

# Trade Union Facilities Time Survey



## Local Education Authorities

March 2013

---

## Acknowledgements

This report was produced by the Workforce Team at the Local Government Association in conjunction with the LGA's Research and Information team.

Thank you to the participants who responded to the survey.

Jacky Teasell  
Workforce Team LGA  
[jacky.teasell@local.gov.uk](mailto:jacky.teasell@local.gov.uk)

For further information on the LGA's Workforce Team work with education and young people please visit: <http://www.local.gov.uk/workforce-education-and-young-people>

To view more research from the Local Government Association Research and Information team please visit: <http://www.local.gov.uk/local-government-intelligence>

---

## Contents

<b>1. Background</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<b>2. Key Findings</b>	<b>Page 5</b>
<b>3. Data Tables and Comment</b>	<b>Page 6</b>
<b>4. Questions asked in the survey</b>	<b>Page 11</b>
<b>5. Response Rates</b>	<b>Page 12</b>
<b>6. APPENDIX A (Question 4)</b> <i>Comments on position taken, or likely to be taken, on de-delegation (2013/14)</i>	<b>Page 13</b>
<b>7. APPENDIX B (Question 8)</b> <i>Approaches taken with regard to facilities time being used to deal with issues relating to academies after the point of transfer (where academies have not bought in or not been allowed to buy in)</i>	<b>Page 15</b>
<b>8. APPENDIX C (Question 10)</b> <i>Comments on current practical issues with regard to de-delegation and academisation in the context of union facilities times in schools</i>	<b>Page 16</b>
<b>9. Contact details for more information</b>	<b>Page 21</b>

---

## 1. Background

In the Department for Education's document *School Funding Reform: Arrangements* it stated in March 2012 the action they would be taking over the next few years to reform the school funding system in order to make it fairer, simpler, more consistent and transparent.

To give schools greater choice over how to spend their budgets, local authorities would be able to work on the basis that services within the notional Schools Block and the funding for them be delegated to schools in the first instance. In most authorities this would mean more delegation to schools than there had been in the past.

Within the delegated areas of spend there were some areas that could be retained centrally by the local authority, with the decision on whether or not to delegate or retain on behalf of maintained schools resting with the Schools Forum. One of these areas is staff costs or supply cover, which includes facilities time.

Local authorities were required to inform the Education Funding Agency of their formula by no later than 31 October 2012, with any decisions taken from April 2013.

In order to find out the impact of these changes on facilities time arrangements, the LGA's Research and Information Team sent out a survey to authorities during 19 February – 20 March 2013. The online survey was emailed to 140 authorities<sup>1</sup> with a good response rate of 75 completed surveys (fifty-four per cent). The full response rates to the survey can be found on page 12. The full set of questions asked in the survey can be found on page 11.

---

<sup>1</sup> The relevant funding arrangements apply in England only, therefore Welsh authorities were not included in the survey. The 140 authorities contacted were the ones for whom the Workforce team have HR contacts for.

---

## 2. Key Findings

- **Ninety-two per cent (69 respondents) said that in 2012/13 the relevant Schools Forum had agreed to de-delegate funds to enable trade union facilities time in primary schools to be funded corporately.**
- **Eighty-seven per cent (65 respondents) said that in 2012/13 the relevant Schools Forum had agreed to de-delegate funds to enable trade union facilities time in primary schools to be funded corporately.**
- **For both primary and secondary schools it appears that schools are taking similar positions for 2013/14.**
- **These responses suggest that schools collectively still see a value in managing facilities time on a centralised basis through the local authority. It will be interesting to see whether this approach changes in future years if school budgets tighten.**
- **The responses suggest that the more significant problem that local authorities are dealing with is how to manage facilities time in the context of academisation. As a result of this, many of the teachers represented by those with time-off for union duties are no longer employees of the local authority, or those union representatives are no longer employees of the local authority.**
- **Thirty-one per cent said the local authority had explicitly told the unions that facilities time being used to deal with issues relating to academies after the point of transfer was not acceptable, where the academy had not bought into the arrangement. Twenty per cent tolerated it on the basis that it supported the maintenance of good employee relations in the sector.**
- **Where union representatives had posts in community schools that had subsequently become academies, thirty-five per cent of local authorities had come to a financial arrangement with the relevant academy to allow the representative to continue to carry out the 'authority wide' role. Fourteen per cent of authorities had told the unions that in such circumstances the time-off needed to be reallocated to a local authority employee.**

---

### 3. Data Tables and Comment

**Q1 – In 2012/13 has the relevant Schools Forum in your area agreed to de-delegate funds to enable trade union facilities time in primary schools to be funded ‘corporately’?**

Response	Number	Per cent (%)
yes	69	92
no	2	3
not applicable	4	5
bases	75	100

Asked to all respondents; 75 answered

**Q2 – In 2012/13 has the relevant Schools Forum in your area agreed to de-delegate funds to enable trade union facilities time in secondary schools to be funded ‘corporately’?**

Response	Number	Per cent (%)
yes	65	87
no	5	7
not applicable	5	7
bases	75	100

Asked to all respondents; 75 answered

**Comment:** The survey responses suggest that the vast majority of local authorities’ schools still recognise the value of managing the issue of facilities through corporate arrangements. The most common reason given as to why the question was ‘not applicable’ was that all/most schools within the sector were academies and therefore the situation did not apply.

---

**Q3 – Comments received on the impact, if any, this had on arrangements for seconding teacher union representatives to undertake duties beyond their own school (for example, involvement in collective consultation/negotiations with HR/director of children’s services and taking on case work in other schools)?**

**Comments received:**

*Lead reps of the majority membership unions (NUT and NASWUT) who are seconded full-time to TU duties are employed in schools that have converted to academies. Delegation and de-delegation arrangements are not considered to have any major impact on relationships between the Council and the TUs. There is progressively less engagement between the Council and the teachers TUs as increasing numbers of schools convert to academies.*

*We are still in negotiation about the impact but it will result in a reduction of TU facilities time of about a 1/3 for each union and to advise schools that did not de-delegate that they should be making their own arrangements.*

*Unions anticipate there will be problems and expect meetings to be held after school when reps are available.*

**Q4 – Do you have any comments on the position taken, or likely to be taken, on de-delegation for this purpose in 2013/14?**

**Comment:** The responses received have revealed that nearly all authorities will be continuing with de-delegation for this purpose in 2013/14. Where ‘formal’ de-delegation has been rejected by a schools forum, in several cases authorities have set up pooled funding arrangements into which schools can buy-in. Several authorities indicated that they would be reviewing facilities time more generally during 2013/14.

Several respondents indicated that only secondary schools had rejected de-delegation. This might be as a result of the amount of funding they would keep being a far greater cash amount than a small primary and/or their judgement that with a greater likelihood of the main teacher unions having representatives within their schools they could manage the issue entirely at school level.

For detailed comments please refer to Appendix A on page 13.

---

**Q5 – How many schools (excluding private schools) are there in your local authority area?**

**Q6 – How many of these are academies?**

**Q7 – How many, if any, of the academies in your local authority area are buying back into the local authority arrangement for trade union facilities time?**

Responses	Total number*
Q.5 Schools	11253
Q.6 Academies	1285
Q.7 Bought back	317

\*Figures relate to survey respondents only

Response (whether councils have academies buying back into the scheme)	Value (n)	Value (%)
councils with no academies buying back into the scheme	32	55
councils with academies buying back into the scheme	26	45
bases	58	100

**Comment:** The average council (where an academy had bought back in) has twenty eight per cent of the academies buying back into local authority arrangements. However it should be noted that in the majority of councils no academies were buying back in. This suggests that there will be increasing practical difficulties in seeking to manage trade union facility time across the state funded sector.

The survey indicated that 11.4% of schools were now academies. This compares with a figure of 13.3% published by the DfE in February 2013. This would suggest that the responses regarding the impact of academisation are a reasonable barometer of the position within the sector as a whole.



**Q8 – Where academies have not bought-in (or not been allowed to buy in) to the local authority’s arrangements for funding trade union facilities time, what approach have you taken with regard to any facilities time being used to deal with issues relating to academies after the point of transfer?**

Response	Value (n)	Value (%)
Explicitly told the unions that this is not acceptable	22	31
Tolerated it on the basis that it assists in maintaining good employee relations	14	20
Allowed it for a specific period after transfer (e.g. one term)	1*	<1
Don't know	9	13
Other (please specify) – Please see <i>Appendix B</i> for comments	20	28
Not applicable	5	7
<b>Bases</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>

\*This was for a three month period.

**Q9 – Where a union representative with a post in a community school has had facilities time to represent their union/members beyond their individual school (for example, involvement in collective consultation/negotiations with HR/director of children’s services and taking on case work in other schools) and that school has then become an academy which of the following approaches have you taken?**

Response	Value (n)	Value (%)
Indicated to the relevant union that you will continue to provide facilities time, but it must be allocated to someone who remains an employee of the local authority	10	14
Come to a financial arrangement with the academy to provide funding for back-filling to enable the previous arrangement to continue	25	35
Don't know	8	11
Other (please specify) – see comment below	13	18
* Not applicable *	16	22
<b>Bases</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100</b>

**Comment:** A number of comments were received under the ‘Other’ category which ranged from the question not being applicable, or they were still in discussion with appropriate bodies. In summary, these comments were:

- Not applicable – 16 comments
- Continuing to fund - 2 comments – (one only funded until 31 March 2013, the other under review in 2013/14)
- In discussions – 4 comments
- Academy must contribute – 4 comments

---

**Q10 – Do you have any other comments on current practical issues with regard to de-delegation and academisation in the context of union facilities time in schools?**

**Comment:**

The responses to this question suggest that academisation is a far bigger issue for authorities in managing facilities time than some schools forums choosing not to de-delegate funding. For many authorities the aim has been to persuade academies to buy-in to the arrangement. However it should be noted that responses to Question 7 indicated that only forty-five per cent of respondents had academies buying back into the arrangements. It should also be noted that in some cases authorities had specifically excluded academies from buying into the facilities time arrangements.

Indications from some authorities are that academies wish to continue the arrangements for facilities time. A move away would necessitate the establishment of a consultation and negotiating machinery which they are reluctant to introduce. Worries about additional workload for HR was also mentioned.

Some respondents said that there would be difficulties in managing facilities time if large numbers of academies did not buy in, and a particular difficulty was where an academy chain operated across local authority boundaries.

The general sense from the comments is that in many cases local authorities, schools and academies are all adjusting to the changed landscape and that arrangements in place at present are not 'set in stone' and are likely to be reviewed in the near future.

Other respondents cited legal issues – for example when a school becomes an academy, the local authority is no longer a party to the employment relationship. This raised questions as to whether the authority should attempt to manage this aspect of the relationship for a different employer.

Please see Appendix C for full breakdown of comments received.

---

## 4. Questions asked in the survey

**Q.1 – In 2012/13 has the relevant Schools Forum in your area agreed to de-delegate funds to enable trade union facilities time in primary schools to be funded ‘corporately’?**

**Q.2 – In 2012/13 has the relevant Schools Forum in your area agreed to de-delegate funds to enable trade union facilities time in secondary schools to be funded ‘corporately’?**

**Q.3 – Please summarise the impact, if any, this has had on your arrangements for seconding teacher union representatives to undertake duties beyond their own school (for example, involvement in collective consultation/negotiations with HR/director of children’s services and taking on case work in other schools)?**

**Q.4 – Comments invited on the position taken, or likely to be taken, on de-delegation for this purpose in 2013/14.**

**Q.5 – How many schools (excluding private schools) are there in your local authority area?**

**Q.6 – How many of these are academies?**

**Q.7 – How many, if any, of the academies in your local authority area are buying back into the local authority arrangement for trade union facilities time?**

**Q.8 – Where academies have not brought-in (or not been allowed to buy-in) to the local authority’s arrangements for funding trade union facilities time, what approach have you taken with regard to any facilities time being used to deal with issues relating to academies after the point of transfer?**

**Q.9 – Where a union representative with a post in a community school has had facilities time to represent their union/members beyond their individual school (for example, involvement in collective consultation/negotiations with HR/director of children’s services and taking on case work in other schools) and that school has then become an academy which of the following approaches have you taken?**

**Q.10 – Do you have any other comments on current practical issues with regard to de-regulation and academisation in the context of union facilities time in schools?**

## 5. Response Rates

### Total response rate

Emailed (n)	Completed (n)	Response rate (%)
140	75	54

### Response rate by region

Region	Emailed (n)	Completed (n)	Response rate (%)
East of England	10	5	50
East Midlands	6	3	50
London	27	14	52
North East	12	7	58
North West	24	13	54
South East	18	10	56
South West	16	8	50
West Midlands	14	9	64
Yorkshire and the Humber	13	6	46

### Response rate by council type

Council type	Emailed (n)	Completed (n)	Response rate (%)
Shire County	27	17	63
London Borough	27	14	52
Metropolitan District	34	19	56
English Unitary	52	25	48

---

## APPENDIX A

**Q4 – Comments were invited on the position taken, or likely to be taken, on de-delegation for this purpose in 2013/14. Here are some of the comments we received.**

*...Our main issue is that as schools continue to convert to academy status, as they are into part of the annual schools forum vote, they may choose not to buy in to any corporate facilities agreement going forward.*

*Schools Forum agreed to de-delegate the funding for Union time for 2013/14 for both primary and secondary so effectively the process will continue as currently with the LA paying the costs against a central budget rather than 'buy-back' from schools. The issue, as with other de-delegated services, is what will happen when schools convert to academy.... There is the option of seeking a 'buy-back' however schools may decide to retain the funding (the same applies for all de-delegated services, not just TU time). If academies opt to remain, then I suspect we will need to notify the union reps that if they do any work relating to an academy school then they must charge the academy direct and should not include the costs on any claim to the LA.*

*Primary schools have de-delegated the funding. Secondary schools have not de-delegated the funding.*

*....have agreed....continue to support de-delegation for 2013/14. However, have asked for a review of the facility time agreement to take place and there are currently local relationship issues with one of the teacher unions which is leading to some unrest amongst schools about continuing to support facility time.*

*...have agreed to de-delegate the budget for 2013/14 but have expressed a view that a review of the funding allocation [union facilities] should be undertaken during 2013/14 in readiness for 2014/15.*

*It appears that some individual secondary schools wish to contribute so that they can continue to have this support – we are examining whether this can be done on a traded basis. We believe that maintained secondary schools have been influenced in this decision by academies who were not able to de-delegate. There is a view which we believe is mistaken that the slack will be taken up by regional officers and perhaps that things will be able to be changed with less consultation.*

*Primary schools agreed it was the best way to proceed. Secondary schools did not wish to de-delegate....Have agreed to do so for the forthcoming year, pending a full review of the current arrangements and on condition that the Local Authority provides a system whereby academies can contribute appropriately.*

*All...academies have agreed to de-delegate their share of the funding to the LA, as none of them wishes to set up their own consultative frameworks. Schools have expressed frustration over facilities agreement funding being distributed via the formula. Their view was that it made little or no sense to delegate the funding stream to schools, when it was*

---

*clear that best value would be served by holding the funds centrally. Delegating and then de-delegating funding simply generates unnecessary work.*

*Trade unions will need to make their own arrangements with schools that have not de-delegated (and academies) from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014. The Council will re-delegate to the trade unions the de-delegated primary school funding under criteria and subject to reporting requirements determined by the Council.*

*Primaries have voted to de-delegate but not secondaries. A further vote will be held as the secondaries reflect on the impact on them.*

*Primary schools have agreed to de-delegate, but secondary schools have not. This has resulted in the facilities time being cut significantly for the 2013/14 financial year.*

*Schools forum have agreed not to de-delegate funds for 2013/14. The LA is proposing to offer a 'pooled' voluntary buy in service for maintained schools and Academies to fund TU facilities time.*

*This budget is being delegated to schools with schools being asked to buy in to a Trade Union Facility Time Service Level Agreement which schools are being asked to pay for.*

*I suspect that the primaries will follow the secondaries and decline the de-delegation next year.*

*Schools have not been asked to de-delegate. Instead we have asked all schools and academies if they wish to contribute towards a 'budget pool' to fund seconded time off from 2013 onwards. This would be via a service level agreement with contributions based on the existing de-delegated budget being proportioned according to staff numbers in each school/academy.*

*De-delegation will not be applied to either primary or secondary sectors from April 2013. We are seeking to maintain a co-ordinate facilities framework through a discretionary 'traded service' arrangement which we think many schools will support.*

## APPENDIX B

**Q8. Where academies have not bought-in (or not been allowed to buy in) to the local authority's arrangements for funding trade union facilities time, what approach have you taken with regard to any facilities time being used to deal with issues relating to academies after the point of transfer?**

### **Under discussion/preparation**

*Six authorities indicated that the matter was under discussion.*

### **Academies pay for service**

*It is a matter for each academy however no SLA is in operation*

*Charge will be levied against the academy*

*If they buy back the HR service then we tolerate it on the basis of maintaining good employee relations. However we will be approaching academies direct to see if they wish to buy in to the facilities agreement, highlighting the benefits to them*

*Forum have agreed the LA will approach the academy allowing them to buy back in under an appropriate mechanism*

*Allow them to buy additional service by hourly rate*

*All bought in for 2012/13. From 2013 only those who contribute will be able to use seconded time for academy related work.*

### **Miscellaneous**

*Currently funded centrally for reviewing 13/14*

*No change for the next two years*

*We have restricted Trade Union access to academies not contributing to the LCC TU facilities agreement to support for those members in those academies to outside of the school day – i.e. 8.30am to 4.00pm*

*A combination of local tolerance and some direct funding by certain academies, outside of LA scheme*

*We hope all schools buy back into the agreement however this is to be discussed with school forum, academies and unions*

*Initially tolerated it on the basis that it helps employee relations but moving to explicitly forbid trade unions using time paid for by other schools for this work. We are fortunate that some of our trade unions are resourced in part by volunteers who are not paid employees.*

*Referred representation of the employees to a regional official of that Trade Union.*

*The Authority is not party to the employment relationship so it is not appropriate for us to continue to maintain the relationship. All the law around trade union representation is geared up to the relationship between the employer, and the representatives of the employees who are employed by the same employer.*

**Q10. Do you have any other comments on current practical issues with regard to de-delegation and academisation in the context of union facilities times in schools?**

#### **Continuing arrangements with academies**

*The indications from the majority of academies is that they wish to continue with an arrangement whereby the previous arrangements for facility time can continue. Most academies have no wish to set up their own consultation and negotiation machinery. Almost all the academies buy HR support from the Council and there is little appetite to move away from locally negotiated policies and procedures.*

*This was becoming a problem until our Finance Team confirmed that money has been held back out of the central allocation to continue with the existing Facilities Arrangements for the next two financial years so that unions continue to provide the same service to both schools and Academies.*

*Future funding of facilities time for trade union reps with county wide duties who are now working in academies is being reviewed at the moment. The majority of academies buy back our HR services, and therefore in the interests of good employee relations we are supporting these academies to retain strong and viable relationships with regional and academy-based union reps through the establishment of Trade Union Recognition Agreements.*

#### **Encouraging academies to buy-back**

*The situation will be impossible to manage if large numbers of academies do not “buy-back”. As more academies go there will be insufficient money centrally to support maintained schools in this so there will be no central funding support.*

*It is really difficult managing facility time when not all academies are buying in. There is a lack of understanding over what facility time is for. Causes problems for HR services where not all schools are buying into facility time. Becoming increasingly difficult where academy chains are across boundaries.*

*If a number of schools converting to academies increases significantly and a significant percentage refuse to de-delegate, then we will be unable to sustain the level of union facilities time currently afforded and the local authority will need to manage these issues.*

*If academy contribution a reduced/revoked amount of paid release time will reduce; possible impact on employee relations and increased reliance on local shop stewards.*

*Where academies have not bought back into the Authority’s SLA, academies have consulted with regional union representatives which has caused issues with the County Secretaries.*



*We intend to move to a position where the option of buy-back into the facilities budget is only available to academies who buy back Schools HR. All maintained schools buy the Schools HR service.*

*The LA has more of its schools moving academy status and is currently considering options to allow academies to buy into a facilities time agreement. Further advice from LGA would be welcome.*

*If academies don't buy into the LA union facilities time then they would have to liaise with the unions Regional Office and this does create a time pressure.*

*The logical thing would be for the academy funding agreements with DfE to require them to buy back into the facility time arrangements*

### **Discussions still on going**

*Still waiting for a decision to be made by each individual academy. Undertaken presentations to academies and issued a detailed paper outlining what obligations academies would be required to fulfil as the "employer" with regard to TU facility time etc. I understand that as a result they may be rethinking their initial stance about not buying into the pooled facility time.*

*We are currently awaiting responses from academies as to whether they wish to enter into a pooled arrangement. Responses so far are not very positive. The funding forum will review the position during early 13/14 and funding for representation in Academies will cease if we do not have a good response from them. This may also influence their decision about continuation of buy back from schools.*

*Not yet decided whether to allow academies to buy in as they would not be bound by the outcome of collective bargaining. DfE model for trade Union representation in academies, i.e. local reps only, is not a true reflection of how TUs work in practice and is not practical. Need to resolve issue of Special Schools which are still maintained as cannot de-delegate.*

*As we are in the process of offering academies the opportunity to buy back into the authority wide arrangements we are not yet in a position to assess the impact of de-delegation in this LA.*

*Burgundy Book is unhelpful. Unions are citing Burgundy Book as the required arrangements which cannot be changed. This argument has been challenged. Task group has been set up by School's Forum to review the current arrangements.*

*There is a particular difficulty with school based trade union representatives who are elected to fulfil roles which are City Council wide. At the moment their backfill arrangements are met from the facility budget de-delegated by schools however increasingly this may become more difficult. It presents issues for the Council and the trade unions in managing the employee relations framework as many employees in schools continued to be employed by the Council therefore are covered by the current facility time agreement for schools however we believe this needs to happen. Debate continues!*

---

### **Particular issues concerning academy chains**

*There are no particular issues at present as only one school has become an academy. A possible issue could be if an academy chain pay for facilitation time but want the negotiations to be with the academy chain rather than the LA.*

### **Miscellaneous**

*Believe that councils should cease to have any involvement in facility funding arrangements (including administration) for schools TU reps. Should be entirely a matter between trade unions and schools/academies direct.*

*We have had issues with TUs not wishing to confirm how that they have spent the Facility Time budget – remains to be seen what impact this will have on future de-delegation*

*This is an issue that has not gone quietly, there are continuing rumbles from ex County Council representatives who have moved to academies requesting centrally co-ordinated representative roles.*

*The situation will become more complex as individual Academies take on different approaches.*

*This is a piece of political nonsense which undermines the local authority's contribution to the employee relations framework. Hopefully most schools and academies (we have a number of further conversions about to proceed) will recognise the benefits of a 'pooled' arrangement – notwithstanding our periodic frustrations with the position taken by unions or their reps.*

*It endangers effective local employee relations arrangements and machinery by dispersal of existing resources.*

*This has been a real problem. With de-delegation from 2013 onwards not being an option we have asked all schools and academies to contribute toward seconded time off under a service level agreement. This seconded time off will be used only for those schools who have contributed. Allocating time off to each union is then difficult as this is limited by the funds contributed by schools.*

### **Academies not intending to continue arrangements**

*The current arrangements stand for this year only. There is an indication that academies in the future may not de-delegate and keep the monies to buy into facilities time as and when.*

*We anticipate that not all academies will buy into our funding agreement, and this is likely to lead to a reduction in funding for facilities time. This could potentially lead to redundancy situations, as we have full time reps who have not taught for many years and there will be issues regarding employment liabilities. We face issues around facilities time for national representatives as this has been awarded on a discretionary basis, but is not part of the employer responsibility to provide facilities. We are starting to question the extent to which union subs fund union officials. We need to review the basis on which our existing facilities agreement has been drawn up. Although in the only case so far where a union rep was in a school that became an academy we said that the time had to be allocated to someone else, we may review this position with future transfers.*

### **Would welcome guidance**

*We are currently assessing the arrangements with the actual number of academies we have. We would welcome any results and information from your survey.*

*At this moment we currently do not have any academies however any information gained from this survey would be very useful, as we develop systems locally*

### **Legal issues**

*One of the biggest difficulties we have is getting both academies and Trade Unions to understand that when the school becomes an academy the local authority is no longer a party to the employment relationship, and therefore providing facilities time and the mechanisms for discussion have to transfer and be e-established. When facilities time is given, even if for casework, the Trade Unions still try to maintain the status quo and discuss with the authority things that are not relevant to them, nor can they have any influence over. This type of 'hosting' arrangement would not occur in any other TUPE situation. De-delegation is fine when all schools delegate back, but I can see it would cause difficulties if any schools chose not to do that.*

*The Council do not provide a traded HR service for schools or academies. In this context the Council has not provided a mechanism for academy schools to buy-back into a trade union facilities time scheme. It would be helpful if guidance could be provided in relation to the legal obligation for schools to provide facilities time and practically what this may mean to them (i.e. – may be requested by TUs to provide and train reps in each school, issues re collective bargaining), in addition to the information contained in the STPCD and NJC conditions of service, in order for schools/schools forum representatives to be aware of their responsibilities should a vote not to de-delegate funding be taken.*

---

### **Availability and workload**

*The de-delegation arrangements (on top of academisation) have had the effect of removing the council wide view of issues and moving to a much more individual school basis in terms of trade union support. This has resulted in more work for HR (rather than less which I imagine was anticipated). Our area has traditionally had schools that worked together in the best interests of the children across the area rather than in the best interests of individual schools. This appears to have been eroded.*

*Current union reps who receive facilities time are undertaking work in Academies outside of their contracted time with their employer creating some issue on availability and overall time worked.*

*Will create issues for employers/staff and unions moving forward in delaying with casework*

---

**For more information please contact**

Jacky Teasell  
Negotiating Officer  
Local Government Association

Local Government House  
Smith Square  
London SW1P 3HZ

Email: [jacky.teasell@local.gov.uk](mailto:jacky.teasell@local.gov.uk)

Telephone: 020 7187 7336



**Contact the Local Government Association**

Telephone: 020 7664 3000

Email: [info@local.gov.uk](mailto:info@local.gov.uk)

Website: [www.local.gov.uk](http://www.local.gov.uk)

© Local Government Association, October 2013