assistant teacher, if they are not already represented amongst those who are nominated by the various official bodies. It is hoped that the interests of the independent schools will also be borne in mind when the Secretary of State appoints her nominees.

In regard to the Teaching Council itself, it is thought that further

consideration should be given to the powers of the Secretary of State. The Joint Four also considers that the number of members appointed by the Secretary of State might be less than fifteen. Points of detail have been raised by one or more of our four Associations but these could no doubt be resolved in subsequent discussion."¹.

The College of Preceptors and the Report.

The College of Preceptors, in its "commentary"² on the Report which it submitted to the Secretary of State, welcomed the proposals of the Working Party. The College's Council noted "with pleasure" references to the past efforts of the College in the movement for registration, and welcomed the Working Party's proposals that the College should be represented on the Council.

The College Council believed that the creation of a Teaching Council was a "wise, necessary and important step in the right direction", and hoped that the Teaching Council would succeed where previous efforts had failed. Consequently the College promised to make "every effort to contribute to its success". The College, however, had a few criticisms to make of the Report.

Firstly, the College Council recognised the difficulties in defining the kind of person who should be admitted to the register and were pleased to note that the phrase "suitably qualified" had been used in relation to the possible future inclusion of persons not within the present accepted categories. (para. 6, 7 and 133 (2)).

Secondly, the College Council "believed that the paragraphs containing

-
1. This information was supplied by Miss Joan Enderby, secretary to "The Joint Four" in a letter dated 24th August, 1971.
 2. See Appendix Eleven. This "commentary" appears in the Educational Newsletter of the College of Preceptors, 70/3, June, 1970.

recommendations on reserve powers must be treated as a whole. "It should be clearly recognised that if any amendments were made to individual paragraphs, they could alter the balance achieved by the whole section". (paras. 31 to 39 and 133 (14) to 133 (18)).

Thirdly, on the subject of probation the College Council was "disturbed at the implied finality of the definition of the term". They considered that the term might need to be redefined after the Teaching Council had been functioning for a time. Thus the suggested para. 52 should read :-

"The system of probation exists only in the maintained schools. Voluntary registrants in other sectors therefore, would, we recommend, be registered only in grade I unless and until they could show that they had satisfactorily completed probation in a maintained school. We recommend however that the Teaching Council should seek to extend the system of probation to cover service in the direct grant and independent schools and until such time as the system of probation is extended to the sectors other than maintained schools, a teacher serving in any of these other sectors shall be required, as a condition of registration in Grade II, to show that he/she has completed satisfactorily a given period of service."

Fourthly, the College Council considered that the subscriptions should be paid in one sum. The College considered the sum too small to necessitate an instalment system, and suggested that if the fee was deducted from the second or third salary cheque, hardship would then be avoided. (para. 116).

Fifthly, the College Council preferred the phrase "professional education" to "apprenticeship" in paragraph 51. This phrase described more accurately "the quality of the work of an Institution preparing a teacher for his profession.

On the Advisory Committee on the Training and Supply of Teachers the College Council made two observations. Firstly, they recommended that the proportion of those engaged in teaching or the training of teachers should be higher than proposed. Secondly, they hoped the Secretary of State would appoint his nominees in such a way as to maintain or improve this proportion.

Finally, "in view of the extensive work of the College in the field of in-service professional education at so many levels," the College Council requested that the "Secretary of State should consider nominating a representative of the College as a member of the Advisory Committee."

The National Association of Head Teachers and the Report.

The National Association of Head Teachers also accepted the findings of the Working Party, although it was disappointed at the conflicting attitudes that arose over the Report. Nevertheless the Association was convinced of the desirability of a general council for the teaching profession and pledged itself to bringing this about.^{1.}

The Association of University Teachers and the Report.

The Association of University Teachers believed that the proposals would establish a Council which would serve a useful purpose. The A.U.T. would not have been happy had it been proposed that university teachers were to be included.^{2.}

1. Letter from the N.A.H.T. ref. FMW/JLK/TGC dated 12th October, 1971. Cook to Booth.
2. Letter from the A.U.T. ref. M/2408 dated 24th August, 1971. Garside to Booth.

The County Councils Association, Association of Municipal Corporations, Association of Education Committees and the Report. ^{1.}

All three Associations accepted the proposals for a Teaching Council. The Association of Education Committees was especially interested in the proposals for setting up some kind of machinery which would allow training matters to be discussed and kept under review. The Association of Municipal Corporations was also interested in the proposed body to advise the Secretary of State on the Supply and training of teachers. It is clear that the Associations considered the proposals for the Teaching Council to be the concern of the Teachers' Associations, and that they were happy to accept this situation since the Secretary of State would retain a reserve power, and there would be a separate body to advise on training and supply.

The progress of events June 1970 to December 1970.

In July 1970 the new Secretary of State for Education and Science was asked in the House of Commons about her attitude towards the establishment of a Teachers' General Council. But this only elicited the reply that Mrs. Thatcher was still awaiting comments from some of the Associations that had been consulted.^{2.} Thus it appeared that in spite of a change in government the issue was still alive and under consideration.

By October, 1970, there was still no further progress towards establishing a Council and the National Association of Schoolmasters began to grow restless with the delay. In a letter to N.A.S. School Correspondents, 26th October, 1970, the Associations' General Secretary, Terry Casey wrote :-

1. Letters from the Association of Education Committees, ref.P/C dated 25th August, 1971. Alexander to Booth : from Association of Municipal Corporations, ref. CJB/YG/8/20 dated 16th August 1971. Swaffield to Booth : County Councils Association, ref. 2E dated 10th August, 1971. Hetherington to Booth.
2. Hansard, Fifth Series, Commons vol. 804, col. 164 written answers, 22nd July 1970, Teachers General Council.

"For many years teachers have recognised that we lack a professional council to regulate conditions of entry, training and discipline. Other professions - many of less importance than teaching - have their statutory councils. It was largely through N.A.S. persistence that Mr. Short set up a Working Party to advise him on this question. Earlier this year a Report was presented to him which recommended a statutory council for teaching on lines the N.A.S. had long advocated. The N.A.S. was the first to support these recommendations. The N.U.T. has so far failed to state its position on this crucial issue."¹

It appears that the obstacle to progress was the absence of a reply from the N.U.T. After a further month had passed, the National Association of Schoolmasters decided on further action, and Casey wrote to Mrs. Thatcher :-

"You will know that your predecessor, Mr. Short, set up a Working Party representing teachers' organisations and L.E.A. interests, under the chairmanship of Mr. Weaver, to examine and report on the desirability of establishing a statutory professional council.

The members of this Working Party reached complete agreement on the main issues, and their report and recommendations were received and published by Mr. Short. I would like to remind you that the Prime Minister has declared his support for a Teachers' General Council and this view was shared by a great many of your Parliamentary colleagues. I believe the majority of the Opposition would support the proposals.

My Executive have instructed me to urge you to declare your support for the Report and to announce as soon as possible the Government's intention to introduce appropriate legislation to give effect to those

1. Letter from Casey to N.A.S. School Correspondents, 26th October, 1970.

recommendations requiring statutory authority." 1.

This approach to Mrs. Thatcher prompted "Education" to comment on the situation. It was pointed out that there was little sign that the N.U.T. wanted to "rush this particular fence." It was reported that although the N.U.T. had finished collecting the reactions from their several hundred branches, the subject had yet to appear on the N.U.T. executive agenda.²

By the middle of December when no further action had been taken on the Report, the issue was again raised in the House by Mr. Hardy. Not only did Mr. Hardy want to know the present position regarding the proposed Teachers' Council, but he asked if Mrs. Thatcher would implement this "desirable development". Furthermore, he wanted to know whether Mrs. Thatcher considered that the teaching council would serve a very worthwhile purpose particularly in training standards, professional co-operation and the orientation of research. The Secretary of State for Education and Science refused to commit herself on the issue. Whilst she appreciated the feeling that existed on the matter, she would

1. N.A.S. Report No. 16 November 1970. The report added that Mrs. Thatcher later stated that she was still waiting to hear from the N.U.T. The letter to Mrs. Thatcher was dated 16th November, 1970.
2. Education 20th November 1970. page 509. "Education" was less interested in the fact that a Teaching Council had not been established, than in the fact that the proposed Advisory Council on the Supply and Training of Teachers had not been set up. Thus the report noted: "It has always been rightly said that the Teachers General Council is primarily a matter to be settled by the teaching profession. There is another side of the business, however, that vitally concerns the L.E.A.s namely the resumption in some form of the work of the national advisory council on the training and supply of teachers. Clearly James will now have some relevance to this but there seems no good reason why some progress should not be made quite quickly."

not make a decision on the Council until she had received full representation.^{1.}

The Situation at the end of 1970.

Thus at the end of 1970 no final decision had been taken on the establishment of a Teaching Council. Although it was apparent that further discussion was needed on certain points of the Report, all the teachers' associations with the exceptions of the N.U.T. and the A.T.T.I. had given their qualified approval to the Report. The l.e.a.s and authorities had also given their approval to the Report's recommendations on the Teaching Council, and were satisfied that their interests in the problem of teacher supply would be safeguarded by the establishment of the A.C.S.T.T.

Although the N.U.T.s position was by no means fully clear, it appeared that the Union was likely to reject the Report on the grounds that its representation on the Council was inadequate; that the recommendations gave the profession insufficient control over the entry into the profession, and the establishment of the proposed A.C.S.T.T. was detrimental to the powers and functions of the Teachers' General Council.

It is likely that the lack of progress since February 1970 in establishing a Teaching Council, and the attitude to the Report taken by the N.U.T. was a great disappointment to many of the teachers' associations that had been represented on the unofficial working party, the Main Committee for the Proposed Teachers' General Council. In particular, the National Association of Head Teachers, which had convened the Main Committee, and the National Association of Schoolmasters which had given

1. Hansard, Fifth Series, Commons, Vol. 808, 17th December 1970. Oral answers columns 1538 and 1539.

the Main Committee its unqualified support throughout its discussions regarded the situation at the end of 1970 with some dismay, and feared that the whole idea would be shelved.^{1.}

-
1. Letters from Cook to Booth - N.A.H.T. ref. FMW/JLK/TGC dated 12th October 1971. and from Marsh to Booth - N.A.S. ref. D.20/PS/3J dated 10th August 1971.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSIONS

When the Report, "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" was published in February, 1970, it appeared that teachers were presented with a real opportunity of achieving the establishment of a Teaching Council. It is true that the Report did not offer teachers all that they desired, but it did offer a substantial measure of self-government, and a starting point to further their professional objectives.

For the first time in the history of the Movement for a Council, it appeared that factors external to the profession were favourable to the establishment of a Council. The Secretary of State for Education and Science, Mr. Short, was sympathetic to the teachers' problems, and was concerned at the decline in the status of the profession. It is true that the growing militancy in the profession, and the decline in the number of applicants for College of Education places¹ indicated to him that something had to be done to raise the status of the profession, but Mr. Short believed a Teaching Council was of intrinsic value to the profession. Consequently, he had adopted the idea of a "Teaching Council" as a part of his policy to reform the educational system. The easing of the supply problem, and the phasing out of unqualified teachers made the establishment of a Teaching

1. The Teachers' World, 12th December 1969, reported a 20% drop in the number of male students applying for entry in the autumn of 1970. In addition the application from girls were also 10% down on the 1969 figures. It was reported that figures to be released would show that applications had dropped for the first time in the last decade by 2½% to about 57,000. The drop in male applicants had been described as a "major headache" by the planners, who pointed out that the teachers' pay strike had almost certainly discouraged many students. Although there would be more applicants than the 35,000 places available in the Colleges, it was feared that there would be a possible drop in standards.

Council a viable proposition.

It also appeared that the majority of the profession were in favour of the idea of a Council, although there were notable exceptions. Furthermore, it seemed that the Main Committee for the Proposed Teachers' General Council had succeeded in achieving a measure of agreement among the teachers' associations on the kind of Council that was desirable. Given this situation, it is pertinent to inquire why some teachers were not anxious to accept this opportunity to acquire a measure of self-government, although committed to the idea of self-government. It seemed that there were five major objections to the Council.

Firstly, the unity in the profession over the structure of a Council was more apparent than real. The National Union of Teachers was never really committed to the type of Council envisaged by the other associations on the Main Committee, but since the issue was one of political significance, the N.U.T. felt that it could not afford to be left out of discussions. The N.U.T. would have preferred to have created a measure of unity in the profession by establishing, first of all, an "all-in-one union", which would eventually acquire statutory powers over entry to the profession. This situation, however, was unacceptable to the other teachers' associations since they did not consider that an "all-in-one union" would make adequate provision for the special interests of their members.

Secondly, the constitution of the proposed Council raised the problem of the balance of power on the Council between the unions. The Main Committee had insisted that the teacher members of the Council should be appointed by the unions, thus avoiding some of the dissatisfaction that had arisen over representation in the Scottish Council, but it was never decided how to arrange the balance of sectional interests on the General Council. When the Working Party was formed, it soon became apparent that

this issue would become problematic given the structure of teachers' associations. Thus it was not surprising that when the Working Party's proposals appeared, the N.U.T. considered its number of nominees in proportion to its membership as inadequate. On the other hand, the N.A.S. and the Joint Four had favourable representation in comparison to their membership. It seemed that the major stumbling block here was that if the N.U.T. was represented in proportion to its members, it would have a majority on the Council : a position which was unacceptable to the other unions.

Thirdly, the issue of representation raised the problem of the nature of the role of the nominees. Whilst the Report stressed that the nominees should not regard themselves as delegates or as representatives of their associations, it stated that it was important that they should speak with knowledge of the policies of the bodies by whom they were appointed. But it is questionable as to the extent to which the nominees could act independently and yet retain the confidence of their associations. Again it was arguable that it was not desirable that the teacher members should be regarded as independent and that they should be responsible to their associations for their actions. But, it must be noted here that the nominees would only be appointed for a set period of time and they could be replaced by other nominees. It would seem that the major drawback of the teacher members being regarded as delegates to the Council would be that the Council might degenerate into another area for inter-union disputes.

Fourthly, it appeared that the N.U.T. objected to the extent of the reserve powers to be exercised by the Secretary of State for Education and Science as proposed by the Report. It appears that the N.U.T. did not object to the need for the Secretary of State to exercise a reserve power, but rather to the way in which this reserve power would operate. In the case of

any dispute between the Secretary of State and the Council, the N.U.T. would have liked the affirmative resolution procedure to be adopted for the Parliamentary scrutiny of the issue. But this possibility had already been rejected in Scotland on the grounds that it was unconstitutional, since Parliamentary procedure would be determined by the decisions of a body outside Parliament.

Fifthly, the N.U.T. believed that the A.C.S.T.T. would also prove to be a serious check on the powers of the Council. But it is likely that the N.U.T. regarded its representation on this body to be inadequate.

The objections to the Council seem to be mainly on administrative details. Whilst it is important that there must be administrative details to safeguard the interests of the participating organisations, it must be noted that the way ^{in which} ~~the~~ the administrative machinery is operated is also important. It was generally accepted that if a Council was to be established, the impetus would have to continue to come from the profession. This necessitated the co-operation and goodwill of all the unions, and the acceptance by some of the unions that they would have to modify their claims, and give up some of their interests. Furthermore, it involved the unions working together with the Secretary of State and the I.e.a.s. in a spirit of mutual trust, and consideration of the interests of all parties. It appeared, however, that there was still a considerable amount of distrust among the unions themselves, It is also apparent that the N.U.T. was not prepared to trust the Secretary of State in the exercise of his reserve powers. This atmosphere was not conducive to the establishment of a Council.

Furthermore, another possible area of conflict which a possible Teaching Council might encounter, and which the unions do not appear to have given adequate consideration is that of the relationship between a Council and the Unions. Two major problems are involved here.

Firstly, since 1968 there has been an increasing tendency by the teachers' unions to stress union values, and a greater willingness by teachers to adopt industrial action. It is possible that the establishment of a Teaching Council could result in a conflict between professional values established by a Council and union values emphasised by militant trade unionism. It has been argued that professional matters and union matters should not conflict, and that they can be separated. This would seem to be an over-simplification of the problem, and in fact union values do conflict with professional values. Strike action and work-to-rule square oddly with the professional requirement that a special relationship should exist between practitioner and client, and the idea that teachers feel themselves to be serving society. Professional status is not achieved merely by the establishment of a Professional Council. If the public are to accord professional status to teachers, teachers must behave and conduct themselves in a way that is considered to be professional. The problem facing teachers is not whether they should deny themselves completely the right to strike, for in some cases strike action may be necessary, but they must decide on the extent, nature, and circumstances in which they are prepared to use such action. Clearly, the establishment of a Teaching Council would do little to raise the status of teachers if industrial action became the norm of teacher politics. It seems that the crucial question that teachers must decide on is whether they would be better off and more effective in achieving their objectives by aligning themselves with organised labour and adopting militant unionism, or by adopting professional means.¹ At the close of 1970 it was not clear which way teachers will turn. On the one hand they claim they want a

1. See the Chapter by Norman Morris, pages 77 and 78, in *Teacher Unions and Associations*, edited by A. Blum : University of Illinois Press, 1969.

Teaching Council and professional status, and an indication of this is the formation of the Professional Association of Teachers. On the other hand, the unions have continued to threaten militant action to secure objectives, and there has been a continuing stress placed on union values.^{1.}

Secondly, the unions do not seem to have evolved any clear policy on their relationships with a possible Teaching Council. It is evident from the work of the Main Committee that the unions considered that they should exercise some influence or control over the Council. It is also evident from the Official Working Party's proposals that the unions were opposed to the Council replacing them as spokesmen of the profession,^{2.} although the Report did envisage that the Council might be the means by which teachers were represented on certain bodies formed the future.^{3.} But these attitudes give rise to confusion over the role of the Teaching Council. One of the assumptions underlying the Council is that on certain professional issues the profession is united and can be represented by a united policy. The value of the Council would be that it would provide teachers with a

1. Several examples of trade union values being stressed and militancy threatened can be cited :- a) The N.A.S. decided to press for the adoption of a teachers' charter defining conditions of service (Times Educational Supplement, 10.4.70. page 11). b) The N.A.H.T. adopted a proviso for strike action (Times Educational Supplement, 29.5.70. page 7) c) The A.T.T.I. voted in favour of the principle of the closed shop (Times Educational Supplement, 29.5.70. page 9). d) In July, there were threats from certain N.U.T. local branches to refuse to co-operate in marking 11 plus tests or helping in other forms of secondary education selection (Times Educational Supplement, 10th July, 1970, page one). e) In September, the Young Teachers section of the N.U.T. carried a motion asserting its belief in 100 per cent trade unionism in the profession, although it rejected a proposal that union membership should be made compulsory (Observer, 6th September, 1970, page one).
2. A Teaching Council for England and Wales para. 25 (H.M.S.O. London 1970).
3. Ibid.

statutory body to put forward this policy. But if the unions were also consulted on these issues there would be the possibility of confusion and contradiction. Furthermore, there would be a possibility of the Council being seen as merely another teachers' sectional interest in an already fragmented profession rather than as a possible means to providing a measure of control over, and unity in the profession.

In spite of the objections to the present proposals, and the likelihood that these will be shelved, it seems that the issue of a Teaching Council will remain an important one in teacher politics. At the moment, as Pollard points out, "poised uneasily between the professional classes and the labour movement, teachers have the advantages of neither while they suffer from the disadvantages of both. They suffer from professional conscience, so that the possibility of a great labour movement gesture, even for one heady day, is forever denied them. Their leaders have been so inept in managing their professional affairs that professional sanctions are equally out of the question - you cannot sanction where you cannot control."¹ But it is clear that whilst groups of teachers have professional aspirations, the establishment of a Teaching Council with statutory powers over the control of entry and the qualifications of the profession, will remain as one of their prime objectives. During the next few years it is likely that a modification of the present proposals, and proposals for alternative administrative structures for a Council will be put forward.

Furthermore, there are two other factors that are likely to keep the Council issue to the forefront of teacher politics. Firstly, teachers still have no official medium or channel through which they can offer advice on the training and supply of teachers. Secondly, it is recognised

1. "What Price Security?" Education and Training, February 1970 page 54.

that the mass body of teachers are politically weak because of the fragmentation of the profession into so many associations. Some teachers see a Teaching Council as one means of providing the profession with a measure of unity, and as a starting point for the achievement of a wider degree of unity in the profession. Consequently, these teachers are likely to continue to press for the establishment of a Council.

POSTSCRIPTEVENTS BETWEEN JANUARY AND AUGUST 1971The N.A.S. and the Proposed Teaching Council

The N.A.S. continued to stress the importance of establishing a Teaching Council. In his final article in the "New Schoolmaster", the retiring President Mr. R. A. Simons hoped that in 1971 teachers would "assume a greater control of the profession in the formation of a General Teachers' Council".^{1.}

At the N.A.S. Conference, the in-coming President, Mr. R.B.Cocking stated :-

"It has always seemed to me most significant that last Spring whilst teachers were engaged in militant action there emerged from the Department of Education and Science a Working Party Report which offered a Teachers' General Council. This could not be self-government free entirely of National Government's final control but self-government comparable with that of other professionals engaged in service of national importance. This Association at its Conference last year accepted and endorsed the report. Your representatives had spent a great deal of 1969 working with representatives of other teacher organisations, Local Authorities and the Department itself to produce the Working Party Report. It was a moment of pride for me when the 1970 Conference accepted, by an overwhelming majority, the report which I had the honour to present. My pleasure came from the reflection of the professional attitude of members of the National Association of Schoolmasters. It is with a sense of disappointment that I place on record the refusal of the other major teachers' organisation, the National Union of Teachers, to accept the Working Party Report to which their ten representatives were signatories.

1. The New Schoolmaster Vol.48 no. 2. Feb/Mar. 1971 page 7.

As an Association we have kept alive the question of the Teachers' General Council. Whenever we have seen the Secretary of State in the past year the matter has always been raised. We have had questions asked in Parliament and the situation is lamentably clear. The National Union of Teachers has not yet properly debated this matter and any debate they have is to be prejudiced by a policy document which goes back on matters over which there was little dissent in the working party. Their change of mind because they want to control the Council through majority vote is completely unjustified in an area where decisions should not, and must not, be made on union lines but on the basis of professional considerations. Which member of this Association would be prepared to submit himself to the judgement of a Council dominated by N.U.T. members?

What the N.U.T. might do is to ensure that there will never be a Teachers' General Council. The present Secretary of State for Education is not over-eager to establish a Council whereas the previous Secretary of State, ex-teacher that he was, supported the Report. I hope that at their Conference this week the N.U.T. endorse the report and follow our lead in pressing for its rapid implementation. This could be the most significant step towards real professional status that teachers have ever made. I am not here attempting to make a special plea for some work in which I was involved. I am anxious to show how on such an important matter as the Teachers' General Council the National Association of Schoolmasters has taken a professional attitude because this Association is composed of career teachers who regard professional advancement as of vital importance.¹

The N.A.S. Conference went on to debate the motion :-

"This Conference urges the Secretary of State for Education and Science

1. The New Schoolmaster Vol. 48 no. 4. pages 8 and 9. Presidential Address by Mr. R.B.Cocking.

to introduce immediate legislation to establish a teaching council for England and Wales as recommended by the Working Party in February, 1970."

"The National Treasurer reviewed the Working Party Report of February, 1970, emphasizing that all its recommendations had been unanimously endorsed by all the representatives of teachers. It was to control entry, qualified teacher status and professional discipline, but proposals did not include 'dealing with the training and supply of teachers, particularly the crucial point of supply'. Indeed, the Secretary of State had decided to have a 'long-stop' in the form of his control of standards of entry. Nevertheless, there were reasonable checks, controls and balance. Mr. Smyth discussed the proposed constitution of the Council and pointed out that all the teachers' associations except the N.U.T. wanted a Teachers' General Council. He urged the Secretary of State therefore to introduce the necessary legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. H. Russon (Sheffield), seconding, pointed out our professional weakness without control of entry. He illustrated his argument on the threat of dilution by reminding his audience that redundant Rolls Royce employees were being encouraged to become teachers. The Teachers' General Council would not solve all problems, but it would provide a foundation for progress." ¹.

The motion was carried unanimously, and the Executive thus had its efforts to achieve the implementation of the Report once again endorsed by Conference. The hopes of the President that the N.U.T. 1971 Conference would also endorse the Report, however, proved to be in vain.

1. The New Schoolmaster Vol. 48 no. 4. page 12 : Second Public Session : "Teachers' General Council".

The N.U.T. Membership and the Proposed Teaching Council

The N.U.T. membership continued to be highly critical of the Report. When the motions for the 1971 N.U.T. Conference appeared in January 1971 three related ^{1.} to the Proposed Teaching Council :-

"155. Conference declares its opposition to some of the proposals of the Working Party for a Teaching Council for England and Wales as being contrary to the interests of teachers and instructs the Executive to seek the views of Local Associations before commencing further negotiations. - Rawmarsh; Hinckley."^{2.}

"156. Conference rejects the proposals for a Teachers' General Council. - W. Wills."

"157. Conference welcomes the proposals for a Teachers' General Council but urges that the following conditions of acceptance should be firmly established.

1. Control of entry and right to grant recognition to a teacher to be vested in the profession.
2. The rights and interests of our Union members to be fully safeguarded by adequate representation of the National Union of Teachers. - E. Derbyshire."

Thus, the degrees of opposition to the Proposed Teaching Council varied from criticisms of parts of the Report and that these should be replaced by other proposals, to outright rejection of the Report.

Further criticism of the Working Party's Report came at the N.U.T.

1. The Teacher, January 8th, 1971. Conference Resolution Supplement pages 6 and 7.
2. This motion seems somewhat strange taking into account the fact that the Executive had circulated the local associations for their views in the Spring of 1970.

Educational Conference in January 1971. Mr. J.M. Armer of Haringey moved a resolution rejecting five of the policies contained in the report, including the retention by the Secretary of State of reserve powers and the restriction of the council to teachers in maintained schools. Mr. Rolf Meyer (Devon) suggested that since there were objectionable features in the report besides the five listed in the motion it would be better to vote on a blanket resolution calling for better terms. Consequently a motion was passed supporting the N.U.T. Executive in its efforts to improve the proposals for a Teaching Council. The delegates to the Conference were told by Dr. Walter Roy (Executive) that the Executive was in the process of discussing the need for bringing in teachers in private schools. Furthermore, he added that the Executive had no intention of agreeing to a Council which did not safeguard the interests of the members.^{1.}

As yet, however, the N.U.T. Executive had not made clear its policy on the Council.

The N.U.T. Executive and the Proposed Teaching Council.

It was not until February 1971, that the N.U.T. Executive issued a statement^{2.} containing its observations on the Working Party's Report, "A Teaching Council for England and Wales". This statement was based on the advice of its own Committees and the views of the Union members as represented through local associations.^{3.}

T

1. Reported in The Teacher, January 8th, 1971, page 9.
2. The Teaching Council. A Statement on the proposals for a Teaching Council for England and Wales, to be presented by the Executive to the Annual Conference of the National Union of Teachers, Scarborough, 1971. (N.U.T. February 1971). In this document, the report of the official working party is referred to as the "Weaver Report".
3. Ibid pages 4 and 5.

iii Government and Council - Balance of Power.^{1.}

The Executive point out that whilst a reduction in the power of the Government in its control of entry to, and discipline within the profession has always been accepted as a necessary adjunct to a Teachers' Council, both the Weaver Report in England and the Wheatley Report in Scotland stressed that since the education service is the responsibility of Central and Local Government, any Government is reluctant to see a diminution of its responsibility with regard to the provision and education of teachers.

"In the Union's view, such a position will make effective self-government difficult, if not impossible. The Union took part in the meetings of the Working Party on the understanding that a form of self-government long envisaged by the teaching profession, i.e. self-government which included control of entry to the profession and control of qualifications, would be discussed. At the final meeting of the Working Party the representatives of the Union made clear their dissatisfaction with the proposals by insisting that they could not put their names to the report unless it was agreed that no association was committed by its proposals."

The Union recognised that the Secretary of State must be responsible in the last analysis for the supply and education of teachers, and theoretically no profession was completely self-governing. Evenso, the Union felt that the medical profession enjoyed self-governing powers equal to those desired by teachers. But the Union could not accept the proposals of the Working Party since they would not give teachers comparable powers to the medical profession, because the role of the Advisory

1. Ibid pages 5 and 6.

Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers would "undermine" the professions control over entry. Furthermore, the profession was under-represented on the A.C.S.T.T.

The Union also considered that teachers would be under-represented on the Teaching Council itself, and demanded that two-thirds of the Council's membership should come from the teachers' organisations. In fact, the Union believed that the Council would be merely taking over functions which had been "effectively controlled hitherto by the teachers' organisations".

iv Professional Unity and a Teaching Council.^{1.}

The Union did not consider that the Working Party's recommendations would enhance the prospects of professional unity. On the contrary, since the Teaching Council was to consist of representatives of the various teachers' organisations it would "perpetuate the existing disunity". "The Union itself is dissatisfied with its suggested representation on the Council and could not accept the basis of representation proposed. It is by far the largest teachers' organisation, with twice as many members as all the other teachers' organisations combined, and, as such, should have a greater proportion of the membership of the Council."

v Comparison with the Scottish Teaching Council.^{2.}

The Union pointed out that it had regarded the Wheatley Proposals for a Scottish Teaching Council as unsatisfactory. It believed that many of the criticisms that had been made about the Wheatley Report "could now be levelled at the proposals made for a Teaching Council for England and Wales". Indeed, the Union considered that the "suggestions on admission

1. Ibid page 6.

2. Ibid pages 6 and 7.

standards and regulations made by the Wheatley Committee are analogous with those made by the Weaver Report". "Without a majority representation of teachers on the A.C.S.T.T., the profession could not be said to have effective control over its own activities and competence in the field of entry to professional training or entry to the profession".

vi Role and Composition of the A.C.S.T.T. ^{1.}

The Union stressed that the representation of the teachers' organisations was stronger on the former National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers than on the proposed A.C.S.T.T. "In particular, the Union had six places out of 54 on the N.A.C.T.S.T.; on the proposed A.C.S.T.T. the Working Party suggested that the Union should have two out of 28 places".

It was not accepted by the Union that the N.A.C.T.S.T. had developed certain defects. Indeed, the Union had pressed for a revival of the N.A.C.T.S.T. which it considered to be "an instrument of pressure for the reform and expansion of teacher education on the Secretary of State and his department". The Union blamed the Government for allowing the Council to fall into disuse, and it believed the Council would have been a stronger and more effective body if teachers had felt they had greater control over the decisions which were taken. Thus "the Union believes that the majority of teachers on the proposed Teaching Council should have been matched by a majority of teachers on the proposed A.C.S.T.T. It is the Union's opinion that a body which advises on teacher education and supply should be an integral part of the Teaching Council. To separate the two functions and

1. Ibid pages 7 and 8.

constitute two very different committees is illogical and could well weaken the power of both. The Union believes, therefore, that the role envisaged by the Working Party for the A.C.S.T.T. should be carried out by a standing sub-committee of the Teaching Council rather than by a separate body and that teachers should have majority membership of the sub-committee".

The sub-committee would enable the Teaching Council to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the education and supply of teachers, and except in limited circumstances in which the Secretary of State might intervene, the Council would control the qualifications necessary for entry into the profession.

The Union accepted that the Secretary of State must retain a reserve power. But to ensure that the Teaching Council's recommendations were accepted unless there were overwhelming reasons to the contrary, the Union submitted that "the affirmative resolution procedure should be adopted for the Parliamentary scrutiny, not only of regulations which the Secretary of State might wish to change, but of any recommendation of the Council on which there was an unresolved difference of opinion between the Secretary of State and the Council. Thus, any change which the Secretary of State wished to introduce would have to be debated in both Houses of Parliament." The Union believed that the profession would act in the interests of education; that recommendations of the Council would reflect that interest; and the reserve powers of the Secretary of State envisaged by the Union would safeguard national interests.

vii Registration ^{1.}

The Union accepted that all teachers in maintained schools should be

1. Ibid pages 8 and 9.

compelled to register as a condition for teaching in those schools, as recommended by the Working Party, but the Union considered that the recommendations should go further. "A definition of a qualified teacher should be made and registration based on this. Registration ought then to be compulsory for all teachers serving in schools, both maintained and private. The Union believes that all parents wish to have the assurance that their children will be taught by professionals and that their education will be in the safe hands of teachers recognised as competent by the Government, the Local Authorities and their colleagues." The Union could see no justification for the separation of the maintained and private sectors. It was accepted, however, that it would be reasonable that requirement of registration should not be applied to private schools immediately the Teaching Council was operational, but within five years of its establishment.

viii Composition and Method of Election to the Council.^{1.}

The Working Party's proposed method of representation for the Teaching Council through teachers' organisations was accepted by the Union, although the Union could not accept the proposed basis of representation. The Union argued that the representatives of the teachers' organisations should be the predominant element in the Council, constituting two-thirds of its membership, so that the Council would "be seen more clearly to be a body accountable to the teaching profession as a whole". Furthermore, if the allocation of places to the teachers' organisations is more clearly to reflect the relative strength of the individual organisations, then the Union, as a body with more members than all the other organisations combined, must be given a majority of the places allocated to the teachers' organisations".

Because the Union believed that the Teaching Council should advise the

1. Ibid pages 9 and 10.

Secretary of State on matters relating to the education and supply of teachers, the Union accepted that representatives of the local authority and other interests should be represented on the Council taking the remaining one-third of the places. "The bodies to be represented would be the County Councils Association, Association of Municipal Corporations, Association of Education Committees, Inner London Education Authority, Welsh Joint Education Committee, the Universities, the Church of England Board of Education and the Catholic Education Council." This would obviate the need of the Secretary of State to directly appoint members from other interested bodies.

ix Terms of Reference. ^{1.}

The Union could not accept the Working Party's statement that the Teaching Council might represent teachers on certain bodies that might be set up in the future. It believed that the functions of a Teaching Council should be limited to determining the standards of qualification, education and experience necessary for entry to the profession, registration and professional discipline, and advising the Secretary of State on the education and supply of teachers. "It is the responsibility of the teachers' organisations to represent the views of teachers on issues wider than those contained in the remit of the Teaching Council".

x Professional Discipline. ^{2.}

The Union agreed with the Working Party that the profession should be responsible for professional discipline. The Union objected, however, to the fact that the Working Party did not make suggestions as to the composition of the proposed Professional Conduct Committee and the Complaints Committee. It was pointed out that, "teachers have the right to be judged by their colleagues on matters affecting professional status" so "teachers should have a substantial majority membership of both

1. Ibid, page 10.
2. Ibid, page 10.

Committees." Furthermore, the Union believed that the matters which are to be the subject of the disciplinary procedures of the Teaching Council should relate only to the professional conduct of a teacher."

It was not clear to the Union whether it was intended that all criminal offences would be referred to the two Committees. The Union wanted a closer definition of the powers of the Committees and an indication of whether there would be a more formal procedure than at the present. It was hoped that the practice of informal hearing would continue.

The Union also points out that the Working Party suggests that an Appeal should lie from the Teaching Council to the High Court or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. "However, it appears that unless a decision is in some way at variance with the law, there can be no appeal." The Union maintained, however, that "whatever the form of the disciplinary procedures eventually adopted, it is essential that they are such as not to impair the Union's ability to defend any member who may seek its assistance."

The Union believed that Professional Conduct Committee's powers should not be restricted to the warning of offenders or the removing their names off the register, but there should be provision "for the teacher to have a caveat registered against his name". Some form of partial exclusion for certain offences should also be included.

It was further argued that the confidentiality of the proceeding taken against a teacher should be maintained, that the teacher would know exactly what was being held against him and have an opportunity of replying to any charges, and have the right to be accompanied by a friend.

xi Conclusion.^{1.}

The Union's criticisms of the Working Party's proposals were motivated by the Union's determination to pursue the aim of self-government, and its refusal to "be diverted from that end by proposals which offer only limited gains on the rights and responsibilities which the teaching profession already possess." "If a Teaching Council is to provide self-government on a basis acceptable to the Union, it is essential that representatives of teachers shall predominate in the Council and that the Union shall have a majority among these representatives. The representatives must have the full confidence of the organisations which nominate them and they should act in a representative, and not a personal, capacity. Moreover, the procedures of the Council must be such that the Secretary of State can never lightly thwart its intentions, and its jurisdictions should encompass all the teachers in the country, not only those in the maintained schools".

Furthermore, a Teaching Council is no substitute for a strong professional organisation or organisations of teachers, and its activities must not jeopardise the activities of such organisations. Its terms of reference, once defined, should be strictly adhered to, and they should include the duty to advise the Secretary of State on the education and supply of teachers."

"If, therefore, the Weaver Report is to be the prelude to any further negotiations or discussions to establish self-government for the teaching profession, Conference insists that the following shall be the basis on

1. Ibid, pages 11, 12 and 13.

which the Union should negotiate :

Functions

1. The Union should oppose any attempt to widen the functions of the Teaching Council beyond responsibility for :
 - (a) determining standards of qualifications, education and experience (including those obtained abroad) necessary for entry to the profession, and to play an appropriate part in the arrangements for teachers' probation;
 - (b) the sole right to grant recognition as a qualified teacher;
 - (c) control over professional discipline;
 - (d) advising the Secretary of State for Education on the education and supply of teachers.

2. The Union should oppose the proposal to create two separate bodies, a Teaching Council and an Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers, and should propose that the function of advising the Secretary of State on teacher education and supply be undertaken by a sub-committee of the Teaching Council.

Powers

3. The Union should propose that the powers and responsibilities conferred upon the Council be such that its recommendations should be accepted unless there are overwhelming reasons to the contrary. To ensure that this is the case, the Union should propose that the affirmative resolution procedure be adopted for the Parliamentary scrutiny not only of regulations which the Secretary of State wishes to change, but of any recommendation of the Council on which there is an unresolved difference of opinion between the Secretary of State and the Council.

Composition

4. The Union should reject the basis of representation, suggested in the Weaver Report for the Teaching Council and the Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers, and should propose that the following be the basis on which the Teaching Council is constituted :

- (a) that the representatives nominated by the teachers' organisations shall be the predominant element, say to the extent of comprising two-thirds of the total membership;
- (b) that the teachers' organisations nominating representatives shall be those listed in the Weaver Report (i.e. N.U.T., N.A.S., Joint Four, A.T.T.I., N.A.H.T., A.T.C.D.E.) and that a majority of the representatives shall come from the National Union of Teachers.
- (c) that the remaining one-third of the Council shall include representatives of those bodies which the Weaver Report proposed should be given representation on the Advisory Committee on the Supply and Education of Teachers (i.e. County Councils Association, Association of Municipal Corporations, Association of Education Committees, Inner London Education Authority, Welsh Joint Education Committee, the Universities, Church of England Board of Education and Catholic Education Board);
- (d) that the sub-committee of the Council set up to advise the Secretary of State on teacher education and supply should include representatives of the teachers' organisations;
- (e) that those individuals nominated by their organisations for appointment by the Secretary of State to serve on the Teaching Council must have the full confidence of the organisations nominating them and shall be regarded as the representatives of the organisations concerned. The nominating organisations shall have the right to recommend to the Secretary of State the replacement of any of their representatives.

Registration

5. (1) The Union accepts the proposal that if a Teaching Council is established it shall be a condition of employment that every teacher shall register on the terms laid down by the Council.
- (2) The Union should propose that, so far as the maintained schools are concerned, the condition of employment shall operate from the date of establishment of the Council and, so far as the private schools are concerned, it shall operate by a specified date, say within five years of the establishment of the Council.
- (3) On the question of cost the Union should accept the proposal that the Council should use the D.E.S. records for the purpose of registration and should not attempt to create a separate register.

Finance

6. The financial arrangements envisaged by the Weaver Report seem generally satisfactory and the Union should support the proposal for a "once-for-all" fee, rather than an annual fee.

Discipline

7. The Union should insist :

- (a) that the matters which are to be the subject of the disciplinary procedures of the Teaching Council shall relate only to the professional conduct of a teacher;
- (b) that the Professional Conduct Committee and Complaints Committee should have substantial and majority teacher membership;
- (c) that the powers of the two Committees are more closely defined and its procedures clarified;
- (d) that the disciplinary powers should not be restricted to warning offenders or removing their names from the Register, but should include provision for some form of partial exclusion;
- (e) that in any proceedings against a teacher confidentiality is maintained;
- (f) that the disciplinary procedures to be operated by the Council shall not be such as would impair the Union's ability to defend any member who may seek its assistance".

At the Press Conference to introduce the document, it was pointed out that there was an illogical inconsistency between paragraphs IV and VIII concerning the method of teacher representation on the Council. Paragraph IV appears to oppose representation by various teachers' organisations as likely to perpetuate existing disunity in the profession. Paragraph VIII, states that, "On balance, the Union supports the Working Party's preference for nomination of the teacher representatives by teachers' organisations rather than direct election by individual teachers".

Mr. Britton admitted the illogicality but pointed out that in preferring

"appointment" to "election" the Union had chosen the lesser of two evils. The experience of the Scottish Teaching Council, he said, had shown that election did not work out democratically. The teachers elected are not representative of a point of view and they have no responsibility to report back. People are voted in because they are prominent names. He believed a Teaching Council for England and Wales would be more effective if all the representatives belonged to one organisation representing a united profession, but it was a mistake to believe that the Council would create unity.¹

N.U.T. Conference 1971.

The Executive's document was submitted to the 1971 N.U.T. Conference to be endorsed as official Union policy. In moving the adoption of the memorandum, Mr. Max Morris (Executive) told the Conference that the proposals failed to provide an adequate framework for professional self-government. He reaffirmed that the Union was in favour of a general council, but such a council would have to be properly constituted and meet three important criteria :-

"First it must achieve genuine control of standards of entry to and training in the profession;
 Second, there must be a right to refuse admittance, with an equal right to remove persons from the profession;
 Third, the council should operate through a register, its regulations to be determined by teachers."

Dr. Walter Ray seconded the motion. He regretted that over the years so little progress had been made with the general council concept. He, too, supported the idea of a council but could not accept the proposals of the working party. He saw no reason why Mrs. Thatcher should not take

1. Reported in the Teachers World, 12.3.71. page 5.

the Union's memorandum as a basis for a teaching council which the profession could accept.

In the ensuing debate, the opponents of the idea of a council proposed an amendment moving the reference back of the memorandum. Proposing this amendment, Mr. F.W.Scott, Wandsworth, described the general council idea as "a swindle which will be a swindle even if the Executive's proposals are accepted." He believed that action was the answer to the teachers' problems, and that more had been achieved through militancy in a few months than had been achieved in years by demanding status. He believed that the profession had to cast off its snobbish image. Mrs. A. Rosenberg, Hackney, supported the amendment and warned Conference that the proposed council could lead to a lowering of standards. Further support came from Mr. S. Page, Mid-Leicestershire, who believed the memorandum lacked teeth. He wanted a completely independent council, and pointed out, a council controlled by the D.E.S. would not do.

Mr. A. Wiltshire, Executive, opposed the amendment to refer back the document. He pointed out that the document was largely a distillation of the predominant opinions of the N.U.T. membership as expressed through the local associations. He believed that there was no evidence to suggest that the membership did not want a teachers' council established as long as it had real power to act and was set up on the right terms. He concluded, "It would be absolutely ridiculous for us now to say that we do not want or need a teachers' general council". Further opposition to the amendment came from Mr. Eddie Haynes, Executive, who reminded the Conference that the N.U.T. had pressed for professional status over the years. He said, "I hope we shall go along with the pioneers of the Union who have pressed for recognition of our status by giving us real self-government."

The motion proposing the amendment for reference back was defeated,

and the memorandum was overwhelmingly approved.¹

In July, 1971, the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, the N.U.T.'s close associate, also declared itself opposed to the Working Party Report. At the July meeting of the Council of the Association, the following motion was adopted; "Council, whilst not opposed to the principles of a Teaching Council, rejects this report."²

Conclusion

It seems that as a result of the N.U.T. policy the idea of a Teaching Council will be temporarily shelved. Neither the Secretary of State nor the L.E.A.s would find the N.U.T.s proposals acceptable in regard to the exercise of the reserve powers nor to the composition of a supply body. Furthermore, the other teachers' associations would not accept the N.U.T. having a majority of places on the Council.

-
1. The debate is reported in The Teacher, April 23rd 1971 page 3.
 2. This information was supplied in a letter from the A.T.T.I. dated 19th August, 1971 reference M/2322/WB/KS.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONEMEMORANDA PRESENTED BY THE ASSOCIATIONS AT THE
SECOND COMMITTEE MEETING, 3rd MARCH 1961(A) National Union of Teachers

The National Union of Teachers is firmly of the opinion that all teachers in primary and secondary schools should receive professional training before they are given qualified status, and temporary and occasional teachers should not be employed in the schools. The Union is further of the opinion that intending teachers should, after the age of 18, have a minimum four-year course of education and training arranged in any way suitable to their particular needs and interests and leading to graduate or graduate equivalent status. At a later stage, when all entrants to primary and secondary schools are so qualified and trained, the Union would wish to extend training to other persons engaged in teaching other than in primary and secondary schools.

(B) National Association of Schoolmasters

The National Association of Schoolmasters believes :-

- a) All who teach in primary and secondary schools should not only be qualified but also should be trained.
- b) the admission of persons other than those with qualified status obtained at universities or training colleges to one year or shortened courses should cease as from, say 1964/5.
- c) In further education, including technical institutions, there should be established a distinction between teachers and instructors and lecturers.

An 'instructor' would commonly be a man or woman from industry or

commerce largely dealing with the practical aspects of craft or business training.

The term 'lecturer' would have its customary meaning, and such a person would deal largely with underlying theory and would do so with the older age groups.

A 'teacher' would have a general training leading to qualification together with professional training and might have special knowledge appropriate to the educational establishments in which he practised.

d) Full membership of a British Teachers' Council should only be available to lecturers and instructors.

(C) Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions.

As with all teachers, two general qualifications are required for teachers in technical colleges, namely, knowledge of the subject matter to be taught and the ability to teach it. In neither of these categories is it possible at present to define qualifications which would be regarded as necessary for a teacher in a college.

The subject matter taught ranges very widely from the mastery of a craft or technical process, to the knowledge of advanced mathematical, scientific and technological theory. Qualifications could therefore not be defined in general terms. If an attempt were to be made to draw up a list of necessary qualifications, each subject would have to be decided upon.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that recognised qualifications do not at present exist in a number of the crafts and skills which are taught in colleges. Moreover, it is unlikely that in the present rapidly expanding situation any complete list could be drawn

up, in so far as new crafts and new techniques are constantly being developed, and then added as new subjects to the curriculum of the colleges.

These new subjects have of necessity to be taught by people who have themselves contributed to the development of the new techniques in industry and, until a reasonable amount of teaching in these techniques is being done in the colleges, it is impossible for there to be a recognised qualification applicable to them. It seems, therefore, that it would not be possible to provide a list of qualifications which would guarantee that a teacher in a college was competent in his mastery of the subject that he had to teach.

With regard to the ability to teach, it must be remembered that the qualification "Qualified Teacher" is not recognised in technical colleges. Indeed, it is only relatively recent that Technical Teacher Training Colleges giving a course of training for teachers in technical colleges have been opened. Although it may possibly be that, at some time in the future, professional training will be regarded as a necessity for any teacher taking up teaching in a technical college for the first time, the entry to, and the provision for, training at the present moment is so small that there can be no prospect within the next decade of requiring training as necessary for recognition as a teacher in a technical college.

The training position for teachers in technical colleges is further complicated by the fact that of necessity a number of teachers are recruited straight from industry well above the age of thirty and at a relatively high salary. These teachers are essential to the proper working of technical colleges. They are, however, men with family commitments who have been used to a relatively high standard of living and for some years have been earning a salary higher than that of a qualified teacher on the maximum of the Burnham Main scales. Until the system of grants for technical teacher

training colleges is drastically altered it would be quite impossible to insist upon training for teachers coming from industry at this level.

It therefore seems impossible at the present stage to give any definition of what could be regarded as the necessary qualification for a teacher in a technical college, either to cover his knowledge of his subject or his professional competence.

(D) Headmasters' Conference.

The Headmasters' Conference does not regard formal training in a Teachers' Training Department of a University as an indispensable qualification for appointment as a master. Normally a University degree is required but there are exceptions when some equivalent, or even proved effectiveness in practical teaching, can be accepted as an alternative, e.g. in the case of a drawing master or a physical education specialist. Most of the Public Schools have a period of probation, and headmasters generally regard satisfactory completion of that period as the real practical confirmation of a man's suitability to teach.

(E) National Association of Headteachers

At the present time the only way of knowing what is meant by the term "qualified teacher" is to refer to a Burnham Report. This is because it is impossible to define in simple terms the range of qualifications of those engaged in education in spheres different as the training of the nursery school child, work in a university or college of advanced technology, and a host of other branches of learning in which the teaching situation is involved.

A Teachers' General Council would be bound to consider the qualifications

and training necessary before recognition as a qualified teacher could be granted in any sector of the teaching front. In this memorandum however, the N.A.H.T. - whilst recognising this problem - naturally limits its suggestions to those sectors of the teaching front with which it is itself principally concerned. No doubt other organisations will make their own appropriate contributions so that the whole field will be covered.

The N.A.H.T. believes that only teachers registered with a Teachers' General Council should teach in state and similar schools, and that qualified status should only be granted to those who possess the necessary personal qualities, who have reached a suitable level of academic achievement as approved by the Teachers' General Council, and who have undergone an appropriate course of training through an Area Training Organisation.

It is our opinion that a qualified teacher should have a mastery of the mother tongue both oral and written, with ability to communicate at the appropriate level of pupil-development, together with an acquaintance to some degree of one "language" involving symbolic representation, e.g. mathematics, music, technical representation. Qualified teachers could well be expected to show a fair level of accomplishment in a physical, an intellectual and an artistic sphere; a humanistic or scientific study; and a good level of achievement in some activity of his own personal interest.

The Teachers' General Council would probably also find it necessary to recognise certain qualifications not specifically pedagogic in the case of teaching within limited fields, though confining the recognition granted to teaching within these fields only.

(F) Joint Four

All teachers should be suitably qualified academically and should be

professionally trained, although not necessarily by the present methods. Consideration was now being given by the Joint Four for a change in the balance of training by which the school would, in close collaboration with University Training Departments, take a much greater responsibility for the training of teachers.

(G) Association of Teachers in Colleges
and Departments of Education

- accepts the N.U.T. Memorandum in general.
- the position in Training Colleges will be guided to a large extent by what happens in schools, as we recruit our staff largely from schools. It is already usual to appoint trained teachers to the staffs of Training Colleges.
- a formal training of some lecturers would have to be postponed i.e. for the present the Training Colleges would continue to use some experienced teachers qualified by long service in the schools.

APPENDIX TWOPRESS RELEASE OF THE MAIN COMMITTEE MAY 1962

In May 1960 an exploratory meeting of representatives of teachers' associations was held to discuss the possibility of forming a Teachers' General Council which could be responsible for the control of entry to the profession, control of standards, of training and of education necessary for those entering.

At the first meeting it became clear that the problems to be solved were of many kinds. Without committing themselves to any decisions as to;

- (a) the possible contribution of such a Council
- (b) the Statutory Instruments which shall bring it into being
- (c) the powers of such a Council

the meeting decided to appoint a Sub-Committee on the feasibility of defining qualified teacher status in such a way as to be a basis of registration by a Teachers' General Council.

At the last meeting held in April 1962, the report of the sub-committee was received and discussed. It showed the sub-committee had been able to agree on a provisional definition of "qualified teacher" in the case of Primary or Secondary Schools but that it had not been found feasible to do so in the case of Further Education in terms of qualifications. The Sub-Committee was instructed to examine further the possibility of defining 'qualified' status in Further Education by other means than reference to academic qualifications.

The Associations represented at the meeting :

A.T.C.D.E.
 A.T.T.I.
 H.M.C.
 JOINT FOUR
 N.A.S.
 N.U.T.
 N.A.H.T.

APPENDIX THREEASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS IN TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONSConditions for Registration of Teachers in Further Education. (646/19263)

Note. The following document is submitted as a discussion document. It has been prepared as a result of Committee discussions in the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions but it has not received Executive approval and cannot at this stage be regarded as Association policy.

1. Introduction

A definition of Qualified Teacher Status for teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools has been accepted by the Committee. However, it was recognised by the Committee that no similar statement could be formulated to define Qualified Teacher Status within Further Education. It was therefore decided to explore the possibility of defining a basis for the registration of teachers in Further Education, the implication being that only Registered Teachers would be permitted to teach full-time in Institutions of Further Education. Implicit in this suggestion was the idea that some teachers would be registered to teach in Further Education only : some in Primary and Secondary Schools only ; and some both in Primary and Secondary Schools and in Further Education, according to the qualifications upon which their registration was based.

A teacher in Further Education requires three things : knowledge of a technology or mastery of a skill ; the ability to teach; and a sufficiently high standard of general education. In Further Education the requisite of a knowledge of a technology or mastery of a skill is in a sense more

important than in Primary and Secondary Schools, for it is to the technology or to acquire the skill that the student comes to the College. If there is no one on the staff of a Secondary School who knows German, then German will be dropped from the School curriculum. This may be unfortunate, but the pupil will still continue to attend the School. But if in a Technical College there is no one on the staff who knows anything about, say, plumbing, then not only will plumbing be dropped from the College course, but the students who came to learn plumbing will cease to attend the College. In this sense therefore the subject knowledge is the most important element in the teacher's requirements for teaching in Further Education.

2. Subject Knowledge.

It is not practicable to lay down a qualification, or a series of qualifications, which would guarantee that the teacher in Further Education had the necessary subject knowledge. In some of the subjects regularly taught (e.g. catering) it would be difficult to find a proper qualification that would guarantee that the teacher had the necessary subject knowledge, or that could be made a compulsory qualification for teachers of that subject. In some subjects no paper qualifications exist.

Nevertheless a teacher should not be registered to teach in Further Education unless he can give evidence of the possession of a suitable standard of subject knowledge. As far as the majority of teachers in Further Education are concerned it would be possible to draw up a list of qualifications that would be accepted for this purpose. Suitable qualifications would be a Degree, an H.N.C., a full Technological Certificate of the City and Guilds or some other equivalent qualification.

But a number of cases could not be met by this procedure and it would be necessary to set up a Qualifications Sub-Committee of the Teachers Registration Council to adjudicate on other qualifications and upon the standard of subject knowledge of individual teachers in cases where paper qualifications did not exist. A teacher whose subject knowledge fell short of the necessary minimum requirement would be able to improve upon that knowledge by attending a course at a Technical College or a Teachers' Training College.

It should be pointed out however that the actual registration would not be attached to the subject in which the teacher had provided evidence of the requisite standard of subject knowledge. This is comparable to the present position in the Schools. A teacher with Qualified Teacher Status in Primary and Secondary Schools is in theory qualified to teach in any Primary or Secondary School. He can be appointed to teach Spanish in a Grammar School VI Form, or Music and Movement in an Infants' reception class. In practice he will not be appointed to teach Spanish unless he knows some Spanish, or Music and Movement unless he has been trained for that activity. In the same way the teacher in Further Education would not in practice be appointed to teach a technology or a skill that he knew nothing about.

Any suggestion that registration in itself should take cognisance of the subject to be taught would imply registration on the basis of separate subjects. With the immense variety of subjects currently taught in Technical Colleges it would be absurd to recommend a scheme which involved subject registration. A teacher should not become a "registered catering teacher" or a "registered mastic-asphalt teacher", but a "registered teacher".

3. Ability to Teach

The other two criteria are different. The ability to teach is a

necessity for all teachers in Further Education whatever the subject. So is the possession of a sufficient standard of general education. The A.T.T.I. has accepted that all teachers in Further Education should be trained. The successful completion of a course of training should therefore be a necessary condition for registration. The standard and length of the course of training would be open to discussion, but on the basis of present practice it seems reasonable that the length of the standard course of training should be one year full-time.

Many recruits to teaching in Further Education come from industry at a relatively mature age and there are obvious objections to restricting the necessary teaching qualification to one year of full-time teacher training. The teaching qualification required for registration should therefore also be obtainable by undertaking a comparable course of training on a sandwich principle extending over two or possibly three years. This would enable new entrants to teaching in Further Education to obtain the training without undue hardship either to themselves or their families. It would therefore be necessary to state the training requirement as "one year's full-time course of training, or its equivalent, spread over a period of two or three years". It would seem that the Area Training Organisation would be the appropriate body to recognise for this purpose.

4. General Education

On this basis the third criterion of a necessary standard of general education could also be met : One of the conditions upon which the Training College would admit students to the one year's training course would be the possession of a suitable standard of general education, although it would be desirable that in the event of an otherwise suitable applicant for training not having a suitable standard of general education, the

Training College should offer an extended course to make up the deficiency in this respect. The Area Training Organisation should also satisfy itself either that the entry conditions to the Training College Course met the necessary general educational requirements or that the course and final qualification had been extended to meet those requirements. A course which did not satisfy these conditions ought not to be recognised by the Area Training Organisation. The same would apply to the A.T.O. recognition of the sandwich course.

It would be expected that some of the courses of training for Primary and Secondary teaching would qualify for recognition as courses of training for Further Education. It would further be laid down that every teacher entering Further Education should obtain the necessary qualification for registration within three years of his first appointment.

It is to be noted that it is not part of this paper to give consideration of how this ideal is to be achieved.

5. University Level Work

In conclusion it should be noted that in Colleges of Advanced Technology and in many Regional and some Area Technical Colleges work is being done which is equivalent in standard to that done in Universities. It would be unreasonable that teachers doing work of University standard in Technical Colleges should be expected to obtain registration qualifications as a necessary condition for retaining their teaching posts, while teachers in Universities and Training Colleges doing exactly the same work should not be under the same necessity. The corollary of registration for teachers in Further Education is therefore that a similar condition should be required from teachers in Universities and Teacher Training Colleges.

6. Part-Time Teachers

It is also to be noted that this memorandum has only considered the registration of full-time teachers in Further Education. Technical Colleges are dependent upon a large number of part-time teachers. Sometimes this part-time teaching is of a highly specialist nature, and it would not be practicable to insist upon part-time teachers obtaining the same qualification for registration as is required from teachers employed full-time. Moreover, since many of the part-time teachers are primarily engaged in an occupation other than teaching and are therefore not essentially teachers, it would seem reasonable that they should not be required to be registered under the same conditions as full-time teachers. This does not necessarily mean that some form of training for part-time teachers is not desirable, but that for the time being part-time teachers in Further Education should not come within the scope of the Registration Council. A part-time teacher should only be permitted to teach under the general supervision of a registered teacher.

7. Definition.

Teachers should be registered by the Teachers' General Council to teach in Further Education under the following conditions :-

(1) All teachers who have completed X years of full-time teaching in Further Education on the operative date for the commencement of Registration should be registered as Teachers in Further Education forthwith.

(Note. The figure to be attached to X would be decided by the Teachers' General Council and would be partly dependent upon the length of notice given of the operative date for commencement of Registration. It is assumed

that it would be chosen to ensure that all teachers who had been bona fide accepted as full-time teachers in Further Education at the introduction of the scheme would be registered as teachers in F.E.).

(2) From the operative date for the commencement of Registration any teacher who had not by the operative date completed X years full-time teaching in Further Education must fulfil the following conditions to qualify for registration :-

- (a) He must satisfy the Qualification Sub-Committee of the Teachers' General Council that he has attained a suitable standard of subject knowledge for teaching in Further Education.
- (b) He must have completed a year's full-time course, or an equivalent course, of teacher training recognised by the Area Training Organisation as suitable for the training of teachers in Further Education. No course would be recognised by the Area Training Organisation as suitable for this purpose that did not either by means of imposing entry qualifications or by other means, ensure that the teacher concerned had achieved a suitable standard of general education.

From the operative date for the commencement of Registration or as soon after as may be practicable, an unregistered teacher would not be allowed to teach as a full-time teacher in Further Education for more than three years.

APPENDIX FOUR

Secretary of State
for Education and Science.

Curzon Street, London, W.1.

17th October, 1966.

Dear Mr. Cook,

Thank you for your letter of 15th July in which you asked me to reconsider my decision, conveyed to you in my letter of 22nd April, not to set up an official working party to look into the possible establishment of a Teachers' General Council at some future date, and for your further letter of 6th October in which that suggestion is repeated.

To illustrate why I came to the conclusion not to set up a working party, may I remind you of the paragraphs numbered (1) (a) and (3) of the points listed at the top of page 5 of the memorandum Mr. Goffe sent me with his letter of 16th February? These make clear that what the teachers' associations have in mind is that the proposed Council should have absolute control over the qualifications to be required for registration as a teacher (in further and higher education as well as in primary and secondary) and that, from some future date, there should be a definite bar on the appointment of unregistered teachers. Moreover, the representatives of the associations with whom I discussed the matter at a meeting on 31st March, 1965, made very clear that they were not interested in the establishment of a Council with any lesser powers. I think it is right for me to say equally frankly that the Government find the teachers' proposal unacceptable at the present time. In these circumstances it would not be useful to set

up a working party to continue discussion of it.

Yours sincerely,

Anthony Crosland.

R. J. Cook, Esq., M.A.,

General Secretary,

National Association of Head Teachers,

29a, The Broadway,

Crawley, Sussex.

APPENDIX FIVE

News Release : for publication at 14:00 hrs. on Tuesday 1st November 1966

THE PROPOSED FORMATION OF A TEACHERS' GENERAL COUNCIL

The Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education

The Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions

The Headmasters' Conference

The Joint Four Secondary Associations

The National Association of Schoolmasters

The National Union of Teachers

The National Association of Head Teachers

Over the last six years representatives of the above associations, representing the majority of teachers in England and Wales, have met regularly to explore the possibility of setting up a Teachers' General Council which would :-

- (i) be responsible for the control of entry to the teaching profession,
- (ii) determine the standards of those entering, and
- (iii) have the power to administer professional discipline.

The body envisaged would have executive powers and would, it is hoped, do much to unify the teaching profession and improve its status. It would be unlike the Teachers' Registration Council and the Royal Society of Teachers which did not make registration compulsory and had no powers.

The Scottish Teachers' Council likewise does not measure up to what is desired for England and Wales. The Scottish Council does not cover the whole field of education, (primary, secondary, further and higher) and has virtually no executive powers.

By July 1964 a large measure of agreement had been reached on the basis for the establishment of a Teachers' General Council resulting in a meeting

with the Secretary of State at which he was requested to set up an official Working Party to investigate thoroughly the proposals. (This gathering of teachers' representatives with the Secretary of State was unique in the sense that in spite of any differences of opinion that might exist between them, they were united in their efforts to secure a Teachers' Council). This request was rejected in November, 1965.

There was great disappointment at the Secretary's refusal to set up a Working Party but this sense of frustration was rendered more acute by the fact that the National Advisory Council for the Training and Supply of Teachers had not met for over eighteen months - the only other means at the disposal of teachers for letting their views on this subject be expressed by a single body.

The representatives of the teachers' associations believe that it is important to mobilise support for the creation of some form of machinery which will enable the teaching profession to assist in formulating policy on the supply of teachers and their qualifications. They believe that this can best be done by a self-governing Teachers' General Council.

APPENDIX SIXPROPOSED TEACHERS' GENERAL COUNCIL

Copy of letter sent by Secretary to Mr. Denis Howell, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State.

4th November, 1968.

Dear Mr. Howell,

I am pleased to say that the Main Committee of the Proposed Teachers' General Council has now met and has discussed the points raised in your letter of 22nd July. I must again apologise for the delay in replying to your letter but the questions have been discussed by the various associations individually and now jointly and it proved difficult to find an earlier date which was convenient to all parties.

The Committee were most appreciative of your interest in this matter to which they have been giving their attention for a number of years. It was again apparent at our meeting that the area of agreement between the various professional bodies on this subject is very great indeed. We had a very harmonious and constructive meeting.

I have been asked to convey to you the following observations from the Main Committee :-

(i) Executive/Advisory Functions

We felt that the Council should have executive powers in certain clearly defined fields. The question of advisory functions was very fully discussed. It was considered that it might well be desirable for advice on such matters as teacher supply to be the concern of a separate body, one free to express possibly controversial points of view which

might not be appropriate for such a Council as we at present envisage. This would not, of course, preclude the Council from being asked for its comments, or advice, on certain matters, e.g. supply and training aspects.

(ii) Executive Functions

The Committee considered that these should embrace the four items which you have mentioned, viz. :

Registration

Control of Qualifications

Professional Discipline

Probation

(iii) Registration

We felt that registration must be compulsory and that it should include all existing teachers "registered" with the Department of Education and Science.

Arrangement would need to be made for the registration of teachers who had not completed their probationary period to be "provisional". This would be converted to full registration on the satisfactory completion of their probation.

(iv) Control of Qualifications

We saw the function of the Council in this matter as being the approval of a list of "registrable" qualifications, including those obtained overseas.

(v) Discipline

We discussed the implications of this matter, bearing in mind the procedure adopted by the General Medical Council where there appears to

be no middle way between striking a member off the register and not striking him off. The power to impose a gradation of penalties is a matter we would like to discuss at some time.

We agree that decisions should be subject to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

(vi) Advisory Functions

As you will see from our reply to Item (i), the Committee felt that a Teachers' General Council might be consulted on certain matters but that on some matters advice from an independent body would be preferable. In the matter of training, for example, advice would be construed as an infringement of the rights of the Institutes and Colleges of Education. The Committee felt that a Teachers' General Council should not be the body charged with the duty of advising the Minister on all those matters that were only largely the concern of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. We would, however, distinguish between this position and one in which the Teachers' General Council by its own volition wished to offer advice or comment on current policies in regard to provision for the education of teachers.

(vii) Finance

We cannot give a firm answer to your question. Our preference would be to rely on the income obtained from the payment of a once for all fee at registration, but it is not possible to state this firmly until a costing exercise is carried out. Such an exercise will be based on estimates of the initial size of the Register, the annual rate of new entry, and on the estimated size of the administrative machine which will be necessary to carry on the functions which the Council will be allotted.

It occurs to us, however, that the Council will be doing some of the work which the present budget of the Department of Education and Science has to finance, and that therefore it would be proper to consider whether the Council should not receive a grant in aid from public funds.

(viii) Composition of Council

We felt that, whatever the composition of the Council, the teacher element should be predominant. The teacher members should be nominated by the teachers' organisations, in the fields of primary and secondary education. Inclusion of representatives of other parts of the education service was considered to be a distinct possibility, but this point has not yet been fully debated. We offer no suggestions at this stage regarding the total composition of the Council.

To return to the first part of your letter, I think the above answers will show that we are in general agreement with the three points you mention.

We very much look forward to having the opportunity of meeting you and discussing in greater detail your questions and our answers.

Thank you once again for the very kind interest that you have shown us.

Yours sincerely,

R.J. Cook.

Secretary to the Main Committee.

APPENDIX SEVEN"Report of a Speech made by Mr. Edward Short at Bede College, Durham, 21.2.69."

Mr. Short stressed the importance of a teacher's job in society, but regretted that the public esteem for the teacher was not very high. He stated that esteem was given rather to academic attainment than professional skill. He was, however, most concerned that the status of the profession should be raised. He argued that this could best be done by raising the qualifications of the profession, and by establishing a General Teaching Council.

Qualifications

He pointed out that it was only recently that "Education" had come to be regarded as a subject in its own right, and an indication of its growing acceptance was the establishment of the Bachelor of Education degree. He hoped that in the future teaching would become an all-graduate profession. He was anxious that serving non-graduate teachers should have an opportunity of acquiring a degree in Education either through in-service training with Area Training Organisations, or by study with the Open University which was to establish B.A. (Educ.) degree courses.

Furthermore, he indicated that he intended to phase out untrained teachers, and agreement had been reached with l.e.a.s. that from a date to be decided, no more untrained graduates would be allowed to teach.

General Teaching Council

Mr. Short stated that at present teachers had no measure of self-government, although he thought that they should have. Thus he intended to set up the machinery of self-government which would take the form of a

"General Teaching Council", although he did not like this title. He would, he hoped, be able to introduce a Bill in the November session of Parliament by which he would transfer certain functions vested in the Secretary of State to a General Teaching Council. He pointed out that this could not be done purely by Royal Charter since some of the powers to be transferred were statutory powers and could be passed on only through legislation.

The Secretary of State then went on to delineate the functions of this proposed Council. The Council would decide on standards of entry to the profession; it would have the power of registration; power of ingress and egress to the profession; it would have disciplinary powers (subject to the Right of Appeal to the Privy Council); and it would act as an advisory body to the Government. The Council would not usurp the functions of the Unions.

The Secretary of State added that there should be a once for all membership fee, Representation on the Council would be based on teachers' union, and although Mr. Short regretted this, he considered it to be the only practical way. In the first instance, the General Teaching Council membership would be obligatory for all teachers in maintained schools. He considered that it would be unrealistic to apply it to the Universities or Further Education at the moment, but he hoped teachers in these sectors would eventually become members.

APPENDIX EIGHTOUTLINE OF PROPOSALS FOR A TEACHING COUNCILIntroduction

1. The following paragraphs set out in broad outline the framework for a professional body for teachers as it has emerged in informal exploratory discussions with the "main committee" set up by the teachers' associations (A.T.C.D.E., A.T.T.I., JOINT FOUR, N.A.H.T., N.A.S., N.U.T.) and with officers of the local authority associations. A few major points and a large number of minor ones remain to be settled in the proposed discussion.

Basic Concept

2. The basic concept is of a council of serving teachers, concerned with the professional interests of teachers. The council would not be a trade union. It would not negotiate or fix salaries or conditions of service.

3. The council might be incorporated by charter, but legislation also would certainly be needed to enable it fully to discharge the functions envisaged for it.

Functions and Scope

4. The council's functions would be :-

- (a) to represent in discussion with government, local authorities, universities, etc. the views of the teaching profession - or that part of it within its scope at any time - on professional matters generally, including the training and supply of teachers;
- (b) to determine (subject to the government's reserve powers - see para 7 below) standards of qualification, training and experience (including those obtained abroad) necessary for entry to the profession;

(c) to keep a register, in one or more sections, of all teachers compelled to register (in the first instance those serving in maintained schools), together with those who volunteered to do so;

(d) to assume responsibility (subject to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council) for the professional discipline of teachers registered with it at any time, including the power to strike off the register and to impose other penalties;

(c) to supervise the arrangements for teachers' probation.

5. Initially the council's concern would be with maintained schools but teachers in other sectors would be encouraged to register and its scope might later be extended. Registered teachers outside maintained schools would be subject to the council's disciplinary jurisdiction.

Constitution

6. The council would have a majority of serving teachers but there would be a minority of outside appointments made by the Secretary of State, to represent other interests. These might include some appointments made on the nomination of the local authority associations. The method of selecting the teachers to serve on the council needs further discussion.

Admission to the Register

7. From the start registration would, subject to what follows, be a necessary condition of employment in maintained primary and secondary schools. If, however, the council had absolute control of standards or registration, it could, by pitching the standard of qualification too high, starve the schools of teachers. The government must therefore retain sufficient reserve powers to safeguard the supply of teachers for

the public system. These powers could apply either at the stage of registration or at the stage of employment. Either the council must be prepared to fix its standards for registration in such a way as not to exclude any categories of teachers that the government thinks are needed, or it must acquiesce in the employment of unregistered teachers. In Scotland the former mechanism has been chosen. The matter needs further discussion.

8. In any event, the "main committee" are prepared to see admitted to the register in England and Wales all qualified teachers in posts in maintained schools on the appointed date.

Finance

9. The "main committee" agree in principle that the council should be financially self-supporting. The possibility of some subvention from public funds (e.g. on a pump-priming basis) is for further discussion. As far as the teachers' own contributions are concerned the idea of a once-for-all registration fee is more attractive, because such a fee is cheaper to collect, than that of an annual subscription (the Scottish Council's current fee is £1 p.a.). If, however, the initial fee had to be relatively large it might be argued that a teacher just embarking on his career could not afford it.

APPENDIX NINEOUTLINE OF PROPOSALS FOR A TEACHING COUNCIL
(Amended by the Main Committee)Introduction

1. The following paragraphs set out in broad outline the framework for a professional body for teachers as it has emerged in informal exploratory discussions with the "main committee" set up by the teachers' associations * and with officers of the local authority associations. A few major points and a large number of minor ones remain to be settled in the proposed discussions.

Basic Concept

2. The basic concept is of a council of serving teachers, concerned with the professional interests of teachers. The council would not be a trade union. It would not negotiate or fix salaries or conditions of service.

3. The council might be incorporated by charter, but legislation also would certainly be needed to enable it fully to discharge the functions envisaged for it.

Functions and Scope

4. The council's functions would be :-

- (a) To determine (subject to what is said in para. 7 below) standards of qualification, training and experience (including those obtained abroad) necessary for entry to the profession;
- (b) To keep a register of all teachers compelled to register (in the first instance those serving in maintained schools), together with

those who volunteered to do so;

- (c) To assume responsibility (subject to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council) for the professional discipline of teachers registered with it at any time, including the power to strike off the register and/or to impose the penalties;
- (d) To approve the arrangements for teachers' probation;
- (e) To present to the government, local authorities, universities, etc. whenever it wishes to do so, the views of the Council on all matters that come within its terms of reference.

5. Initially the council's concern would be with maintained schools but teachers in other sectors would be encouraged to register and its scope might later be extended. All registered teachers would be subject to the council's disciplinary jurisdiction.

Constitution

6. The council would have a majority of serving teachers but there would be a minority of outside appointments made by the Secretary of State, to represent other interests. These might include some appointments made on the nomination of the local authority associations. The method of selecting the teachers to serve on the council needs further discussion.

Admission to the register

7. From the start registration would be a necessary condition of employment in maintained primary and secondary schools. It is generally recognised that arrangements should be made between the Council and the government to safeguard the supply of teachers for the public system. It has been suggested that these powers could apply either at the stage of registration or at the stage of employment. The "main committee" consider that there must be further discussion to determine the procedure to be followed in

the event of any conflict of policy arising between the Council and the Government.

8. The "main committee" are prepared to see admitted to the register in England and Wales all qualified teachers in posts in maintained schools on the appointed date.

Finance

9. The "main committee" agree in principle that the council should be financially self-supporting. The question of contributions from public funds (e.g. on a pump-priming basis or on a continuing basis in respect of functions taken over by the Council) is for further discussion. As far as the teachers' own contributions are concerned the idea of a once-for-all registration fee is more attractive, because such a fee is cheaper to collect, than that of an annual subscription (the Scottish Council's current fee is £1 p.a.). If, however, the initial fee had to be relatively large it might be argued that a teacher just embarking on his career could not afford it.

APPENDIX TENA POSSIBLE FRAMEWORK FOR A TEACHING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND
AND WALES

(This appears as Appendix I in "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" (London : H.M.S.O. 1970))

Introduction

1. The following paragraphs set out in broad outline a possible framework for a professional body for teachers as it has emerged in informal exploratory discussions with, among others, the "main committee" set up by the teachers' associations. A few major points and a large number of minor ones remain to be settled in the proposed Working Party.

Basic Concept

2. The basic concept is of a council of serving teachers, concerned with the professional interests of teachers. The council would not be a trade union. It would not negotiate or fix salaries or conditions of service.

3. The council might be incorporated by charter, but legislation would certainly be needed to enable it fully to discharge the functions envisaged for it.

Functions and Scope

4. The council's functions would be :-

- (a) to determine (subject to what is said in Para. 7 below) standards of qualification, training and experience (including those obtained abroad) necessary for entry to the profession, and to play an appropriate part in the arrangements for teachers' probation;
- (b) to keep a register of all teachers compelled to register (in the first instance those serving in maintained schools), together with those who volunteered to do so;

- (c) to assume responsibility (subject to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council) for the professional discipline of teachers registered with it at any time, including the power to strike off the register and/or to impose other penalties;
- (d) to represent in discussion with the government, local authorities, universities etc. the views of the teaching profession - or that part of it within its scope at any time - on professional matters generally, including the training and supply of teachers.

5. Initially the council's concern would be with maintained schools but teachers in other sectors would be encouraged to register and its scope might later be extended. All registered teachers would be subject to the council's disciplinary jurisdiction.

Constitution.

6. The council would have a majority of serving teachers but there would be a minority of outside appointments made by the Secretary of State, to represent other interests. These might include some appointments made on the nomination of the local authority associations. The method of selecting the teachers to serve on the council needs further discussion.

Admission to the register

7. From the start registration would, subject to what follows, be a necessary condition of employment in maintained primary and secondary schools. It would however be necessary for the government to retain sufficient reserve powers to safeguard the supply of teachers for the public system. It seems possible that these powers could be exercised either at the stage of registration or at the stage of employment. Either the council must fix its standards for registration in such a way as not to exclude any categories of teachers that the government thinks are needed, or it must

accept the employment of unregistered teachers.

8. The "main committee" are prepared to see admitted to the register in England and Wales all qualified teachers in posts in maintained schools on the appointed date.

Finance

9. The "main committee" agree in principle that the council should be financially self-supporting. The possibility of some subvention from public funds (e.g. on a pump-priming basis) is for further discussion. As far as the teachers' own contributions are concerned the idea of a once-for-all registration fee is more attractive, because such a fee is cheaper to collect, than that of an annual subscription. If, however, the initial fee had to be relatively large it might be argued that a teacher just embarking on his career could not afford it.

APPENDIX ELEVEN

"A Teaching Council for England and Wales"
(H.M.S.O. London, 1970).

Part IV Chapter X pages 31 - 36.

Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

133. We summarise our conclusions and recommendations as follows :

- (1) The history of the teaching profession, and the experience of other professions, show that the key to an effective system of professional self-government is the imposition on the individuals of an obligation to have his name included in the register of a professional council (para.6).
- (2) Compulsory registration in the register of a Teaching Council should be introduced, in the first place as a condition of employment in the maintained schools. There should be arrangements for voluntary registration of suitably qualified persons serving in other sectors of the educational system. (paras. 6 and 7).

Advice on the Supply and Training of Teachers

- (3) We are required to formulate proposals for the establishment and operation of a Council through which teachers can exercise a measure of professional self-government; and for arrangements for advice to the Secretary of State on the training and supply of teachers. These two matters require separate and distinct bodies (para. 9).
- (4) For the latter purpose a standing advisory body to be called the Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers (A.C.S.T.T.) should take the place of the former (N.A.C.T.S.T.) To be effective it should be small (paras. 11 and 13).
- (5) The A.C.S.T.T.'s primary function would be to advise the Secretary

of State on policy matters referred by him connected with the supply and training of teachers for maintained schools, and establishments of further education in England and Wales, but the Committee would not be precluded from giving him advice on its own initiative (para. 12).

(6) The A.C.S.T.T. should consist of a chairman, 20 members from local authority and teachers' associations and from the teacher training system, and 8 members appointed by the Secretary of State (para. 16).

(7) Members of the A.C.S.T.T. should be free to form their own personal judgements, but the 20 members must have the confidence of their associations and should therefore be nominated by them, and not chosen by the Secretary of State (para. 15).

(8) In making his 8 appointments the Secretary of State should consider those interests which are not directly represented and should also give weight to the need to make good any lack of balance (para. 17).

(9) Alternates should be permitted. (para. 18).

(10) The Secretary of State and nominating bodies should bear in mind the claims of serving teachers for membership (para. 19).

(11) The Committee should in general regulate its own procedure but we hope that the Secretary of State would be informed of differing opinions rather than merely of the majority view. The organisation would be committed by views expressed by its nominee. The A.C.S.T.T.'s deliberations would not replace normal consultation (para. 21).

The Teaching Council

(12) The Council's existence should not affect the well-established process by which associations express their views. In particular the representatives

of the profession on other bodies should normally be nominated by associations and not by the Teaching Council (para. 25).

Purview of a Teaching Council

(13) Only qualified teachers should be eligible for registration by the Teaching Council (para. 29).

Reserve Powers

(14) The Secretary of State must retain power in the last resort to reject or modify recommendations of the Teaching Council on standards of entry to the profession (para. 31).

(15) However, the Teaching Council's recommendations about qualifications for entry to the profession, or to training, should be accepted unless there were overwhelming reasons to the contrary. When the Teaching Council made policy recommendations the Secretary of State should give the A.C.S.T.T. an opportunity of expressing its views (para. 35).

(16) We believe that in the great majority of cases the Secretary of State would accept the Teaching Council's recommendations and lay before Parliament a statutory instrument to give effect to them which would be subject to the negative resolution procedure. (para. 36).

(17) If the Secretary of State wished without the agreement of the Teaching Council to modify a recommendation or to give effect to it only in part or not at all he should be required to publish, and inform Parliament of, his reasons (para. 36).

(18) If the Secretary of State wished on his own initiative to modify or revise regulations concerned with entry to training or to the profession he should consult the Teaching Council and A.C.S.T.T. If he wished to

proceed despite their opposition the necessary statutory instrument should be subject to the affirmative resolution procedure (para. 39).

Entry to training

(19) The Secretary of State should, subject to his reserve powers, give effect to recommendations of the Teaching Council on conditions of entry to training. The training institutions should remain responsible for choosing between qualified candidates, and the area training organisations should remain responsible for approving exceptional admissions, and admissions to shortened courses. The Teaching Council should, however, have power to keep itself informed about the policies and practices of area training organisations with a view to promoting uniformity of practice (para. 41).

Courses of training

(20) There need be no change at present in the existing arrangements for control of courses but the Teaching Council should have power to make recommendations to the appropriate bodies which should be required to have regard to them and to report back what action, if any they proposed (para. 42.)

Qualification and Registration

(21) The Secretary of State should secure that only registered teachers were permitted by law to teach in a fully professional capacity in maintained schools. The position of persons without qualified teacher status would not be changed. Qualified teachers outside the maintained schools, and persons eligible to be qualified teachers, should be able to register voluntarily (para. 45).

(22) The Teaching Council should accept for registration any person recommended by an area training organisation as having satisfactorily completed training (para. 46).

(23) Officers of the Department should continue to handle, on behalf of the Teaching Council and within the Council's policy recommendations, the case work arising on admission to the register of persons with qualifications other than the normal ones (para. 48).

Probation

(24) The Teaching Council should establish two grades of registration - grade I for teachers who had not yet satisfactorily completed probation and grade II for those who had (para. 51).

(25) No change is necessary in procedure for dealing with probation of teachers whose suitability was in no doubt. Borderline cases should be referred for final decision to the Teaching Council (para. 54).

(26) No attempt should be made for the first two years or so to record whether or not teachers who were in post in maintained schools on the appointed day had passed probation (para. 55).

(27) Eligible teachers not in maintained schools on the appointed day who wished to be registered should go into grade I, unless they could produce evidence of satisfactory completion of probation (para. 56).

The register and the process of registration

(28) The Teaching Council should not be required to publish a register or to maintain a list of addresses of registered teachers, but information related to the registration of teachers should be kept as part of the Department's Main Mechanised Record of Teachers (para. 63).

(29) The proposed legislation should allow, on a provisional basis and subject to safeguards, the employment of teachers whose registration was pending (para. 65).

Public Access

(30) The recommended procedures would provide adequate opportunity for public access to the register (para. 66).

Grades of registration

(31) Legislation should not prescribe in detail the exact form or pattern of the register; the possibility should be left open of allowing more grades to be added (para. 68).

The process of registration

(32) A satisfactory procedure for registration and for collection of registration fees could be devised without imposing on the Teaching Council a large clerical machinery (para. 69)

(33) A system which we have considered would, by allowing fees to be collected by local education authorities, save the Teaching Council unwarranted expense, while not being in any way derogatory to the Council's position (para. 74).

(34) The period within which the fee was collected should be limited to one term (para. 75).

Objection on grounds of conscience

(35) We found no practical way to exempt from registration a teacher who objected on grounds of conscience (para. 76).

Professional discipline : The structure proposed

(36) Teachers struck off the register should have the right to appeal to the High Court or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (para. 82).

(37) There should be a Professional Conduct Committee to which the Teaching Council should delegate its disciplinary function and a Complaints Committee to establish when there was a prima facie case (para. 83).

(38) The legislation should lay down broad principles and require the Teaching Council to make detailed rules of procedure, subject to approval by the Privy Council, and to publish them (para. 86).

Professional discipline : Medical implications

(39) We hope that the Department would, initially, help the Teaching Council with advice on medical reports submitted by teachers (para. 89).

Dual jurisdiction

(40) All teachers registered with the Teaching Council should be subject to its jurisdiction. In some institutions both registered and unregistered teachers would be employed and the Secretary of State would have to deal with questions of discipline relating to the unregistered teachers. There should be close liaison between the Teaching Council and the Department to ensure consistency of practice (para. 91).

Teachers excluded from teaching before the establishment of the Teaching Council.

(41) The Teaching Council should accept the decision of the Secretary of State and any conditions he had laid down in the case of a teacher excluded by him from teaching (para. 97).

Constitution of the Teaching Council and provision for a review

- (42) The Teaching Council should consist of 40 members appointed by the Secretary of State, of whom 25 should be nominated by the main teachers' associations in the numbers shown (para. 102).
- (43) Some of the members appointed directly by the Secretary of State should be able to present the views of the local authority associations, the universities, and the public. The Secretary of State might include a person who had been associated with the College of Preceptors (para.103).
- (44) Members of the Teaching Council should exercise independent judgement and should not regard themselves as delegates or representatives (para. 105).
- (45) The Teaching Council should appoint its own chairman and be as free as possible to regulate its own procedure (para. 106).
- (46) The Council should be known as the Teaching Council for England and Wales (para. 108).
- (47) The Teaching Council's functions and constitution should be reviewed after it had been in operation for three years (para. 109).

Finance

- (48) It would be wise to assume that the cost of the Teaching Council would be £200,000 in its first year and £150,000 p.a. thereafter (para. 113).
- (49) A duty should be imposed on local education authorities to collect the Teaching Council's fee (para. 116).
- (50) A small, once-for-all, fee would be preferable to a recurrent fee (para. 117).
- (51) All qualified teachers in maintained schools should be required to

pay the fee (para. 118).

(52) A uniform fee, the same for all teachers, would be preferable (para.119).

(53) A once-for-all fee of £2 from every registered teacher would come near to being sufficient to cover the Council's costs (para. 124).

(54) We see the establishment of a Teaching Council as a co-operative venture involving local and central government as well as the professions.

We therefore recommend that

- a. local education authorities should agree to waive charges for the compulsory collection of the Teaching Council's fees (para. 128);
- b. the government should make available a pump-priming loan to enable the Teaching Council to start its operations;
- c. the government should accept the obligation to make a continuing subvention to the Teaching Council related to the cost of the work of which it would be relieved by the Council (paras. 130 and 131).

(55) The Teaching Council's power to fix fees should be subject to the Secretary of State's approval (para. 132).

APPENDIX TWELVEA TEACHING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND AND WALESA Commentary by the Council of the College of Preceptors

1. In making any comment on the document entitled "A Teaching Council for England and Wales" (H.M.S.O. 4/6d) members of the Council of the College of Preceptors cannot ignore the efforts of the predecessors over the past century in the movement for registration in the teaching profession. They note, therefore, with pleasure the references in the early paragraphs of the document to these efforts.
2. They are glad to note that the Working Party in their preparation of the document have accepted as a logical conclusion of their recognition of the efforts of the College of Preceptors that the College should be represented on the Teaching Council. They hope that the Secretary of State for Education and Science will find it possible to accept this recommendation.
3. In their discussions on the document the College Council has appreciated the difficulties which have had to be surmounted and the conflicting interests which had to be resolved. Any criticisms which they offer are made in the hope that they will help towards achieving the establishment of a Teaching Council.
4. The College Council has no illusions that the creation of the Teaching Council will immediately establish that professional status which teachers so much desire. They believe it is a wise, necessary and important step in the right direction. They sincerely hope that it will succeed where previous efforts have failed and the College will make every effort to contribute to its success.
5. The College Council recognises that there has been some difficulty in

defining the kind of person who should be admitted to a register and they are pleased to note that the phrase "suitably qualified" has at this stage been used in relation to the possible future inclusion of persons not within the present accepted categories. (paras. 6, 7 and 133 (2)).

6. On the question of reserve powers, the College Council believes that the paragraphs containing these recommendations must be treated as a whole. It should be clearly recognised that if any amendments were to be made to individual paragraphs, they could alter the balance achieved by the whole section (paras. 31 to 39 and 133 (14) to 133 (18)).
7. On the subject of probation, the College Council is disturbed at the implied finality of the definition of the term. They think it would be wiser to admit that this term might need to be redefined after the Teaching Council has been functioning for a time. They suggest that para. 52 should be extended to read (the additions are underlined) :

"52. The system of probation exists only in the maintained schools, Voluntary registrants in other sectors therefore would, we recommend, be registered only in grade 1 unless and until they could show that they had satisfactorily completed probation in a maintained school. We recommend however that the Teaching Council should seek to extend the system of probation to cover service in the direct grant and independent schools and until such time as the system of probation is extended to the sectors other than maintained schools, a teacher serving in any of these other sectors shall be required, as a condition of registration in Grade II, to show that he/she has completed satisfactorily a given period of service."
8. On the method to be used for collecting the subscription to the Teaching Council the College Council is of the opinion that the payment should be

in one sum and not by instalments. The total amount is so small as to make unnecessary the complicated and expensive procedure involved in the instalment system. To avoid hardship they recommend that the deduction be made from the second or third salary cheque or transfer payment to the teacher by the local authority. (para. 116).

9. The Council would prefer to see the phrase "professional education" substituted in paragraph 51 for the word "apprenticeship". This new phrase would seem to describe more accurately the quality of the work of an Institution preparing a teacher for his profession.
10. On the proposed Advisory Committee on the Training and Supply of Teachers the College Council makes two observations.
11. First, they consider that on a body which is advising on the training of teachers the proportion of those engaged in teaching or the training of teachers should be higher than is at present proposed (para. 16).
12. Secondly, they hope that the Secretary of State will appoint his nominees in such a way as to maintain or improve this proportion (para. 17).
13. Finally, in view of the extensive work of the College in the field of in-service professional education at so many levels, the College Council asks that the Secretary of State should consider nominating a representative of the College as a member of the Advisory Committee.

1st June, 1970.

J. Vincent Chapman,
Secretary.

This Commentary appears in "The Educational Newsletter of the College of Preceptors, 70/3, June, 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECTION A

Primary Sources and Documents not available to the public

1. The Proposed Teachers' General Council Main Committee. Documents, Minutes and Correspondence of the Main Committee 1960-1969. Made available by the National Association of Schoolmasters.
2. Minutes of the Preliminary Meetings of the Department of Education and Science, the Main Committee and the Local Authorities : December 1968 and January 1969. Made available by the National Association of Schoolmasters.
3. Minutes of the Official Working Party for a Teaching Council (July 1969 to January 1970), set up by Mr. E.Short, Secretary of State for Education and Science. Made available by the National Association of Schoolmasters.
4. National Association of Schoolmasters. Documents and Correspondence related to the Main Committee and Official Working Party, 1960 - 1970.
5. Personal Correspondence with the major English Teachers' Associations, and the Local Authority Associations on the issue of a Teachers' Council.
6. Personal correspondence with the major Scottish Teachers' Associations and the General Teaching Council for Scotland.

The above provide the principal sources of this thesis. These sources have been stated fully in the footnotes.

SECTION B - Government Publications. Published by H.M.S.O., London except where stated.

1. Report of the Schools' Inquiry Commission (1868).
2. Special Report from the Select Committee on the Teachers' Registration and Organisation Bill (1891).
3. Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education (1895).
4. Education (Administrative Provisions) Act 1907.
5. Teachers and Youth Leaders. Report of the Committee to Consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders (McNair Committee), 1944.

6. The Education Act, 1944. (7 & 8 Geo. 6, c.31).
7. Teachers' Registration Council Revoking Order, 1949. Statutory Instruments, 1949. No. 604.
8. Three Year Training for Teachers. 5th Report of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, 1956.
9. Schools Regulations, 1959 : Statutory Instruments, 1959. No. 364.
10. Higher Education. Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins. 1961 - 63. (Reprint 1968) Vol. One.
11. The Teaching Profession in Scotland. (Cmd 2066) 1963. Arrangements for the Award and Withdrawal of Certificates of Competency to Teach. (Edinburgh : H.M.S.O. reprint 1966).
12. Report of the Committee on University Teaching Methods, 1964.
13. The Demand for and Supply of Teachers, 1963 - 1986. Ninth Report of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers 1965.
14. Teaching Council (Scotland) Act 1965. (Edinburgh : H.M.S.O. reprinted 1969).
15. Staffing of Local Government, 1966 (Dec. 22nd).
16. Management of Local Government Report, 1967.
17. Teachers (Education, Training and Registration) (Scotland) Regulations 1967 Statutory Instruments, 1967, No. 1162. (Edinburgh : H.M.S.O. 1967)
18. The Schools (Amendment) Regulations, 1968. Statutory Instruments, 1968, No. 1281.
19. Qualified Teachers and Other Persons in Schools. 1968 D.E.S. Circular 15/68 (replacing circular 6/59).
20. Recommendations Concerning the Status of Teachers, 1968. D.E.S. Circular 5/68.
21. The Distribution of Teachers. Reports on Education, No. 42, January 1968.

22. The Schools (Qualified Teachers) Regulations, 1969.
Statutory Instruments, 1969, No. 1777.
23. Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Dispute between the
Durham Local Education Authority and the National Association of
Schoolmasters, 1969 Cmd. 4152.
24. Educational Expenditure.
Reports on Education, No. 53, February 1969.
25. Review of the Constitution and Functions of the General Teaching
Council. Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Scotland, 1969.
(Edinburgh : H.M.S.O. 1969).
26. A Teaching Council for England and Wales. Report of the Working
Party appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science.
1970.
27. Hansard : Lords, 4th Series, Vol. 165, 21st Nov. 1906 columns 773 and 774.
28. Hansard : Commons, Fifth Series, Vol. 766, Oral Answers, 20th June,
1968, Column 1293, section 22.
29. Hansard : Commons, Fifth Series, Vol. 770, Oral Answers, 17th October,
1968, Column 562, section 17.
30. Hansard : Commons, Fifth Series, Vol. 782, Oral Answers, 24th April,
1969, Column 636, section 13.
31. Hansard : Commons, Fifth Series, Vol. 804, Written Answers, 22nd
July, 1970, Column 164.
32. Hansard : Commons, Fifth Series, Vol. 808, Oral Answers, 17th December
1970, Columns 1538 and 1539, section 7.

SECTION C - Published Works

1. Alexander, Sir W.P.
Education in England. The National System - How it
Works. London : Newnes, Second Edition, 1964.
2. Alexander, Sir W.P.
Towards a New Education Act.
London : Councils and Education Press, 1969.

3. Baron G.
Society, Schools and Progress in England
Oxford : Pergamon Press, 1965.
4. Beer, S.H.
Modern British Politics
London : Faber and Faber, Second Edition, 1969.
5. Blaug, M. (edit)
Economics of Education I.
Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin, 1968.
6. Blyth, W.A.L.
English Primary Education, Volume One
London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.
7. Britton, E.
The Teaching Profession and the Education of Teachers. To be found in Colston Papers No.20. Towards a Policy for the Education of Teachers
London : Butterworth, 1969.
8. Castle, E.B.
The Teacher.
London : Oxford University Press, 1970.
9. Collins, M.
Students into Teachers.
London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, Students Library of Education, 1969.
10. Crossman, R.H.S.
Introduction to Walter Bagehot's, The English Constitution. Farnhill : Fontana Library, 1963.
11. Eveleigh, C. and Kyrle, M.
Teaching - a Profession? A proposal for an Institute of Teachers. London : New Orbits Publication 7, Second Edition, 1968.
12. Glass, D.V. (ed)
Social Mobility in Britain
London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.
13. Gould, R.
England and Wales, In, Yearbook of Education, 1953.
R.K.Hall, N. Hans, and J.A. Lauwerys (eds).
London : Evans, 1953.

14. Gould R.
Factors Affecting Teachers' Salaries in England and Wales. In, Yearbook of Education, 1956.
Education and Economics, R.K.Hall and J.A.Lauwerys(eds)
 London : Evans, 1956.
15. Hoyle, E.
The Role of the Teacher
 London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, Student Library of Education, 1969.
16. Kob, J.
Definitions of the Teachers' Role. In Halsey, A.H., Floud, J., and Anderson, C.A., (eds), Education, Economy and Society.
 New York : Free Press, Second printing 1966.
17. Layard, R., King, J., Moser, C.
The Impact of Robbins.
 Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin 1969.
18. Lieberman, M.
Education as a Profession.
 Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey : Prentice Hall 1956.
19. Manzer, R.A.
Teachers and Politics : The role of the National Union of Teachers in the making of national educational policy in England and Wales since 1944.
 Manchester : Manchester University Press, 1970.
20. Marshall, G. and Moodie, G.C.
Some Problems of the Constitution.
 London : Hutchinson University Library, revised edition 1961.
21. Millerson, G.
The Qualifying Associations.
 London : Routledge and Kegan Paul 1964.
22. Morris, N.
Chapter 2. England. In Teacher Unions and Associations, edited by A. Blum.
 University of Illinois Press 1969.
23. Roach, J.P.C.
The Teaching Profession : Some Reflections on a Century of Development : Inaugural Lecture.
 University of Sheffield, 1966.

24. Tropp, A.

The Changing Status of the Teacher in England and Wales. In. Yearbook of Education 1953; Hall, R.K., Hans, N., Lauwerys, J.A. (eds).
London : Evans, 1953.

25. Tropp, A.

The School Teachers. The Growth of the Teaching Profession in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day.
London : Heinemann, 1957.

26. Taylor, G. and Saunders, G.B.

The New Law of Education.
London : Butterworth, sixth edition, 1965.

27. Taylor, W.

The Secondary Modern School.
London : Faber and Faber, 1963.

28. Taylor, W.

Society and the Education of Teachers.
London : Faber and Faber, 1968.

29. Vaizey, J.

Britain in the Sixties : Education for Tomorrow.
Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin Special, 1962.

30. Vaizey, J.

The Control of Education.
London : Faber and Faber, 1963.

31. Vaizey, J.

The Economies of Education.
London : Faber and Faber, 1962.

SECTION D - Union Pamphlets obtainable from the appropriate Unions.

National Union of Teachers.

1. The Training of Teachers : statement of Executive policy on the training of teachers, adopted by Conference, 1951.
N.U.T., 1951.
2. The Teaching Profession - Statement of Executive Policy adopted by Conference, 1958.
N.U.T., 1958.

3. Professional Unity - A Memorandum to be submitted by the Executive to Conference, 1960.
N.U.T., 1960.
4. Professional Unity - An Interim Report.
N.U.T., March 1962, No. 243.
5. Teachers in their first posts. The Probationary Year.
Joint N.U.T. / A.T.C.D.E. publication, 1961.
6. Establishing a Self-governing Teaching Profession - a report on the proposals for a professional council for teachers presented to the N.U.T. Blackpool Conference, 1964.
N.U.T., Nov. 1963.
7. A Survey : Why Teachers are Underpaid.
N.U.T., January, 1969.
8. Into the 1970's. A discussion document prepared by the Union's Ad Hoc Committee on the New Education Act.
N.U.T., April 1969.
9. The Future of Teacher Education
N.U.T., July 1969.
10. The Teaching Council. A statement on the proposals for a Teaching Council for England and Wales, to be presented by the Executive to the Annual Conference of the National Union of Teachers, Scarborough, 1971.
N.U.T., February, 1971.

National Association of Schoolmasters.

11. Report on Professional Status.
N.A.S., 1961.
12. Professional Status through a Teachers' General Council.
N.A.S., No. 140/B, undated.
13. The Economic Status of the Schoolmaster. A digest of the E.I.U. Report on Teachers' Salaries commissioned by the N.A.S.
N.A.S., 1967.

The Educational Institute of Scotland.

14. The facts about the G.T.C.
E.I.S., January, 17th, 1969.

SECTION E. - Articles

1. Bamford, T.W.
Professional Implications in Status and Training. To be found in, The Professional Education of Teachers : Aspects of Education - Three.
Journal of the Institute of Education; University of Hull, December, 1965.
2. Baron, G.
The Teachers' Registration Movement.
British Journal of Educational Studies, May, 1954.
3. Chapman, J. Vincent.
The Movement for Registration in the Teaching Profession 1861 - 1966.
College of Preceptors, Education Today, Jan/Feb., 1968
Vol. 18 No. 1.
4. Craddock, W.J.
Young Teachers on Trial.
Education, 28th August, 1970, Vol. 136, No.9.
5. Elliott, G.K. and Margerison, C.J.
Split down the middle on question of pay.
Times Educational Supplement, 4th April, 1969.
6. Goodings, R.E.
The B.Ed and After.
Cornmarket : Higher Education Review, Summer, 1969.
7. Gould, R.
National Planning with the Education Service.
College of Preceptors, undated.
8. Pattison, G.
A Fair Gow
Assistant Masters Association Journal, October 1964.
9. Pollard, M.
What Price Security ?
Education and Training, February, 1970.
10. Ree, H.
Teaching - A Profession.
New Society, 14th October, 1965.
11. Thomasson, R.
Home Rule for Teachers?
New Society, 25th September, 1969.

12. Thomson, A.W.J.
Salaries in the Seventies : Teachers and the rest
Times Educational Supplement, 6th February, 1970.
13. Vaisey, J.
Teachers Under Authority.
Times Educational Supplement, 9th and 16th, January, 1959.
14. Westwood, L.J.
The Role of the Teacher.
Educational Research, Vols. 9 and 10, 1967.
15. Williams, Sir Griffith
The First Ten Years of the Ministry of Education
British Journal of Educational Studies, May 1955.
16. Wilson, B.R.
The Teacher's Role.
British Journal of Sociology, March 1962.

SECTION F - Other Documents.

1. Conservative and Unionist Teachers' Association Report on Professional Status : Approved by the National Advisory Committee on 13th May 1961.
To be found in the N.A.S. collection of papers on the Teaching Council.
2. The Proposed Teachers' General Council : Historical Document.
To be obtained from the N.A.H.T., Maxwellton House, 41-43 Boltro Road, Haywards Heath, Sussex.

SECTION G. - Newspapers, Journals and Periodicals to which specific references are made in the thesis.

1. The A.M.A. - Journal of the Assistant Masters Association.
2. Daily Express.
3. Daily Telegraph.
4. Economist.

