

Job Sizing

Issue

Job sizing needs to be reviewed to ensure that there are financial incentives to take on headship.

Headline position

While by no means the only factor influencing decisions about seeking headship, financial incentives are crucial in recruiting new head teachers in sufficient numbers. The current job sizing arrangements fail to deliver those incentives.

Full position

AHDS had been arguing for change to the job-sizing toolkit for several years as we believe the current system is fundamentally flawed. It acts against sensible career pathways into and through formal leadership roles, it is overcomplicated, open to variable implementation and is not at all clear to those who are subject to it. We believe that, while by no means the only factor, job-sizing is a major factor in the falling number of applications for headship.

This paper seeks to set out what we would like to see in place of the current system.

There are two principles which should underpin the mechanism for arriving at salaries for promoted post holders:

- It should support appropriate career structures/pathways – with appropriate differentials between different grades of promoted post.
- It should be clear and comprehensible to those affected by it.

A much simplified toolkit should consider only three factors:

- Role (HT, DHT, PT) – this would determine which scale your salary was taken from.
- Roll (as an actual headcount – or overall capacity in the case of nursery schools and classes – and applied consistently across Scotland)
- Staff (a headcount of those the post holder reviews and those any subordinate reviews)

Roll and staff would be given unequal weightings with roll accounting for about 80% of the outcome. We have considered the arguments for inclusion of deprivation indicators but concluded that schools in areas of deprivation had different rather than greater challenges. Further there would be some recognition of these challenges through the staffing element of the formula.

We would like to see a system which builds in clear differentials between different grades of staff to ensure there is a financial incentive to take the next step up the career ladder (in a range of meetings with DHT members they have been clear and consistent in their view that no DHT should be paid more than a HT). We recognise that to develop a system which caters for Nursery, Primary and Secondary schools with this 'rule' in place would be impossible. A more practical way to move forward would be to have separate scales for each role (HT, DHT, PT) with considerable overlap in possible salary. Pointages would then determine where individuals fell within these scales. They would be designed such that DHTs in primary schools would almost never receive more than any primary HT – the only time the 'rule' would be broken would be in exceptionally large primary schools.

Clearly there would be costs in bringing about such a change. The first would be that to deliver a scenario where deposes would not normally be paid more than HTs would inevitably create an upward pressure on HT salaries. Modelling would be required to assess the potential impact of this. Also, there would be transitional costs in moving from one system to another. Transitional costs would be considerably smaller than they have been in the past if only transitional conservation (rather than lifetime conservation) was part of the package.

The need for this change has become even more pressing with the introduction of further hurdles – financial and otherwise – in the way of application for progression, particularly to HT roles.

Example salary scales:

Using the April 2016 salary scales as a starting point, these scales have been put together to illustrate the arrangement we would like to see in place and do not reflect actual salary levels. Salaries in italics highlight PTs and DHTs unlikely to be found in primaries. Scales should be such that a depute in a large school, perhaps around 500 pupils – should not be beyond DHT4 irrespective of staffing.

Salary point	Current salary
PT1	38991
PT2	40602
PT3	42225
<i>PT4</i>	<i>43845</i>
<i>PT5</i>	<i>45468</i>
<i>PT6</i>	<i>47085</i>
<i>PT7</i>	<i>48705</i>
<i>PT8</i>	<i>50315</i>

DHT1	44225*		HT1	51705**
DHT2	45585		HT2	53187
DHT3	47085		HT3	54681
DHT4	48705		HT4	56172
<i>DHT5</i>	<i>50319</i>		HT5	57672
<i>DHT6</i>	<i>51687</i>		HT6	60162
<i>DHT7</i>	<i>53187</i>		HT7	62658
<i>DHT8</i>	<i>54681</i>		HT8	65148
<i>DHT9</i>	<i>56172</i>		HT9	67638
<i>DHT10</i>	<i>57672</i>		HT10	71370
<i>DHT11</i>	<i>60162</i>		HT11	75108
<i>DHT12</i>	<i>62658</i>		HT12	78852
<i>DHT13</i>	<i>65148</i>		HT13	82584
<i>DHT14</i>	<i>67638</i>		HT14	86319

*41432 required to maintain a £2k differential between this post and PT3.

**48480 required to maintain a £3k differential between this post and DHT4.