
Procedure Title - Procedure for amendment to aspects of Secondary Management Restructuring

Management Information	
Lead Officer	Name: J M Simpson
	Designation: Senior Education Officer
	Tel: 0131 469 3137
Lead Service Area	Schools and Lifelong Learning
Date Agreed	
Last Review Date	
Next Review Date	
Agreed by	
Has Screening for Equality Impact been undertaken for this procedure	Yes/No: <i>(please specify)</i> Date
Has Implementation and Monitoring been considered for this procedure	Yes/No: <i>(please specify)</i> Date
If appropriate has Health and Safety section had oversight of this procedure	Yes/No: <i>(please specify)</i> Date
Name of Health and Safety contact	

Definition: Procedure – An agreed method or approach to comply with Policy, Legislation and Departmental Decisions.

This document may be out of date if printed, the latest version is available on the Council Intranet.

LOCAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE FOR TEACHERS

Local Agreement

Amendment to aspects of Secondary Management Restructuring

1. The procedure will take effect following agreement in the Local Negotiating Committee for Teaching staff and takes account of the work done by the Empowerment Staffing (Secondary) Short Life Working Group which, in turn, reports to the Empowerment Staffing Board.
2. The SLWG had representation from Communities & Families, HR, Finance, headteachers, Curriculum Leaders (including Pupil Support Leader/Support for Learning Leader input) and professional associations.
3. The current funding model distributes additional resource to schools on the basis of Positive Action money. This is calculated using a formula of deprivation and attainment and requires to be reviewed. It is proposed that a more nuanced set of measures be used, resulting in a points-based formula, which will accurately and sustainably reflect the range of pressures and needs in each school and its community.
4. The main recommendation is that Headteachers will now have the flexibility to configure staffing structures to more effectively raise attainment. Principally this means the option to add one depute headteacher to the current senior staffing structure.
5. This addition will be in the context that all depute headteachers will take on a teaching commitment of 0.4FTE.
6. In terms of jobsizing, the addition of a depute headteacher and the introduction of a teaching commitment will mean that, based on figures for school rolls in August 2020, two schools would see a rise in the Scale Point allocated to DHTs, fifteen would maintain the *status quo* and six would see a reduction to the Scale Point. (See Appendix 1).
7. To manage change effectively, schools will agree with the Senior Education Officer when, over a three-year period, these changes will be made. There will be a caveat for the six schools where there is a negative financial implication for existing DHTs, in that they can delay implementation until such time as the school roll rise would offset the reduction in line

management responsibilities, the major jobsizing factor that leads to an overall drop in the allocated Scale Point.

8. When the headteacher chooses to implement change, there will be an alteration to the overall staffing profile of the school, in that the teaching FTE taken up by the DHTs will be deducted from the overall staffing complement in what is effectively a cost-neutral approach. (See Appendix 2.)
9. Where a headteacher chooses to enhance leadership capacity through additional Curriculum Leaders, this will be done within the school's financial allocation. (For example, where a whole-school jobsizing exercise is triggered by the annual census, rather than increase the Scale Point of Curriculum Leaders who are already dealing with a large workload, the available monies arising from the exercise, could be used to support additional middle management posts at the lower end of the PT Scale in order to take on the development of identified school tasks and relieve the burden on existing middle management.)
10. A spreadsheet has been produced to allow secondary headteachers to see their allocated promoted staffing budget (together with the school's PEF allowance) and how any changes to their staffing profile will impact on that budget. Any changes will have to be feasible within that overall budget, again in a cost-neutral approach. (See Appendix 3.)
11. Secondary headteachers will have to factor into this approach any changes to the staffing profile which result in elements of cash conservation for individual members of staff.
12. Exceptional arrangements re the jobsizing approach to the posts of Pupil Support Leaders and Support for Learning Leaders were implemented in December 2017 in response to concerns that the generic jobsizing toolkit led to situations in some schools where an additional PSL was required but that all PSLs saw a reduction in their Scale Point as a result. The pragmatic response at that time, sanctioned by the LNCT, was to freeze the Scale Point for all PSL/SfLL posts at the point at which they were set as of the Management Restructuring exercise in 2011-12.
13. Given that almost two and a half years have elapsed since this change was made, it is appropriate that the position be revisited.
14. The intention is to institute a review of the jobsizing approach to PSL/SfLL posts in the Autumn Term 2020 with any changes decided by December 2020, which will represent three years since the initial amendment was made. Consideration will be given to the caseload, and to the teaching commitment of PSLs.
15. This review may be informed by the current COSLA/SNCT review of jobsizing although timescales for that have yet to be determined.

16. The currently constituted jobsizing toolkit was identified by the SLWG as a major issue for school empowerment.

REVIEW

This agreement will be reviewed after two years (*date to be inserted*) or if either Joint Secretary requests.

LOCAL AGREEMENT (In accordance with the LNCT Recognition and Procedure Agreement)

This local agreement has been reached in the LNCT and is consequently binding on the signatory parties. It may be adjusted by negotiation to meet changing future.

Signed:



A Gray
Joint Secretary
Management Side
Date: 20 May 2020



A Murphy
Joint Secretary
Teachers' Side
Date: 20 May 2020

Appendix 1

POTENTIAL CHANGES TO DHT ALLOCATION (WITH 0.4FTE TEACHING COMMITMENT) BASED ON PROJECTED SECONDARY SCHOOL ROLLS FOR AUGUST 2020

School	Current DHTs	Current		+1 DHT/0.4FTE (11 hours)^		
		Points	SCP	Points	SCP	
Balerno	2	189	5	187	5	=
Boroughmuir	*3	241	9	228	8	-
Broughton	3	218	7	218	7	=
Castlebrae	2	157	3	158	4	+
Craigmount	3	227	8	225	8	=
Craigroyston	2	194	6	186	5	-
Currie	2	190	5	175	5	=
Drummond	2	179	5	168	4	-
Firrhill	3	212	7	212	7	=
Forrester	2	194	6	192	6	=
Gracemount	2	193	6	179	5	-
Holy Rood	3	234	8	222	8	=
James Gillespie's	4	226	8	230	8	=
Leith	3	202	6	204	6	=
Liberton	2	193	6	192	6	=
Portobello	4	228	8	232	8	=
Queensferry	**3	186	5	192	6	+
St Augustine's	***2	197	6	195	6	=
St Thomas of Aquin's	2	213	7	200	6	-
The Royal High	4	224	8	228	8	=
Trinity	3	198	6	199	6	=
Tynecastle	2	200	6	186	5	-
Wester Hailes	2	160	4	161	4	=
						(6-, 15=, 2+)

(^ based on estimated school rolls as of 08/2020)

(* based on a rise from 3>5 DHTs as current roll allows for 4 but not taken up by the school)

(** already has an additional DHT in complement; figures throughout based on 3)

(*** annual census-related jobsizing exercise ongoing)

FINANCIAL FIGURES ATTACHED TO APPENDIX 1

	DHT	SCP	Current	DHT	SCP	+1 DHT/0.4	Remove Teacher	Net	Net Change	
Balerno High School	2.00	5	£153,000	3.00	5	£229,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£169,000	£16,000
Boroughmuir High School	3.00	9	£256,000	4.00	8	£332,000	-1.60	-£80,000	£252,000	-£4,000
Broughton High School	3.00	7	£242,000	4.00	7	£323,000	-1.60	-£80,000	£243,000	£1,000
Castlebrae High School	2.00	3	£143,000	3.00	4	£222,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£162,000	£19,000
Craigmount High School	3.00	8	£249,000	4.00	7	£323,000	-1.60	-£80,000	£243,000	-£6,000
Craigroyston High School	2.00	6	£157,000	3.00	5	£229,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£169,000	£12,000
Currie High School	2.00	5	£153,000	3.00	5	£229,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£169,000	£16,000
Drummond High School	2.00	5	£153,000	3.00	4	£222,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£162,000	£9,000
Firrhill High School	3.00	7	£242,000	4.00	7	£323,000	-1.60	-£80,000	£243,000	£1,000
Forrester High School	2.00	6	£157,000	3.00	5	£229,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£169,000	£12,000
Gracemount High School	2.00	6	£157,000	3.00	5	£229,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£169,000	£12,000
Holy Rood High School	3.00	8	£249,000	4.00	8	£332,000	-1.60	-£80,000	£252,000	£3,000
James Gillespie's High School	4.00	8	£332,000	5.00	8	£415,000	-2.00	-£100,000	£315,000	-£17,000
Leith Academy	3.00	6	£235,000	4.00	6	£314,000	-1.60	-£80,000	£234,000	-£1,000
Liberton High School	2.00	6	£157,000	3.00	5	£229,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£169,000	£12,000
Portobello High School	4.00	8	£332,000	5.00	8	£415,000	-2.00	-£100,000	£315,000	-£17,000
Queensferry High School	3.00	5	£229,000	3.00	5	£229,000	0.00	£0	£229,000	£0
St. Augustine's High School	2.00	6	£157,000	3.00	5	£229,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£169,000	£12,000
St. Thomas of Aquin's High School	2.00	7	£162,000	3.00	6	£235,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£175,000	£13,000
The Royal High School	4.00	8	£332,000	5.00	8	£415,000	-2.00	-£100,000	£315,000	-£17,000
Trinity Academy	3.00	6	£235,000	4.00	6	£314,000	-1.60	-£80,000	£234,000	-£1,000
Tynecastle High School	2.00	6	£157,000	3.00	5	£229,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£169,000	£12,000
Wester Hailes Education Centre	2.00	4	£148,000	3.00	4	£222,000	-1.20	-£60,000	£162,000	£14,000
Totals	60.00		£4,787,000	83.00		£6,468,000	33.20	£1,580,000	£4,893,000	£101,000

Additional DHT Cost	£1,681,000
----------------------------	-------------------

SECONDARY MANAGEMENT COSTING SCENARIOS (EXAMPLE)

Example		Select School from dropdown List		
Table 1	DSM Budget Allocation			
Budget	Budget SCP	Average FY Cost	Budget FTE	Budget
HT	16	£117,766	1.00	£117,766
DHT	8	£85,408	3.00	£256,223
CL	4.53	£69,607	18.00	£1,252,927
			22.00	£1,626,916
Table 1 Estimates Promoted Staffing Budgets for financial year 2020/21.				

Alternative Management Structures can be considered, by populating column M of Table 2 with potential FTE's per scale point.

Table 2							
Scale	Point	Salary	Nat Ins	Pension	FY Cost	FTE	Total Cost
Principal	1	£45,150	£5,018	£10,385	£60,552		
Principal	2	£47,017	£5,276	£10,814	£63,107		
Principal	3	£48,896	£5,535	£11,246	£65,677		
Principal	4	£50,773	£5,794	£11,678	£68,245	8.50	£580,080
Principal	5	£52,652	£6,053	£12,110	£70,815	8.50	£601,929
Principal	6	£54,525	£6,312	£12,541	£73,377		
HT/DHT	1	£51,208	£5,854	£11,778	£68,840		
HT/DHT	2	£52,785	£6,072	£12,141	£70,997		
HT/DHT	3	£54,524	£6,312	£12,541	£73,376		
HT/DHT	4	£56,399	£6,570	£12,972	£75,941		
HT/DHT	5	£58,267	£6,828	£13,401	£78,497		
HT/DHT	6	£59,851	£7,047	£13,766	£80,663		
HT/DHT	7	£61,590	£7,287	£14,166	£83,042		
HT/DHT	8	£63,319	£7,525	£14,563	£85,408	4.00	£341,631
HT/DHT	9	£65,045	£7,763	£14,960	£87,769		
HT/DHT	10	£66,781	£8,003	£15,360	£90,144		
HT/DHT	11	£69,670	£8,402	£16,024	£94,096		
HT/DHT	12	£72,557	£8,800	£16,688	£98,045		
HT/DHT	13	£75,440	£9,198	£17,351	£101,989		
HT/DHT	14	£78,323	£9,596	£18,014	£105,933		
HT/DHT	15	£82,644	£10,192	£19,008	£111,844		
HT/DHT	16	£86,973	£10,790	£20,004	£117,766	1.00	£117,766
HT/DHT	17	£90,412	£11,264	£20,795	£122,471		
HT/DHT	18	£94,608	£11,843	£21,760	£128,211		
HT/DHT	19	£98,810	£12,423	£22,726	£133,959		
Budget Allocation						£1,626,916	
Estimated Cost of Proposed Structure						£1,641,406	
Estimated Overspend						-£14,490	

Pupil Equity Funding (2019/20)	£116,400
---------------------------------------	-----------------

