



**Clackmannanshire Council : Services to People**

**A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

**Promoted Post structures**

**Towards implementation in primary schools**

**The authority's response to consultation**

**Agreement on interim implementation**

## Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Principles	3
3.1	General considerations	4
3.2	Professional duties and responsibilities	4
3.3	General principles to be adopted for promoted posts in primary schools	4
3.4	DHTs/ AHTs	5
3.5	Principal teachers	5
3.6	Guidance and pastoral care	6
3.7	Options for promoted posts in primary	6
3.8	Resource allocation	6
3.9	Implementation time frame	6
3.10	Early severance	6
3.11	Initial appointment of principal teachers	8
4.	Summary	9
Appendices		
1.	Responses to consultation	10
2.	Summary of issues and authority's response	11
3.a.	Review of staffing formula : commentary	12
3.b.	Staffing formula – all rolls	19
3.c.	Staffing formula – Clackmannanshire schools	
3.d.	Staffing formula – comparison with another authority	
4.	Promoted post structures: principles to be adopted	20
5.	Sample job outline for principal teachers	21
6.	Examples of principal teacher remits in primary schools	22

## Clackmannanshire Council : Services to People

### A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

#### Promoted Post structures : Towards implementation in primary schools

##### The authority's response to consultation and interim agreement

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. 6 responses to consultation were received: 5 responses (from 4 schools), and 1 Clackmannanshire-wide responses (EIS). A list of responses received is given as Appendix 1. The authority regrets that there was a relatively disappointing response to consultation. It is however fully understood that the pressures schools were under during the summer term because of the involvement of staff in a range of activities and because of the lack of available cover will have impacted on the capacity of schools to respond.
- 1.2. In addition, many teachers attended the launch meeting held at the start of the consultation process.
- 1.3. This paper is aimed at addressing the issues raised during consultation, and proposes further consultation in the light of changing circumstances, particularly those implied by the outcome of the job-sizing exercise.
- 1.4. The interim implementation has been agreed by the LNCT at its meeting of 30 October 2003.

## 2.0 Principles

- 2.1. The authority is of the view that key principles outlined in the Discussion Paper: "Promoted Posts : Principles to be adopted" remain the key to the review of promoted post structures:
- 2.2. *"The promoted post structure should contribute to improved experiences and outcomes for young people in our schools.*

*It should lead to improvement in :*

- *the leadership of the school at all levels*
- *the effectiveness of a school achieving its goals*
- *the quality of learning and teaching*
- *the working conditions of all in the school*

*It should ensure that the needs of the young person and the personal and professional development needs of all staff are at the centre of changes in the promoted post structures".*

- 2.3. The authority remains of the view that for, the above conditions to be met, there is a need for a re-appraisal of the relationship between the classroom teacher and those who provide management and leadership within the schools. It also remains of the view that the introduction of principal teacher posts into primary schools is a key element of the Agreement in order to provide enhanced management capacity and improved career progression in the primary sector.

- 2.4. It accepts, without reservation, that future re-structuring must be within the terms of the Agreement, 'A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century'.

### **3.0 General considerations**

- 3.1. The proposals below build on the interim paper discussed at the LNCT on 18 September and makes concrete proposals on moving forward on interim arrangements for promoted post structures in primary schools. It follows the structure of the original consultative paper for ease of reference.

### **3.2. Professional duties and responsibilities (Section 2 of original paper)**

- 3.2.1. It is proposed that this section be adopted in any final agreement on promoted post structures in primary schools. The Appendices of the original paper related to this section (Appendix 2.A and 2.B) should also be retained as the basis for the definition of duties of principal teachers in primary schools.

### **3.3. General principles to be adopted for promoted posts in primary schools (Section 3 of original paper)**

- 3.3.1. The authority remains of the view that the imbalance in management capacity between the primary and secondary sectors requires to be redressed (in relation to both the numbers of posts and the management time available).
- 3.3.2. It also remains of the view that any new system should be based on the allocation of formula-based funding to allow each school to determine the precise configuration of management which meets its needs. However, further detailed examination of the implications of the job-sizing exercise is likely to constrain the extent to which this will be possible. In particular, the element of job-sizing which allocates pointage to the amount of teaching time in any given post is a factor which will need to be considered carefully in the light of advice from SNCT on re-job-sizing. The authority is of the view that it would be inappropriate to put any head teacher in the position where a school-based decision on the allocation of HT management time could impact on the salary of that head teacher.
- 3.3.3. The authority sees merit in the adoption of a principle whereby each level of promoted post should carry with it a minimum entitlement to management time. This has been built in to a comprehensive review of the formula funding.
- 3.3.4. Appendices 3(a) to 3 (d) provide full details of the revised staffing formula. Appendix (a) gives explanatory notes. Appendix 3(b) lists the staffing which would be allocated to schools with rolls from 30 to 500. Appendix 3(c) extracts from this full listing the staffing allocation to Clackmannanshire's primary schools if the revised formula had been applied at the time of the staffing returns in March 2003. Appendix 3(d) gives information on the staffing which would be allocated to Clackmannanshire primary schools if we operated to the staffing formula of another authority.
- 3.3.5. The main changes from the current staffing formula are that specific, separate allocations are provided for management time and for teaching time. This has the broad effect of allocating additional management resources to smaller primary schools, but with a concomitant effect of reducing the total staffing to larger primary schools in order to maintain as far as possible the same overall staffing allocation.

- 3.3.6. The number of posts allocated to schools in particular roll bands has been taken from Model B of Appendix 6 of the consultation paper. The number of hours allocated to HT, DHT and PT posts has been changed from the original proposal after further consideration of the outcome of the job-sizing exercise and of the need to manage the process within existing resources. The spreadsheets in Appendix 3(b) and 3(c) detail the basis for these allocation.
- 3.3.7. This proposal has been discussed with primary head teachers. There was broad agreement with the proposals, with some specific concerns raised which have been addressed in the appendices or which have been acknowledged as being issues which remained to be resolved.

#### **3.4. DHTs / AHTs (Section 4 of original paper)**

- 3.4.1. The references above to the need to review the basis for the allocation of management posts and management time will have implications for the precise configuration of DHT posts in the new structures.
- 3.4.2. There is a reduction of 7 DHT posts from the current complement of 19. 3 are temporary posts. Because of falling rolls, schools are currently operating at a further 3 above that allowed for in the current scheme of devolved management. The effect of the change to the staffing formula, there will be one additional surplus DHT post. Banchory, Deerpark and St Serf's have temporary DHTs; Claremont, Alva and Tillicoultry currently have surplus DHTs; Abercromby PS will lose one DHT post under the revised staffing formula.
- 3.4.3. Paragraph 4.3 of the original consultation paper set out the authority's view in relation to the position of DHT postholders in the event of there being surplus posts in a particular school.

*"All existing permanent post-holders of AHT posts will be re-designated DHTs with effect from August 2003, unless they opt to retire, wind-down, seek actuarially reduced pensions or step down from that post. In the event of there being more DHTs in a school than are required under the new structures for that school, the title of DHT and the conserved salary which the post-holders will have will be personal to the post-holders. Any surplus post will disappear on the promotion, resignation or retirement of that post-holder. Detailed consideration will require to be given to ensuring that all processes relating to such adjustments are fully within the Council's policies and procedures. It should be noted that the requirement under the School Boards' legislation for all DHT appointments to be made by an appointments' panel with School Board members having rights of participation on the panel has been waived under the School Education (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2002."*

- 3.4.4. It is proposed that those schools currently with an acting DHT post to which they are no longer entitled will no longer continue with these posts after the end of session 2003/04 at the latest, at which point the acting postholders will revert to their former substantive posts. However, it is also hoped that early actions in relation to new PT posts will resolve the situation during the course of session 2003/04 (see paragraphs 3.11.2 and 3.11.3).
- 3.4.5. Further consideration is given to this in Sections 3.10 and 3.11 below.

### **3.5. Principal teachers (Section 5 of original paper)**

- 3.5.1. The remits allocated to principal teachers in the new structures will be within the terms of Annex B of the Agreement. Examples of such remits were included in the original consultation paper and are considered to provide the basis for the determination of precise remits in all schools. These are replicated as Appendices 4 & 5.
- 3.5.2. There was reference in only one response to the request for views on the possibility of creating principal teachers with cluster responsibilities. This response was not in favour of the possibility. It is proposed therefore not to proceed with this option.
- 3.5.3. Further consideration is given in Section 3.11 to the phased introduction of PT posts.

### **3.6. Guidance and pastoral care (Section 6 of original paper)**

- 3.6.1. The authority remains of the view that there should be no authority-wide introduction of principal teacher (guidance) posts in primary schools. It reiterates its view that each individual school will require to allocate responsibilities for the management of pastoral care to the appropriate management post within its structures. This might be within the remit of the head teacher, a DHT or a PT.

### **3.7. Options for promoted posts in primary schools (Section 7 of the original paper)**

- 3.7.1. The original consultation paper described two possible models for promoted post structures in primary school. It was however stressed that these had been constructed without regard to the outcome of the job-sizing exercise. As indicated above in paragraph 3.3.6, the revised staffing formula has been based on Model B of Appendix 6 of the consultation paper. The balance of funding has been adjusted to provide additional resources for smaller primary schools. It was felt that the additional transfer of resources which would have been required if Model A had been adopted would have created real difficulties for larger schools.

### **3.8. Resource allocation (Section 8 of the original paper)**

- 3.8.1. This section continues to provide the context within which the review of promoted posts in primary schools will be carried out.
- 3.8.2. It should however be stressed that the revised structures and staffing formula will require to be phased in as funding can be released from savings elsewhere (see Section 3.11 below).

### **3.9. Implementation time frame (Section 9 of the original paper)**

- 3.9.1. It was originally proposed to advertise a number of principal teacher posts before the October holidays, with appointments being taken up from 1 January.
- 3.9.2. The position has, however, been complicated by the announcement of transitional funds, after the previous consultation paper was agreed. In the secondary sector, funds were allocated to the offer and granting of early severance to a small number of principal teachers.

### **3.10. Early severance**

- 3.10.1. It is proposed that this early severance scheme be extended to former senior teachers and to DHTs in the primary sector, with as far as possible the same parameters as were agreed for the secondary sector.
- 3.10.2. This proposal is subject to approval by Council at its meeting of 12 November 2003.
- 3.10.3. The authority will write to all permanent postholders of DHT, and those who previously held ST posts in primary schools, over the age of 55 by the end of the financial year 2003/04 (31 March 2004), to invite expressions of interest in early severance packages.
- 3.10.4. The number of packages to be made available cannot be determined at this stage. The actual costs of a package for each eligible teacher who applies cannot be estimated in advance. The secondary packages agreed cost in the region of £38,000 in relation to the strain and enhancement lump sum costs. Some additional costs may be required to off-set elements of re-structuring in secondary schools, although these are expected to be minimal. It is therefore anticipated that up to 8 early retirement packages may be available.
- 3.10.5. In the event that the cost of packages for the number of applications exceeds the funding available, then consideration will require to be given to a combination of factors:
  - (a) satisfying as many requests as can be accommodated within the available funding;
  - (b) the interests of the authority in achieving its goal of moving towards a re-structuring;
  - and (c) any other relevant factors.
- 3.10.6. For example, a maximum of four requests from DHTs can be accepted, given that the authority only requires to reduce its permanent establishment by that number. This situation is complicated by the fact that there are four schools which will have a supernumerary DHT (ie the difference between current permanent postholders and the number proposed in the new DSM formula): Abercromby PS, Alva PS, Claremont PS and Tillicoultry PS. If more than one DHT in any of these schools applies, then priority will be given to the one where the costs to the authority will be lowest.
- 3.10.7. The possibility of offering early severance to all DHTs, and accepting the four which provided the greatest saving to the authority was considered. However, School Boards have rights in relation to an involvement in the appointment of DHTs and it would not be possible to put in place the compulsory transfer scheme for DHTs which would ensure that those schools which had surplus posts could reduce their complement. It has therefore been agreed that early severance will only be offered to DHTs in those schools which have a surplus DHT post.
- 3.10.8. The scheme will require a resignation from post well before the end of the financial year to ensure that costs can be paid from funding available this financial year. The suggested date for this is 21 March 2004. This will allow time for the recruitment of teachers to replace those who will be resigning their posts.
- 3.10.9. The timescale for the implementation of this part of the interim agreement is extremely tight, if pension arrangements are to be in place by 21 March 2004. The following timing will be required to be adhered to:
  - a. Letters will be sent to all eligible teachers by 31 October 2003, seeking expressions of interest, stressing that the offer of early severance is subject to Council approval.
  - b. Teachers will require to express an interest by 14 November 2003.

- c. Calculations of the offers which would be made will be communicated to those who have expressed an interest on 28 November 2003.
- d. The deadline for the acceptance of these offers will be 12 December.

### **3.11. Initial appointment of principal teachers**

- 3.11.1. It is proposed to advertise and appoint a limited number of principal teacher posts in the primary sector during the course of session 2003/04.
- 3.11.2. These posts will be ring-fenced in the first instance to those teachers who were, prior to August 2003, senior teachers in a primary school and who are now on conserved salaries at point 3 on the CT scale and to any acting DHT who is not also a former ST. It is recognised that it is not possible to estimate how many of these postholders will express an interest in such an opportunity, although it is very much hoped that there will be a significant number who wish to develop their careers on the management side.
- 3.11.3. The post will be advertised in those schools where there is the greatest need to compensate for a current lack of management capacity and in schools where there is currently an acting DHT as the sole management post other than the HT. The following schools are proposed: Banchory PS, Menstrie PS, Deerpark PS, St Mungo's PS, St Serf's PS. An additional PT post will be advertised for Claremont PS in the event of the surplus DHT applying for and accepting early severance. Even although the last three schools will be entitled to two PTs on full implementation of the scheme only one post will be advertised at this stage.
- 3.11.4. Prior to any such posts being advertised, there will be a requirement for the posts to be job-sized. The questionnaires will be completed by the head teacher of the school to which an appointment is being made. It is important to recognise that, subject to advice being received from the SNCT, the creation of these additional management posts may have implications for the job-sizing outcomes of existing management posts at HT level, given that management functions will inevitably be transferred to the new PT posts.
- 3.11.5. It will not be possible to guarantee the allocation of management time to these PT posts for the remainder of session 2003/04, although, subject to the capacities of individual schools, every effort will be made to do so.
- 3.11.6. It is proposed to advertise these posts internally by early January, with appointments being made for the postholder to take up post after the Easter holidays. All appointments will be subject to normal appointment procedures. Consideration will be given to the possibility of having joint interviews should people apply for more than one post. There will be no in-built assumption that applicants who apply for only one school will be given priority. If applicants do not meet the criteria for a post, then no appointment will be made. It should, however, be noted that, except in exceptional circumstances, these posts will not be re-advertised if appointments cannot be made since there is no budget provision for additional PT posts other than those which can be funded through the appointment of existing former STs.
- 3.11.7. It should also be noted that in the event of a teacher being appointed as PT in a school other than her or his own, then there will be a need for a compulsory transfer from the school to which that person is appointed into the school from which the appointed teacher has moved. Any such compulsory transfer will be made according to the Council's compulsory transfer procedures.

3.11.8. It is proposed that a further paper be brought to LNCT to consider the possibility of additional PT posts being established for the start of session 2004/05. The number possible will depend on the budget position.

#### **4.0 Summary**

- 4.1. The authority values the representations made by teachers and management colleagues in response to the initial consultative paper.
- 4.2. It believes that it has responded openly and constructively to these representations, while retaining the right to determine the management structures in schools.
- 4.3. The authority continues to be of the view that the Agreement, 'A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century' is one which will enhance the quality of pupils' experiences in schools. It is this aspect of change which must remain at the centre of our collective endeavours.

Sandy Wilson  
31 October 2003

## Appendix 1

### Responses to consultation

<b>Response from</b>	<b>School / authority-wide</b>	<b>Date received</b>
St Bernadette's Primary School	Whole School	16 <sup>th</sup> June 2003
Deerpark Primary School	Teaching staff	17 <sup>th</sup> June 2003
Deerpark Primary School	EIS	25 <sup>th</sup> June 2003
EIS Clackmannanshire	Authority-wide	26 <sup>th</sup> June 2003
Menstrie Primary School	Head Teacher	27 <sup>th</sup> June 2003
Tillicoultry Primary School	Whole School	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2003

## Appendix 2 : summary of issues and the authority's response

	Issue raised	Response
1.	The promoted post structures in primary schools should be based on educational principles and practical experience rather than being driven by financial considerations or short-term initiatives. There is a clear need for an increased number of promoted posts in the primary sector, based on an audit of management responsibilities, including those carried out by previous STs.	It is agreed that educational principles should underpin the implementation of change. However, financial constraints will inevitably impinge on the pace at which change can be implemented. The authority remains of the view that there will be a need to transfer resources from the secondary sector as and when this becomes possible.
2.	All schools should have a head teacher. All HT posts should be non class committed.	While it is accepted that the management time allocated to HTs should be reviewed, the authority does not believe that there should be an automatic assumption that all HTs should be non class committed. At one end of the spectrum, it would not be sensible to have such an absolute policy, should there be a position where there were to be a one-teacher school in the authority.
3.	If there is a teaching head, there should be a PT if there is no DHT. The PT post to include within the remit "To act as the source of contact and communication in the case of the temporary absence of the HT".	No such commitment is possible. The authority does not believe that it would be appropriate, for example, to have a two teacher school wherein there is an HT and a PT post.
4.	There should be formal position on an entitlement to management time allocated to DHT posts	This requires further discussion and agreement. There is a need to maintain a balance between central determination of such matters and the in-school determination within the devolved management framework. It is accepted that the weighting given to the balance between teaching and non-teaching time within the job-sizing exercise adds an addition layer of complexity to this balance, for all promoted posts (HT, DHT or PT).
5.	All management functions in a school should be allocated to a promoted post-holder. All promoted postholders should be allocated management time to carry out these duties. The authority should adopt the model being used in other authorities for 25 days out of class each year.	It is agreed that all promoted post holders should be allocated management time. The suggested allocation of 25 days per year does not appear to be one which is easily manageable. The authority would prefer to negotiate an allocation on a weekly basis, so that appropriate permanent staffing arrangements can be made to allow for continuity of learning.
6.	A major role of promoted posts should be one of leadership, rather than one of policy making and direction associated with a line management model.	The job profiles of promoted posts should reflect Annex B of the Agreement. There is also a strong case to develop proposals whereby the leadership role of all teachers can be recognised and enhanced.
7.	There is a need for acting PT posts to be put in place by August 2003, until permanent posts can be agreed.	This was not possible, given the need for further negotiation after the consultation period up until the end of June 2003.

	<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
8.	PT posts should be initially ring-fenced to existing STs and to teachers within the school where such a post is to be created	Not agreed. The ring-fencing to individual schools is not in the interests of all teachers, given that the introduction of PT posts is likely to have to be phased because of financial constraints. Ring-fencing to the authority has already been agreed for promoted posts in secondary schools. This principle should be extended to the primary sector. While it is agreed that former STs should be given priority in leeting for new posts, there should be no automatic assumption that they should be given priority in appointments. Appointment procedures should comply with existing Council policies in relation to fairness and equity.
9.	Depending on the outcome of the national review of guidance, it could be appropriate to create a post of PT guidance in primary schools. Management responsibility for the wider support needs of pupils arising from the increase in mainstreaming of pupils with special needs and the greater demands made on schools in relation to social inclusion should be an explicit part of management remits within each school. Management of behaviour support and learning support should be inextricably linked to the management of learning and teaching. This should be recognised in management structures and remits, including the right to a PT for this aspect of management.	The remit for individual PT posts will depend on the needs of the school and the balance of responsibilities elsewhere within the management structure. The authority accepts that a PT post might include management responsibilities for support for pupils, including guidance responsibilities, but does not accept that there should be a general requirement for PT Guidance posts in the primary sector. The authority does not believe that there should be a mandatory policy which allocates specific management responsibilities to specific posts (whether at HT, DHT or PT level). Determination of where management responsibilities lie is one for individual schools to determine.
10.	Any unit (eg nursery class or special needs unit) attached to a school requires the allocation of management, either at DHT or PT level.	The authority agrees that there should be specific management time allocated to such units. It does not however agree that a separate post is the only way to achieve this outcome.
11.	The deployment of teachers in support teams working on a peripatetic basis outwith the management of individual schools should be supported by appropriate management structures, including the creation of appropriate PT posts.	Consideration is being given to this within the context of the SEN review.
12.	Disappointment that implementation could not have been started in August 2003, in spite of recognised financial difficulties	It is accepted that it would have been desirable to begin to implement changes sooner. However, financial considerations have to be a major factor in the light of the introduction of new PT posts in the primary sector.
13.	The omission of consideration of the Chartered Teacher programme is regretted.	The CT programme must not be seen as part of the promoted post structures. The Agreement makes clear that CTs are not part of the management structures of schools.
14.	The recognition of the needs of small schools in relation to the DSM formula to be adopted is welcomed.	This will be given due consideration in any revision of the formula.

	<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>Response</b>
15.	Further consideration should be given to a greater degree of centrally imposed determination of structures, albeit with some degree of adjustments possible within an overall scheme. The LNCT should be given rights of determination if there were disagreement between the centre and schools.	While there is some merit in having a greater degree of central determination, the authority believes that school management has a crucial role to play in determining what is appropriate for that school. It is the view of the authority that it would not be appropriate for the LNCT to have an adjudication role. Final decisions relating to management structures remain one for the authority, having taken due account of consultation.
16.	Reservations were expressed about the suggestion that schools should have the right to use promoted post salary costs to add to the administrative capacities of schools, rather than to use these for promoted teacher costs.	There is no suggestion that this should be imposed, but the authority believes that it is a legitimate option for schools, after due consultation.
17.	The proposal regarding PT posts being shared between two or more schools was considered impractical.	The authority believes that it is an option which should not be excluded, should schools wish to consider it further.
18.	The promoted post staffing structures given in Appendix 6 were not felt to be sufficient to provide small schools with adequate management time. Further consideration should be given to the recommendation that schools with roll lower than 100 should not have a PT entitlement. It was suggested that schools with more than three staff should have a non class committed HT.	Further consideration will be given to the balance of entitlement for small schools. There will, however, always require to be cut-off points: it would, for example, be unreasonable at one extreme to suppose that a two teacher school should have a non-teaching HT and a PT.
19.	Consideration should be given in any new promoted post structure to the needs of schools with significant deprivation, where the presence of a DHT would be an important element in providing additional support to children. This would be preferable to having 2 x PTs as suggested for one such school in Appendix 6.	Further consideration is being given to the sample promoted post structures given in the consultation paper in the light of the outcome of the job-sizing exercise.
20.	It was argued that schools in 'Band B' in the draft structures 'lose out' in comparisons with other schools	Larger schools require more management time than smaller schools. It should be recognised that schools in 'Band B' do not lose out in comparison with the existing provision. They have been allocated management posts under the new structures to which they are currently not entitled. These schools currently are only entitled to an HT post.
21.	One school argued that the post of PT would not be of interest, but that the school would prefer to maintain its current allocation of DHT posts.	The Agreement has provision for PT posts in primary schools. This is an important step on the management career route. The authority is of the view that there is a clear need to add PT posts where appropriate. The corollary may be that this might result in a reduction in the need for DHT posts. The authority believes that it is important to ensure that the full range of principles of the Agreement are adopted.
22.	The proposal to change the allocation of management time for schools with a nursery class by including pre-school children at a 0.5 ratio to take account of their part-time placements was not endorsed by the one school to comment on this. It argued that the 0.5 placement did not reflect the fact that each child still required a full management allocation, in order to respond to the needs of the child.	This will be considered in any final recommendation on management time allocation. It was disappointing that no other school commented on the specific question raised in paragraph 3.5.

## Appendix 3 (a)

### Review of staffing formula : explanatory notes

#### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. The review of promoted posts in primary schools introduces for the first time principal teachers into primary schools. The consultation paper also recommended that we should review the number of DHTs in relation to the overall senior management capacity in primary schools.
- 1.2. Since the circulation of the consultation paper, it has become apparent that the job-sizing exercise has further complicated matters. The outcome of the job-sizing has made it clear that the salary for individual management posts has been, to no small degree, affected by the amount of class contact of the postholder. In effect, the more class contact, the more points are allocated. The interim report on consultation has indicated that it would be inappropriate for HTs to be able to determine their own salary levels by deciding whether or not they should be 'x'% class committed.
- 1.3. Given these factors, it is clear that the current staffing formula for primary schools (1.2 FTE core plus 0.04 FTE per pupil on the roll) inevitably means that the amount of class contact time for a head teacher of a small school will be dependent on the vagaries of relatively small gains or losses in the numbers of pupils. For example, a school of 45 pupils will be entitled to 3.0 FTE teachers, will require to have two classes, thus allowing the head teacher to be fully non-class committed (or to be 0.7 FTE non-class committed and to use 0.3 FTE for learning support or visiting specialists). If the roll of the school should rise to 51, the school will be entitled to 3.24 FTE and will require to run 3 classes. The maximum non-class contact time will therefore be 0.24 FTE and there will be no possibility of having LS or VS teachers.
- 1.4. The formula has therefore been fundamentally revised in order to allocate specific management time to schools, and to adjust the teaching time allocation according to pupil numbers.

#### 2.0 Spreadsheet giving revised formula and comparison with current position

- 2.1. The main spreadsheet at Appendix 3(b) gives the staffing allocations proposed for all schools with rolls from 30 to 500, the likely maximum range within Clackmannanshire. The summary spreadsheet at Appendix 3(c) extracts the same information for Clackmannanshire schools and the school rolls on which the staffing allocation for 2003/04 was originally based on the roll projections available in spring 2003.
- 2.2. The following explanatory notes will, I hope, be helpful. The letters refer to the columns on the spreadsheet:
  - a. School roll on which the staffing allocation for 2003/04 was provisionally based
  - b. Clackmannanshire primary schools at a particular roll
  - c. Staffing allocated under current staffing formula of  $1.2 + 0.04 \text{ FTE}$

- d. Blank
- e. Proposed management time allocation for HTs under new formula (see box at top of spreadsheet): HTs in schools smaller than 100 = 0.8 FTE; all other HTs = 1.0 FTE.
- f. Management time for nursery classes: the existing 'formula' of 0.1 FTE for each school has been retained. It is not proposed at this stage to amend the current allocation for the purposes of this exercise. Future discussion may lead to a revised formula, but this will not affect the overall principles for 'core' management and teaching time allocations in relation to the primary cohort.
- g. Proposed management time allocation for DHTs. The number of DHT posts indicated on the sheet is according to roll bands (see second box at top of spreadsheet). There is a reduction of 6 DHT posts from the current complement of 19 (of which 3 are temporary posts). However, because of falling rolls, schools are currently operating at 6 above that allowed for in the current scheme of devolved management.

0.5 FTE has been allocated to each DHT post: this seems to be a reasonable 'middle ground figure': it also allows for a class to be allocated 50:50 to a DHT and eg a 50% job-sharer or part-time post.

- h. Proposed management time allocated to PT posts: 0.1 FTE is proposed. This is broadly in line with the current practice in secondary schools where subject PTs have traditionally been allocated between 2.5 and 3.5 additional periods of a 30 period week = between 8% and 11% of the week.

The number of PT posts proposed is again based on pupil roll. The total number of PTs which would result from the formula is 36 (see second box at top of spreadsheet). Although this is fewer than the total number of PT posts in secondary (including faculty PTs, and PTs for 'support for pupils'), this is compensated for by the existence of more senior management posts in the primary sector.

- i. Total management time proposed (ie total of four previous columns).
- j. Existing management time (based on staffing returns proposals).
- k. Difference between existing and proposed management time (a positive figure indicates an increase: a negative figure indicates a decrease). The overall total indicates a 3.45 FTE increase.
- l. Minimum teaching time required. This is simple to calculate for small schools. The maximum class size for a composite class is 25. Hence, a school of 26-50 pupils requires as an absolute minimum of 2 FTE teachers, a school of 101-125 pupils a minimum of 5 teachers, etc. Matters become more complicated at the point where it can legitimately be expected that composites are less likely to be required. This has been estimated provisionally at around 200 pupils. Thereafter it has been assumed that 30 pupils will generate a need for an additional class.
- m. Teaching time (additional): in essence, this column provides a series of steps in allocating staffing between the two fixed points in the preceding column. In other words, the difference of 1.0 FTE allocated for two fixed pupil roll figures (in column N) is divided by the number of steps between these two fixed points. This then

gives eg a figure of 0.033 FTE. Each additional pupil above the lower fixed point then attracts additional funding for 0.033 FTE. The first few 'pupils' above the lower fixed point do not attract this pro-rata funding in the lower roll bands

- n. Total teaching: this is the total of the two preceding columns (ie columns L and M)
- o. This gives, for Clackmannanshire schools, the actual number of classes in 2003/04
- p. This indicates the deprivation allowance given to certain Clackmannanshire schools in 2003/04 (see also below in section 2.3)
- q. Total of management time plus teaching time proposed (ie the totals of columns I and N)
- r. Difference between the current staffing formula allocation and that proposed under the revised system. A positive figure indicates increased staffing; a negative figure indicates a decrease.

The overall total for Clackmannanshire schools indicates an additional 0.32 FTE is required. The two smallest schools show little change; schools with rolls from 70 – 210 show a significant gain; two schools around 230-240 rolls show minimal change; 7 schools with rolls above 250 show significant reductions, ranging from –0.41 FTE to –0.93 FTE.

The third spreadsheet attached as appendix 3 (d) shows the current staffing formula of another authority, which also demonstrates significant differences between their formula being applied to our primary schools and our own current formula. Again, smaller schools would gain if we used their system and larger schools would lose. It is also worth noting that the overall staffing for our primary schools, if staffed to the same formula, would be reduced by 12.31 FTE on the current DSM formula.

- s. This translates the new proposed staffing allocation 'back' into a 1.2 plus '0.0something' equation. As would be expected from the analysis under 'R' above, this shows that smaller schools will have a somewhat enhanced equivalent allocation. Larger primary schools are, however, reduced to 1.2 plus 0.038 or 0.039.
- t. Teacher : pupil ratios – this provides an indication of teacher pupil ratios under the new proposed formula
- u. Teacher : pupil ratios – this provides an indication of teacher pupil ratios under the existing formula
- v. Teacher : pupil ratios – this indicates the difference between the teacher pupil ratios under the new proposed formula and the existing, with smaller schools having an improved teacher pupil ratio and larger schools having a worse ratio under the new system.

2.3. The following has not been considered but will require further un-picking:

- a. No account has been taken of the reduction in the class contact week
- b. No account has been taken of the capacity of the system to ensure that there is equitable access to learning support for all schools. The review of SEN allows for a

different formula funding to be applied to a wide range of support needs for individual pupils.

- c. No account has been taken of visiting specialists. It should, however, be noted that the reduction in the primary teaching week may impact on the need for visiting specialists. If this is the case, then there is an argument for reducing pro-rata the funding allocation to schools to compensate for this change. Further examination of this issue may result in a change to the proposed staffing formula.
- d. No account has been taken of the fact that it considered desirable to re-allocate deprivation funding under a revised formula, which would replace the existing broad classification system with a sliding scale, which would take cognisance of a wider cohort of children than is possible under the current formula approach where schools are allocated a fixed full time teacher if they reach a particular FME percentage, and then lose this again if they slip below that percentage point.
- e. No account has been taken of the cost of salaries of new appointments to PTs. If one is to assume that the PT in primary schools is likely to be sized at between Point 1 and Point 3 (there is some informal evidence from other authorities to this effect), the difference in salary between a PT (average point 2) and the top of the scale teacher at August 2003 is around £4,800 including on-costs. 36 PTs at this salary level would cost around £170,000.

It is proposed to offer early severance to DHTs and STs over a certain age and according to agreed principles to be agreed at LNCT, subject to remaining funding being allocated to this. This will release some funds. It is also proposed to ring-fence a limited number of PT posts to existing STs, with a limited cost.

It is, however, recognised that there will be a need to effect the transfer of resources from secondary in order to be able fully to implement the full scheme. While there has been some movement in the creation of faculty PT posts, there will be insufficient funding to complete the process in August 2004.

- f. It is proposed that the management time for PTs should, in principle, only be allocated to schools once the appointment of a PT has been made. Management time should also be allocated to DHTs who are 'surplus' under the revised formula.

It is also accepted that the revised formula needs to be tested in practice against the innumerable variations of class configurations which are educationally desirable, even within the same roll band. Particular 'bulges' at particular stages can impact in unpredictable ways. It is therefore proposed to retain at the centre the 'spare' management time which is not allocated to 'establishment' PT posts which cannot be appointed given the lack of resources to implement the scheme fully. This 'spare' resource will then be used to off-set particular strains which emerge in individual schools at the time of staffing returns in spring 2004. Each school will be entitled to seek compensatory funding if the 'teaching time allocation' is insufficient to cover the actual need for 'x' number of classes. Each claim will be subject to rigorous and transparent challenge by the authority.

It might also be desirable to provide opportunities for teachers to develop leadership skills under a scheme of 'project leadership' within a professional development context (cf the paper on this which has been agreed for the secondary

sector by the LNCT). Consideration will be given to the piloting of this in the primary sector, depending on the actual outcome of the staffing exercise in spring 2004.

- 3.0** This paper has been discussed with head teachers, with broad approval for the revised formula. It has been adjusted to take account of points made by head teachers.

Sandy Wilson  
21 October 2003

**Appendix 3 (b)**

**Primary staffing formula for schools with rolls from 30 – 500**

and

**Appendix 3 (c)**

**Primary staffing formula for Clackmannanshire primary schools as at spring 2003**

and

**Appendix 3 (d)**

**Current primary staffing formula – comparisons with another LA**

See separate spreadsheets (sheet 1 - 3)

## Appendix 4 (replicates Appendix 2 A from the original consultation paper)

### Extract from Clackmannanshire Council's discussion paper

#### "Promoted post structures - Principles to be adopted"

##### 1.1. The functions of promoted posts

1.1.1. The functions of all posts should be defined in terms of:

- creating a learning environment which is informed by the developing understanding of how people learn and of what constitutes effective teaching;
- securing conditions that are optimal for learning and teaching;
- providing leadership, good management and the strategic direction of colleagues;
- the systematic development of the personal and professional capacity of all staff;
- promoting quality assurance.

1.1.2. All promoted post holders should be members of a school's management team, with a collective commitment to contributing to the goals of:

- improving pupil attainment and achievement;
- securing the welfare and progressive development of pupils and staff.

Their collective efforts should be concerned with people and should not be unnecessarily constrained by the notion of specific subject departments or school stages.

1.1.3. The promoted post structure should be such that it assists the school in a collegiate approach to strategic management in:

- the formulation of the school aims, goals and targets;
- the formulation of the development plan, staff review and development, and associated matters;
- monitoring and evaluation within the agreed quality assurance process.

**It should enable the school to consult effectively with staff, pupils, parents and other stakeholders.**

1.1.4. Administrative functions which support the central function of promoted post holders also require to be considered during the re-structuring process.

## **Appendix 5 (replicated from Appendix 2 B of the original consultation paper)**

### **Sample job outline for principal teachers**

#### **Based on Annex B of the Agreement**

**It is proposed that the job profile for each principal teacher will contain a core element, along with specific additional duties related to each particular post.**

#### **1. Core element**

- the leadership, good management and strategic direction of colleagues
- the management and guidance of colleagues
- reviewing the CPD needs, career development and performance of colleagues
- the provision of advice, support and guidance to colleagues
- working in partnership with colleagues, parents, other specialist agencies and staff in other schools as appropriate
- quality assurance
- implementation of whole school policies dealing with assessment and pupil welfare
- contributing to the development of school policy in relation to the behaviour management of pupils

#### **2. Other elements**

- curriculum development and the management of curriculum development
- the development of school policy for the behaviour management of pupils
- implementation of whole school policies dealing with guidance issues, pastoral care, assessment and pupil welfare
- responsibility for the leadership, good management and strategic direction of pastoral care within the school

## **Appendix 6 (replicated from Appendix 5 of the original discussion paper)**

### **Examples of principal teacher post remits in primary schools**

**Each job profile will require to conform to Annex B of the Agreement and the sample job outline in Appendix 5**

The following are possible aspects of primary PT responsibilities:

- To work with colleagues by providing leadership, good management and strategic direction in the staff review and development process.
- To work in partnership with colleagues, parents, other agencies and staff in other schools within the context of school policy in relation to behaviour management of pupils.
- To manage and lead the development of key areas of the curriculum as identified within the school development plan.
- To work with colleagues, parents and other specialist agencies in the support of pastoral care, guidance issues, and pupil welfare.

Please note that in those schools where there is no DHT post envisaged, it is recommended that the PT post includes within the job profile the following duty:

- “To act as source of contact and communication in the case of the temporary absence of the head teacher”.