



The Educational  
Institute of Scotland

ADVICE FROM THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCOTLAND ON RESPONDING TO  
TRANSFORMING CHILDREN'S SERVICES IN SCOTTISH BORDERS  
SEPTEMBER 2008

The following points of policy and advice will be relevant to our responses to TCS. The Local Executive Committee of the EIS urges all members to respond in writing to the Director of Education and elected members of SBC. The documents referred to here are 'Promoted Post Structures' (updated at August 2005) and 'Falling School Rolls'. The numbering in brackets refers to sections and bullet points in those documents.

Promoted Post Structures

1. (Section 17) Introduction of Change

The policy of the EIS clearly states that any changes in the promoted post structure should be the outcome of negotiation with the Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers (LNCT). In particular, "specific duties and job remits" are matters specifically devolved to the LNCT for local agreement. It is not open to any employer to move away from the terms of the Agreement – A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century – by deciding not to establish new posts or by deciding to create posts that are not part of the Agreement – for example 'Leaders of Learning'. So far none of the proposals in TCS have been brought to the LNCT for approval.

To ensure continuity and effective development, any development of new promoted post structures must be based on evolution from current practice rather than revolution. We contend that the proposals recommended in the TCS document are more akin to the latter than the former – especially considering the timescale.

The promoted post structure cannot be used as a means of introducing or promoting radical change in the organisation of the curriculum. Any major change in school organisation is likely to be dependant on coordinated and agreed developments at several levels: curriculum structures, pre-service education, GTCS registration, CPD, school qualification and certification arrangements. The promoted post structure must reflect agreed developments.

2. (Section 7) Principal Teachers (Curriculum)

While the EIS recognises that many Principal teachers currently have responsibility for several related subjects, any extension of this pattern can only be justified in the following circumstances: the new structure is the result of educationally informed discussion and debate; there is agreed curricular and educational benefit to the school; the introduction of the new structure is the result of negotiation; there is no artificial linkage of disparate subject areas; there is no detriment to existing post holders; the new structure is coherent. Such a move cannot be justified as a cost saving device. Any such development should be fully agreed within the LNCT.

The EIS recognises that the implementation of ACE will have implications for promoted post structures especially at the level of principal teacher. Any changes in promoted post structures should follow educational development within the context of this document rather than be utilised as a means of imposing change. In general the increasing demands on the management of the curriculum are most unlikely to be able to be carried out by reducing the number of principal teachers, whatever the details of their remits.

(Appendix 1) The pattern of one PT post per subject in secondary schools allows for learners and teachers to be afforded a range of support in terms of the management the curriculum, assessment (including certification), staff development and review and resourcing.

### 3. (7.8) Principal Teachers (Primary)

The EIS believes that the negotiating objective should be a least one principal teacher in every primary school with a roll in excess of 100. The number of principal teachers in larger schools should be roll related. Principal teachers should have a reduction in class contact time commensurate with the pupil roll of the school.

### 4. (Section 8) Principal Teachers (Pastoral)

In accordance with the Agreement the EIS recognises that all teachers in all sectors throughout their day to day interaction will afford them with 'advice and guidance ... on issues related to their education'. Some have interpreted this to mean the imposition in secondary schools of more formal first line guidance systems building on current registration procedures. First line Guidance systems which seek to impose any of the duties of promoted post holders on unpromoted teachers are unacceptable to the EIS. The development of first line Guidance systems should take place only where there is discussion and agreement involving all teachers likely to be affected in the school. The development should take place also clearly within the context of the 35 hour working week.

The promoted post structure in all secondary schools will provide for PTs with areas of responsibility in guidance or pastoral support. In larger schools their remit will be restricted to pastoral responsibilities in others they may in addition have other responsibilities. The details of the structure should be agreed within the LNCT.

The number of such PT posts within each school should be determined according to a formula that is equitable and transparent. A PT (Pastoral) who has no other subject teaching commitment (excluding any PSE classes) should have a case load of no more than 200 pupils.

The EIS recognises that the implications of *Better Behaviour – Better Learning* for the management of pupil support, including pastoral, support for learning and behaviour support, in schools in all sectors must be considered. Some in the management of education have read into this Action Plan that there must be a reduction or streamlining of such posts. This cannot be a realistic option at a time when the demands made on promoted staff in all such posts are increasing substantially.

### 5. (Section 14) Teachers working in Peripatetic Teams

Any negotiations on the promoted post structure within an authority should take into account the need to ensure that teachers employed on this basis are provided with a coherent career structure and adequate administrative support including the maintenance of appropriate PT posts.

The following points of policy are from the document 'Falling School Rolls'

1. (Section 2 - Principles) Joint Headships

(2.1.2) It is the stated policy of the EIS that each primary and secondary school should have a designated catchment area determined by the local education authority in consultation with staff and the local community.

(2.1.3) The EIS maintains that every school should have its own head teacher in order to recognise and to support the educational and social integrity of the community of each and every nursery, primary, secondary and special school.

(2.1.4) Each school has a recognisable identity and works in partnership with its local community. The promotion structure should reflect this. Accordingly, the use of shared headships should be avoided. In addition, the creation of promoted posts deployed across more than one school should only be introduced, if ever, after very careful consideration, discussion and negotiation.

(2.1.5) The Agreement, *A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, requires job remits to be agreed locally. It is not open to any employer to move away from the terms of the Agreement by deciding to create posts that are not part of the Agreement.

(2.1.6) Local Negotiating Committees for Teachers (LNCTs) will play a vital role in monitoring the local implementation of any changes to the pattern and provision of school education in each local authority.

2. (Section 6) Specific Guidance for Local Associations on changes to the existing pattern of provision.

(6.1) School estate planning and school closures or mergers are areas of great concern for the EIS. One very simple rule has to be applied – the quality of the facilities and the educational provision in the communities have to be better at the end of the process, both in terms of the fabric of the buildings and in terms of the day to day operational facilities. This process will be enhanced through the maximum involvement of the community and the EIS locally in each stage of school closures or mergers processes. The key role for the local association, in these circumstances, is to ensure that the general legislative requirements and the specific guidance contained within Circular 2/2004 are adhered to by the local education authority.

(6.4) Local associations should seek to ensure that local authorities give consideration to travel times and distance in proposed changes to existing patterns of provision. The key issues here are the questions of safety, the provision and availability of public transport and the age and stage of the pupils affected.

(6.5) Local Authorities have been advised to plan ahead on the basis of the best available projections on population figures, pupil numbers and school roles. Local

associations should seek to ensure that local authorities are being open and transparent in their decision making on the matter of school rolls and capacity, by formally requesting this information and by seeking to ensure that these projections are in the public domain during the consultation periods.

(6.6) Local associations are reminded that, regardless of any proposals to change school estate planning and educational provision, job remits of all promoted posts have to be agreed at the LNCT in each local authority.

Kay Miller  
Secretary  
EIS, Scottish Borders