

What do you think the main benefits of this proposal could be?

- ☐ More teachers in classrooms
- ☐ Sharing specialists (like science teachers) with neighbouring schools
- ☐ Giving Heads more time to lead schools, instead of having them teach as well
- ☐ More equality between schools, with resources better shared
- ☐ Expert specialists in local schools (like assessment specialists, or early years specialists)
- ☐ More collaboration between schools
- ☐ Improved progression for pupils between primary classes and when moving to secondary
- ☐ An Executive Head Teacher whose job is to drive improvement across all the local schools
- ☐ Other (please explain below)

#### Other Benefits

Detail any additional benefits or elaborate on any benefits listed above.

We do not see any benefits in this proposal for our children and their education journey in schools in Helensburgh and Lomond.

It is easy to tick every one of the above boxes as things that would be welcome, but there is no real information on how they would be achieved without considerable additional cost and many disbenefits and disruption of the system that already works well on so many levels. The need for collegiate working to share resources, expertise, improvement planning, best use of finances etc is obvious and we would be surprised to be told that this does not already happen and that schools in H&L do already collaborate and communicate with each other. If they do not this is an easy fix without disrupting the whole system.

Expert specialists (an additional cost of a reorganisation that is described as at no cost) would of course be beneficial, but experts cannot be everywhere at once, so it is not an equal opportunity. Head Teachers leading the school and being non-teaching would be welcome, more teachers and improvements in the availability of supply teachers and better financial management would all be welcome. That teachers, and head teachers in particular, work many more hours than their contracts require is well known, as is the fact that more teachers are needed. However, the 'In a Nutshell' document and Empowering Educators video do not explain how these things, or any of the above proposed benefits will actually be achieved and delivered. Disbenefits are more easily identified and some of the suggested benefits such as greater collaboration between schools and progression to secondary school are, we believe, already covered under the current system.

There is absolutely no indication or quantification of how all these possible benefits might be achieved, no costing, no policy, no impact or risk assessments. There is no existing benchmark to work from and no assessment of what the improvement targets would be. There are no options presented – were other models considered and if so, why have they been discounted.

What are your main reservations about the proposal?

This proposal is ill-thought out and an over-arching but vague idea in which none of the actual outcomes are known or detailed. It is a consultation on an idea and as such, without knowing the actual real objectives, risks or impacts or how it would be implemented, it is impossible to undertake a meaningful consultation or for people to provide an appropriate response. It also appears to be a rather cavalier way to make decisions on such an important topic as the quality of education the children of Argyll and Bute will have access to if nobody has done an impact assessment and considered how this would actually work in practice. There appears to be no information on the practical implementation or desired outcomes of such a scheme.

Head teachers and their relationship with their pupils on their learning journey from Day One is being completely devalued and its importance is not recognised by this proposal.

The additional teaching time this proposal says it would deliver appears disingenuous. There is no commitment to employ more teachers or increase the register of supply teachers. It appears to be another layer of bureaucracy and administration and only more teachers will deliver more teaching time.

It really is impossible to see how this proposal could be cost neutral – if more teachers and another layer of management is employed this is an additional cost. Whilst the proposal is being presented as about empowering and improving education it is clearly about saving money, as stated in the A&B C Business Continuity Committee of 13 August 2020

A review entitled "Modernising Education" is already underway and there are a number of sub-themes that are being worked on that will take some time to evaluate but will deliver savings in the medium to longer term. Phase 1 will be progressed as part of the budget for 2021-22 and this will be to look at all "Support for Teaching and Learning".

Falling school rolls is not an issue in Helensburgh and Lomond, if anything they are increasing with the Naval families moving to the area and the many new homes being built in Helensburgh. Shared Heads might work for small island and very remote schools as already been demonstrated since 2010 by the Shared Headships (see A& B C Community Services Committee report on Shared Headships 11 December 2014) but it is not suitable or appropriate for schools that have a full roll such as Rhu Primary with c. 200 pupils.

The proposals suggest a lack of job security for head teachers and compromised career progression. Given the difficulty A&B C has in attracting new teachers implementing this system this will not help at all and teachers in H&L can easily go to a neighbouring authority where this Heads of School model is not being considered or implemented.

The lack of practical details of how this proposal would be implemented has raised concerns about bias with the hosting school receiving greater benefits and whether an Executive Head based in a secondary school will really understand what is important at primary level.

Having engaged with the proposal, do you believe the School Collective Leadership model will positively affect the future education of young people in Argyll and Bute:(Required)

Strongly Disagree

Is there anything else you would like to share?

No-one is against collaboration, sharing experiences, specialist teachers and sharing resources. Head Teachers already do this, but the rationale for the proposed New Executive Head system is not justified and runs counter to the message that each school is unique.

This proposal would, in our view, be likely to have a negative impact on our many excellent head teachers who exercise their skills and experience to ensure the highest standards of education are maintained while retaining the unique identity, values and stewardship of their schools. The pastoral care provided by the head teacher at a primary school is beyond price and extends far beyond the school gate. The system is not broken and does not need to be so radically overhauled. Education does need to be better resourced and supported and there is always room for improvement, modernisation and new approaches but this radical rearrangement of the system is not wanted or welcomed by parents

The message from our community is very strong that this proposal is not welcome.

The proposal takes a 'one size fits all' approach and clearly there is a huge difference between large primary schools like Rhu and the small schools where shared headships are implemented and working well.

Finally, children have endured two years of disruption already because of Covid, they need stability and the leadership and care of their head teacher, not more change and uncertainty.