

Cabinet Committee

Committee Room 2, 5th Floor, Fife House, North Street,
Glenrothes / Blended Meeting



Thursday, 12th January, 2023 - 10.00 a.m.

AGENDA

Page Nos.

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** – In terms of Section 5 of the Code of Conduct, members of the Committee are asked to declare any interest in particular items on the agenda and the nature of the interest(s) at this stage.
3. **MINUTES**
 - (i) Cabinet Committee of 15th December, 2022. 3 – 7
 - (ii) Minutes of the Education Appointment Committee of 13th and 15th December, 2022. 8 - 9
4. **REVENUE MONITORING 2022-23** – Report by the Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Services). 10 – 22
5. **CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN UPDATE - PROJECTED OUTTURN 2022-23** – Report by the Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Services). 23 – 31
6. **EMPTY NON-DOMESTIC RATES CHARGES** – Report by the Head of Revenue and Commercial Services. 32 – 39
7. **DOMESTIC WASTE OPERATIONS: BULKY UPLIFTS - FREE OF CHARGE SERVICE** – Report by the Head of Environment and Building Services. 40 – 46
8. **RESETTLEMENT OF VULNERABLE PEOPLE IN FIFE** – Report by the Head of Housing Services. 47 – 49
9. **SCHOOL LEADERSHIP MODELS (2)** – Report by the Executive Director (Education and Children’s Services). 50 - 100

Members are reminded that should they have queries on the detail of a report they should, where possible, contact the report authors in advance of the meeting to seek clarification.

Lindsay Thomson
Head of Legal and Democratic Services
Finance and Corporate Services
Fife House
North Street
Glenrothes
Fife, KY7 5LT

5th January, 2023.

If telephoning, please ask for:

Michelle McDermott, Committee Officer, Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes
Telephone: 03451 555555, ext. 442238; email: Michelle.McDermott@fife.gov.uk

Agendas and papers for all Committee meetings can be accessed on www.fife.gov.uk/committees

Blended Meeting Notice

This is a formal meeting of the Committee and the required standards of behaviour and discussion are the same as in a face to face meeting. Unless otherwise agreed, Standing Orders will apply to the proceedings and the terms of the Councillors' Code of Conduct will apply in the normal way.

For those members who have joined the meeting remotely, if they need to leave the meeting for any reason, they should use the Meeting Chat to advise of this. If a member loses their connection during the meeting, they should make every effort to rejoin the meeting but, if this is not possible, the Committee Officer will note their absence for the remainder of the meeting. If a member must leave the meeting due to a declaration of interest, they should remain out of the meeting until invited back in by the Committee Officer.

If a member wishes to ask a question, speak on any item or move a motion or amendment, they should indicate this by raising their hand at the appropriate time and will then be invited to speak. Those joining remotely should use the "Raise hand" function in Teams.

All decisions taken during this meeting will be done so by means of a Roll Call vote.

Where items are for noting or where there has been no dissent or contrary view expressed during any debate, either verbally or by the member indicating they wish to speak, the Convener will assume the matter has been agreed.

There will be a short break in proceedings after approximately 90 minutes.

Members joining remotely are reminded to mute microphones and switch cameras off when not speaking. This includes during any scheduled breaks or adjournments.

THE FIFE COUNCIL - CABINET COMMITTEE – BLENDED MEETING

Committee Room 2, 5th Floor, Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes

15th December, 2022.

10.00 a.m. – 12.35 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillors David Ross (Convener), David Alexander, Lesley Backhouse, David Barratt, John Beare, James Calder, Ian Cameron (substituting for Councillor Judy Hamilton), Fiona Corps, Altany Craik, Dave Dempsey, Linda Erskine, Derek Glen, David Graham, Peter Gulline, Cara Hilton, Gary Holt, Rosemary Liewald, Jonny Tepp, Ann Verner (substituting for Councillor Carol Lindsay), Ross Vettraino, Craig Walker and Jan Wincott.

ATTENDING: Steve Grimmond, Chief Executive; Eileen Rowand, Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Services), Alison Binnie, Finance Business Partner (Education and Children's Services), Sharon McKenzie, Head of Human Resources, Fiona Allan, Service Manager, Anne-Marie Cardle, Service Manager, Jacqui Cameron, Service Manager, Human Resources, Lindsay Thomson, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Alison Marr, Solicitor, Helena Couperwhite, Manager (Committee Services) and Michelle McDermott, Committee Officer, Legal and Democratic Services, Finance and Corporate Services; Kathy Henwood, Head of Education and Children's Services (Children and Families and Criminal Justice), Shelagh McLean, Head of Education and Children's Services (Early Years and Directorate Support); Angela Logue, Head of Education and Children's Services (Primary Schools and Improvement Support), Louise Playford, Service Manager (Asset Management and Development), Rona Weir, Education Manager, Pamela Colburn, Quality Improvement Officer, Sharon Smith, Quality Improvement Officer and Kevin Funnell, Service Manager (Operations), Education and Children's Services; Donald Grant, Community Manager (North East Fife), Communities and Neighbourhoods Service; and Ms. Mary Caldwell, Roman Catholic Church and Mr. Alastair Crockett, Cupar Baptist Church, Religious Representatives.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors Judy Hamilton and Carol Lindsay and Mr. Brian Blanchflower, Church of Scotland, Religious Representative.

55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were submitted in terms of Standing Order No. 7.1.

56. MINUTE

The Committee considered the minute of the Cabinet Committee meeting of 17th November, 2022.

Decision

The Committee agreed to approve the minute.

57./

57. WORKFORCE MATTERS

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Human Resources setting out key strategic workforce activities and outlining the Council's approach to workforce planning and recruitment strategy. The report also presented proposals for future reporting on the progress against the success measured and actions of Our People Matter (the Council's workforce strategy) and on actions identified through the corporate workforce planning process.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) agreed to the future reporting on Our People Matter, the Council's workforce strategy and Our People Plan, the Council's corporate workforce plan; and
- (2) agreed the approach outlined in the recruitment strategy.

58. CHILDREN AND FAMILIES' STRATEGY 2022-2025

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director (Education and Children's Services) reviewing the Children and Families' Strategy "Belonging to Fife" and recognising what had been achieved to date. The report also outlined next steps in the Belonging to Fife (2) strategy.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) agreed the next steps in the Children and Families' Strategy, B2F(2), which included investment in additional staffing from the existing service budget;
- (2) approved, in principle, the progression of Barnardo's Gap Homes to improve young people's transitions to independence, providing a revenue saving to the Council; and
- (3) noted the test of change work around Community Social Work.

The meeting adjourned at 11.25 a.m. and reconvened at 11.40 a.m.

59. FIFE YOUNG PEOPLE HEALTH AND WELLBEING CENSUS

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director (Education and Children's Services) advising elected members of the recommendation of the Education Scrutiny Committee of 15th November, 2022 with regard to the proposed arrangements for Fife Council to undertake a Survey of Young People's Health and Wellbeing and providing an alternative approach for members to consider in relation to processes associated with implementation.

Decision/

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) noted the content of the report to the Education Scrutiny Committee of 15th November, 2022 relating to implementing a survey within Fife on the Health and Wellbeing of Young People;
- (2) noted the Education Scrutiny Committee recommendations to the Cabinet Committee that the Council does not implement the survey;
- (3) noted the revised proposals for the data protection arrangements and that survey response data would be collected for statistical and research purposes only, as part of the Council's duty as a local authority to plan for children's services in our area;
- (4) noted the concerns of the Education Scrutiny Committee and how these had been addressed in the revised proposals and on the basis that the survey would be anonymous, agreed to proceed with the survey; and
- (5) agreed that the survey should proceed based on the previously used HBSC questions and with the assurance that such questions would only be asked of senior aged pupils.

60. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP MODELS

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director (Education and Children's Services) providing members with an overview of the development of school leadership models from 2009 that had strengthened the leadership and management of our schools and early learning centres. The report also provided an outline of suggested next steps, building on the successes of the last thirteen years in Fife and current national and international research to enable the Education Service to continue to strengthen leadership and management arrangements in schools and early learning centres in order to achieve improvements in attainment, attendance and positive destinations.

Motion

Councillor Fiona Corps, seconded by Councillor James Calder, moved as follows:-

“Remove recommendations and replace with following recommendation:-

Bring back another paper to Cabinet Committee with detailed evidence analysing the costs and benefits of joint leadership models as well as the pressures leading to this potential change of approach, including the shortage of headteachers, the reasons for this and the plan to recruit and train more”.

Amendment

Councillor Craig Walker, seconded by Councillor David Alexander, moved that the recommendations detailed in the report be approved.

Roll/

Roll Call

For the motion – 13 votes

Councillors James Calder, Ian Cameron, Fiona Corps, Altany Craik, Dave Dempsey, Linda Erskine, David Graham, Peter Gulline, Cara Hilton, Gary Holt, David Ross, Jonny Tepp and Jan Wincott.

For the Amendment – 10 votes

Councillors David Alexander, Lesley Backhouse, David Barratt, John Beare, Derek Glen, Rosemary Liewald, Ann Verner, Ross Vettrano, Craig Walker and Mr. Alastair Crocket, religious interest representative.

Decision

The Committee agreed that a further paper be brought back to the Cabinet Committee with detailed evidence analysing the costs and benefits of joint leadership models as well as the pressures leading to this potential change of approach, including the shortage of headteachers, the reasons for this and the plan to recruit and train more.

61. LOCHGELLY SOUTH PRIMARY SCHOOL - IMPROVEMENT WORK

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Education and Children's Services seeking endorsement of the approach to deliver urgent improvement work to address historic mining issues at Lochgelly South Primary School.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) noted all the options that were considered to address the required ground consolidation works, along with improvements, to the existing Lochgelly South Primary School building;
- (2) noted the decision to proceed with a project of refurbishment of Lochgelly South Primary School, because of the need to achieve an appropriately managed decant from the property within the required timescale and a return to the property within a reasonable timescale; and
- (3) endorsed officer recommendations for the temporary decant solution to St. Kenneth's RC Primary School, for all primary aged children, and Lochgelly Sunflower (MacGregor Avenue) Nursery, for eligible nursery children, to enable works at Lochgelly South Primary School to proceed.

62. COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFER APPLICATION BY FOOTPRINT EAST NEUK

The Committee considered a joint report by the Head of Property Services and Head of Communities and Neighbourhoods Service seeking approval for a Community Asset Transfer request received from Footprint East Neuk under Part 5 of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 to purchase land at Dreelside Woods, Anstruther.

Decision/

Decision

The Committee approved the asset transfer request at less than market value at the price of £1 and all otherwise on terms and conditions to the satisfaction of the Head of Property Services and Head of Legal and Democratic Services.

**THE FIFE COUNCIL – CABINET COMMITTEE – EDUCATION
APPOINTMENT COMMITTEE – GLENROTHES**

13 December 2022

12.00-14.00

PRESENT: Councillor Kathleen Leslie, Councillor Alistair Suttie, Angela Logie, Head of Service, Jackie Funnell, Education Manager, Megan Shields, Parent Council Chair, Gemma Frame, Parent Council.

3. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

Decision

The Committee resolved that under Section 50(A)(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 7A to the Act.

4. HEADTEACHER – STRATHALLAN PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Committee interviewed 1 applicant on the short list for this post.

Decision

Agreed to recommend the appointment of Drew Murray, currently Acting Headteacher at Strathallan Primary School.

**THE FIFE COUNCIL – CABINET COMMITTEE – EDUCATION
APPOINTMENT COMMITTEE – GLENROTHES**

15 December 2022

13.00-15.00

PRESENT: Councillor Eugene Clarke, Councillor Alycia Hayes, Maria Lloyd, Head of Service, Deborah Davidson, Education Manager, Laura Frew, Parent Council Chair, Tricia Hunter, Parent Council.

5. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

Decision

The Committee resolved that under Section 50(A)(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 7A to the Act.

6. HEADTEACHER – KIRKCALDY HIGH SCHOOL

The Committee interviewed 1 applicant on the short list for this post.

Decision

Agreed to recommend the appointment of Chris McKay, currently Acting Headteacher at Kirkcaldy High School.

Revenue Monitoring 2022-23

Report by: Eileen Rowand, Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Services)

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide members with a strategic overview of Fife Council's finances and to report the current forecast position for 2022-23.

Recommendations

It is recommended that members note:-

- (i) the ongoing financial impacts arising from recovery from the pandemic which continue to be managed using one off additional funding and from underspends;
- (ii) the high-level financial position as detailed in this report; and
- (iii) that detailed monitoring reports will be submitted to the relevant Scrutiny Committees.

Resource Implications

The current forecast presents a short-term favourable position in the current year, an underspend of £5.845m. This is mainly a result of an underspend of grant income received in the year that will be used next year and the successful implementation of the Children and Families strategy.

The financial consequences of COVID-19 continue to be estimated at £22m this year. This additional cost is being funded from a combination of both specific and general revenue grant funding carried forward from previous years, with the remaining cost of £6m being met from service underspends. Some of these impacts are likely to continue into future years and funding has been earmarked from balances in recognition of this.

Included in the current forecast is an updated estimate of the financial impacts of ongoing pay negotiations. These estimates are based on the known settlement for particular staff groups and estimates for those still in negotiations. Therefore, the financial impact may change once negotiations are concluded.

Although this is a positive position in the immediate term, the scale of financial pressures on the Council linked to the pandemic, supply chain problems and considerable inflationary cost pressures remain substantial and uncertain. Commitments against balances have been reviewed and taking these revised assumptions into account the estimated level of uncommitted balances is £27.492m.

Legal & Risk Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

Impact Assessment

An EqIA is not required because the report does not propose a change or revision to existing policies and practices.

Consultation

None.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The Council continues to deal with the continued financial implications arising from the pandemic as well as increased financial pressures and uncertainty brought about by the current economic crisis and the high level of inflation. This report provides a summary of forecast variances against budget, with further detailed variance analysis provided in the Appendix.
- 1.2 The format of this report has been revised in that the main body of the report focuses on the overall financial position of the Council commenting on significant financial issues which impact on the overall financial position of the Council.
- 1.3 Detailed explanation of forecast variances and analysis by Service is detailed in Appendices 1 to 4 of this report.
- 1.4 Whilst the immediate position continues to be favourable, there are continued significant uncertainties and financial pressures associated with the costs of recovery from the pandemic, inflationary pressures impacting all supply chains (notably energy, fuel, construction costs and other commodities) and employee costs. Some of which have been funded temporarily and have also led to the need to earmark reserves to fund these significant financial risks and impacts (Appendix 6), leaving a level of £27.492m uncommitted balances.
- 1.5 More detailed financial reports will be presented to the relevant Scrutiny Committees as part of the Council's wider scrutiny and performance management reporting arrangements. It is the role of the Scrutiny Committees to carry out in-depth scrutiny of the financial performance of functions within their particular remit.

2.0 Financial Overview

COVID-19 Recovery

- 2.1 At this point in time, the additional net costs associated with COVID-19 remain estimated to be in the region of £22m this year. Specific Funding has been identified for the majority of these costs leaving the remainder of £6m being funded from Service underspends.
- 2.2 Costs as a legacy of COVID-19 are likely to continue into future years and assumptions have been made as to the possible impacts for both 2023-24 and 2024-25 and commitments are recognised against balances to mitigate these costs. Loss of income remains a particular challenge in a number of areas and may take a number of years to recover.

Pay Award

- 2.3 The level of pay award for 2022-23 for single status staff and craft workers has been agreed, however, this has yet to be reflected in individual service budgets, therefore the unfunded shortfall is reflected as a corporate overspend in contingencies. Budgets were being updated in December once payment was made to employees.
- 2.4 The Scottish Government have confirmed they will fund elements of the pay award with £140m being made available across Scotland as additional General Revenue Grant, Fife's share being £9.438m.
- 2.5 In addition, capital grant of £120m has also been made available for the pay award, Fife's share being £8.130m. Guidance on the accounting arrangements have also been issued by the Scottish Government which sets out circumstances of how this funding can be used to fund revenue costs.
- 2.6 The additional funding, coupled with budgetary provision that the Council had made, leaves a shortfall of £8.933m at this time. Negotiations continue in respect of teachers and chief officers. The current forecast highlights Service underspends will offset the budget shortfall for the current years pay costs.

Other pressures – Economic/Cost of Living Crisis

- 2.7 The current global economic crisis is concerning in terms of the possible financial repercussions of inflation for the Council. These inflationary pressures mean the Council is already experiencing increased costs, most notably, energy costs (£5.4m) along with others such as fuel and other commodities.
- 2.8 The cost-of-living crisis is increasingly affecting households and, as such, commitments for a number of approved Cost of Living crisis measures are reflected in the budget.

3.0 Revenue forecast – Summary

3.1 General Fund Services

3.1.1 *Current revenue budget*

The current revenue budget of £976m is shown in Appendix 1. The table below shows all budget changes since the earlier Cabinet report:-

	Total Expenditure £m
2022-23 Budget (August 2022)	961.946
SG Funding	9.438
CFCR	0.950
Budgets Funded from/ (to) Balances	
- Continuing Financial Consequences of COVID-19	3.180
Current 2022-23 Budget (October 2022)	975.514

3.1.2 Annual forecast

The current forecast presents a short-term favourable position in the current year, an underspend of £5.845m. This is a combined result of service underspends of £12.840m (1.32% of budgeted expenditure) and an overspend of £6.995m in Additional Items as shown in the Table 1 below:-

Table 1 – General Fund – 2022/23 Summarised Forecast Statement

	Annual Budget £m	Forecast £m	Variance £m	Previous Committee Variance £m	Movement £m
Service Totals	875.965	863.125	(12.840)	(11.209)	(1.631)
Additional Items	99.549	106.544	6.995	18.625	(11.630)
Total Expenditure	975.516	969.669	(5.845)	7.416	(13.261)
Financing	(975.514)	(975.514)	0.000	(9.600)	9.600
Contribution (to) / from Balances	0.000	(5.845)	(5.845)	(2.184)	(3.661)

3.1.3 At the last reported position, the forecast was an underspend of £2.184m; the forecast underspend has therefore increased by £3.661m since the previous forecast was presented to Cabinet. The most significant reasons are favourable movements within Education and Children's Services as a result of incorporating the forecast for the current academic year, coupled with vacancies and recruitment delays in Children and Families. The Loans Charges forecast has also been updated to reflect that cash balances being used throughout the year has been used as an alternative to borrowing, resulting in interest payments being less than expected.

3.1.4 There are two significant offsetting movements in Table 1. These are a result of realigning the budget for pay into contingencies to reflect the confirmed level of funding for the recent pay awards as outlined in para 2.3 to 2.6.

3.1.5 The net underspend will increase general fund reserves by £5.845m. Section 5 below provides more information on balances. The variances and movement are set out and explained in more detail at Appendices 1 and 2.

3.2 Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

3.2.1 The Housing Revenue (HRA) Account is shown in Appendix 3.

3.2.2 To maintain the breakeven position for HRA and maintain HRA reserves, CFCR (Capital Financed from Current Revenue) is reduced by (£4.025m) to offset the net forecast overspend of £4.025m for the HRA.

3.2.3 As is the case for General Fund, the HRA is also experiencing inflationary pressures which has significantly increased Repairs and Maintenance costs, energy, hostel and property insurance costs.

3.2.4 Appendices 3 and 4 provide further detailed variance analysis and commentaries on all variances that exceed +/- £250k.

4.0 2021-22 Revenue Budget Savings Progress

4.1 It is anticipated that the Council will achieve 92% of 2022-23 budget savings as shown in Appendix 4. This is an improvement on the last two years when the ability of services to deliver savings on time was significantly impacted in some areas as a direct result of the pandemic.

4.2 Directorates are working to deliver all savings as soon as possible and more detailed reports on the progress of savings will be presented to the relevant Scrutiny Committees as part of the Council's wider scrutiny and performance management reporting arrangements.

5.0 Balances

5.1 General Fund Balances

5.1.1 Appendix 6 details the forecast General Fund balances position which are held to fund specific one-off expenditure, provide funding to contribute to change initiatives, accumulate funds for a specific or "earmarked" purposes and to mitigate against risk by providing a level of uncommitted reserves which can be drawn on to respond to "shocks" such as unforeseen cost increases. It is important to note balances are split into two categories – committed and uncommitted with the breakdown of the detail being provided at Appendix 6.

5.1.2 Whilst the opening balance of £182.813m was exceptional, it was a direct result of increased one-off funding levels late last year and a change in accounting treatment of various Government Grants. Budgets which have been transferred to Services since the last report are detailed in Table 2 of Section 3. The forecast underspend detailed in Section 3 will provide a positive contribution to the balances position, with the estimated level before commitments being £145.804m.

5.1.3 The current commitments against balances have yet to be added to Service budgets. However, there is a high level of commitments, bringing uncommitted balances to £27.492m.

Earmarked and Commitments against Balances

5.1.4 The earmarked balances reflect unused grants and ring-fenced income which will fund specific expenditure. Balances are also earmarked for dealing with the ongoing costs associated with recovery from the pandemic and the impacts of inflation and supply chain disruption.

5.1.5 Commitments represent items for which provision has been made but, as yet, the costs are yet to be incurred.

5.1.6 After taking account of all commitments, the level of uncommitted balances as at 31st March, 2025 is expected to be £27.492m which equates to approximately 2.8% of the revenue budget.

HRA Balances

- 5.1.7 The opening HRA balance was £7.005m. There are approved commitments of £2.5m for the Transitional Affordable Housing Programme 2022-24 and £1.5m for improving Estates Management in 2022-23. After taking these commitments into account, the level of uncommitted balances is £3.005m which is above the policy minimum of £2.5m.

6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1 There is currently a forecast underspend of £5.845m. However, the level of financial risk and inflation moving forward is beyond that seen in decades. Whilst the forecast position remains favourable in the short term, it provides a level of one-off protection from the current rapidly increasing inflation as well as the continuing financial consequences of COVID-19.
- 6.2 The positive balances position is providing the Council with a level of protection from these significant cost increases but, given balances is one off in nature, will only be able to assist the Council's financial sustainability in the immediate term, leaving challenges ahead for the medium and longer term. Allowing for all commitments, the uncommitted level of balances is estimated as £27.492m in future years. Balances can only be used once and it is important that the focus continues to be on strong financial management and a sustainable level of core funding and decisions are taken wisely on use of balances without adding to recurring expenditure in future years.
- 6.3 The forecast position for the Council's Housing Revenue Account in 2022-23 is a break-even position. The level of HRA balances, allowing for all commitments, is £3.005m which is above the policy minimum.

List of Appendices

1. General Fund Revenue Summary 2022-23
2. General Fund Variance Analysis
3. Housing Revenue Account Summary 2022-23
4. Housing Revenue Account Variance Analysis
5. Approved Savings 2022-23
6. Summary of Balances

Background Papers

None.

Report Contacts

Elaine Muir
Head of Finance
Finance & Corporate Services
Fife House
North Street
Glenrothes
Email: elaine.muir@fife.gov.uk

Laura Robertson
Finance Operations Manager
Finance & Corporate Services
Fife House
North Street
Glenrothes
Email: LauraC.Robertson@fife.gov.uk

FIFE COUNCIL
GENERAL FUND REVENUE SUMMARY 2022-2023

	Annual Budget £m	Forecast £m	Variance £m	Previous Committee Annual Variance £m	Movement £m
EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES					
Education (Devolved)	227.868	220.794	(7.074)	(8.527)	1.453
Education (Non Devolved)	119.819	117.197	(2.622)	(0.741)	(1.881)
Children and Families	65.458	59.061	(6.397)	(5.459)	(0.938)
Criminal Justice Service	0.169	0.097	(0.072)	0.032	(0.104)
	413.314	397.149	(16.165)	(14.695)	(1.470)
HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE					
Health & Social Care	208.874	208.429	(0.445)	(1.741)	1.296
Contribution to IJB		0.445	0.445	1.741	(1.296)
	208.874	208.874	0.000	0.000	0.000
ENTERPRISE & ENVIRONMENT					
Assets, Transportation and Environment	91.644	93.636	1.992	1.932	0.060
Planning	1.629	1.314	(0.315)	(0.295)	(0.020)
Protective Services	3.048	2.292	(0.756)	(0.649)	(0.107)
Business & Employability Service	10.080	9.494	(0.586)	(0.542)	(0.044)
Property Repairs and Maintenance	14.442	14.442	0.000	0.000	0.000
	120.843	121.178	0.335	0.446	(0.111)
COMMUNITIES					
Housing & Neighbourhood Services	12.911	12.719	(0.192)	(0.123)	(0.069)
Communities & Neighbourhood	52.043	55.680	3.637	3.287	0.350
Customer & Online Services	14.072	14.271	0.199	0.156	0.043
	79.026	82.670	3.644	3.320	0.324
FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES					
Assessors	1.761	1.708	(0.053)	(0.039)	(0.014)
Finance	4.902	4.999	0.097	0.048	0.049
Revenue & Commercial Services	14.626	14.371	(0.255)	(0.208)	(0.047)
Human Resources	6.313	6.414	0.101	0.170	(0.069)
Business Technology Solutions	16.325	16.837	0.512	0.813	(0.301)
Legal & Democratic Services	4.877	5.032	0.155	0.150	0.005
	48.804	49.361	0.557	0.934	(0.377)
Miscellaneous	0.127	0.127	0.000	0.000	0.000
Housing Benefits	1.986	0.815	(1.171)	(1.171)	0.000
	50.917	50.303	(0.614)	(0.237)	(0.377)
CHIEF EXECUTIVE					
Chief Executive	0.293	0.253	(0.040)	(0.044)	0.004
Corporate and Democratic Core	2.698	2.698	0.000	0.001	(0.001)
	2.991	2.951	(0.040)	(0.043)	0.003
SERVICE TOTALS	875.965	863.125	(12.840)	(11.209)	(1.631)
ADDITIONAL ITEMS					
Loan Charges (including interest on revenue balances)	57.930	55.992	(1.938)	(0.075)	(1.863)
Capital Expenditure Financed from Current Revenue	5.319	5.319	0.000	(8.100)	8.100
Legislative Obligations / Contingencies	36.300	45.233	8.933	26.800	(17.867)
	99.549	106.544	6.995	18.625	(11.630)
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	975.514	969.669	(5.845)	7.416	(13.261)
FINANCED BY:					
General Revenue Grant	(572.215)	(572.215)	0.000	(9.600)	9.600
Non Domestic Rates	(179.690)	(179.690)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Council Tax Income	(180.755)	(180.755)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Budgets transferred to/(from) Balances (previous years carry forwards etc)	(42.854)	(42.854)	0.000	0.000	0.000
TOTAL INCOME	(975.514)	(975.514)	0.000	(9.600)	9.600
CONTRIBUTION (TO)/FROM BALANCES	0.000	(5.845)	(5.845)	(2.184)	(3.661)

**FIFE COUNCIL
VARIANCE ANALYSIS**

GENERAL FUND				
Area	Forecast Variance £m	Previous variance £m	Movement in variance £m	Commentary
EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES				
Education (Devolved)	(7.074)	(8.527)	1.453	<p>As part of the DSM scheme projections by schools are input by business managers in conjunction with head teachers:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil Equity Funding (PEF) underspend of (£5.000m) - this is ring-fenced funding which is spent across 2 financial years (1 academic year) • Underspend of (£1.980m) across all school sectors due to updated projections received following the exercise to update budgets in October; • <i>The movement in variance on DSM of +£1.453m is a result of lower underspends across the sectors based on projections from schools, as opposed to the previous projection which reflected their 2021-22 DSM carry forward.</i>
Education (Non Devolved)	(2.622)	(0.741)	(1.881)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early Years underspend of (£5.616m) due to the level of specific grant funding for Early Years provision and non-domestic rates relief to nurseries; • General Education underspend of (£1.676m) due to the impact of adjusting schools' budgets mainly for the reduction in school rolls; • Overspend of +£3.015m in relation to maternity pay and +£0.510m long-term absence. These costs are in relation to teachers but are charged to the non-DSM budget and not the DSM; • Transportation overspend +£0.798m and PPP charges +£0.813m due to inflationary increases relating to RPI, which are in excess of the inflation assumed in the budget. • <i>Most of the movement from August is from the impact of updating schools' budgets to reflect updated rolls and the impact of funding for probationers .</i>
Children and Families	(6.397)	(5.459)	(0.938)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underspends on third party payments and transfer payments relating to Purchased Placements (£5.243m) and foster care (£1.319m), which reflect the continued reduction in placement numbers; • Employee costs underspend of (£1.800m) predominantly due to staffing vacancies and delays in recruitment; • Some of the underspend in third party costs is offset by overspends in Continuing Care of +£1.039m, respite care of +£0.494m and supported lodgings of +£0.313m reflecting changes in care arrangements. An overspend in premises costs of £0.309m is also projected due to increases in costs for respite and kinship care, and increases in rents for the throughcare team. • <i>The movement since the last report is due to updated projections for staffing of £0.988m as delays in recruitment are reflected in the projection.</i>
HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE				
Health & Social Care	(0.445)	(1.741)	1.296	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Placements overspend +£6.222m due to greater volume of adult packages being commissioned; • Adults Supported Living underspend (£3.804m) due to vacancies across the service which will not be filled until the future design of the service is established; • Underspend of (£0.918m) on the budget allocated to pay weekend enhancements where the original provision was higher than required; • Adults Fife wide underspend (£1.380m) - reduced provision for new packages where their future requirements and being considered and delays in staff recruitment to take on new packages of care; • Care at Home underspend (£0.406m) due to difficulties in recruiting staff which is partially offset by increase in direct payments. • <i>There is a movement of £0.970m on adult placements which is partly offset by increased vacancies across the services with the balance resulting in a reduced contribution to IJB reserves .</i>
Contribution to IJB	0.445	1.741	(1.296)	Any over or underspend in Health & Social Care is transferred to/from IJB reserves.
ENTERPRISE & ENVIRONMENT				
Assets, Transportation and Environment	1.992	1.932	0.060	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads and Transportation overspend +£1.299m primarily relates to Structural Maintenance to reduce the backlog of pothole patching and winter maintenance; • Domestic Waste & Street Cleaning overspend +£0.613m due to increased transportation costs relating to fuel and vehicle repairs.
Planning	(0.315)	(0.295)	(0.020)	• Underspend is mainly due to part year vacancies and filling of vacancies is progressing. Other underspend is expected from an over recovery of statutory fee income, this is offset by increased expenditure on background assessments to inform the Local Development Plan and related policies.
Protective Services	(0.756)	(0.649)	(0.107)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over recovery of Building Warrant statutory fees due to an increased volume of applications as a result of the recovery from the COVID pandemic; • Other underspend is due to part year vacancies due to recruitment challenges.
Business & Employability Service	(0.586)	(0.542)	(0.044)	• Increased short term external funding and grant funded contributions toward operational costs.

**FIFE COUNCIL
VARIANCE ANALYSIS**

GENERAL FUND				
Area	Forecast Variance £m	Previous variance £m	Movement in variance £m	Commentary
COMMUNITIES				
Communities & Neighbourhood	3.637	3.287	0.350	<p>A legacy from the pandemic continues to impact on level of demand and income received for some services. These include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fife Sports and Leisure Trust and Fife Cultural Trust projected deficit £1.885m. Council officers continue to review the areas where the level of income received has been impacted by the pandemic and both Trusts continue to receive temporary financial support from the Council; • Community Use and Halls and Centres projected overspend £1.084m due to lost income; • Community Use for Public Private Partnership (PPP) charges projected overspend £0.295m; • Reduction of swimming lesson income £0.200m as lessons transferred to FSLT, expenditure relating to this will reduce once the full transfer has concluded. • <i>The movement of £0.350m relates to Fife Sports & Leisure Trust identifying the need for reduced support based on performance in early 2022/23, which is offset by a decrease in anticipated income from Community Use</i>
FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES				
Revenue & Commercial Services	(0.255)	(0.208)	(0.047)	• Underspend relates to staffing due to recruitment issues partially offset by delayed delivery of previously agreed savings.
Business Technology Solutions	0.512	0.813	(0.301)	• Overspend relates to legacy savings not being achieved.
Housing Benefits	(1.171)	(1.171)	0.000	• Underspend relates to a reduction in Housing Benefit costs due to the incremental movement of benefit claimants nationally from Housing Benefits to Universal Credit.
ADDITIONAL ITEMS				
Loan Charges (including interest on revenue balances)	(1.938)	(0.075)	(1.863)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has had significant cash balances throughout the year which have been used as an alternative to borrowing, resulting in interest payments being less than anticipated. • <i>The movement reflects the updated projection following a review of the borrowing requirement.</i>
Capital Expenditure Financed from Current Revenue	0.000	(8.100)	8.100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Scottish Government have provided capital funding to meet some of the additional costs associated with the pay award. This has meant an increase in capital grant to the Council, and a subsequent reduction in funding for Capital from revenue sources. • <i>The capital grant has now been received and the appropriate entries have been made which accounts for the movement in variance.</i>
Legislative Obligations / Contingencies	8.933	26.800	(17.867)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the budget process, provision is made for additional costs associated with inflation, pay awards and additional government funding. This is held centrally until the costs are known and the budget is then transferred to the Services, reflecting where expenditure will be incurred. • The level of projected overspend reported reflects the estimated shortfall in funding associated with the pay awards.
INCOME				
General Revenue Grant	0.000	(9.600)	9.600	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget has been updated to include the confirmed additional funding being provided by the Scottish Government to offset some of the additional costs of the pay award. • <i>This also accounts for the movement.</i>

FIFE COUNCIL
HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT SUMMARY 2022-2023

	Annual Budget £m	Forecast £m	Variance £m	Previous Committee Annual Variance £m	Movement £m
BUDGETED EXPENDITURE					
Repairs and Maintenance	36.598	39.026	2.428	2.429	(0.001)
Supervision and Management	20.065	20.116	0.051	(0.002)	0.054
Funding Investment					
Cost of Borrowing	29.925	30.096	0.171	0.130	0.041
Revenue Contribution (incl CFCR)	29.327	25.302	(4.025)	(3.853)	(0.172)
	<u>115.914</u>	<u>114.539</u>	<u>(1.374)</u>	<u>(1.296)</u>	<u>(0.078)</u>
Voids	2.146	2.503	0.356	0.489	(0.133)
Housing Support costs	(0.448)	(0.495)	(0.047)	(0.021)	(0.026)
Garden Care Scheme	0.395	0.395	0.000	0.000	0.000
Bad or Doubtful Debts	3.000	3.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Other Expenditure	10.191	11.973	1.783	1.546	0.237
Covid Expenditure	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	<u>131.197</u>	<u>131.916</u>	<u>0.718</u>	<u>0.718</u>	<u>0.000</u>
FINANCED BY					
Dwelling Rents (Gross)	(123.910)	(124.837)	(0.928)	(0.928)	0.000
Non Dwelling Rents (Gross)	(3.494)	(3.494)	0.000	0.000	0.000
Hostels - Accommodation charges	(2.397)	(2.325)	0.072	0.072	0.000
Other Income	(1.397)	(1.259)	0.138	0.138	0.000
	<u>(131.197)</u>	<u>(131.916)</u>	<u>(0.718)</u>	<u>(0.718)</u>	<u>0.000</u>
CONTRIBUTION (TO) / FROM BALANCES	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

FIFE COUNCIL
VARIANCE ANALYSIS

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT				
Area	Forecast Variance £m	Previous variance £m	<i>Movement in variance £m</i>	Commentary
Repairs and Maintenance	2.428	2.429	<i>(0.001)</i>	• Increased costs of repairs as a result of inflationary pressures.
Revenue Contribution (incl CFCR)	<i>(4.025)</i>	<i>(3.853)</i>	<i>(0.172)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To maintain the breakeven position for HRA and maintain HRA reserves CFCR (Capital Financed from Current Revenue) is reduced by (£4.025m) to offset the overall HRA net overspend; • As the year progresses the final CFCR and the associated impact on the level of borrowing required to fund the HRA Capital Programme will become more certain.
Voids	0.356	0.489	<i>(0.133)</i>	• A recent court judgment on Temporary Accommodation has meant that a large number of HRA rental properties are being reprovioned as temporary accommodation increasing the value of rent lost due to properties remaining empty.
Other Expenditure	1.783	1.546	<i>0.237</i>	<p>The overspend mainly relates to Hostels, Insurance and Energy costs:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hostels expenditure is projecting to overspend by +£0.758m. The service is seeking to remove this pressure in year by implementing a revised model as part of wider reforms taking place across the Homelessness service which includes General Fund Housing Homelessness and HRA Hostels; • Property Insurance is also estimated to overspend in year by +£0.579m based on a projected 33% increase.
Dwelling Rents (Gross)	<i>(0.928)</i>	<i>(0.928)</i>	<i>0.000</i>	• Dwelling Rents income is higher than anticipated by +£0.928m due an increase in housing stock as the Affordable Housing Programme and Property Acquisitions progress.

FIFE COUNCIL
APPROVED SAVINGS FOR 2022-23
October 2022

Directorate	Savings Target £m	Forecast £m	(Under)/Over £m	Forecast to be Achieved %
Education & Childrens Services	0.350	0.350	0.000	100%
Enterprise & Environment	0.175	0.127	(0.048)	73%
Finance & Corporate Services	0.040	0.040	0.000	100%
	0.565	0.517	(0.048)	92%

**FIFE COUNCIL
BALANCE - GENERAL FUND SERVICES**

	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	Future Years £m
Balance at 1 April 2022	(182.813)	(69.612)	(42.997)	(27.492)
Budgets transferred (to)/from balances	42.854			
Add Overall budget variance 2022-23 (Appendix 1)	(5.845)			
Estimated General Fund Balance at 31 March	(145.804)	(69.612)	(42.997)	(27.492)
Earmarked Balance				
Devolved School Management	2.074			
Energy Management Fund	2.447			
Council Tax - Second Homes	9.281			
SG Specific funding	28.111			
COVID-19 Funding:				
Continuing Financial Consequences of COVID-19	8.825	4.400	1.257	
Community Recovery Fund	5.000	5.000		
COMIS/SWIFT delay	0.000	2.185		
Inflation - Supplies & Services	2.344	1.700		
Construction Inflation :- Unallocated	9.907			
Total Earmarked	67.989	13.285	1.257	0.000
	(77.815)	(56.327)	(41.740)	(27.492)
Commitments against balance				
Budget Carry Forward Scheme	0.000			
Change Programme		5.000	5.000	
Dempgraphics/Pay/Pensions	5.000	6.000	7.000	
Fife Job Contract	0.300	0.300	0.216	
Barclay Funding - Assessors	0.147	0.030	0.032	
Workforce Change	1.130	2.000	2.000	
Lease Surrender - The Kirkcaldy Centre	0.890			
Pay Strategy	0.122			
BTS Investment Case	0.528			
Other Commitments	0.086			
Total Commitments	8.203	13.330	14.248	0.000
Estimated uncommitted balance at 31 March	(69.612)	(42.997)	(27.492)	(27.492)

BALANCE - HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

	2022-23 £M	2023-24 £M	2024-25 £M	Future Years £M
Balance at 1 April 2022	(7.005)	(7.005)	(5.505)	(3.005)
Add Overall budget variance 2022-23 (Appendix 2)	0.000			
Estimated Balance at 31 March	(7.005)	(5.505)	(3.005)	(3.005)
Earmarked Balance				
COVID Mitigation				
Estates Management Improvement	1.500			
Transitional Affordable Housing		2.500		
	1.500	2.500	0.000	0.000
Estimated uncommitted balance at 31 March	(5.505)	(3.005)	(3.005)	(3.005)

Capital Investment Plan Update – Projected Outturn 2022-23

Report by: Eileen Rowand, Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Services)

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a strategic financial overview of the Capital Investment Plan and to advise on the projected outturn for the 2022-23 financial year.

Recommendations

The Cabinet Committee is asked to:-

- i) note the projected outturn position and that the level of financial risk is heightened due to high levels of inflation and supply chain challenges;
- ii) note that more detailed capital outturn reports for 2022-23 will be submitted to relevant Scrutiny Committees of the Council; and
- iii) note that budget variances will be managed by the appropriate Directorate in conjunction with the Investment Strategy Group.

Resource Implications

The level of financial risk associated with inflation, and difficulties in supply chains, continues with the impact on rising prices likely to continue for some time to come. At this point in time, there is estimated to be an unfunded overspend of £3.215m on the major capital projects which will require a funding solution which will be reviewed in the upcoming capital plan review.

Legal & Risk Implications

Potential risks include the continuing difficulties across supply chains, rising inflation on costs of construction and availability of funding streams for larger capital projects, e.g. Developers' Contributions. Further detail relating to the current risks is contained in section 2.2.

Impact Assessment

An EqIA is not required because the report does not propose a change or revision to existing policies and practices.

Consultation

Financial projections are agreed in consultation with each Directorate and are based around the expected progress and delivery of individual projects.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise members of the high-level projected outturn position for the Council's Capital Investment Plan (the Plan) for the financial year 2022-23. The report also highlights the projected outturn position for major projects over £5.000m along with any potential risks associated with these projects. Explanation is provided at Section 2.1 where there is deemed to be a greater level of financial risk linked to major projects. The Plan covers capital expenditure on all Council Services including the Housing Revenue Account, which is managed and accounted for separately from the General Fund.

2.0 Issues

2.1 Major Projects

- 2.1.1 Appendix 1 provides a summary of the major projects within the Plan. There are 25 projects / programmes in this category with an overall budget of £999.967m.
- 2.1.2 At this stage, cost estimates suggest that there could be an overspend of £3.215m across the life of several major projects in the programme.
- 2.1.3 Within "Opportunities for All", the projected overspend relates to 3 projects, the Viewforth High School extension project £0.634m, the construction of the Methil Care Home £1.000m and the construction of Cupar Care Home £1.341m, all as a result of increased materials and labour costs. Estimates for the Care Homes are being advanced and indicate an increase in costs. These overspends will be considered as part of the capital plan review process.

2.2 Potential Risks and Issues

- 2.2.1 Across the Capital Investment Plan there continues to be risk that both the timing and the costs of projects are adversely affected by the current economic climate. Throughout the programme, issues are continuing to be identified in relation to the supply of construction materials which are resulting in delays to projects which, in turn, could lead to increased slippage and increased costs. However, the overall future impact of this is difficult to predict with any degree of certainty and the forecasts in this report for 2022-23 predominantly relate to projects that are currently in progress with contracts that are already agreed. Monitoring of the impact of any additional costs on projects still in their infancy will continue and any significant impact on timescales and associated risks will be reported to this Committee. Where appropriate, any known impact on timing of delivery of projects has been built in to the rephased plan and the overall scale of any additional costs or further delays will be kept under review in future reports and through the upcoming review of the Capital Investment Plan.
- 2.2.2 The Council's approved Capital Plan includes £213m investment in respect of Secondary Schools in West Fife, which includes Dunfermline Learning Campus (DLC) and the Inverkeithing High School replacement. The budgets for the projects reflect the funding arrangements of the Scottish Government's Learning Estate Investment Programme, which requires the Council to fund the up-front cost of construction, with Government support coming in the form of a revenue contribution based on the achievement of outcomes. The potential risks associated with the DLC project significantly reduced following financial close in July 2022 (award of the construction contract), which now limits the impact of inflation on the project. In addition, the project is progressing in line with the required timeline with the campus due to open in August 2024.

2.2.3 There is a risk that the cost of completing the Phase 3 and Transitional Affordable Housing Programmes will cost more than the current approved project budget of £161m. This is due to the unit cost per property continuing to rise as inflationary pressures increase. The Affordable Housing Board will continue to monitor the cost of completing these phases and will report back to this Committee on any mitigating actions or potential additional borrowing required. Any additional borrowing required will be fully tested for affordability as part of the HRA 2022 Business Plan.

2.3 Financial Performance – 2022-23 Total Expenditure - Projected Outturn

2.3.1 Appendix 2 provides a summary by capital theme of projected expenditure and income for 2022-23 showing the total reprofiled expenditure budget of £201.384m and projected spend of £188.284m in the 2022-23 financial year, £13.101m slippage across the plan. Comparable expenditure for the previous 3 years was £163.805m (2021-22), £138.473m (2020-21) and £175.104m (2019-20).

3.0 Budgets and Funding

3.1 Budget

The Capital Investment Plan 2021-31 was approved by Fife Council in March 2021. At the end of each financial year, any budget which has not been spent is rolled forward into the next financial year as slippage. Services are asked to re-profile their project budgets in light of this slippage and the result of this can be seen in the movement from the approved budget to the current budget as detailed in Appendix 2.

The changes to the approved plan are summarised below and are the result of an increase in grant funding/other contributions. The change below followed agreed governance processes and have been endorsed by the Investment Strategy Group, chaired by the Head of Finance.

	Total Expenditure £m
Current Capital Investment Plan as at June 2022	197.420
CFCR	2.650
Increased Grant and Contribution Income	1.314
Current Capital Investment Plan as at Aug 2022	201.384

3.2 Expenditure

Expenditure variances are projected across all themes within the plan, the most significant being: -

3.2.1 Opportunities for All

Education & Children’s Services – (£2.694m)

Slippage under Early Learning & Childcare is a result of the remaining projects due to be completed next financial year. Slippage for Nursery Refurbishment where projects will happen in future years. Slippage of £0.500m for Dunfermline Learning Campus (DLC) as a result in change in the contractors’ timescales. There may be further slippage this financial year in DLC depending on winter weather over the following months and around the purchase of employment land which is now likely to happen next financial year.

Health and Social Care - £0.866m

The overspend for Methilhaven Care Home is expected to be £1m by the anticipated handover date in March 2023. This is due to the extended time the project is taking to complete and is attributed to material/supply chain delays. This has led to additional contractor claims due to extended periods on site.

3.2.2 Thriving Places

Asset, Transportation & Environment – (£1.364m)

Sustainable Transport (£0.845m) slippage primarily relates to the Levenmouth Reconnected Programme. The projected spend for the financial year is £1.320m, however, 50% of this will be claimed against the Transport Scotland Grant. Further grant applications are being assessed and prioritised for approval.

Strategic Transport Intervention Programme (£0.519m) because of a delay in the Housing Land Audit which has impacted on the expected timing and has resulted in slippage this year. The slippage relates to two projects – Northern Link Road East End (£0.267m) - an external consultant has been appointed to progress with the detailed design which is due for completion in Summer 2023. Bothwell Gardens Roundabout Signal Replacement (£0.296m) - an in-house design resource has been allocated with the detailed design programmed for completion in Summer 2023.

Area Community & Corporate Development – (£5.016m)

There are several projects contributing to the expected levels of slippage, the main areas of slippage are as follows:

Area Community Facilities slippage of £2.520m relates to Abbeyview Integrated Hub, tenders are due to be received in early 2023. Sport & Leisure Facilities has slippage of £1.080m, £0.696m relates mainly to Lochore Meadows destination playpark. The retendered project is being evaluated and a full consultation exercise will be undertaken before the contract is let. Sports Leisure and Community Assets is showing slippage of £0.830m and will be used to support projects in 2023-24.

Improving Health Through Leisure & Sport has slippage of £0.557m relates to a number of playpark projects across Fife, these projects are at the design and consultation stage or out to tender.

Community Facilities Programme has an advancement of £0.500m due to the Glenwood Regeneration project progressing quicker than anticipated meaning the expenditure will be incurred in 2022/23 rather than in 2023/24. There is also a projected overspend of £0.500m for the same project, as a result of the Compulsory Purchase Orders being higher than anticipated.

3.2.3 Inclusive Growth and Jobs

Business & Employability – (£1.200m)

Growing the Economy – (£0.825m)

There is slippage on the council funded contribution to Levenmouth Business Units mainly because of advancing the externally funded phase of the project in order to maximise grant funding opportunity in this financial year.

Industrial Investment Programme – (£0.374m)

This variance is mainly due to the redesign of the Glenrothes Flemington Road project following a decision to deliver this project in house. A site acquisition at Dalgety Bay will slip to next year resulting in slippage of £0.234m and there has been underspend at Lochgelly of £0.209m where full contingency was not required. This has been offset by advancement of the construction of Levenmouth Business Units of £0.518m to maximise grant funding available in this financial year.

3.2.4 Maintaining Our Assets – Rolling Programmes

Education & Children’s Services - £0.789m

There has been an advancement of spend within the Education ICT Programme of £1.123m, which mainly relates to the refresh of technology across the Primary School estate.

Slippage in Education Rolling Programme is around a small number of projects that had initially been planned for this financial year now having been delayed and not starting until next financial year.

Asset & Transportation & Environment – (£2.962m)

Structures infrastructure (£3.082m)

The slippage primarily relates to Leven Railway Bridge (£2.500m). The Council is in the process of commissioning Network Rail and their contractors to construct the bridge and to do so requires a formal Implementation Agreement to be signed with Network Rail. Additional investment, which has since been approved, was required before the agreement could be signed to allow the works to commence and this should be finalised by the end of the calendar year. The remaining slippage in the programme relates to utility work delays.

Area Community & Corporate Dev – (£0.676m)

Slippage relates to Parks development projects across Fife. Projects such as Ravensraig Play Park, Castle Terrace Play Area and Daisy Park being in consultation design and tender stages.

3.2.5 Housing Revenue Account – (£0.369m)

There are advancements of spend within the Property Acquisitions Programme £5.622m and Gypsy Travellers sites £3.000m. Approval was given at Cabinet Committee on 25th August, 2022 for the HRA to work to acquire sufficient properties beyond the original target of 50 to meet increasing demand. The regenerations work at the Tarvit Gypsy Traveller site was delayed in previous years due to COVID-19 but is now expected to complete in year.

Within Policy Options there is slippage of £1.150m relating to Energy Efficiency projects which were previously delayed because of COVID-19. Work is expected to progress in this area in 2023-24 and will form part of the larger Energy Efficiency Standards for Social Housing (ESSH 2). There is slippage of £1.064m projected within Regeneration & Estates Action. This is mainly due to the Touch Regeneration project (slippage £0.745m) being paused while it is rescope. The remaining slippage is due to several smaller projects which have been delayed or paused whilst the plans for each site are finalised.

Despite the risk outlined on para 2.2.4 the Affordable Housing Programme is projecting slippage of £5.002m in year. This is due to the timings of site completions and payment stages for each site.

3.3 Total Income

- 3.3.1 Capital expenditure is funded from several income sources, some of which contribute specifically to individual projects in the plan. These income sources are Capital Financed from Current Revenue (CFCR), Scottish Government Specific Capital Grant and other grants and contributions (e.g., lottery funding).
- 3.3.2 Appendix 2 shows that there is a total income budget of £59.305m against a forecast of £61.044m giving a projected variance of £1.739m. This variance results from two main factors, a decrease in the expected CFCR and increased grant income both in respect of the Housing Revenue Account.
- 3.3.3 Overspends and pressures within the Housing Revenue Account means that the Service cannot commit to the level of CFCR which was originally budgeted, detail is presented in the revenue monitoring report on this agenda. Increased grant relates to the Tarvit Mill Gypsy Travellers Site and the Property Acquisitions Programme.

3.4 Total Funding

- 3.4.1 Within the total funding section of Appendix 2, the other income such as General Capital Grant and Capital Receipts are not specifically related to any capital project but is funding for the plan overall. The overall variance of £14.840m is mainly due to changes in both General Fund and HRA borrowing.

4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 The current total expenditure budget is £201.384m, and the Council is estimated to deliver £188.284m investment in the year, with slippage of (£13.101m).
- 4.2 This level of projected expenditure demonstrates continued progress on the delivery of a wide range of capital projects. Major capital investment by Fife Council continues, however, there is still a level of uncertainty associated with speed of delivery and future costs.
- 4.3 There are 25 projects/programmes within the Plan which have a value of £5.000m or greater. The overall budget for these projects is £999.967m, the Council is showing estimated expenditure of £1,003.182m and an estimated overspend of £3.215m (0.3%).
- 4.4 Where significant variances arise, these are reviewed by the Investment Strategy Group in conjunction with the appropriate Directorate and reflected in any future capital plan reports.
- 4.5 Services have reviewed expected project delivery timescales and have re-profiled expenditure into future years where appropriate to reflect a more realistic investment profile.

List of Appendices

1. Major Capital Projects total Cost Monitor
2. Monitoring Report by Capital Theme

Background Papers

None

Report Contact

Laura Robertson
Finance Operations Manager
Finance & Corporate Services
Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes

Telephone: 03451 55 55 55 (Ext. 450552)

Email: laurac.robertson@fife.gov.uk

FIFE COUNCIL
CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN 2021-31
TOTAL COST MONITOR - MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS

Appendix 1

	Service	Original Approved Budget £m	Current Project Budget £m	Total Projected Outturn £m	Variance £m	Variance %	Current Project Status	Expected Project Completion Date
Opportunities for All								
Madras College - Langlands	E&CS	50.170	58.313	58.313	0.000	0.00%	Completed Project	2021-22
Madras College Extension	E&CS		5.709	5.709	0.000	0.00%	Future Project	2026-27
Dunfermline Learning Campus	E&CS		122.025	122.025	0.000	0.00%	Current Project	2024-25
Extension Secondary School - Viewforth	E&CS	5.989	6.335	6.969	0.634	10.01%	Future Project	2030-31
New Secondary School - Glenrothes /Glenwood	E&CS	27.532	78.937	78.937	0.000	0.00%	Future Project	2028-29
Queen Anne High School Extension	E&CS		6.626	6.626	0.000	0.00%	Future Project	2030-31
Inverkeithing High School	E&CS		85.000	85.000	0.000	0.00%	Future Project	2026-27
Primary School Development Future Projects	E&CS		79.357	79.357	0.000	0.00%	Future Project	2029-30
Methil Care Home	H&SC	6.620	7.277	8.277	1.000	13.74%	Current Project	2022-23
Cupar Care Home	H&SC	5.580	7.879	9.220	1.341	17.02%	Current Project	2023-24
Anstruther Care Home	H&SC	6.145	6.595	6.595	0.000	0.00%	Feasibility	2024-25
		102.036	464.053	467.028	2.975	0.64%		
Thriving Places								
Glenrothes District Heat	ATE	10.320	9.449	9.449	0.000	0.00%	Current Project	2023-24
Northern Road Link East End	ATE		11.171	11.171	0.000	0.00%	Preparatory Works	2026-27
Western Distributer Road	ATE		10.326	10.326	0.000	0.00%	Future Project	2028-29
Northern Road A823	ATE		8.568	8.568	0.000	0.00%	Preparatory Works	2025-26
Adam Smith Creative Hub	Communities		7.171	7.411	0.240	3.35%	Current Project	2023-24
Abbeyview Integrated Hub	Communities	1.500	7.506	7.506	0.000	0.00%	Current Project	2023-24
Templehall Community Hub	Communities	1.500	9.004	9.004	0.000	0.00%	Current Project	2025-26
		13.320	63.196	63.436	0.240	0.38%		
Inclusive Growth and Jobs								
Fife Interchange Business Units - Phase 1 & 2	Bus & Employ	8.129	11.068	11.068	0.000	0.00%	Current Project	2024-25
John Smith Business Park Business Units	Bus & Employ	3.644	5.517	5.517	0.000	0.00%	Current Project	2026-27
		11.773	16.585	16.585	0.000	0.00%		
Housing Revenue Account								
Affordable Housing	Housing	281.869	424.238	424.238	0.000	0.00%	Current Project	2022-23
		281.869	424.238	424.238	0.000	0.00%		
Maintaing Our Assets								
West Fife Depot	ATE	4.525	8.041	8.041	0.000	0.00%	Completed Project	2019-20
Leven Railway Bridge & Bawbee Bridge	ATE	2.279	8.247	8.247	0.000	0.00%	Preparatory Work	2023-24
Local Area Network	BTS	7.200	7.308	7.308	0.000	0.00%	Current Project	2023-24
Balwearie High School	E&CS	8.300	8.300	8.300	0.000	0.00%	Future Project	2026-27
		22.304	31.896	31.896	0.000	0.00%		
Grand Total		431.302	999.967	1,003.182	3.215	0.32%		

**FIFE COUNCIL
CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN 2022-23
MONITORING REPORT**

Appendix 2

Capital Theme	Approved Budget £m	Current Budget £m	Actual to Date £m	Projected Outturn £m	Projected Variance £m	Projected Outturn as % of Plan
Opportunities for All	42.474	45.274	17.447	43.445	(1.828)	96%
Thriving Places	16.485	16.285	3.228	9.561	(6.723)	59%
Inclusive Growth and Jobs	5.947	6.295	2.412	5.096	(1.200)	81%
Maintaining Our Assets - Rolling Programmes	42.437	47.687	20.346	44.219	(3.468)	93%
Maintaining Our Assets - Specific Programmes	6.099	3.649	1.288	4.137	0.488	113%
Housing Revenue Account	80.195	80.195	39.971	79.825	(0.369)	100%
Corporate Items	2.000	2.000	0.000	2.000	0.000	100%
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	195.636	201.384	84.692	188.284	(13.101)	93%
Scottish Government Specific Capital Grants	(1.429)	(1.429)	(2.456)	(4.623)	(3.195)	324%
Other Grants and Contributions	(18.502)	(18.323)	(12.055)	(20.879)	(2.556)	114%
Capital Financed from Current Revenue (CFCR)	(43.440)	(39.554)	(5.319)	(35.541)	4.012	90%
TOTAL INCOME	(63.370)	(59.305)	(19.830)	(61.044)	(1.739)	103%
TOTAL NET EXPENDITURE	132.266	142.079	64.863	127.240	(14.839)	90%
Scottish Government General Capital Grant	(24.806)	(33.816)	(23.271)	(33.816)	0.000	100%
Capital Receipts	(10.480)	(10.480)	(6.024)	(10.702)	(0.222)	102%
NHT Loan Repayments	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0%
Borrowing from Loans Fund - General Fund	(56.743)	(58.496)	0.000	(45.295)	13.201	77%
Borrowing from Loans Fund - HRA	(40.237)	(39.287)	0.000	(37.427)	1.860	95%
TOTAL FUNDING	(132.266)	(142.079)	(29.295)	(127.240)	14.840	90%

Empty Non-Domestic Rates Charges

Report by: Les Robertson, Head of Revenue and Commercial Services

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

This report introduces a charging/relief policy for non-domestic rates in respect of empty/unoccupied properties.

The policy is required as Empty Property Relief (EPR) has been devolved to local government with effect from 1st April, 2023 onwards to any business or owner of unoccupied rateable subjects.

The attached policy has been designed to mirror the current provisions as set by the Scottish Government for EPR and this will allow time for an EPR to be conducted by rates staff along with consultation both within the Council and with external stakeholders such as local businesses.

A further report will be brought forward to Cabinet Committee during 2023-24 setting out recommendations for the relief from April 2024 onwards.

Recommendation

Members are requested to:-

- (i) approve the proposed policy to be effective from 1st April, 2023;
- (ii) note that officers intend to review the EPR policy during 2023 with a view to making changes to the charging regime from April 2024 onwards; and
- (iii) note that officers will consult widely over any future proposals to amend the charging scheme.

Resource Implications

The Scottish Government have made funding £105 million available nationally, based on best estimates from the Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS), to cover the cost of meeting income lost from empty rate. The administration of the EPR policy will require an additional Revenues Officer at grade FC5.

Legal & Risk Implications

The Council must implement a charging policy for empty non-domestic rates otherwise full rates will be charged on all empty non-domestic rates properties from 1st April, 2023. As detailed in the agreed COSLA leader's report, there is an inherent risk to Fife Council should the number of empty dwellings exceed the funding received. To mitigate this risk, we have an agreement that where this happens and a 3% threshold above funding is reached, LA's can approach the Scottish Government for a redetermination of funding.

An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is not required as there are no changes to existing service delivery and policy.

Consultation

It is intended to consult widely over future decisions on amending the charges levied or exemptions applied to empty non-domestic rating properties.

1.0 Background

1.1 Legislation

1.1.1 Currently all local authorities administer Empty Property Relief (EPR) on behalf of the Scottish Government. This is done using various pieces of primary and secondary legislation:-

- Sections 24 & 24A to the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1966
- Non-Domestic Rating (Unoccupied Property) (Scotland) Regulations 1994
- Non-Domestic Rating (Unoccupied Property) (Scotland) Regulations 1998

1.1.2 From 1st April, 2023, Fife Council is required to develop a policy on charging and reliefs available to empty rateable subjects contained within the Assessment Roll. The proposed policy is detailed in full in Appendix 1 to this report.

1.2 Empty Relief

1.2.1 The current empty relief applied to empty rateable subjects is as follows:-

Unoccupied industrial properties are awarded 100% relief for the first six months of becoming unoccupied and thereafter 10% relief is awarded until property is reoccupied (short periods of occupation of less than 3 months are ignored).

All other empty rateable subjects are given relief of 50% for the first three months of becoming unoccupied and then awarded 10% thereafter (again short periods of occupation are ignored).

Several unoccupied rateable subjects receive 100% relief for indefinite period if they fall into the following classes (full descriptions are contained in the proposed policy):-

- Where the subject is a listed building
- Where the subject has a Rateable Value £1700
- Where the subject's liability falls to be made by a trustee in sequestration, liquidation, or executor of an estate
- Where the subject's occupation is prohibited by law
- Where the subject is under a compulsory purchase order
- Where the owner of a subject is in administration (or subject to an administration order)
- Where the owner of the subject is a company or partnership that is formally being wound up

1.2.2 Fife Council, in the last financial year 2021-22, awarded the following in terms of empty relief:

Type of Relief	Number of Awards	Value of Relief Awarded
100% Industrial	213	£320,993
10% Industrial	408	£111,169
50% Other	331	£112,205
10% Other	975	£222,842
Listed Buildings	332	£1,096,203
Land – No buildings	287	£1,431,524
Small RV £1700	471	£104,806
Trustee	30	£17,359
Prohibited by Law	Nil	£0
Compulsory Purchase	Nil	£0
Administration	63	£785,860
Company Wound Up*	Nil	£0
Total		£4,202,961

*Not used in Fife as Liability always reverts liability to proprietor.

1.3 Scottish Government Funding

1.3.1 The Scottish Government has estimated (using best estimates supplied by Institute of Fiscal Studies) and has made an annual fixed sum available for the next three years amounting to £105 million across Scotland.

1.3.2 Clearly, the funding is greater than the total awards made for empty relief above (2021-22 financial year), however, this is a fixed amount for each of the next 3 years and does not factor the following matters: -

- (a) The rate poundage set by the Scottish Government each year may impact in the amount of relief awarded i.e. if rate poundage increased, this will also directly increase the value of relief awarded.
- (b) The impact of revaluation of all non-domestic properties takes effect from 1st April, 2023 and may also impact on the level of relief awarded.
- (c) Any future changes in the economy which may increase or decrease the number or value of empty properties. Thus, the funding provided cannot be utilised for any other purpose than to meet the costs of the EPR scheme. The overall costs and funding will be monitored as part of the normal budget process.

2.0 Administration

- 2.1 As this report is not recommending altering (for 2023-24) the conditions for applying relief, there are only small amendments to the administration of the process in terms of reporting reliefs to Scottish Government and on how Fife Council will now deal with written-off debt where it relates to unoccupied rates charges.
- 2.2 There will no changes to businesses who require relief. As stated in the policy, we intend to transfer existing reliefs on 31st March, 2023 to the new local relief scheme and allow the balance of any time limited reliefs already awarded to continue. All new requests for empty relief will be by application in the same way as businesses apply presently.
- 2.3 The Revenue Service will, during 2023-24, carry out a full review of our records as they relate to empty properties to ensure our records are up-to-date with correct proprietor, tenant and occupier information as well as seeking confirmation that these properties are still unoccupied. Additional resource of one Revenues Officer at FC5 will be required to deal with the additional workload of the EPR review etc.
- 2.4 Another key factor which is currently under development by Scottish Government is anti-avoidance measures to be moved onto a statutory basis. The Scottish Government took powers under the Non-Domestic Rates (Scotland) Act 2020 to lay legislation to stop anti-avoidance schemes currently in operation. It is hoped that the appropriate statutory instruments will be laid before the Scottish Parliament prior to 31st March, 2023 as these will be essential in ensuring that only genuine arrangements are awarded relief going forward.

3.0 Review of Policy

- 3.1 Members should be aware once the EPR review is concluded, officers intend to review the relief policy during 2022-23 with the review looking at the following areas: -
 - (a) Are the time limited reliefs awarded at the appropriate percentage relief.
 - (b) Are the current time scales for time limited relief appropriate.
 - (c) Are the classes of indefinite 100% relief still appropriate or should Fife Council consider introducing changes to these indefinite relief classes:
 - (d) Any other changes identified during the review.
- 3.2 When carrying out this review, if any changes are proposed to the policy, such changes will be brought to this Committee for discussion and approval during 2023-24.
- 3.3 Stakeholder engagement into the review will be carried out across internal and external stakeholders as well as engagement at a national level using existing professional associations, COSLA and Scottish Government colleagues.

4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 The Scottish Government, supported by COSLA, have agreed to devolve empty rates relief to local government from April 2023. Officers have worked closely with colleagues in COSLA and Scottish Government to ensure the necessary guidance is in place to allow Council's to implement appropriate local policies as well as agreeing a funding model that goes a long way to protect Council's financial position.

- 4.2 Given the relative short time scales to have a policy agreed and the fact that Fife Council needs to carry out a full review of existing empty relief, a policy has been brought forward for 2023-24 which replicates the existing provisions.
- 4.3 Fife Council will carry out the EPR review in 2023 and commence consultation and discussions with key stakeholders and with other Councils with a view to reviewing the policy from April 2024. We will also be taking cognisance of the overall budget situation of Fife Council when developing any amended policy.

List of Appendices

1. Empty Property Relief Policy

Report Contact

Les Robertson
Head of Revenue and Commercial Services
Fife House
Glenrothes
Email: les.robertson@fife.gov.uk

Fife Council

Empty Property Relief Policy

Effective Date

This policy will become effective from 1st April 2023.

Legislative Background

The policy is required to be put in place to allow relief to Non-Domestic Rates for Empty Rateable Subjects. Section 19 to the Non-Domestic Rates Act (Scotland) 2020 repeals the existing provisions for award of relief (Section 24 to the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1966).

This policy is introduced in terms of Section 3A to the Local Government (Financial Provisions etc) (Scotland) Act 1962 as amended by Section 140 to the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015.

Section 3A States:

“Schemes for reduction and remission of rates

- (1) This section applies in relation to rates leviable for the year 2015-16 and any subsequent year.
- (2) A rating authority may, in accordance with a scheme made by it for the purposes of this section, reduce or remit any rate leviable by it in respect of lands and heritages.
- (3) Any reduction or remission under subsection (2) ceases to have effect at such time as may be determined by the rating authority.
- (4) A scheme under subsection (2) may make provision for the rate to be reduced or remitted by reference to—
 - (a) such categories of lands and heritages as may be specified in the scheme,
 - (b) such areas as may be so specified,
 - (c) such activities as may be so specified,
 - (d) such other matters as may be so specified.
- (5) Any reduction or remission under subsection (2) ceases to have effect on a change in the occupation of the lands and heritages in respect of which it was granted.
- (6) Before exercising the power conferred by subsection (2), or amending a scheme made under that subsection, the rating authority must have regard to the authority’s expenditure and income and the interests of persons liable to pay council tax set by the authority.”.

Empty Rates Policy Definitions and Content

Definition

Empty properties are defined as those rateable entries which are not currently occupied. Part Occupied properties are not included in this policy as they are covered by Section 24A to the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1966.

Relief to be awarded – Time Limited

- a) Industrial Properties (with the same definition as was contained previously in the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1966) will receive 100% relief for 6 months from the last date of occupation and 10% relief thereafter.
- b) All other properties (non-industrial) will receive 50% rates relief for the first 3 months from the last occupation date and 10% relief thereafter.
- c) Short periods of occupation of 3 months or less will be ignored when assessing last occupation date for (a) & (b) above.

100% Relief awarded – without limit of time (Numbers 1 to 7 below)

The following types of properties/owners/rateable occupiers will receive 100% rates relief for an indefinite time on unoccupied properties as follows:

- 1) Listed Buildings or subject to preservation order
The rateable subjects are:
 - a) Are subject of a building preservation notice/s as defined by Section 56 of the town and Country Planning (Scotland) act 1972 (a) or included in a list compiled under Section a of that Act; or
 - b) Included in the Schedule of Monuments compiled under Section 11 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act; or
 - c) Industrial lands and heritages.
- 2) Properties that do not comprise any building or part-building.
Property not comprising one or more buildings or a part of a building
- 3) Properties with a rateable value is less than £1700.
- 4) Properties where the rateable occupier is a trustee for sequestration, liquidation, or an executor.

The person entitled to possession of the lands and heritages is so entitled by virtue only of being: -

- a. The trustee under a trust deed for creditors; or
- b. The trustee under an award of sequestration; or
- c. The executor of the estate of a deceased person.

- 5) Properties where the rateable occupier is a company that has been wound up under the Insolvency Act
 - a) The person entitled to possession of the lands and heritages is so entitled in his capacity as liquidator by virtue of an order made under Section 112 or Section 145 of the Insolvency Act 1986 (d); or
 - b) The owner of the lands and heritages is a company which is subject to a winding-up order made under the Insolvency Act 1986, or which is being wound up voluntarily under that Act.
- 6) Properties where occupation is prohibited by law

The owner of the lands and heritages are prohibited by law from occupying them or allowing them to be occupied.
- 7) Properties which are subject to a compulsory purchase order

The lands and heritages are kept vacant by reason of action taken by or on behalf of the Crown or any local or public authority with a view to prohibiting the occupation of the lands and heritages or to acquiring them.

Awarding Relief to unoccupied properties

Fife Council will transfer existing reliefs and exemptions existing on 31st March 2023 awarded to empty properties.

Where time limited reliefs are in place as of 31st March 2023 Fife Council will continue to award the relief, but each premises will only receive the balance of relief based on the overall maximum period of 6 months (industrial 100% relief) and 3 month (other 50% relief) contained in this policy.

For new reliefs, the rateable occupier (or other who are held liable) will need to make application to Fife Council for the relief to be applied. Application forms and advice are available from Fife Council.

Fife Council will commit to carrying out an empty relief review across all empty relief during 2023-24 to ensure our records are up to date.

Domestic Waste Operations Bulky Uplifts – Free of Charge Service

Report by: John Rodigan, Head of Environment and Building Services

Purpose

To approve the removal of charges for the bulky uplift service from April 2023.

Recommendation

Cabinet is asked to remove the charges for bulky uplifts from April 2023 subject to £1.16m of additional resources and lost revenue being funded through the budget process.

Resource Implications

The removal of charges for bulky uplifts will result in lost income, the requirement for additional staff and vehicles and increased waste processing and disposal costs. The total revenue cost of providing the free bulky uplift service will be £1.16m.

Once a consistent level of demand is established, vans will be purchased instead of hired and if assumptions are realised, the capital cost requirement would be £390k. This investment would be required every 7 years. The vehicles coming off hire would create an annual revenue cost reduction of £72k.

It is proposed that all costs are funded through the budget process.

Legal & Risk Implications

There are no legal implications. However, should demand exceed the predicted three-fold increase, residents may have to wait on available booking slots and this may give rise to public complaint.

Impact Assessment

The Fife Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed (Appendix 1).

Consultation

Consultation has been undertaken with the Finance Service, Human Resources and Fife Resource Solutions.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The current bulky uplift service is based on a points per item system that generates a charge of £15 or £30 depending on the type and volume of items to be collected.
- 1.2 Concerns are growing that the current cost of living crisis will see some residents unable to pay for the uplift of bulky items they cannot dispose of in their domestic waste bins.
- 1.3 The removal of bulky uplift charges will support residents with financial challenges and help them to dispose of their waste in a responsible manner.
- 1.4 In 2021/22, 34,859 items were collected in 14,235 bulky uplift collections.

2.0 Free of Charge Bulky Uplift Scheme

- 2.1 The proposal is to remove all charges for the bulky uplift service from April 2023.
- 2.2 Bulky uplifts will continue to be ordered online via the Fife.Gov customer portal and the current points system will continue to be used.
- 2.3 Uplifts will be scheduled on a first come first served basis and 180 booking slots will be available on a daily basis for the whole of Fife.
- 2.4 The list of items that can be uplifted will not change and landfill material will continue to be accepted.
- 2.5 The online access forms will be revised and made more user friendly.
- 2.6 Only vans will be used to collect bulky uplifts, and this will prevent recyclable materials going to landfill in refuse collection vehicles.
- 2.7 Data will be collected on the volume of requested uplifts, types of material and disposal method (landfill, recycled and waste to energy).

3.0 Resources

- 3.1 The provision of a free bulky uplift service by both Fife Council in 2004 and, more recently, by Falkirk Council showed a three-fold increase in demand. It is reasonable to assume that this will be the case with the new scheme and all resource requirements have been based on that level of increase.
- 3.2 A three-fold increase in the current demand for the collection of materials takes the annual volume from circa 35,000 to 105,000 items.
- 3.3 The service estimates that one van and two operatives can make 20 uplifts in a day, with an average of 2.5 items per collection. With 9 vans in operation working 260 days per year, the number of items lifted would be 117,000. This exceeds the anticipated three-fold demand, however, an additional van and two operatives will be required to cover staff holidays, sickness, training and vehicle downtime.
- 3.4 The service currently deploys 3 vans to the bulky uplift service, an additional 7 would be required to meet the new demand. Each new vehicle would require two operatives; therefore 14 additional staff would need to be recruited.

4.0 Recycling, Landfill and Waste to Energy

- 4.1 All bulky collections in the new scheme will be uplifted by vans, the 26-ton refuse collection vehicles will no longer be used. The deployment of vans will provide the opportunity to identify materials, minimise landfill and maximise recycling.
- 4.2 Fife Resource Solutions estimate that one third of the uplifts will go to landfill, a third will be recycled and the remaining third will be processed as waste to energy because of the presence of persistent organic pollutants in the materials.
- 4.3 Fife Resource Solutions will process all bulky uplift materials at landfill sites and recycling centres.
- 4.4 Materials destined for use as fuel for energy from waste will be converted to heat and power at the Earls Gate Energy Centre, Grangemouth.

5.0 Finance

Revenue

- 5.1 In 2021/22, the bulky uplift service generated an income of £254k, this will be lost with the provision of the free of charge service.
- 5.2 To meet the additional demand, the new scheme will require an additional 14 staff and 7 vans with all associated fuel and fleet maintenance costs. Until a sustainable level of demand can be established, the vans will be hire vehicles that can be returned if anticipated pressures do not materialise. Likewise, redundant temporary staff will be redeployed to seasonal activity elsewhere within the Service.
- 5.3 Fife Resource Solutions have confirmed that there is very little cost difference in processing landfill, recycling and 'waste to energy' streams. Based on the three-fold increase in demand, Fife Resource Solutions estimate that the processing costs for all waste streams will be £304k.

5.4 Estimated Costs Table

Item	Number	Cost / Item (£ 000)	Total (£ 000)
Staff	14	30	420
Vehicles	7	17	119
Fuel	7	7	49
Repairs	7	2	14
Lost Income	-	-	254
Waste Processing	-	-	304
		Total	£1,160

- 5.5 Based on the assumptions within this report, the total cost of the free of charge service will be £1.16m. The digital booking system and limited number of daily slots will ensure that demand is controlled and additional resources and associated costs are not incurred.

Capital

- 5.6 Once a constant level of demand has been established, the Service will move to purchase vans rather than hiring them. If there is a three fold increase in demand, the resulting capital cost requirement would be £390k and this would become a capital plan pressure every 7 years with the fleet replacement cycle. However, this would also result in an annual revenue cost reduction of £72k, with vehicles coming off hire.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 The provision of a free of charge bulky uplift service at an estimated cost of £1.16m will meet an anticipated three-fold increase in demand.
- 6.2 The collection of landfill materials will continue but a significant increase in recycling and 'waste to energy' will be achieved through the use of vans and Fife Resource Solutions processing systems.
- 6.3 Residents in Fife struggling with the cost-of-living crisis will benefit from having their unwanted bulky household waste items uplifted free of charge.

List of Appendices

1. Fife Environmental Impact Assessment

Contact

John Rodigan
Head of Service, Environment and Building Services
Bankhead Central, Glenrothes
Tel: 03451 55 55 55 Ext No 473223
Email: john.rodigan@fife.gov.uk

Fife Environmental Impact Assessment

Project name:	Free of Charge Bulky Uplift Service	Committee report title:	Cabinet
Committee name & date:	Cabinet - December Meeting	Have the proposals been subject to any other formal environmental assessment?	No
Completed by:	John Rodigan, Head of Service, Environment and Building Services	Completed on:	20/11/2022

A. Wildlife and biodiversity		Answer	Comments
Fife Council is committed to protecting and enhancing Fife's natural heritage.			
1	What impact will the proposals have on wildlife (including protected sites and species)?	Beneficial impact	The anticipated three-fold increase in demand for bulky uplifts should see a reduction in fly tipping and associated negative impacts on the natural environment.
B. Impacts on people		Answer	Comments
Fife Council is committed to protecting and enhancing the wellbeing of our people.			
2	What impact will the proposals have on environmental nuisance? (i.e., visual impacts, traffic, noise, vibration, odour, dust, particulates, smoke)	Beneficial impact	Any reduction in fly tipping will improve the natural environment and remove the blight that litter presents on the landscape. Additional vans will emit particulates on a low-level basis.
3	What impact will the proposals have on human health or wellbeing?	Beneficial impact	Less litter in Fife's greenspace will make it more attractive and encourage residents and visitors to get out and enjoy the natural environment.

C. Pollution		Soil and geology Answer	Comments
Fife Council is committed to protecting and improving air, water, and soil quality.			
4	What impact will the proposals have on pollution (including pollution to air, water, or soil)?	Beneficial impact	Less fly tipping presents a direct reduction in environmental pollution. Additional vans will cause air pollution on a low-level basis.
D. Climate change		Answer	Comments
Fife Council is committed to cutting carbon emissions and making Fife more resilient.			
5	What impact will the proposals have on greenhouse gas emissions?	Beneficial impact	Recycling volumes will increase and disposal of waste to landfill will reduce, bringing down greenhouse gas emissions. Additional vans will generate low level emissions.
6	What impact will the proposals have on resilience to the adverse effects of severe weather events, including flooding and landslips?	No impact	No response
7	What impact will the proposals have on flooding and sites designated as being at risk of flooding or sea level rise?	No impact	No response
E. Resources and waste		Answer	Comments
Fife Council is committed to using resources efficiently and minimising waste.			Please clarify your response
8	What impact will the proposals have on how much waste is generated or how waste is managed?	Beneficial impact	More waste will be generated because the service is free of charge, however recycling will be maximised, and landfill minimised.
9	What impact will the proposals have on energy use and the consumption of material resources?	Negative impact	Additional vans to uplift the increased volume of bulky materials will increase fuel consumption.

F. Cultural heritage		Answer	Comments
Fife Council is committed to protecting Fife's cultural heritage.		Please select an option:	Please clarify your response
10	What impact will the proposals have on cultural heritage (including designated heritage / archaeology sites or listed buildings)?	No impact	No response

Good practice	6
Data gaps or mixed impacts	1
Environmental red flags	0
No impacts identified	3

Resettlement of Vulnerable People in Fife

Report by: John Mills, Head of Housing Services

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

This report is a follow-up to the report to Cabinet on 25th August 2022 which outlined the various resettlement strands that Fife was involved with. This report provides an update on current need and requests for accommodation and support for Afghan families from the UK Government.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- (i) agree to work proactively with the Home Office and MOD by leasing 28 properties at Leuchars and Rosyth to house Afghan Families currently residing in the Bridging Hotel in Fife and wider afield; and
- (ii) note that a further report will be made to Cabinet in February or March 2023 to update members on accommodation and support request for Ukrainians and Asylum Seekers.

Resource Implications

Fife's participation in previous Resettlement schemes has been funded by the UK Government and has been cost neutral to the Council. Based on UK and Scottish Government commitments to CoSLA and Local Authorities, Housing & Finance Services expect that Resettlement Schemes will continue to be funded on the tariff basis underpinned by the funding instruction and Officers are committed to operating within funding availability.

The portfolio of 28 MOD properties which will be leased by the Council will be operated as an addition to the Council's temporary accommodation and will be self-financing over 3-5 years in terms of repairs, decoration, furnishing and management. Rents will be charged in accordance with Fife Council Temporary Accommodation Rents Policy with costs recovered through Housing Benefit. Management costs will be covered in part by the same subsidy and through the Tariff payments made by UK Government.

Legal & Risk Implications

The decision to aid Afghan families come to and live in the UK was taken by the UK Government in 2021. Fife has been offering support to the Home Office to support Afghans in the bridging hotel in Fife. As the accommodation will be provided by the MOD, there are no risks to the council in leasing and managing the accommodation for families at Leuchars and Rosyth.

Impact Assessment

Fife is currently experiencing a very high level of homelessness and housing applicant demand on housing and support services. The provision of additional accommodation for Afghan families in MOD housing has a low impact on the council's resources.

Consultation

Consultation has been completed with the Chief Executive, Leader, Housing and Building Services Spokesperson and the Home Office/MOD.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 As reported in August 2022 to Cabinet, Fife has a positive reputation and experience in responding to significant humanitarian and other crises which date back to the original Afghan Relocation Programme in 2014. Previous reports and Elected Member Briefings have set out a range of challenging resettlement strands that, when brought together, puts pressure on Council and our Partners to deliver a joined-up and adequate response to the humanitarian crises in Ukraine, Afghanistan and with Asylum Seekers coming to the UK.
- 1.2 This report focuses on where we are now in assisting Afghan families to move on from the Bridging Hotel in Fife and for new arrivals from Afghanistan.
- 1.3 Further requests for support from the UK Government come at a time of homelessness crisis in Fife with a significant number of households in temporary accommodation and a rising demand from applicants on the Fife Housing Register. Although there are some specific housing pressures unique to Fife, there is an understanding by all local authorities that there are significant housing access pressures in the post Covid-pandemic recovery and the current Cost-of-Living crisis.

2.0 Specific Requests to Fife for Assistance

Afghan Families

- 2.1 Members will be aware that up to 100 Afghans at any time have been housed in a Bridging Hotel in Fife and that close working with the Home Office and the Fife Resettlement Co-ordination Group has resulted in good levels of support. There are currently 51 arrivals from Afghanistan in the hotel.
- 2.2 Discussions with the MOD and Home Office have been ongoing for some months to arrange for move-on accommodation for families to move from the hotel into family accommodation in Fife or elsewhere in the UK. Despite commitment from the Council and the MOD to lease 10 properties in Leuchars and Rosyth, progress with discussions has been slow and managed in accordance with other priorities emerging through different resettlement areas of activity.
- 2.3 An approach was made to the Chief Executive in November 2022 for a meeting with senior officials from the Home Office and the MOD to discuss ongoing pressures from Afghans in hotels and the need to bring more at risk to life individuals and families from Afghanistan in early 2023. The Head of Housing and the Service Manager for Housing Access met with officials on 1st December 2022.
- 2.4 The outcome of the meeting was an offer of a further 18 properties at Leuchars to house families from hotels and new arrivals from Afghanistan. In addition to the original 10 properties offered, this now creates a pool of accommodation of 28 properties that could be leased to the Council for a period of 3-5 years. There has been ongoing work with Legal Services and Estates, so the Council could move relatively quickly to confirm the lease and with MOD officials to achieve occupancy on a phased basis from March 2023. Occupancy would be arranged on a similar basis to previous established Resettlement Schemes which have operated successfully in the past.

- 2.5 Ongoing support for the Afghan families relocated to Leuchars and Rosyth would be provided by the Fife Resettlement Team and Link Living. The costs of providing the accommodation are summarised as:
- Lease of 28 properties
 - Furnishings
 - Repairs and Garden Management
- 2.6 The properties will be absorbed into the Council's temporary accommodation portfolio for the leasing period. Rents charged will be at the current temporary accommodation rate, supported by housing benefit claimed by the ARAP families. Afghans will be asked to sign the Council's revised Occupancy Agreement. On this basis, there will be no deficit for the Council's General Fund Housing Account to pick up on a similar basis to previous resettlement schemes which have operated on a cost neutral basis.

3.0 Conclusions

- 3.1 Fife has a strong track record of positively assisting vulnerable and displaced people and will continue to co-ordinate a comprehensive offer to vulnerable people. The Core Group has the appropriate partners and has the expertise to make the proposal a continuing success in terms of outcomes for the vulnerable people involved.
- 3.2 The pressures on the housing sector are well documented. Taking account of this, the specific proposal outlined in this report is mainly externally funded and supported and will enable vulnerable people already in Fife and coming to Fife over the short-term to be in improved housing accommodation without taking up active council housing stock.
- 3.3 The Fife Resettlement Core Group will continue to support the Afghan families as they move onto the temporary accommodation at Leuchars and Rosyth.

Report Contacts:

John Mills
Head of Housing Services
Email: john.mills@fife.gov.uk

Gavin Smith
Service Manager Housing Access
Email: gavin.smith@fife.gov.uk

School Leadership Models (2)

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director (Education and Children's Services)

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

This report responds to the decision of the Cabinet Committee of 15th December, 2022 by providing further evidence of the benefits of joint leadership approaches; an analysis of the costs of joint leadership models; and an overview of the reasons for a potential change of leadership arrangements in the Waid Cluster area.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to:

- (i) approve the aims and principles that will continue to guide the establishment of school and early learning centre leadership models in Fife as outlined in the School Leadership Models Cabinet Committee paper (15th December, 2022 – included in Appendix A of this paper) and in Section 1 (1.2 and 1.10) of this paper;
- (ii) approve further consultation with the parents/carers in the Waid Cluster, on the full range of leadership models outlined in the School Leadership Models Cabinet Committee paper (December 2022 - included in Appendix A of this paper), to allow for permanent school leadership arrangements to be in place from August 2023 or as soon as reasonably possible thereafter; and
- (iii) agree that, following local consultation with stakeholder groups, where changes in school or early learning centre leadership arrangements include more than 2 schools, approval is sought through the relevant Council Committee.

Resource Implications

None.

Legal & Risk Implications

There are no direct legal/risk implication arising from the report. Impact Assessment

Impact Assessment

An EqIA and summary form have been completed and formed part of the School Leadership Models Cabinet Committee paper (December 2022 - included in Appendix A of this paper).

Consultation

We currently have 32 joint leadership models across Fife. A consultation exercise was carried out between March and June 2021 involving headteachers with more than one early year's setting and/or school. Feedback was also gathered from staff, parents and pupils through surveys and focus groups during academic session 21/22. Further consultation took place with the Fife Joint Headteacher network, following the Cabinet Committee of 15th December, 2022, to consider the benefits and challenges of joint leadership models. An overview of the outcome of this consultation is illustrated in 2.6 - 2.8 of this report.

1.0 Rationale for Change

- 1.1 Following consideration of the School Leadership Models paper, on 15th December, 2022, Cabinet Committee asked for a report to be brought to its next meeting 'with detailed evidence analysing the costs and benefits of joint leadership models, as well as the pressures leading to this potential change of approach, including the shortage of headteachers, the reasons for this and the plan to recruit and train more'.
- 1.2 The **aims** of School Leadership Models strategy are outlined below, and these are the basis upon which any decision to create joint leadership arrangements across establishments are and will be made:
- (i) to develop and establish leadership models that strengthen leadership and management arrangements across schools and early centres (ELCs). This includes creating Headteacher, Depute Headteacher and Principal Teacher posts that are attractive to high quality, experienced candidates across all parts of Fife;
 - (ii) to support partnership working, within and across the local area, which is responsive to the needs of the children, young people, families and communities whilst maintaining the individual identities of every school but capitalising on the opportunities to strengthen partnership working across the local school/ELC communities;
 - (iii) to create the conditions that support staff across schools/ELCs to work together effectively. Encouraging networking and collaboration across the wider staff team, for a range of purposes, to strengthen school improvement activity and the professional learning of staff. Enabling the sharing of skills, knowledge and expertise and encouraging leadership across schools, ensuring the needs of all children and young people are met through high quality learning, teaching and assessment; and
 - (iv) to maximise the use of local resources, spaces and opportunities to strengthen relationships amongst children and young people, parents/carers and staff within and across schools/ELCs.
- 1.3 Joint leadership arrangements have also been considered where there has been a lack of interest in single school Headteacher positions in some schools or areas of Fife. Although this remains an option for the Service, should this situation arise, it is not the primary driver for the establishment of joint leadership arrangements. The primary drivers are those outlined in the stated aims of the strategy.
- 1.4 However, over the years in parts of Fife where there are small schools, we have also seen a more frequent turnover of Headteachers as post holders move onto roles with a larger scope of responsibility within 18 months to 3 years. In previous papers to Committees, the decision to phase out Teaching Headteachers was agreed to create more attractive non-teaching joint headteacher posts and retain post-holders for longer periods in these areas.
- 1.5 Our Professional Learning and Leadership strategy within the Education Service has continued to impact positively on the professional development of aspiring leaders across our schools and early learning centres. Our Professional Learning Framework provides a range of opportunities for the development of leadership and management skills, including programmes to develop as enquiring professionals, aspiring middle leaders (Principal Teachers and Depute Headteachers) and aspiring Headteachers.

- 1.6 The introduction of the mandatory Into Headship qualification for all new Headteachers from August 2020 has created a new challenge for aspiring Headteachers and may deter some from embarking on that career pathway. Nevertheless, in partnership with Edinburgh University, we have had 69 aspiring Headteachers in Fife complete the mandatory Into Headship Masters Level qualification, with a further 17 participants part way through the programme. However, we have appointed over 35 new Headteachers into our schools or early learning centres over the last 3 years and 13 Into Headship graduates have taken up positions in other local authorities.
- 1.7 Continuing to identify, support and develop aspiring Headteachers in our workforce is crucial to our service moving forward. We must ensure that aspiring Headteachers have career progression opportunities in all parts of Fife that allows them to develop their leadership and management skills, knowledge and understanding whilst working alongside and with other more experienced leaders.
- 1.8 As outlined in the School Leadership Models paper presented to Cabinet on 15th December, 2022, in the last 12-18 months we have considered the possibility of alternative leadership arrangements in the Waid Cluster area, in order to achieve the aims outlined in 1.2 across the eight primary schools and Waid Academy.
- 1.9 Due to permanent Headteachers retiring, or moving onto other posts in Fife schools, during the last 2 years Headteachers have been appointed to Waid Academy, Anstruther Primary School, Pittenweem Primary School, Elie Primary School, Colinsburgh Primary School and Crail Primary School on a temporary basis. The decision to appoint on a temporary basis was partly due to the uncertainty caused by the Covid-19 pandemic during that time, but also to allow time for consideration to be given to the most suitable long-term leadership and management arrangements for the schools in the Cluster.
- 1.10 Waid Cluster is unique in its own context within Fife. Waid Academy has a falling school roll, dropping from 712 young people in 2020, to a projected roll of 660 in August 2023. This makes Waid Academy the smallest of our secondary schools in Fife. The combined Primary School roll in the Waid Cluster area is also projected to drop during that same period. These figures are provided in Appendix B. As pupil rolls drop, the staffing levels are adjusted in line with our Devolved School Management staffing formulae used across all schools in Fife.
- 1.11 Given the contextual factors in the Waid Cluster, as outlined above, we have considered how we create and sustain the conditions across the Waid Cluster that will provide the leadership capacity and opportunities for collaboration that ensures:
- strategic planning and evaluation of improvement across all schools
 - curriculum development across all subject areas and through interdisciplinary learning, that develops the skills and attributes children need to thrive as they progress through school into a positive destination beyond school
 - sharing of good practice in learning and teaching, utilising expertise across schools to meet the needs of all children, particularly those experiencing barriers to their progress
 - maximisation of budgets across schools to invest in high quality resources or learning experiences for children and young people
 - strengthening of transitions between stages to support the wellbeing and learning needs of all children.

- 1.12 In summary, we want to create a strong and resilient model, or models, of leadership and management across the schools that will continue to improve outcomes for children and young people in the area.
- 1.13 We would like to engage with the children and young people, parents/carers and staff in the Waid Cluster area to explore the opportunities and challenges of the options outlined in Appendix A. This would inform decision-making on permanent leadership arrangements within the Waid Cluster as soon as reasonably possible.
- 1.14 To inform the decision-making process regarding the establishment of any leadership model, the principles outlined below will continue to be considered:
- **Sustainable** – the leadership models must be future proofed and sustainable for the current and future generations of families, communities and employees.
 - **Effective** – the leadership models must achieve positive outcomes for all families, communities and employees.
 - **Cohesive** – the leadership models must support the concept of the learners' journey, i.e. reducing transitions for staff and learners.
 - **Efficient** – the leadership models must aim to achieve our vision for a Self-Improving Networked System and to create an efficient public sector which reduces duplication and shares people and material resources and services wherever possible.
 - **Fair and equitable** – the leadership models must demonstrate equity and fairness for employees in terms of professional opportunities, learning and development; it must also be fair and equitable in the quality of leadership being provided to the learning community.
 - **Empowering** – the leadership models must aim to empower leaders within their communities to make decisions that best meet the needs of their communities.
 - **Integrating** – the leadership models must aim to develop better partnerships, collaboration and effective delivery within and across local communities.
 - **Contextualisation**- the leadership models must take into account community and cultural links within and across education settings.
 - **Accountable** - the leadership models must fulfil all legislative requirements and procedures and be able to demonstrate impact upon outcomes for families and communities.

2.0 Benefits and Challenges of Joint Leadership Models - Fife

- 2.1 Within the School Leadership Model paper presented to committee in December 2022 (Appendix A), an overview of the opportunities and challenges of each leadership model that may be considered is provided. These benefits and challenges have been informed by ongoing review and evaluation of the joint leadership arrangements we have had in Fife over the last 10+ years and through our engagement with officers and Headteachers from other local authorities in Scotland.
- 2.2 As detailed in Appendix B, the size of the combined school rolls within joint leadership arrangements have varied significantly, ranging from 50 pupils to over 1000 pupils. The majority of our joint school leadership models also have nurseries within the establishments, and a few are either joined with a special school (3-18) or have additional support classes within the model. However, we do not yet have any joint leadership models established that encompass a mainstream secondary and one or more primary schools. Neither do we have any models that include more than 2 primary schools.

- 2.3 Below is a summary of the sources of evidence that we have used over the past 10+ years to evaluate the success of our joint leadership models and also to learn how we can strengthen the models and/or overcome any challenges stakeholders encounter as a result of the leadership arrangements in place.
- 2.4 The Curriculum for Excellence Attainment Levels 2021/22 for schools who are part of a joint leadership arrangement are outlined in Appendix B. The table provides an overview of the percentage of P1, P4 and P7 children attaining expected levels, as reported to Scottish Government in Summer 2022. The table also provides the P1, 4 and 7 percentage attainment in comparator schools in Scotland, for each of the schools listed. Comparator Schools have similar levels of poverty based on the SIMD profile of the school. Those percentages highlighted in green indicate stronger performance than comparator schools. As can be seen from the table, most schools are reporting stronger attainment levels than comparator schools and most are also above the Fife average CfE attainment highlighted at the top of the table. Projected and achieved attainment levels are monitored throughout the academic years for all schools, to monitor performance and identify areas for improvement and/or targeted support.
- 2.5 The quality assurance and quality improvement processes of our schools and early learning centres are fundamental to our role as a local authority. We have established a Self-Improving System across Fife's schools and early learning centres, in consultation with our Headteachers and Deputy Headteachers, to support the continuous improvement in outcomes for our children and young people. Indicators of the performance of joint leadership arrangements are gathered through these processes. Some key indicators of recent school performance are provided below:
- 2.5.1 Annually, all establishments gather evidence to support self-evaluation activities. Over the past 3 school sessions, within all establishments led by a joint Headteacher, almost all evaluations are good or better across all 4 quality indicators. These are outlined in Appendix C.
- 2.5.2 7 of these establishments have been inspected by Education Scotland whilst being led by a joint Headteacher. Most evaluations are good or better. The evaluations given were 20% Satisfactory, 55% Good and 25% Very Good.
- 2.5.3 2 of these establishment have been inspected this session, since the re-start of external scrutiny; [Coaltown of Balgonie Primary School](#) and [Tulliallan Primary School](#). A key strength in both of these establishments was the impact of staff working together to learn and develop professionally. This was evaluated as impacting directly on the quality of the children's learning experiences and achievements. Both of these schools work very effectively with their colleagues across the joint leadership model.
- 2.5.4 14 establishments have been inspected by Care Inspectorate whilst being led by a joint Headteacher. All evaluations are good or better. The evaluations given were 26% Good, 68% Very Good and 6% Excellent.
- 2.5.5 All establishments prepare a Standards and Quality Report and Improvement Plan yearly. As a joint Headteacher, separate reports and plans are written for each establishment. All reports and plans received by the local authority for all establishments with a joint Headteacher reported progress across the last few sessions and they have detailed plans in place to support improving outcomes for children and young people within their own school community. There is evidence within these reports of the positive impact of collaboration between and across schools to support improvement activity.

- 2.5.6 Since August 2022, our Fife full quality assurance calendar has re-commenced following no, or interrupted, visits to establishments since March 2020 due to COVID-19. Since August 2022, 7 establishments with a joint Headteacher have had a visit as part of our self-improving system. This involves other Headteachers and a local authority representative. These visits have all reported good or very good progress towards improvement priorities for this session.
- 2.6 As outlined in the School Leadership Models paper, December 2022 (Appendix A), the views of our current joint headteachers, on the benefits and challenges of joint leadership models, are gathered regularly to continue to inform our School Leadership strategy. Most recently, on 9th December, 2022, the Fife's Joint Headteachers (JHT) group came together to collaborate, share practice and share feedback on the continued benefits of the models and any challenges that remained or had arisen. There was representation from across all Clusters with JHTs. Most present were JHTs of schools with a middle leadership team (Depute Headteacher or Principal Teacher) to support the JHT, however, there were two JHTs present who do not have middle leaders within their establishments. There was also a variety in the representation of the maturity of the JHT models.
- 2.7 In summary, the continuing benefits that Joint Headteachers highlighted were:
- being able to create stage partners across school teams increases opportunities to moderate approaches to learning, teaching and assessment. This develops a shared understanding of levels, standards and progression for children across stages in learning. This has led to raised expectations of learners, increased pace and challenge in learning, as well as improvement in differentiating learning experiences to ensure all children are making good progress;
 - opportunities for collegiate working, shared professional learning and opportunities to learn from each other, which has a direct impact on the quality and range of learning experiences for children across curricular areas;
 - increased range of opportunities for children and young people due to a wider staff team (e.g., increased range of specialism – outdoor learning, expressive arts, sports, etc);
 - the opportunities to enhance children's experiences at points of transition. For example, when moving from P7 to S1 joint planning can be undertaken across schools and with the secondary school. This would include opportunities for P7 children across schools to communicate, work together and enjoy joint experiences which are more easily planned and co-ordinated;
 - the ability to use staff flexibly within and across establishments;
 - the ability to be relatively flexible with budgets, e.g., increasing buying power through combining aspects of budgets, through effective use of the Devolved School Management scheme;
 - opportunities to build leadership capacity within the staff team and upskill future leaders through encouraging individuals and groups across the establishments to lead and collaborate on a range of aspects of improvement activity;
 - opportunities to create consistency of leadership teams as combined rolls often help to stabilise the leadership model; and
 - the increased number of staff working together brings a significant increase in the support to staff to ensure they are effectively meeting the needs of all children, but it also increases the professional challenge required to ensure robust self-evaluation of practice across the establishments.

2.8 In summary, the challenges identified by the Joint Headteachers continued to be mainly operational or administrative, as a result of similar tasks required for each establishment separately, or duplication of communications to each establishment. Joint Headteachers also highlighted the ongoing need to build a shared understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the leaders across the establishments, with all stakeholders. The visibility of leadership in all schools is important to ensure people feel listened to and valued, across stakeholder groups, in each establishment. Where Joint Headteachers find these challenges more significant is where there are no principal teachers or deputy headteachers included in the leadership model. This occurs where there are two very small schools linked as part of a joint leadership model. These models remove the need for the Headteacher to be teaching, which would be the case if they were single school leadership models (Model 1), however, there is no scope within the budget to create any other promoted posts due to the size of the two schools.

2.9 The views of our children, parents and staff have also continued to inform our school leadership strategy over the past ten years plus. These were provided in some detail in the School Leadership Models paper, December 2022 (Appendix A) but in summary they have included:

2.10 **Young people's viewpoints**

- When asked what was special about their schools, the pupils talked about the people - their teachers, their friends and the things they do together. When asked who looked after them at school, their responses were again very much in line with those in a single school leadership model with one headteacher. No children made reference at any point to any particular characteristic of the joint leadership model, such as the Headteacher being unavailable on certain days.
- Almost all children whose views were sampled reported that they enjoy school, they enjoy their learning and feel supported by their friends and the adults around them.
- The P7/S1 pupils were particularly asked about transition activities in preparation for high school. Responses were mostly positive; however, it was noted that there was little mention of engagement with children from other primary schools, which is likely to have been linked to the restrictions in place in 2020 and 2021.

2.11 **Views of parents and Carers**

In June 2022, individual school-based parent surveys from a variety of Joint Headteacher schools with varying school rolls and geographical contexts were analysed to identify any specific parental feedback from this group. The following key themes were identified:

- The majority of respondents considered that the schools had progressed well since the start of the joint headship.
- The importance of each individual school's highly valued identities within their communities continuing to be promoted, protected and supported.
- The benefits to children of continued collaboration across schools were recognised, either to support the professional learning of the school staff or to enhance the learning and teaching experiences of their children.
- The importance of parental views supporting school improvement activity and evaluating progress made.
- That staff members' roles and responsibilities were clear and that communication with school is effective. Parents/carers knew who to contact if they were worried about their child's happiness or friendships at school.

- An important consideration for parents is the progress that their child makes at school, their wellbeing and happiness in school and whether their child is known as an individual. In response to questions about children receiving the help they need, almost all parents agreed that their child was receiving the help they needed to do well, and almost all agreed that the schools effectively supported their child's emotional wellbeing.
- Almost all parents were happy with their child's progress and commented that the schools kept them well informed about this.
- When asked about next steps for those schools, there were mixed comments with most parents/carers content with the joint leadership models continuing, but a few suggesting the model should be ended. However, when asked as to whether or not they thought the joint headship was successful/well led, almost all agreed that it was.

2.12 School Staff Members' Views

In session 2021/22 feedback was gathered from all Education staff through the Directorate's Staffwise Survey. Views were compared between staff in joint leadership model schools and those in single school leadership models. The information provided in the table below suggests little to no difference between staff experiences of the joint leadership model and single school leadership models.

Survey Statement	Staff Feedback	
	Joint Leadership Model schools	Single School Leadership Model schools
'I have appropriate support from my line manager	91% agreed	92% agreed
'There is a positive ethos in my team/ school/ centre,'	86% agreed	83% agreed
'The relationships with others in my team/school/ centre are good,	95% agreed	96% agreed
'In my team/ school/ centre change is managed effectively,'	81% agreed	79% agreed
'There is effective communication within my team/ school/ centre,'	82% agreed	79% agreed

3.0 Benefits and Challenges of Joint Leadership Models – Outwith Fife

- 3.1 As outlined in the School Leadership Models Cabinet Committee paper, December 2022 (Appendix A), we have engaged with several local authorities over recent years and months to inform the planning and development of our school leadership models. These local authorities have been: Scottish Borders, Dumfries and Galloway, Argyll and Bute and Highland Council Education Services. Our proposed models, outlined in Appendix A, are in place across those local authorities, and beyond. Identified below are the benefits and challenges shared as part of our discussions with those local authorities, as well as information from a recent paper published by the University of Aberdeen, in conjunction with the Northern Alliance Regional Improvement Collaborative.

3.2 One leadership team across two or more primary schools

3.2.1 The benefits highlighted by colleagues from other authorities echoed our own evaluations here in Fife:

- The opportunities for collaboration across more than one establishment
- Reduced isolation for both teachers and Headteachers – essentially creating a larger team
- Opportunities to create middle leader positions where appropriate - in turn building capacity and leadership opportunities
- Increased professional learning opportunities, the sharing of good practice, and moderation activities
- Increased benefits for P7 transition, if the schools are within the same Cluster
- Flexibility of resource allocation and staffing, where appropriate

3.2.2 Challenges:

- Time taken up by Headteacher travelling between schools in some rural and island areas
- Visibility of Headteacher in each school
- Parental understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Principal Teachers and Depute Headteachers and their responsibility to act on behalf of the Headteacher
- Duplication of operational matters and activities across both schools
- Maintaining separate school identities

3.3 Cross-Sector 3-18 Leadership Models

3.3.1 **Benefits:**

- Consistent tracking and monitoring of pupils from the start of their educational journey, supporting early identification and intervention
- The removal of formal transitions as children visit the secondary campus regularly, if relevant to the model
- Creation of cross-sector remits for School Leadership Team to support the ongoing development of cross sector practice
- Increased Leadership Team across establishments and sectors to provide in school day to day support to children, young people, teaching staff and families
- Collegiate working across sectors strengthens as the model matures, with joint working time agreements, and joint school improvements identified where possible
- Opportunities to draw on expertise of colleagues across sectors to support the learning opportunities of children and young people and educational staff

3.3.2 **Challenges:**

- Building credibility of the Headteacher within the sector they do not have registration in, e.g. a Secondary HT leading in a Primary School. Please note the Standard for Headship is the same for all sectors.
- The Headteacher must ensure the strategic vision for the school is in place from the start to ensure success of the model.
- Ensuring all stakeholders are included throughout the whole process of change, as key to the success is ownership, which in turn engenders a sense of family and loyalty.
- Managing the perception of the cross-sector Model in the Community can be challenging.

- Managing parental expectations of the Headteacher – clear communications required at all times.

3.4 A recent publication [*Shared Headships Across the Northern Alliance*](#), (Bain, Barnard and Simpson, 2022) was curated by the University of Aberdeen in conjunction with the Northern Alliance Regional Improvement Collaborative (RIC), which comprises 8 local authorities in Scotland. Its purpose was to set a recommendation of considerations for Northern Alliance, and beyond, with regards to shared leadership arrangements. The research project focused on the experiences of those only in the following 7 local authorities as Aberdeen City Council does not have any shared (Joint) leadership arrangements: Aberdeenshire, Argyll and Bute, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar (Western Isles), Highland, Moray, Orkney Islands, and Shetland Islands councils. The publication focuses on leadership models as defined below:

- *Model 1 – A non-teaching shared headteacher has leadership responsibilities for two school sites and an attached nursery. They are supported by teaching principal teachers in both schools who act as head when the shared headteacher is not on site.*
- *Model 2 – A non-teaching shared headteacher and non-teaching shared principal teacher work together across two school sites. This has the advantage of reducing disruption to classes which a principal may have been teaching.*
- *Model 3 – This is an executive model that suggests it is possible for a non-teaching executive headteacher to strategically lead multiple shared headteachers.*

3.5 Feedback information was gathered across numerous schools from various stakeholders and the following benefits, challenges and recommendations were identified.

3.5.1 **Benefits:**

- Increased levels of support for staff including the headteacher, due to a wider staff base
- Increased chances for distributed leadership, allowing for clearer succession planning and more opportunities for professional development
- Collaboration and learning between school staff were enhanced due to a greater pool of teachers
- An increase in access to resources and buying power
- Extended opportunities for learners including wider socialisation and shared interdisciplinary learning

3.5.2 **Challenges:**

- De-skilling as a classroom teacher, feelings of loneliness due to the uniqueness of the position
- Making sure communications were clear was a challenge. First, for the schools so that all staff could easily contact the headteacher and understand the shared arrangements. Second, with the community, especially in consultation about the setting up of a shared model
- A difficulty, some suggested, was doubled workload, especially regarding the policy documents for two school sites
- Fairly job sizing shared positions where responsibilities may be wider but student rolls smaller

4.0 Cost Analysis of Joint Leadership Models

- 4.1 The possible leadership models that could be applied, in line with the principles in section 1, are summarised in the School Leadership Models Cabinet Committee paper, December 2022 (Appendix A). Within Appendix D of this paper, an illustration of the costing of these models is provided. Below are some important points to note:
- In any joint leadership model, the full staffing budget from each individual school or early learning centre is combined and then used to create the new leadership model across the establishments. No budget is removed from any school to create a joint leadership model.
 - The budget for the leadership and management model of every school in Fife is based on a formula which takes into account pupil roll, Free School Meal entitlement (FME), nursery roll and additional support class(es) roll (as appropriate).
 - Leadership and Management models for all primary schools are reviewed every three years. This has been agreed with Headteachers and trade unions to both provide stability for schools over that period but also to ensure that where there have been changes in rolls or demographic then this is taken into consideration on a regular basis.
- 4.2 The joint leadership models do create attractive leadership roles for Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers and Principal teachers. As Headteacher roles have a wider scope of responsibility, they are job-sized higher in the Headteacher/Deputy Headteacher pay scale. Similarly, Deputy Headteacher posts within the joint leadership models align with the pay scale point of most small school Headteacher roles through the job-sizing process.
- 4.3 Within Joint Leadership Models, the Headteacher works closely with the service to determine the most appropriate leadership model for the schools and nurseries. In accordance with the principles of the Devolved School Management scheme, the overall budget can be used flexibly to suit the context and needs of the establishments.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 As stated in the School Leadership Models paper (December 2022), Fife's Education and Children's Services Directorate believes that there will be considerable educational benefits arising from each of the leadership models outlined. Each model offers different opportunities for collaborative approaches to working which support the development of the highest quality curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment, impacting positively on pupil attainment and experiences across schools.
- 5.2 Through the last 10+ years we have consistently applied the aims and principles of our school leadership strategy to support decision-making around the most suitable leadership model for any establishment(s). We have regularly reviewed the aims and principles to ensure that they remain relevant to the needs of our schools and early learning centres to most effectively improve outcomes for our children and young people. Following Cabinet approval, we would continue to apply the stated aims and principles to guide the establishment of school and early learning centre leadership models, as appropriate.
- 5.3 We have regularly engaged with stakeholders to inform our strategy and to make improvements in approaches, systems and processes to ensure that we are making the most of the opportunities joint leadership models provide.

- 5.4 Quality assurance of the performance of our schools and early learning centres has enabled us to monitor the successes of the joint leadership models and to quickly address any areas for improvement with the leadership team. We are confident that all our joint leadership arrangements in Fife are effective in achieving continuous improvement.
- 5.5 With Cabinet approval, we would proceed with further consultation with children and young people, parents/carers and staff in the Waid Cluster area to consider the options for leadership models across the 8 primary schools and Waid Academy, as outlined in the School Leadership Models Cabinet Committee paper, December 2020 (Appendix A).

List of Appendices

- Appendix A: School Leadership Models – Cabinet Committee Paper December 2022
- Appendix B: Joint Leadership Models – School Rolls, CfE Attainment Outcomes 21/22 and Comparator Outcomes
- Appendix C: Quality Improvement Evaluations, HMle & Care Inspectorate inspection outcomes 2019-2022
- Appendix D: Cost Analysis – Illustrations of School Leadership Models

Report Contacts

Angela Logue
Head of Education & Children's Services
Fife Council
Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes, Fife, KY7 5PQ Glenrothes
Email: Angela.logue@fife.gov.uk

Sharon Smith
Quality Improvement Officer, Professional Learning & Leadership
Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes, Fife, KY7 5PQ
Email: sharon.smith@fife.gov.uk

Kevin Funnell
Service manager (Operations)
Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes, Fife, KY7 5PQ
Email kevin.funnell-ed@fife.gov.uk

School Leadership Models

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director (Education and Children’s Services)

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to provide the Cabinet Committee with an overview of the development of school leadership models from 2009 that have strengthened the leadership and management of our schools and early learning centres. The paper also provides an outline of suggested next steps, building on the successes of the last 13 years in Fife, and current national and international research, to enable the Education Service to continue to strengthen leadership and management arrangements in schools and early learning centres, in order to achieve improvements in attainment, attendance and positive destinations.

The paper also aims to provide the Cabinet Committee with options for school leadership models in the Waid Cluster area based on the aims and principles outlined in Section 2 of the report. With most of the Headteacher roles in this cluster area temporary at present, there is an opportunity to create permanent, more sustainable leadership roles across the area that would attract high quality, experienced candidates to Headteacher, Deputy Headteacher and Principal Teacher posts. The possible models outlined in Appendix 4 would also strengthen partnership working, networking and collaboration across schools, early learning centres and other services within the area to support improvements in the curriculum, learning and teaching.

Recommendation

The Cabinet is asked to:

- (i) approve the aims (2.1) and principles (2.2) that will continue to guide the establishment of school and early learning centre leadership models (Section 3), that appropriate to the context, could be applied to settings or groups of settings across Fife; and
- (ii) approve further consultation with the parents/carers in the Waid Cluster, on the full range of leadership models outlined in Appendix 4, to allow for permanent school leadership arrangements to be in place from August 2023.

Resource Implications

None.

Legal & Risk Implications

There are no direct legal/risk implication arising from the report.

Impact Assessment

An EqIA and summary form have been completed – the summary form is attached to the report (Appendix 5).

We currently have 32 joint leadership models across Fife. A consultation exercise was carried out between March and June 2021 involving headteachers with more than one early year's setting and/or school. Feedback was also gathered from staff, parents and pupils through surveys and focus groups during academic session 21/22. Important benefits of the leadership models again emerged as well as current or possible challenges to be overcome to support continuous improvement of leadership and management arrangements. These are outlined in detail in Appendix 1: Stakeholder Consultation 21-22.

1.0 Background and Rationale

- 1.1 The joint leadership and management of two schools by one Headteacher was first approved as an approach to be applied as appropriate at the Education and Children's Services Committee in February 2009. Approval was given to these arrangements being put in place between two schools of a similar size or one larger/one smaller school. These leadership and management arrangements increased the scale of Headteachers posts which attracted more applicants and retained Headteachers in posts longer term. The teaching commitment of the headteachers was also removed and opportunities for staff to engage collaboratively in professional learning and school improvement activities increased.
- 1.2 In January 2016, following on from the Leadership of Learning Communities in Fife report to Executive Committee in June 2014, an extensive review took place which reflected on our position as an employer in supporting and developing our current and future school leaders. At this time, there was significant movement across the education community in developing leadership at all levels with a focus on building capacity across the system. However, as a local authority it was clear, at that time, there was a shortage of high-quality candidates coming forward to apply for headteacher posts in our early learning centres and schools, particularly in the primary sector. A number of factors were attributed to the shortage at this time which included: a large number of retirements of headteachers which has continued to this date; the reduction in management time has made the post of headteacher less attractive with an increase in workload being an attributing factor; the disparity in remuneration between a depute headteacher and headteacher post with some depute headteacher posts having a higher salary than that of a small school headteacher.
- 1.3 In order to mitigate against the factors outlined above, the Education, Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee approved the Professional Learning & Leadership Strategy (2016) to implement, over time, the following leadership models as appropriate to the needs of the school and local community:
 - Model 1 - Single school model of leadership: a leadership team serving a single school.
 - Model 2 - School grouping model of leadership: a leadership team serving a group of schools brought together by key links e.g., community, cultural, school, partners, demographics.
 - Model 3 - Learning journey model of leadership: a leadership team serving the learners' journey e.g., 0 – 5 or 0 – 12 or 0 – 18 years including children with additional support needs.

- 1.4 Since 2016, the Professional Learning and Leadership strategy within the Education Service has been continually refreshed in line with the national priorities, the changing nature of the leadership role of the Headteacher and the ambition of the Council to attain the best outcomes for our staff, children, families, and communities. It has been built on national and international research findings into successful systems and schools.
- 1.5 Our strategy takes into account the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) report (2015) which called for a strengthened middle within the Scottish Schools system, operating through networks and collaborations within and among schools, and in and across local authorities. It also remains in line with the principles of the 'Education Reform: Joint Agreement' (June 2018) including:
- The need for strong leadership at all layers of the system
 - The requirement for genuine collaboration in the system
 - Empowered schools require strong and distributive leadership
- 1.6 In Education Scotland's 'Empowered System' guidance (2018), it highlights how 'Scotland has started a collective effort to build an empowered, connected, self-improving education system to achieve excellence and equity for all children and young people as set out in the National Improvement Framework.' One of the key drivers for improvement within this guidance is 'School Leadership'. The guidance identifies that school leaders, at all levels, 'who are empowered and collaborative, and who empower others, are well placed to ensure the highest quality of learning and teaching'. Fostering teacher agency is core to an empowered system, supporting teacher empowerment at all levels, encouraging and enabling collaborative professionalism and actively seeking teacher-led professional learning. Those school leaders should also 'be adaptive and creative in their approach to leading learning and teaching', be 'collaborative and collegiate in their approach' and 'seek to develop trusting relationships with parents and carers'. Fife's Professional Learning and Leadership Strategy identifies the importance of effective school leaders and how they support those empowered cultures in and across the boundaries of the schools they lead.
- 1.7 In the [International Council of Education Advisers Report \(December 2020\)](#), it was recognised that in order for our system to continue to improve and to move forward after the global pandemic, that we need to begin to think differently about the models of school leadership so that we can use the crisis to become a 'truly extraordinary educational system in the future'. In doing so, we need to consider 'moving away from the more traditional models of school leadership' in order that we capitalise on the strengths in the system. We need to move forward from a self-improving system to a networked learning system where collaboration and professional autonomy bring about ongoing improvements in education for all our children and young people.
- 1.8 In the Achieving Excellence and Equity (2022) National Improvement Framework and Improvement Plan, one of the drivers of improvement is 'School and Early Learning Centre (ELC) Leadership', whereby it states that 'Local authorities will continue to promote a culture of leadership at all levels and in a range of contexts, where educators are empowered to lead across the wide range of educational settings.' Fife's Professional Learning and Leadership strategy fully embraces this approach to strengthening leadership at all levels and using varied and different approaches in doing so, that best meet the needs of individual contexts.

- 1.9 We recognise the importance of high-quality leadership, at every level in our schools and communities, as key to improving outcomes for our children and young people. We have continued to review and develop the leadership models across Fife schools to create effective and sustainable structures, which address local and national priorities. We currently have 32 joint headteachers in Fife. Our current joint leadership arrangements continue to be based around two establishments, e.g. 2 x Primary Schools (23), a Primary and Early Years Centre (3), 2 x Early Learning Centres (4) and a Primary and a Special School (1). With one exception in the early years where a Headteacher is leading and managing three establishments.
- 1.10 Significant progress has already been made in Fife to develop and implement leadership models in our school communities that strengthen leadership, professional autonomy and collaboration. This was reported to the Education and Children's Services Sub-Committee in September 2021 with agreement to continue with the development and implementation of Leadership Models 2 and 3 (as outlined in 1.3) to best meet the needs of school and local communities. We were well-placed to build on this progress as we moved forward.
- 1.11 In January 2022, three recommended options to strengthen leadership and management models, (based on Model 2 and 3 in 1.3), were developed for consultation and engagement with Headteachers, staff, parents and pupils in the Waid Cluster area. In summary these were:
- **Proposed Model A**
 - **Part 1** - 2-18 Leadership Model across Waid Academy & Anstruther Primary School
 - **Part 2** - A joint leadership model across all 7 other primary schools (Colinsburgh, Ellie, Kirkton of Largo, Lundin Mill, Pittenweem, St Monans and Crail)
 - **Proposed Model B** - Waid Academy & all 8 Primary Schools
 - **Proposed Model C** – All 8 Primary Schools - Waid Academy leadership model remaining separate.
- 1.12 Due to concerns raised by constituents in the East Neuk and Landward, Leven, Kennoway and Largo wards, the Education and Children's Services Sub-Committee, 1st March 2022, noted that:
- (1) *Further engagement with all stakeholders is required in order to understand concerns and meaningfully inform the leadership strategy going forward.*
 - (2) *Further consultation will be undertaken in the next academic session (2022/2023) on the leadership strategy that will contain more clarity and detail regarding a wider range of options for leadership of the Waid Cluster of schools.*
 - (3) *The current leadership arrangements across the Waid Cluster will remain as they are for August 2022. The Sub-Committee agrees to endorse this approach and requests a full report on future options and consultation to the Sub-Committee (or its successor) prior to this consultation being carried out.*

- 1.13 Feedback received from the initial engagement with parents/carers and staff in the Waid Cluster area was gathered and analysed in April 2022. The key themes to emerge from parents/carers are outlined in Appendix 2. These have been used to inform the remainder of this paper.

2.0 Aims and Principles of School Leadership Models

- 2.1 The aims of the leadership models that could be applied to settings or groups of settings across Fife were outlined in the Professional Learning & Leadership Strategy paper approved at the Education, Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee (2016) and updated version at Education and Children's Services Committee in September 2021. To guide this strategy moving forward, we have updated our aims based upon the on-going review and evaluation of the sustainable impact of our leadership models on improving outcomes for children and young people. The aims below provide the basis for the establishment of all school leadership models moving forward:
- 2.1.1 To continue to develop and establish leadership models that strengthen leadership and management arrangements across schools and early centres (ELCs). This includes creating Headteacher, Depute Headteacher and Principal Teacher posts that are attractive to high quality, experienced candidates to all parts of Fife.
- 2.1.2 To support partnership working within and across the local area, which is responsive to the needs of the children, young people, families, and communities. Maintaining the individual identities of every school but capitalising on the opportunities to strengthen partnership working across the local school/ELC communities.
- 2.1.3 To create the conditions that support staff across schools/ELCs to work together effectively. Networking and collaboration across the wider staff team, for a range of purposes, to strengthen school improvement activity and the professional learning of staff. To enable the sharing of skills, knowledge and expertise and encourage leadership across schools ensuring the needs of all children and young people are met through high quality learning, teaching and assessment.
- 2.1.4 To maximise the use of local resources, spaces and opportunities which strengthen relationships amongst children and young people, parents/carers and staff within and across schools/ELCs.
- 2.2 The following principles will be taken into account when creating leadership models for Fife education communities as we move forward:
- 2.2.1 **Sustainable** – the leadership models must be future proofed and sustainable for the current and future generations of families, communities and employees.
- 2.2.2 **Effective** – the leadership models must achieve the positive outcomes for all families, communities and employees.
- 2.2.3 **Cohesive** – the leadership models must support the concept of the learners' journey i.e., reducing transitions for staff and learners.
- 2.2.4 **Efficient** – all leadership models must aim to achieve our vision for a Self-Improving Networked System and to create an efficient public sector which reduces duplication and shares both people and material resources and services wherever possible.

- 2.2.5 **Fair and equitable** – the leadership models must demonstrate equity and fairness for employees in terms of professional opportunities, learning and development; it must also be fair and equitable in the quality of leadership being provided to the learning community.
- 2.2.6 **Empowering** – the leadership models must aim to empower leaders within their communities to make decisions that best meet the needs of their communities.
- 2.2.7 **Integrating** – the leadership models must aim to develop better partnerships, collaboration and effective delivery within and across local communities.
- 2.2.8 **Contextualisation**- the leadership models must take into account community and cultural links within and across education settings.
- 2.2.9 **Accountable** - the leadership models must fulfil all legislative requirements and procedures and be able to demonstrate impact upon outcomes for families and communities.

3.0 School and Early Learning Centre Leadership (ELC) Models

- 3.1 The aims and principles will guide the creation of new leadership models which will serve the learning communities of Fife. In order to provide greater clarity around the description of the leadership models outlined in the papers in 2016 and 2021, more detailed descriptions are provided below, and exemplar illustrations of these models are provided in Appendix 3:
 - **Model 1** - Single school or early learning centre model of leadership: a headteacher and/or leadership team serving a single school. The size and composition of the leadership team will be dependent on the school roll.
 - **Model 2** – Two establishments with one Headteacher and where applicable a leadership team across both schools/ELCs. The size of the leadership team would be dependent on the combined school/ELC rolls. There are currently 26 of these models in place across Fife.
 - **Model 3** – Cross Sector leadership model, e.g.:
 - One Headteacher and leadership team across a special school and either a primary school or a secondary school. Age range 3-12 years or 3-18 years. This model is already in place across Duloch Primary School and Calaiswood Special School (3-18) in Fife.
 - One Headteacher and leadership team, if applicable, across an Early Learning Centre and Primary School, Age range could be 0-12 years, 2-12 years or 3-12 years. There are 3 models like this already in place across Fife.
 - One Headteacher and leadership team across a Primary School and Secondary school. Age range could be 0-18 years, 2-18 years, 3-18 years or 5-18 years. Note that some Primary Schools include a nursery provision. There are no models in place in Fife at present across a primary and secondary school.
 - **Model 4** – School Grouping model. One Headteacher and leadership team across a group of schools, including nursery provisions, within the same Cluster area.

- A group of primary schools within the same cluster area. This is likely to be applied where there are a number of small primary schools where the Headteacher would be a Teaching Headteacher and/or there is limited middle leadership opportunities. This could also include one larger primary school and a number of smaller primary schools.

4.0 School Leadership Roles: Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers and Principal Teachers

4.1 The Senior Leadership team within Fife schools will comprise of a variety of job roles and the structure of this will be dependent upon the pupil roll of the school. These job roles are namely Headteacher, Depute Headteacher and Principal Teacher. All teaching professionals are registered with the General Teaching Council, Scotland (GTCS) and work within a set of agreed standards. There are many commonalities between the Standard for Middle Leadership (PT and DHT) and the Standard for Headship (DHT and HT). For example:

Standard for Middle Leadership	Standard for Headship
Understand how to develop and demonstrate a strategic vision.	Fully understand how to develop and demonstrate a strategic vision.
Have an enhanced and critically informed understanding of Curriculum	Have an enhanced and critically informed understanding of Curriculum
Collaborate with colleagues, learners, parents/carers and families and the wider learning community in identifying, agreeing and implementing improvement priorities.	Lead and collaborate with colleagues, learners, parents/carers and families and the wider learning community in identifying, agreeing and implementing improvement priorities.

4.2 There are shared responsibilities within every school context, particularly within the Senior Leadership Team where all members are responsible for leading the direction of the school.

4.2.1 Shared roles between Headteacher and Depute Headteacher (Principal Teacher, where appropriate):

- Quality of Learning, Teaching and assessment across the school
- Self-evaluation, continuous improvement and leadership
- Promoting an inclusive community
- Promoting collaboration and pedagogy
- Working in partnership with staff, learners, parents and the wider school community
- Safety and welfare of all
- Contributing to cluster, local and national developments

4.2.2 Role of Headteacher supported by Depute Head Teacher (Principal Teacher, where appropriate):

- Strategic vision, ethos and aims of the school
- Building and maintaining partnerships with learners, families and other relevant partners
- Strategic overview of planning, delivery and assessment in accordance with national policy
- Culture of Professional Learning
- Use of available resources (financial, human, physical) to enhance appropriate learning environment

All of the above can be led by the Depute Head Teacher/Principal Teacher when deputising for the Headteacher.

- 4.3 The role of a Headteacher, whether it be a Teaching Headteacher, Joint Headteacher or the Headteacher of a single establishment has many different roles and responsibilities. It is often the case that these roles and responsibilities cause the Headteacher to be in an establishment other than their own, whether this be Professional Development, Cluster Activities or Learning Partnerships. All schools and Headteachers encourage leadership at all levels to both develop the capacity and progression of staff. All staff play a part in being role models and being the face of the school to parents/carers and pupils.
- 4.4 A key role of the Headteacher as set out in the General Teaching Council for Scotland is the Leadership and Management of staff. In larger schools or partnerships this responsibility can be delegated to Depute Headteachers or Principal Teachers, but the Headteacher retains ultimate responsibility and the quality assurance of performance of all staff.
- 4.5 Headteachers assisted by Depute Headteachers and other members of the extended leadership group are responsible for ensuring consistent, high-quality experiences, for all children and young people, across all areas of the establishment. This may include across different schools, or across different departments/year groups within the same school.
- 4.6 Engaging with the school community is both a legislative and vital part of a school leader. Headteachers, assisted by their leadership teams will always aim to attend as many events as they can whilst meeting the legislative requirements of the parent council.

5.0 Sharing Practice with other Local Authorities

- 5.1 Over recent months and years we have engaged with Scottish Borders, Dumfries and Galloway, Argyll and Bute and Highland Council Education Services to inform our planning and development of sustainable leadership models across schools in Fife. Our identified four models, as described in section 3.1, are in place across those local authorities and, indeed, in others across Scotland and beyond. Those engagements highlighted the educational benefits of these models and the considerations required to mitigate any potential challenges.
- 5.2 It was clear from the conversations undertaken that each scenario and context need individual consideration. The configuration of leadership models arises due to various circumstances, e.g., because of a new build requirement; challenges arising from staffing issues or redeployment; the desire to create non-teaching HT positions and to increase the middle leadership opportunities within certain communities; geographical requirements; or changing school roles. There is no 'one size fits all' and careful consideration is given to each context and surrounding circumstances.
- 5.3 The feedback from other LAs regarding cross-sector models was particularly positive, with HTs and leadership teams from those schools sharing their enthusiasm and positivity about their own experiences, and those of their staff, their pupils and their families. One school stated: *'There are absolutely no disadvantages and that everything about the merger has been nothing other than positive. The campus has changed from three disparate schools into one campus family. It would be an utter disaster if that ever changed, as everyone is completely committed to the model. The whole team have a 3-18 commitment, which stops a 'them' and 'us' mentality across the sectors.'*

- 5.4 One of the main highlights shared about the cross-sector model is seeing children from the start of their school career straight through until they move on. This ensures early tracking of progress, which is a powerful tool in the early identification and intervention of support, to improve the outcomes for individuals.
- 5.5 Collegiate working opportunities support and help the community building of new cross-sector, joint headship and cluster/ school grouping models of leadership. Cases were shared as to how some schools created inter-disciplinary learning opportunities across the different schools allowing everyone to learn together, to share the activities and learning experiences and to draw on teacher expertise across the schools and different sectors. A very positive example of this was a Learning for Sustainability project undertaken in Dornoch Academy (2-18 multi school campus), in Highland Council.
- 5.6 One key consideration to the success of the cross-sector and the school grouping / cluster models is the appointment of the Headteacher. Feedback from other local authorities suggested that if appropriate, the appointment of the Headteacher of either model ideally should be made before the initiation of the school, to oversee the recruitment of other staff, where applicable, and to be the strategic decision maker from the very beginning. There needs to be a very clear strategic focus shared with all parents, with clear explanations and expectations. Feedback has indicated that communication is the key to success.
- 5.7 In the two-school joint headship models and the larger school grouping model, challenges will arise for the Headteacher who could potentially be travelling between schools regularly. Initial work is required to support the need for changed expectations of families and staff with regards to the daily presence of the HT in school. The roles and responsibilities of DHTs and PTs include the deputising for the HT in their absence, and this subtle shift in parental expectation needs to be shared and supported with clear communication strategies for all. A considerable cause for concern for parents and families is that the HT will not know their child well. Feedback has indicated that this can be addressed by ensuring parents know that the class teacher, support staff and the other members of the leadership team will know their child well and are suitably placed to make daily decisions together about their child's learning and welfare.
- 5.8 In cross-sector and school grouping models, one key to success was to create an 'executive' Parent Forum/Parent Council. Each individual school would have its own Parent Forum and then the executive parent forum would comprise of representatives from each individual parent forum. This model affords each school the opportunity to support their schools individually, but also to feel part of, and contribute to, the wider vision, values and life of the whole school community.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 Fife's Education and Children's Services Directorate believes that there will be considerable educational benefits arising from each of the leadership models identified in section 3. Each model offers different opportunities for collaborative approaches to working which support the development of the highest quality curriculum, learning, teaching and assessment, impacting positively on pupil attainment and experiences across schools.
- 6.2 Every HT in Fife, regardless of the leadership model, requires time to get to know the school context(s), the school staff, pupils and families and ensure they use staff expertise the best way possible to maximise the impact on the children and young people. Within all contexts there will be positives and challenges, however, solution-focused approaches will ensure those challenges are faced head on to provide the best opportunities for everyone within the school community.

- 6.3 Through engagement with other Local Authorities (as outlined above), we heard primarily of the positives joint, cross-sector and school grouping/ cluster models bring. The opportunities for support staff and teachers to learn together and from each other, sharing expertise and good practice is extremely beneficial. Smaller schools feel less isolated and developing a more expansive learning context has brought significant positives. It is also expected that as approaches to curriculum-design and delivery are co-produced and shared across schools, this will lead to increased opportunities for children to work with other children across schools. This would include through interdisciplinary learning experiences, outdoor learning opportunities and shared themes/areas of focus across schools (Global Citizenship/STEM).
- 6.4 Cross-sector working, as in Model 3, facilitates improved tracking and monitoring across the sectors from Early to 4th Level. This enhanced knowledge informs curriculum development and planning, but also ensures opportunities for earlier identification of dips in attainment, which can be addressed early on. Models 2 and 4 provide the opportunity to identify patterns across schools where development needs, common to more than one school, be identified and addressed more effectively and coherently. This can be achieved through the strategic directing of expertise from other schools within those specific leadership models to support a school's drive for improvement and will encourage collaborative planning of interventions suggested by the tracking and monitoring.
- 6.5 Some of the challenges identified in other Local Authorities have specifically centred around the lack of shared understanding of the roles and responsibilities of school leadership teams beyond the role of the Headteacher. Through clear communication and shared understanding, these initial challenges can easily be overcome to ensure that families feel confident their children and young people are best served by all.
- 6.6 Budgets and resources will also be used and shared effectively to support improvement activity equitably across schools. Existing good practice will be recognised and identified within the school leadership models and incorporated into the strategic planning by the Headteacher to improve provision and ensure consistency of experience for all young people across the schools.
- 6.7 Further detail of each model in practice and an illustration of the staffing model for each is outlined in Appendix 3.
- 6.8 Possible options to strengthen school leadership arrangements in the Waid Cluster are outlined in detail in Appendix 4.

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Stakeholder Feedback 21-22

Appendix 2: Waid Cluster Parent/Carer Consultation January-March 2022

Appendix 3: Models of practice and exemplar illustrations of School Leadership Models

Appendix 4: Options for School Leadership Models for Waid Cluster Schools

Appendix 5: Equality Impact Assessment Summary Report

Report Contacts

Angela Logue

Head of Education & Children's Services

Fife Council

Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes, Fife, KY7 5PQ Glenrothes

Email: Angela.logue@fife.gov.uk

Sharon Smith
Quality Improvement Officer, Professional Learning & Leadership
Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes, Fife, KY7 5PQ
Email: sharon.smith@fife.gov.uk

Kevin Funnell
Service manager (Operations)
Fife House, North Street, Glenrothes, Fife, KY7 5PQ
Email kevin.funnell-ed@fife.gov.uk

Stakeholder Feedback 21-22

Joint Headteachers:

Benefits:

- Enhanced levels of collaboration are evident across a wider network which ensures that school improvement activity has a positive impact on outcomes for children.
- As there is no teaching commitment for the headteacher then they can focus on being a strategic leader of change and improvement without having to split their focus between class teaching and being the headteacher.
- A larger staff team allows for more consistency in staffing within the smaller school setting as there is less reliance on having probationer teachers each school session to allow for the headteacher to have more time out of class.
- Being a joint headteacher gives the opportunity for experienced heads to develop their skills, knowledge and understanding of leadership further. This also allows for expertise to be shared across more than one early year's/school setting.
- Ability to distribute leadership across more than one setting gives opportunities for increased collaboration and learning which builds capacity at all levels.
- Flexibility to share staffing across more than one setting ensures that the needs of more than one school community are met.
- Where staff are less reliant on the headteacher being in the building at all times, they are empowered to make decisions independently to meet the needs of all learners.

Challenges

- Where logistical or operational challenges were highlighted by the consultation group it was clear that the service had supported our joint headteachers to overcome any issues or barriers they were faced with. We work closely with our joint headteachers as a service to ensure that any operational/logistical issues are addressed promptly so that these barriers can be removed. As we move forward, we will continue to support our joint headteachers to address any operational or logistical barriers or issues that may arise.

Schools Staff Views

Staff feedback has recently been gathered from all Education staff through our Staffwise Survey 21-22. Data from all primary schools has been analysed and comparisons made between staff in Joint Headteacher schools and those in non-Joint Headteacher schools. The comparisons can be seen below:

- In response to the statement: '***I have appropriate support from my line manager,***' **91%** of staff in Joint Headteacher schools **agreed** to that statement, compared to a slightly higher **92%** of staff in non-Joint Headteacher schools **agreeing** to that statement.
- In response to the statement: '***There is a positive ethos in my team/ school/ centre,***' **86%** of staff in Joint Headteacher schools **agreed** to that statement, compared to a slightly lower **83%** of staff in non-Joint Headteacher schools **agreeing** with the statement.
- In response to the statement: '***The relationships with others in my team/school/ centre are good,***' **95%** of staff in Joint Headteacher schools **agreed** with the statement compared to a slightly higher **96%** in non-Joint headteacher schools **agreeing** with the statement.
- In response to the statement: '***In my team/ school/ centre change is managed effectively,***' **81%** of staff in Joint Headteacher schools **agreed** with the statement compared to a lower **79%** in non-Joint Headteacher schools agreeing with the statement.

- In response to the statement: '***There is effective communication within my team/ school/ centre,*** 82% of staff in Joint HT schools **agreed** to that statement, compared to a lower 79% of staff in non-Joint Headteacher schools **agreeing** with the statement.

From the above information, it can be concluded that school staff's experiences demonstrate there is little to no difference between the Joint Headteacher and non-Joint Headteacher Leadership models.

Parent/Carer Views

In June 2022, individual school-based parent surveys from a variety of Joint Headteacher schools with varying school roles and geographical contexts were analysed to identify any specific parental feedback regarding the impact of Joint Headship models. The following findings are summarised below:

School identity

School identity remains an important factor for parents and carers. In those surveys which specifically asked about the joint headship model, almost all thought that their schools had their own identity.

Collaboration

Although school identity is important, parents participating in specific joint headship surveys identified that the children and young people could and should benefit from continued collaboration across joint headship schools, either to support the professional learning of the school staff or to enhance the learning and teaching experiences of their children.

In the surveys where parents were specifically asked about giving their own views, most agreed that the school asked for parental views, with most agreeing that their views are taken into consideration by the schools.

Communication

Across all surveys, communication features highly. All schools, joint headship and non-joint headship, communicate differently with parents and therefore responses around communication vary from school to school. Nevertheless, there was no evidence from the surveys gathered that there were any specific concerns about communication within joint headship schools. In fact, those joint headship schools surveyed were mostly happy with the communication, and almost all who responded felt that they all received timely responses when they contacted schools.

Reassuringly, it was also evident that almost all parents knew who to contact if they were worried about their child's happiness or friendships at school.

Senior Leadership Teams/ Headteachers

In those surveys which specifically asked about the joint headship model, almost all thought that they had access to the leadership team if they felt they had a concern.

Individual school-based surveys offered opportunities for parental reflections on the joint headship model, with the majority considering the schools to have progressed well since the start of the joint headship. When asked about next steps for those schools responding to specific questions about joint headship, there were mixed qualitative responses with some parents wishing the joint leadership model to continue, and others wishing the model to end. However, of those who responded, the majority thought the schools had made very good progress as joint headship schools.

Those who participated in joint headship specific surveys, when asked as to whether or not they thought the joint headship to be successful/ well led, almost all agreed.

Pupil progress

An important consideration for parents is the progress that their child makes at school, their wellness and happiness in school and whether their child is known as an individual. In response to questions about children receiving the help they need, almost all parents agreed that their child was receiving the help they needed to do well, and almost all agreed that the schools supported their child's emotional wellbeing.

Across the varying school-based surveys, almost all parents were happy with their child's progress, which is extremely positive given the current challenges due to the pandemic. Most parents also commented that the schools kept them well informed of their child's progress.

In conclusion, it is clear to see that parents have shared no areas of cause for concern because of the joint headship model.

Pupil Views

Pupils from the same joint schools as the parent school-based surveys engaged in focus group discussions which aimed to gather insight into what they felt about their schools. They were **not** asked specific questions about the joint leadership model.

When asked what was special about their school, the pupils answered mostly about their teachers, their friends, the fun things they do etc. There was no reference to the fact their schools were part of a joint headteacher leadership model.

When asked who looked after them at school, there was the expected responses of their friends, teacher, PSAs, buddies, DHT, HT etc. There was no reference to the Headteacher being unavailable on certain days. There was a similar response, when asked if they had a problem, who would they go to.

The P7/S1 pupils were asked about transition activities in preparation for high school. Responses were mostly positive, however, there was little mention of engagement with children from other primary schools. This is likely to be illustrative of the context at the time with the limitations on collaborative activities due to the pandemic. However, it is important that moving forward, opportunities for joint learning experiences and collaborations across schools, regardless of the joint headship arrangements, are planned for in order to build relationships that will support strong transitions to secondary school, as well as enhancing the development of important skills for learning, life and work.

It is clear from the pupil responses that almost all enjoy school, they enjoy their learning, and they feel supported by their friends and the adults around them. The absence of the headteacher on certain days of the week does not appear to impact on them as individual learners.

Waid Cluster Parent/Carer Consultation January-March 2022

There were a number of common questions raised by parents that we have grouped together under headings and responded to below:

What will be the roles and responsibilities of staff in school, particularly when the Headteacher is not on-site?

- *The roles and responsibilities of teaching and support staff in the school would not differ significantly under a joint headship model. For example, every school has a Child Protection Coordinator and a Depute Child Protection Coordinator and there would be clear arrangements in place for both staff to pick up responsibilities when the Headteacher is not in school. This is no different to current arrangements.*
- *Joint leadership models often offer a reduction in teaching time for the Headteacher, allowing for more time to be dedicated to Leadership tasks, such as Child Protection, community engagements/events, Assemblies/Celebrating Wider Achievements alongside the day-to-day management tasks.*
- *The reduction in teaching time also allows releases the leadership team to interact with more with all young people and their parents across the whole school day, whilst also providing targeted support where required.*

How will the headteacher ensure the needs of all schools are met? Particularly around sustaining each schools' identity.

- *All schools will develop their School Improvement Priorities unique to their community and involving all stakeholders. There are often common themes in School Improvement Priorities across schools and clusters, but due to local circumstances there will often be priorities unique to that setting.*
- *Where a Headteacher is leading more than one school, they will always consider common themes across the schools and those individual to the school's circumstances.*

Who will we speak to about our children if the Headteacher is not available or in another school?

- *In all schools there is a named person for each child and clear guidelines on how children and families can contact this person or raise concerns. For most learners across the authority, this named person is not the headteacher of the school, however, a member of the senior leadership team will be involved with any issues if required.*

In small schools there is often changes in staff, resulting in inconsistency of staffing in our school.

- *Where schools are led by a Headteacher who has leadership responsibility for more than one establishment, there is more opportunity and flexibility to develop staff and offer opportunities of progression meaning that staff do not need to move out with the school/cluster to pursue their ambitions.*

There are concerns that proposed changes to the Leadership Model is an avenue to implementing budget cuts through demoting Headteachers to Depute Headteachers and we are not convinced that leadership time is not being cut.

- *Headteachers are given a budget for the establishment(s) that they lead. The Headteacher has a high level of autonomy about how they use this budget to best meet the needs of all learners in their community. They will use creative solutions to increase leadership time. The budget given to the schools remains the same whether it is a joint establishment or not.*

How will the schools meet learners' individual needs when the headteacher is not present? Who will deal with discipline, take small groups and arrange for medical assessments?

- *In cases where learners need extra support, school leaders will ensure that effective plans are in place to meet the needs of a learner. Examples of this may include strategies that the teacher can employ, or the use of a pupil support assistant amongst other approaches. Small groups are a common approach to supporting some learners across the curriculum but in most cases are not taken by a Headteacher.*

What is the rationale for the NEED for a change?

- *Local and national evidence that strengthening leadership models, with experienced strategic leaders, increased middle leadership and opportunities for collaboration, will achieve sustainable improvements in the leadership and management of curriculum, learning and teaching, that will meet the needs of all children and young people across the schools.*
- *Specific examples of successfully implemented models across Scotland.*

Role of Parent Councils

In the case of a leadership model which involves more than one school, each school will continue to retain its own parent council which will have a specific role to play in developing and improving experiences within each individual school. Senior leaders would continue to attend and work with the parent council in a similar manner as it does now. There is clear legislation about this.

With regards leadership models which include more than one school, there may be an opportunity to create a group where representatives from different parent councils attend to discuss matters that are common across schools. For example, transition activities to secondary school.

Career Progression Opportunities

The traditional leadership model in smaller Primary schools is to have a Teaching Headteacher and a number of teachers. For those staff who wish to develop their career pathway, it often means they need to move away from the school/area they currently work in, to a larger school which may have a Principal Teacher or Depute Headteacher post. In joint leadership models there is more scope to create these Principal Teacher or Depute Headteacher posts within the smaller schools.

Exemplar illustrations of School Leadership Models

Model 1

Single schools can vary in size; however, all are led by one Headteacher (HT) serving one school. There may be a leadership team (i.e., Depute Headteachers (DHTs) or Principal Teachers (PTs), depending on the school role. Most leadership models in Fife are currently based on this model.

For a single school the management model is applied to all Primary settings. Secondary management models are devolved to the school to determine.

Weighted Roll of School	Teaching Headteacher	Headteacher	Depute Headteacher	Principal Teacher
1 to 125	1	-	-	-
126 to 170	-	1	-	-
171 to 260	-	1	-	1
261 to 375	-	1	1	-
376 to 525	-	1	2	-
526 and above	-	1	3	-

Teaching Headteachers are class committed for 70% of the teaching week and have management time for 30% of the week.

Within Primary, Depute Headteachers are class committed for 50% of the teaching week with the remainder management time. Primary Principal Teachers are class committed for 80% of the teaching week and the remaining 20% protect time to lead on strategic areas for the school.

Opportunities & Challenges

Curriculum, Learning and Teaching – Lead by the HT, the school staff will plan for and design the curriculum and teaching and learning experiences for their children and young people (CYP). Smaller single schools working in isolation will not have the wider expertise of staff to share the planning and designing of learning and teaching experiences. This can be overcome, to some extent, by working with colleagues across schools/ Early Learning Centres (ELCs) and networks in Fife to ensure they gain a wider knowledge and understanding and are able to share good practice.

Enhanced Transitions – Enhanced transitions between ELC and Primaries, or Primaries and Secondaries need to be planned for at Cluster Level to support the specific needs of all learners involved in those specific transitions. This requires specific coordination and planning across Cluster schools.

Impact for School leadership teams – Single schools have varied leadership teams depending on the school role. Some small schools will have a HT with teaching responsibility. In small schools there are often no leadership development opportunities due to the lack of promoted positions available in these schools, especially within Primaries. Those HTs who lead schools without a wider leadership team need to seek opportunities to collaborate with other Headteachers to share expertise, learn from each other, and to support their own professional learning. Larger

schools, such as Secondary schools, have more middle leaders who support the development and improvements across the larger school community.

Partnership working –Larger single schools are able to work with their stage/ level / year/ department colleagues to support their own professional development, curriculum design and learning and teaching planning. This moderation approach is crucial to ensure high-quality provision and expectations from all. If this is not an option in smaller school, teachers need to seek this across networks and across Cluster schools to support quality assurance.

Impact for families – Families work closely alongside the school to support the learning of their CYP. As in all schools, the parents will have avenues of communication with both the classteacher and the Senior leadership Team. As outlined in roles and responsibilities section 4, the other members of the senior leadership team are qualified and expected to act on behalf of the HT when required.

Model 2

This model has two establishments (individual schools) which are led by one Headteacher (known as Joint HT) and a leadership team across both schools. The size of this leadership team depends on the combined school rolls and discussions with the Headteacher to determine the most appropriate model for their setting within the resources available. For a joint headship the standard management allocations per Model 1 are not applied, this is to ensure our schools are supported with an agreed management model appropriate to the joint headship.

Management model examples

Example A:

School A has a pupil roll of 34, with School B a pupil roll of 75. In a single school management model both School A and School B the schools would be led by a Teaching Headteacher. A Teaching Headteacher has a teaching allocation of 70% of the teaching week, and a management allocation of 30%.

Weighted Roll of School	Teaching Headteacher	Headteacher	Depute Headteacher	Principal Teacher
1 to 125	1	-	-	-

In a joint headteacher model, if we applied the standard management allocation as above, the school roll would be 109 pupils which would allocate a Teaching Headteacher. This is recognised as a model that would not be suitable. The model applied in this joint headship would be one Headteacher who is non-teaching, this allows the Headteacher to split their increased management time across both schools.

Example B:

School A has a pupil roll of 150, with school B a roll of 200. In a single school management model, School A would be led by a non-teaching Headteacher, and School B, a non-teaching Headteacher with a Principal Teacher.

Weighted Roll of School	Teaching Headteacher	Headteacher	Depute Headteacher	Principal Teacher
126 to 170	-	1	-	-
171 to 260	-	1	-	1

In a joint headteacher model the Headteacher can determine how best they structure their schools within the resources available. Through discussion, the Headteacher may elect to create a Depute Headteacher post(s) and/or create additional Principal Teacher posts. They may also consider reducing the class teaching commitment either for Depute Headteacher or Principal Teachers within their schools to increase the management and leadership time available across the schools. Each model is agreed with the Headteacher for their local context and the available resource. Within this model the available resource allocated to the Headteacher is the full salary of the Headteacher post removed from the structure, no saving is retained by the Service and funds fully devolved to the Headteacher.

Example C:

School A has a pupil roll of 275, with school B a roll of 450. In a single school management model, School A would be led by a non-teaching Headteacher, and one Depute Headteacher, School B, a non-teaching Headteacher and two Depute Headteacher.

Weighted Roll of School	Teaching Headteacher	Headteacher	Depute Headteacher	Principal Teacher
261 to 375	-	1	1	-
376 to 525	-	1	2	-

Again, a Joint Headteacher can determine how best they structure their schools within the resources available. As the Depute Headteacher have a teaching commitment of 50%, one option the Headteacher may consider in School B is appointing an additional class teacher who would release both Depute Headteachers from their teaching commitment to allow them to perform management roles 100% of the school week. In School A they may do similar or recruit to Principal Teacher posts.

Opportunities & Challenges

Curriculum, Learning and Teaching – Lead by the HT, the school staff in each individual school will plan for and design the curriculum and teaching and learning experiences for their CYP. Smaller single schools that have the same Headteacher will not need to work in isolation as they may choose to draw on the expertise from their colleagues in the other school to support their planning and designing of learning and teaching experiences. Each school will maintain its own identity and will have its own individual School Improvement Plan, however there will be collective opportunities for collaboration over some of those improvement foci.

Enhanced Transitions – Enhanced transitions between ELC and Primaries, or Primaries and Secondaries need to be planned for at Cluster Level to support the specific needs of all learners involved in those specific transitions. However, there are exciting opportunities for those CYP who attend schools with a shared leadership model as they can be offered the opportunities to work alongside their peers across the schools prior to attending their secondary schools.

Environment for learning – Teaching and support staff will have options as to the best place for some learning experiences to take place, and if considered suitable, may wish to use the facilities within across the schools to support the required learning. There will also be a greater opportunity to share school resources to support the learning and teaching opportunities of all.

Impact for School leadership teams – Joint HT models have potential to be very joined up in their approach to how they work as a leadership team. Headteachers may wish to draw on the expertise across the leadership teams to support the work in both schools, or focus their leadership teams in specific schools only. That is a decision that remains with the HT. However,

there are significant opportunities to collaborate and share, and to learn together to build a wider sense of community across pupils, staff and leadership teams. In Model 2 schools, the HT has no teaching commitment, and DHTs will have 0.5 of the week teaching commitment. Some schools may not have DHTs but will have PTs who deputise for the Headteacher when they are out of that specific school and working in the other school. There needs to be a high level of trust across the leadership team and the wider school community must work along with the school to ensure communication is key to everything they do. Careful time management and planning is required by the HT to ensure they do not spend significant amounts of time travelling between schools. Joint Headteacher schools generally offer greater possibilities for promotion due to there being DHT positions in some of those schools.

Partnership working – Colleagues across the schools are able to work together to enhance their professional learning and share their expertise and good practice. Larger schools will also have the opportunity to work with their stage/ level / year/ department colleagues to support the planning for learning experiences and also with their professional development. This moderation approach is crucial to ensure high-quality provision and expectations from all.

Impact for families – Families work closely alongside the school their CYP attends. As in all schools, the parents will have avenues of communication with both the class teacher and the Senior leadership Team. In Joint HT schools it may not be the Headteacher who responds to concerns, however as outlined in roles and responsibilities in section 4, the other members of the senior leadership team are qualified and expected to act on behalf of the HT.

Model 3

This model has two establishments (individual schools) which are led by one Headteacher (known as Joint HT) and an extended leadership team across all the schools. Within this example it is a Secondary school with a Primary school. In this model the Headteacher can determine how they wish to utilise the available resource to determine the most appropriate model for the schools. As the full budget is allocated to the Headteacher they have flexibility and empowerment to create a model that supports the local needs of each school. The model differs from the previous models as the Secondary Management Model is fully devolved to the school, each Secondary is allocated a budget which they are empowered to create their own model, this includes Class Teachers, Principal Teachers, Guidance Teachers and Depute Headteachers. The Headteacher can increase Class Teachers by reducing Principal Teachers for example, or have more Principal or Guidance Teachers and less Depute Headteachers. The overall staffing plan in a Secondary School is agreed with all staff members via a formal policy (LNCT13), this ensures a Headteacher consults with all staff in determining the most appropriate structure for the school.

If the Primary Headteacher post was removed as part of the joint model, the budget for the Headteacher is fully available for creating a structure. The remaining posts in the Primary School would remain, as per the table below as examples.

Weighted Roll of School	Teaching Headteacher	Headteacher	Depute Headteacher	Principal Teacher
126 to 170	-	1	-	-
171 to 260	-	1	-	1
261 to 375	-	1	1	-
376 to 525	-	1	2	-

The Joint Headteacher may create additional posts within the Primary, such as a Depute Headteacher and/or create additional Principal Teacher posts. They may also consider the transition between Primary and Secondary and appoint a Depute Headteacher or Principal Teacher across both settings to support transition. With this model no saving is retained by the Service and funds fully devolved to the Headteacher.

This is a cross-sector leadership model, with one HT and an extended leadership team leading across one, two or three different sectors. Currently in Fife we have 3 examples of ELCs and Primary Schools (0-12 years, 2-12 years, or 3-12 years). There are no current examples in Fife of Early Years, through Primary years and into Secondary (0-18 years, 2-18 years, 3-18 years or 5-18 years).

Opportunities & Challenges

Curriculum, Learning and Teaching – Lead by the HT, the school staff in each individual school will plan for and design the curriculum and teaching and learning experiences for their CYP. The CYP will be able to contribute to the planning of their learning and teaching and personalise that to their age and stage. The staff will be able to work across the sectors to draw on specific expertise and provide additional and exciting opportunities for learning across the sectors.

Enhanced Transitions – Enhanced transitions, depending on the age and stages of the CYP within this model, may not necessarily be required. The CYP will be familiar with the contexts, the staff, the school buildings, and therefore additional transition experience may not be required. If the model exists for Early Years and Primary only, then additional enhanced transitions will be required for CYP moving on to Secondary Education, and these will be planned for in local Cluster groups. There will be improved tracking and monitoring of pupil progress in this model due to closer nature of working, and the strong links between the different sectors.

Environment for learning – Staff will have extra opportunities to widen the learning experiences of CYP as they will be able to capitalise on the additional facilities and resources available to them.

Impact for school leadership teams – HTs of cross-sector models have an enhanced strategic role, which will require them to have an overview of the whole school and draw on the sector experience and expertise of the wider school leadership team. The decision of how the leadership team work together will lie with the strategic overview of the HT. The leadership team will need to establish respectful and trusting working relationships to support the development of the wider school community. It may be possible, and deemed advantageous, that the leadership team all have specific strategic remits with additional whole school responsibilities that support the improvements across the sectors.

Partnership working – Colleagues in cross sector schools will have the opportunity to work together to enhance their professional learning and practice. As the school will serve one community, there will be strong links established over the years with the wider community, which will bring opportunities for partnership working with local businesses and other organisations.

Impact for families – Families work closely alongside the school their CYP attends. As in all schools, the parents will have avenues of communication with both the classteacher and the Senior leadership Team. In Cross-Sector schools the relationships between families and the school will be enhanced due to the long- term relationships that families will have with one school over their CYP's whole school journey. Throughout that journey there will be different people responsible for the learning and welfare of levels/ year groups/ sectors, depending on who the HT has appointed responsible for those different groupings, and it will be that member of the SLT, and not the HT, who will be the main point of contact beyond the classteacher. As outlined in roles and responsibilities in section 4, the other members of the senior leadership team are qualified and able and expected to act on behalf of the HT.

Model 4

This is a School Grouping model where one Headteacher (Joint HT) who leads and manages a leadership team across a group of schools within the same Cluster area. This may be a group of primary schools within the same cluster area, or indeed include a cluster of primary schools and the secondary school.

The model follows on from Model 3 with additional schools added to the Joint Headship. Once again the Headteacher can determine how they wish to utilise the available resource to determine the most appropriate model for the schools. As a number of Headteacher posts are removed in this model the financial resource available increases. If a Teaching Headteacher post is removed from a school with a weighted roll of under 125 the model is required to cover the teaching commitment of 0.7fte for the teaching Headteacher, all other resources re available to determine the most appropriate model. In a cluster arrangement the Headteacher may wish to allocate non-teaching Depute Headteachers across a number of schools, this enables the Depute Headteacher to be fully released from teaching and provide management time as appropriate.

Weighted Roll of School	Teaching Headteacher	Headteacher	Depute Headteacher	Principal Teacher
1 to 125	1	-	-	-
126 to 170	-	1	-	-
171 to 260	-	1	-	1
261 to 375	-	1	1	-

Opportunities & Challenges

Curriculum, Learning and Teaching – Lead by the HT, the school staff in each individual school will plan for and design the curriculum and teaching and learning experiences for their CYP. The CYP will be able to contribute to the planning of their learning and teaching and personalise that to their age and stage. As in Model 2, smaller single schools that share the same HT will not need to work in isolation as they may choose to draw on the expertise from their colleagues in their partner schools within their school grouping to support their planning and designing of learning and teaching experiences. Each school will maintain its own identity and will have its own individual School Improvement Plan, however there will be collective opportunities for collaboration over some of those improvement foci.

Enhanced Transitions – As in Model 2, enhanced transitions need to be planned for at Cluster Level to support the specific needs of all learners involved in those specific transitions. However, there are exciting opportunities for those CYP who attend schools that are part of the school cluster model as they can be offered the opportunities to work alongside their peers across the cluster schools prior to attending their secondary schools.

Environment for learning – As in Model 2, teaching and support staff will have options as to the best place for some learning experiences to take place, and if considered suitable, may wish to use the facilities within their cluster schools to support the required learning. There will also be a greater opportunity to share school resources to support the learning and teaching opportunities of all.

Impact for School leadership teams – Model 4 Joint HTs have a very strategic role, requiring them to be involved in the strategic overview of all the schools, and not involved in the operational decision making of each school. The Joint HT will need to consider the value and impact of when and how they allocate their time to individual schools within their cluster model, and this is likely to be reviewed regularly depending on the needs of each individual context. The HT may wish to draw on the expertise across the leadership teams to support the work in all schools, or focus their leadership teams in specific schools only. That is a decision that remains with the HT. As in Model 2, there are significant opportunities to collaborate and share, and to learn together to build a wider sense of community across pupils, staff and leadership teams. In Model 4 schools, the HT has no teaching commitment, and DHTs will have 0.5 of the week teaching commitment. Some schools may not have DHTs but will have PTs who deputise for the HT when they are out of that specific school and working in the other schools. There needs to be a high level of trust across the leadership team and the wider school community must work alongside the school to ensure communication is key to everything they do. Joint Headteacher schools generally offer greater possibilities for promotion due to there being DHT positions in some of those schools.

Partnership working – Colleagues in Model 4 schools, as in Model 2 schools, are able to work together to enhance their professional learning and share their expertise and good practice. Larger schools will also have the opportunity to work with their stage/ level / year/ department colleagues to support the planning for learning experiences and also with their professional development. This moderation approach is crucial to ensure high-quality provision and expectations from all. As in Model 3 schools, the schools will serve one wider geographical area, and therefore will be able to develop strong links with local businesses and other organisations, and opportunities to partnership working to provide exciting learning experiences for our CYP.

Impact for families – Families work closely alongside the school their CYP attends. As in all schools, the parents will have avenues of communication with both the classteacher and the Senior leadership Team. In school grouping schools it likely will not be the HT who responds to concerns, but the designated DHT/PT for the individual school. As outlined in roles and responsibilities in section 4, the other members of the senior leadership team are qualified and expected to act on behalf of the HT.

Options for School Leadership Models for Waid Cluster Schools

Introduction

The aims and principles of the school leadership models strategy, outlined in section 2, together with the possible models laid out in section 3, have been used to inform strategic and operational planning to strengthen school leadership models in the Waid Cluster.

School Rolls 2019-2024 (Figure 1)

School	Session 2019/2020		Session 2020/2021		Session 2021/2022		Session 2022/2023		Projected Roll 2023/2024	
	Roll	No of Classes	Roll	No of Classes	Roll	No of classes	Roll	No of classes	Roll	No of classes
Waid Academy	680	-	712	-	704	-	698	-	660	-
Anstruther (Nursery)	330 (73)	12	329 (61)	12	321 (62)	12	305 (41)	11	308 (41)	11
Colinsburgh	45	3	41	2	41	2	34	2	39	2
Crail (Nursery)	88 (18)	4	74 (28)	4	77 (20)	4	89 (16)	4	80 (16)	4
Elie	38	2	27	2	25	2	24	2	18	1
Kirkton of Largo	32	2	27	2	21	2	13	1	15	1
Lundin Mill	93	4	101	5	113	5	130	6	104	5
Pittenweem (Nursery)	72 (22)	3	73 (23)	4	73 (23)	3	89 (14)	4	72 (14)	3
St Monans (Nursery)	96 (25)	4	85 (30)	4	88 (21)	4	78 (21)	4	82 (21)	4
Primary (Nursery) Total	794 (138)	34	757 (142)	35	759 (126)	34	762 (92)	34	718 (92)	31
Area Total	1,612	-	1,611	-	1,589	-	1,552	-	1,470	-

*2023/2024 projections for nursery are the 2022/23 figures

Current Primary School Leadership Models (2022/23) (Figure 2)

School	Leadership Entitlement	Current Leadership Model	Leadership Time
Waid Academy	HT plus 2 x DHT	Temporary HT plus 2 x DHT (1 Temporary)	
Anstruther	HT plus 2 x DHT	Temporary HT plus 2 X DHT	2 x Full-time Equivalent (DHTs both have teaching commitment half of the week)
Colinsburgh	Teaching HT	Temporary Joint HT	1 Full-time Equivalent
Elie	Teaching HT		
Kirkton of Largo	Teaching HT	Permanent Joint HT	1 Full-time Equivalent
Lundin Mill	Teaching HT		
Pittenweem	Teaching HT	Long-term Temporary Joint HT plus 1 X PT	1 Full-time Equivalent + 1 additional day (PT)
St Monans	Teaching HT		
Crail	Teaching HT	Temporary Teaching HT	0.3 Full-time Equivalent (1.5 days management/ 3.5 days teaching)

To strengthen leadership arrangements in the Waid Cluster, as per the aims of the school leadership models strategy, the following options are proposed for consultation with the Waid Cluster headteachers, staff, parents/carers and children/young people:

Option 1:

To make permanent the current leadership models outlined in Figure 2.

Option 2: 2-18 Leadership Model across Waid Academy & Anstruther Primary School

The current leadership in place within Waid Academy is a Headteacher, and two Deputy Headteachers. Anstruther has a Headteacher, and two Deputy Headteachers (with a teaching commitment of 2.5 days a week each).

This model has a combined school roll of 1,044 pupils across both settings, encompassing Nursery, Primary and Secondary pupils (based on August 2022 pupil roll)

The headteacher post would be job re-sized to align with the strategic and operational responsibilities of a 2-18 model. This would increase the salary scale of the post making it a more attractive position for an experienced school leader.

With the leadership and management budget remaining, there are a number of options for the Headteacher in creating a strong leadership team. One option, as shown below is to create an additional Deputy Headteacher and/or Principal Teacher posts within the Primary setting. This would increase leadership roles, or alternatively the teaching commitment of the Primary Deputy Headteachers could be undertaken by a new teaching post, thereby reducing their teaching commitment and increasing leadership time. The extended management team within Waid Academy including Principal Teachers of Curriculum, Principal Teachers and Guidance Teachers remain unchanged in this model.

School	Leadership Entitlement	Current Leadership (22/23)	Leadership Time (22/23)	Proposed Model
Waid	HT plus 2 x DHT	HT plus 2 x DHT	3 FTE	1 HTs 5 x DHTs 1 x PT
Anstruther	HT plus 2 x DHT	HT plus 2 x DHT	2 FTE	

Option 3: 2-18 Leadership Model across Waid Academy, Anstruther Primary School & Crail Primary School

School	Leadership Entitlement	Current Leadership (22/23)	Leadership Time (22/23)	Proposed Model
Waid	HT plus 2 x DHT	HT plus 2 x DHT	3 FTE	1 HT 5 x DHT's 2 x PT
Anstruther	HT plus 2 x DHT	HT plus 2 x DHT	2 FTE	
Crail	Teaching HT (1.5 days)	Teaching HT (1.5 days)	0.3 FTE	

This model has a school roll of 1,149 pupils across Nursery, Primary and Secondary (based on August 2022 pupil roll). This model brings Crail Primary School into the 2-18 model outlined in Option 2 which allows us to remove the Teaching Headteacher post in line with our Leadership Strategy (2015). An additional PT is included within this model. There would be scope to have an additional DHT post in lieu of the PT posts.

Option 4: Joint Leadership Model across Kirkton of Largo, Lundin Mill, Pittenweem, St Monans, Elie & Colinsburgh Primary Schools

This model has a school roll of 403 pupils across Nursery and Primary. This model removes all the Primary Headteacher posts and creates one new Headteacher post across the six schools. In addition, two new Primary DHT posts are added and three PT posts. The two DHT posts would retain a 0.5fte teaching commitment. The five additional Principal Teacher posts all have 0.2fte management time. This model replaces the Joint Headteachers in Colinsburgh & Elie, Kirkton of Largo & Lundin Mill, Pittenweem & St. Monans.

School	Leadership Entitlement	Current Leadership (22/23)	Leadership Time (22/23)	Proposed Model
Lundin Mill	Teaching HT	Joint HT	1 FTE	1 HT 2 x DHT's 3 x PT's
Kirkton of Largo	Teaching HT			
Colinsburgh	Teaching HT	Joint HT	1 FTE	
Elie	Teaching HT			
Pittenweem	Teaching HT	Joint HT 1 PT (Temp funded via the current Joint Head model)	1.2FTE	
St Monans	Teaching HT			

Option 5: Joint Leadership Model across Kirkton of Largo, Lundin Mill & Colinsburgh Primary Schools

School	Leadership Entitlement	Current Leadership (22/23)	Leadership Time (22/23)	Proposed Model
Lundin Mill	Teaching HT	Joint HT	1 FTE	1 HT 1 x PT
Kirkton of Largo	Teaching HT			
Colinsburgh	Teaching HT	Joint HT with Elie	0.5 FTE (0.3fte if reverts to Teaching HT)	

This model has a school roll of 177 across the three primary schools. Note, the projection for Kirkton of Largo for 2023/24 is approximately 15 pupils, one class, however the school has no P1, P2, P3 or P4 pupils currently, when the P7 pupils depart at the end of the 2022/23 session the roll has potential to decrease to 11 pupils with no new enrolments. If this continued and no pupils enrolled in Kirkton of Largo, Lundin Mill may move to a Teaching Headteacher role. This model removes the permanent joint head arrangement for Lundin Mill and Kirkton of Largo, and the temporary joint head arrangement for Colinsburgh and Elie. For a school roll of 171 and above, a single site school would be allocated one non-teaching Headteacher and one teaching Principal teacher post, if the roll reduced as per the projections, a single school under 171 would receive the allocation of a single management post of non-teaching Headteacher. The proposed model is to put in place a permanent non-Teaching Headteacher, and one Principal Teacher, this would not be reduced to a single Headteacher should the roll fall below 171 as anticipated.

Option 6: Joint Leadership Model across Pittenweem, St Monans & Elie Primary Schools

School	Leadership Entitlement	Current Leadership (22/23)	Leadership Time (22/23)	Proposed Model
Elie	Teaching HT	Joint HT with Colinsburgh	0.5 FTE (0.3fte if reverts to Teaching HT)	1 HT 1 x PT
Pittenweem	Teaching HT	Joint HT 1 PT (Temp funded via the current Joint Head model)	1.2 FTE	
St Monans	Teaching HT			

This model has a school roll of 226 across the three primary schools. This model removes the temporary joint head arrangement for Elie and Colinsburgh, and Pittenweem and St Monans. St Monans as a single school would have a non-teaching Headteacher based on the current role if the temporary joint head arrangement ended, however due to the reduced roll it is likely that the school would move to a Teaching Headteacher at the next management update (takes place every three years), all three schools would at that point have three teaching headteachers with a management time of 0.9fte combined, 0.3fte per school. The proposed model is to put in place a permanent non-Teaching Headteacher, and one Principal Teacher.

Option 7: Joint Leadership Model across Kirkton of Largo, Lundin Mill, Pittenweem, St Monans, Elie, Colinsburgh and Crail Primary Schools

This model has a school roll of 508 across Nursery and Primary. This model removes all the Primary Headteacher posts and creates one new Headteacher post. In addition, two new DHT posts are added, five PTs and a 0.7fte teacher for Crail. This is to allow every school to have a management post within its structure.

School	Leadership Entitlement	Current Leadership (22/23)	Leadership Time (22/23)	Proposed Model
Lundin Mill	Teaching HT	Joint HT	1 FTE	1 HT 2 x DHT's 5 x PT's
Kirkton of Largo	Teaching HT			
Colinsburgh	Teaching HT	Joint HT	1 FTE	
Elie	Teaching HT			
Pittenweem	Teaching HT	Joint HT	1 HT 1 PT (Temp funded via the current Joint Head model)	
St Monans	Teaching HT			
Crail	Teaching HT	Teaching HT	0.3	

These options are example models. A Headteacher may elect to utilise the budget to create an alternative model that suits the needs of the schools. If a preferred Option was chosen alternative models could be explored further.

<p>Which Committee report does this IA relate to (specify meeting date)?</p> <p>Cabinet Committee December 2022</p>
<p>What are the main impacts on equality?</p> <p>The curriculum, and the learning and teaching experiences may be further enhanced in these proposed school leadership models as the Headteacher may be able to facilitate the drawing on expertise from colleagues within their other joint schools and undertake high-quality professional learning that will ultimately enhance the educational experiences of all the children and young people.</p> <p>There will be positive impacts on the quality of the learning environments, whereby staff will be able to share and consider the way their resources across establishments can be best used to improve equal opportunities for all.</p> <p>Enhanced transitions between ELC and Primaries, or Primaries and Secondaries would benefit from working collaboratively with their peers in other cluster schools to build positive relationships prior to moving on to their next educational establishment.</p> <p>School leadership teams will be more flexible, with Headteachers having the option to draw on the expertise of their leadership teams across more than one school. This will provide opportunities for the sharing of skills and expertise, and also the opportunities for wider leadership opportunities. Joint HT schools generally offer greater possibilities for promotion due to there being DHT positions in some of those schools.</p>
<p>In relation to a strategic decision, how will inequalities of outcome caused by economic disadvantage be reduced?</p> <p>One of the benefits of these school leadership models is that Senior Leadership Teams will no longer work in isolation. Therefore, expertise can be shared and solutions to inequalities over economic disadvantage considered and overcome more quickly as a result. Due to a greater size of team, any solutions can be followed through in a supported, strategic fashion.</p>
<p>What are the main recommendations to enhance or mitigate the impacts identified?</p> <p>There are no negative impacts identified.</p> <p>The positive impacts will be enhanced through ensuring strategic planning to provide opportunities for widening and enhancing the collaborative experiences of children, young people and their education staff who support their learning experiences.</p>
<p>If there are no equality impacts on any of the protected characteristics, please explain.</p>
<p>Further information is available from: Name / position / contact details:</p> <p>Angela Logue, Head of Education & Children's Services (Primary & Improvement Support)</p>

Appendix B: Joint Leadership Models – School Rolls, CfE Attainment Outcomes 21/22/Comparator

	Est.	School Name	Pupil Roll (20/12/22)	Literacy %	Numeracy %	Comparator School Literacy %	Comparator School Numeracy %
		FIFE		68	75		
1	2012	Blairhall	64	55	76	68	74
		Tulliallan	182	78	84	67	74
2	2012	Dulloch	444	77	84	77	83
		Calaiswood SS	64				
3	2014	McLean	380	84	85	67	74
		Milesmark	91	91	88	69	76
4	2014	*Largoward	19	89	89	67	73
		Lawhead	218	84	81	75	81
5	2015	Canongate	191	73	72	74	80
		Kingsbarns	44	87	82	72	79
6	2015	Capshard	514	79	85	73	80
		Torbain	529	71	81	65	72
7	2017	Holy Name	31	65	71	58	65
		St Serf's	69	67	79	55	63
8	2018	Guardbridge	60	70	65	72	79
		Strathkinness	75	72	85	76	82
9	2018	Springfield	51	55	75	62	69
		*Letham	23	80	80	72	78
10	2018	Colinsburgh	34	78	78	67	73
		*Elie	26	79	93	66	73
11	2019	Crossford	189	62	66	75	82
		Carnock	72	62	65	68	74
12	2019	St Monans	89	74	83	62	69
		Pittenweem	89	76	79	70	76
13	2019	Lundin Mill	128	78	84	68	75
		*Kirkton of Largo	11	78	89	67	73
14	2019	Newburgh	134	64	67	65	72
		Dunbog	45	88	81	65	72
15	2019	Coaltown of Balgonie	101	98	98	70	76
		*Star	26	67	80	73	79
16	2020	Inzievar	215	64	68	59	66
		Townhill	233	81	84	66	73
17	2020	Wormit	186	80	90	74	81
		Balmerino	49	79	86	72	79
18	2020	Culross	64	83	83	69	75
		Torryburn	115	70	73	63	71
19	2021	Auchtermuchty	148	68	67	68	75
		Strathmiglo	67	62	69	72	79
20	2021	Ladybank	93	64	64	68	74
		*Pitlessie	15	67	67	71	78
21	2021	Ceres	109	69	80	72	78
		*Craigrothie	28	50	64	70	77
22	2021/ 22	Kennoway	394	70	73	59	66
		Methilhill	354	27	41	56	63

Appendix C: Quality Improvement Evaluations, HMle & Care Inspectorate inspection outcomes 2019-2022

Evaluative grades from Standard and Quality Reports and HMle Inspection Activity

Name of School	Session 2019 - 2020				Session 2020- 2021				Session 2021- 2022				HMle Inspection (as joint Headteacher)			
	1.3	2.3	3.1	3.2	1.3	2.3	3.1	3.2	1.3	2.3	3.1	3.2	1.3	2.3	3.1	3.2
Star	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good				
Coaltown of Balgonie	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good			V Good
Craigrothie	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good				
Ceres	Sat	Good	V Good	Sat	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good				
Dunbog	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good				
Newburgh	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good				
Ladybank	Sat	Sat	Good	Sat	Sat	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Good				
Pitlessie	Good	Good	Good	Sat	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good				
Auchtermuchty	Sat	Sat	Sat	Sat	Sat	Sat	Sat	sat	Sat	sat	sat	Sat				
Strathmiglo	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	V Good	Good
Canongate	Good	Good	Good	Sat	Good	Good	Good	Sat	Good	Good	Good	Sat	Sat	Sat	Sat	
Kingsbarn	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Sat	sat	Good	Good	Sat				
Guardbridge	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Sat	sat	Sat				
Strathkinnes	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Sat	Good	Good				
Largoward	Good	Good	V Good	Sat	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good				
Lawhead	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good				
Blairhall	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good		Good
Tulliallan	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good
Carnock	Good	V Good	V Good	Good	Good	V Good	V Good	Good	Good	V Good	V Good	Good				
Crossford	Sat	Sat	Good	Sat	Sat	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat				
Mclean	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good				
Milesmark	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good			Good
Torryburn	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Sat	Good	Sat				

Culross	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	V Good	V Good
St Serfs	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good
Holy Name	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Colinsburgh	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Elie	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Kirkton of Largo	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Lundin Mill	Sat	Sat	Good	Good	Sat	Sat	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Pittenweem	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Sat	Good	Good	Sat
St Monans	Sat	Sat	Sat	Sat	sat	Sat	Sat	Sat	Good	Good	Good	Good
Dulloch	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	V Good
Calaiswood	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good
Capshard	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good
Torbain	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good
Springfield	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Letham	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Inzievar	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	V Good	Good	V Good	Good
Townhill	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good
Wormit	V Good	Good	V Good	V Good	V Good	Good	V Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Balemrino	Good	V Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	V Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Kennoway	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good	V Good	Good
Methilhill	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat	Good	Sat

Good	V Good
	Good

Care Inspectorate Outcomes

Service Name	Inspector Date	KQ1 Care And Support	KQ2 Environment	KQ4 Staffing	KQ3 Management and Leadership
Auchtermuchty Primary School Nursery Centre	16/09/2019	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good
Blairhall Primary School Nursery	06/08/2022	Good	Good	Good	Good
Crossford Primary School Nursery	13/11/2019	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good
Ladybank Primary School Nursery	28/11/2022	Good	Good	Good	Good
Lawhead Primary School Nursery	29/05/2019	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	N/A
Lundin Mill Primary School Nursery	01/05/2018	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	N/A
McLean Primary School Nursery	24/05/2018	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	N/A
Newburgh Primary School Nursery	10/06/2019	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Good
Pittenweem Primary School Nursery	22/06/2018	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	N/A
St. Monans Primary School Nursery	22/06/2022	Very Good	Very Good	Good	Very Good
St. Serf's R C Primary School Nursery	26/02/2019	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	N/A
Strathmiglo Primary School Nursery	07/06/2017	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	N/A
Torryburn Primary School Nursery	23/11/2022	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good
Tulliallan Primary School Nursery	28/11/2019	Excellent	Excellent	N/A	N/A

Appendix D: Cost Analysis – Illustrations of School Leadership Models

Model 1 - Single school or early learning centre model of leadership: a headteacher and/or leadership team serving a single school. The size and composition of the leadership team will be dependent on the school roll.

The following examples are single school settings, varying in size. The Headteacher salary is determined by the national Job Sizing Toolkit. All class teacher costs are based on the top of scale salary for a class teacher. Five primary schools range from the smallest with 1 class, to our largest with 22 classes. Nursery classes are in addition.

In a small school example with a pupil roll of 24 with no nursery the school is allocated two classes. The management allocation is a Teaching Headteacher. The Teaching Headteacher teaches 70% of the week and another teacher teaches the remaining 30%. In addition, a further 1.22 FTE is allocated for the second class and the appropriate non class contact time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff is approximately £159,882.

Small School Example

Pupil roll	24
Primary Classes	2

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Teaching Headteacher	1	73,128	DHT02/T19	Teaches 0.7fte/Management 0.3fte
Class teacher	1.22	69,632	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
Teaching Headteacher cover	0.3	17,123	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		159,882		

In a medium school example with a roll of 130, with a nursery roll of 50 in addition, the school is allocated four classes. The management allocation is a Headteacher, non-teaching. 4.45 FTE is allocated for the four classes and the appropriate non class contact time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff is approximately £337,081.

Medium School Example

Pupil roll	130	With a nursery with 50 pupils
Primary Classes	4	

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	83,097	DHT06/T23	Non teaching
Class teachers	4.45	253,984	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		337,081		

In a large school example with a pupil roll of 350, with a nursery of 50 pupils in addition, the school is allocated 11 classes. The management allocation is a Headteacher, non-teaching, and two Depute Headteachers. Depute Headteachers have a teaching commitment of 0.5fte. 11.23FTE is allocated for the eleven classes and the appropriate non class contact time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff is approximately £880,110.

Large School Example

Pupil roll	350	With a nursery with 50 pupils
Primary Classes	11	

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	88,000	DHT08/T25	Non teaching
Depute Headteachers	2	151,158	DHT03/T20	0.5 teaching commitment each
Class teachers	11.23	640,952	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		880,110		

In a very large school example with a pupil roll of 492, with a nursery of 140 pupils in addition, the school is allocated 17 classes. The management allocation is a Headteacher, non-teaching, and three Depute Headteachers. Depute Headteachers have a teaching commitment of 0.5fte. 17.39 FTE is allocated for the seventeen classes and the appropriate non class contact time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff is approximately £1,320,090.

Very Large School Example

Pupil roll	492	With a nursery with 140 pupils
Primary Classes	17	

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts	
Headteacher	1	92,878	DHT10/T27
Depute Headteachers	3	234,678	DHT04/T21
Class teachers	17.39	992,534	MT05/T07
		1,320,090	

Model 2 – Two establishments with one Headteacher and where applicable a leadership team across both schools/early learning centre. The size of the leadership team would be dependent on the combined school/early learning centre roll. There are currently 26 of these models in place across Fife.

The following two examples show the single school budget and a joint headteacher model budget. In the first example, the combined school roll is 75, with no nursery in either setting. Both schools in a single model are allocated a Teaching Headteacher, a teacher to cover the Headteachers management time of 0.3fte. 30%. In addition, a further 1.22 FTE is allocated for the second class and the appropriate non class contact time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff for School A is approximately £162,333. For School B the cost is £159,882. The differential in cost is due to the Headteachers Job Sized salary with School A being DHT03/T20 and School B being DHT02/T19. In this example School A has a higher Free School Meal entitlement which resulted in the salary being higher to the similar sized School A. The combined cost is approximately £322,215 for both schools.

In the joint model, the combined the Headteacher becomes non-teaching, the salary is Job Sized as DHT04/T21. In additional 4.44fte is allocated to cover the four classes, and in this model both schools require 0.7fte to cover the Teaching Headteacher teaching time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff is approximately £331,639. This model incurs a cost of £9,424, no savings are made. The school budget is allocated in full, there is no detriment to the school budget.

Two small schools, both Teaching Headteacher roles

Combined Pupil roll	75	No Nursery
Combined Primary Classes	4	

School A

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Teaching Headteacher	1	75,579	DHT03/T2 0	Teaches 0.7fte/Management 0.3fte
	1.2			
Class teacher	2	69,632	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
Teaching Headteacher cover	0.3	17,123	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		162,333		

School B

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Teaching Headteacher	1	73,128	DHT02/T1 9	Teaches 0.7fte/Management 0.3fte
	1.2			
Class teacher	2	69,632	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
Teaching Headteacher cover	0.3	17,123	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		159,882		

Individually 322,215

Joint Model

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	78,226	DHT04/T2 1	Non teaching
	4.4			
Class teacher	4	253,413	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		331,639		

Cost of model 9,424

In the second example, the combined school roll is 224, with a nursery in one setting with 35 pupils. In single school models, in School A the management allocation is a non-teaching Headteacher, and a Depute Headteacher with a 0.5fte teaching commitment. In School B, the management allocation is a Teaching Headteacher.

In School A there is allocation of 8.39fte class teachers for the 8 classes and the appropriate non class contact time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff for School A is approximately £639,991. School B is allocated the Teaching Headteacher, a teacher to cover the Headteachers management time of 0.3fte and in addition, a further 1.22 FTE is allocated for the second class and the appropriate non class contact time. For School B the cost is £157,654.

The combined cost is approximately £797,645 for both schools.

In the joint model, the combined the Headteacher salary is Job Sized as DHT09/T26, an increase of two salary scale points.

In additional 10.61fte is allocated to cover the ten classes, including the 0.7fte to cover the Teaching Headteacher teaching time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff is approximately £771,579.

This model delivers a flexible budget available to the Headteacher of approximately £26,069. The budget is allocated in full to the Headteacher. This may allow the Headteacher to create a Principal Teacher post (approximate cost of £16,691) or release the Depute Headteacher from teaching commitment to provide extra management time, or use the funds for additional Pupil Support Assistants or resources as determined by the local needs of both schools.

Two schools, one small Teaching Headteacher role, one medium, Non Teaching Headteacher

Combined Pupil roll 224 With a Nursery with 35 pupils
 Combined Primary Classes 10

School A

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	85,553	DHT07/T24	Non teaching
Depute Headteacher	1	75,579	DHT03/T20	0.5 teaching commitment
Class teacher	8.39	478,859	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		639,991		

School B

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Teaching Headteacher	1	70,900	DHT01/T18	Teaches 0.7fte/Management 0.3fte
Class teacher	1.22	69,632	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
Teaching Headteacher cover	0.3	17,123	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		157,654		

Individually 797,645

Joint Model

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	90,431	DHT09/T26	Non teaching
Depute Headteacher	1	75,579	DHT03/T20	0.5 teaching commitment
Class teacher	10.61	605,566		
		771,576		

Cost of model (26,069) To be utilised by the Headteacher

Model 3 – Cross Sector leadership model, e.g.:

One Headteacher and leadership team across a special school and either a primary school or a secondary school. Age range 3-12 years or 3-18 years. This model is already in place across Duloch Primary School and Calaiswood Special School (3-18) in Fife.

One Headteacher and leadership team, if applicable, across an Early Learning Centre and Primary School, Age range could be 0-12 years, 2-12 years or 3-12 years. There are 3 models like this already in place across Fife.

One Headteacher and leadership team across a Primary School and Secondary school. Age range could be 0-18 years, 2-18 years, 3-18 years or 5-18 years. Note that some Primary Schools include a nursery provision. There are no models in place in Fife at present across a primary and secondary school. For the first example, the costings for Duloch and Calaiswood have been detailed below.

The combined school roll is 441 mainstream pupils, with a nursery roll of 138 pupils and a Special School roll of 60 pupils.

In single school models, both schools would have a management allocation of a non-teaching Headteacher, Duloch three Depute Headteachers with 0.5fte teaching commitment and Calaiswood one Depute Headteacher.

In Duloch there is allocation of 16.28fte class teachers for the 16 classes and the appropriate non class contact time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff for Duloch is approximately £1,420,516. Special School classes are staffed and funded on a different staffing model, this is unchanged in any joint models. The management allocation for Calaiswood has a cost of approximately £163,779.

The combined cost for Duloch and Calaiswood is approximately £1,420,516 for both schools. In the joint model, the combined the Headteacher salary is Job Sized as DHT14/T31, an increase of four salary scale points.

The staffing allocation for the classes in both Duloch and Calaiswood remain the same. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff is approximately £1,351,252. This model delivers a flexible budget available to the Headteacher of approximately £69,264. The budget is allocated in full to the Headteacher. This may allow the Headteacher to create multiple Principal Teacher post (approximate cost of £16,691 per post) or release the Depute Headteachers from teaching commitment to provide extra management time, or use the funds for additional Pupil Support Assistants or resources as determined by the local needs of both schools.

Duloch and Calaiswood for this example

Combined Pupil roll	441	With a Nursery with 138 pupils and Special School with 60 pupils
Combined Primary Classes	16	

School A

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	92,878	DHT10/T27	Non teaching
Depute Headteacher	3	234,678	DHT04/T21	0.5 teaching commitment each
Class teacher	16.28	929,181	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		1,256,737		

School B

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	85,553	DHT07/T24	Non teaching
Depute Headteacher	1	78,226	DHT04/T21	0.5 teaching commitment each
		163,779		

Individually 1,420,516

Joint Model

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	109,167	DHT14/T31	Non teaching
Depute Headteacher	4	312,904	DHT04/T21	0.5 teaching commitment each
Class teacher	16.28	929,181		
		1,351,252		

Cost of model (69,264) To be utilised by the Headteacher

The second example of cross sector leadership is not currently in place. This model is for a Primary and Secondary model. The calculations vary from the previous models as the Secondary Staffing Allocation is the provision of cash budget for the Headteacher to determine locally their school staffing requirements. This includes how many Depute Headteachers, or Principal Teachers and Class Teachers the school will have, all managed within the budget allocated.

In this example the Secondary school has a school roll of 700 and a budget allocation of £3,192,959. The school has a model of a Headteacher, and two Depute Headteachers. Within Secondary Depute Headteachers do not have the 0.5fte teaching commitment as in Primary, the school determines the teaching commitment to meet the needs of the timetable. The school has 4 Principal Teachers of Curriculum, 7 Principal Teachers and 49 Class teachers. All funded from the £3,192,959 and any underspend is utilised as per the school requirements.

The Primary school has a roll of 350, with a nursery of 50 pupils in addition, the school is allocated 11 classes. The management allocation is a Headteacher, non-teaching, and two Depute Headteachers. Depute Headteachers have a teaching commitment of 0.5fte. 11.23FTE is allocated for the eleven classes and the appropriate non class contact time. The cost for the leadership and teaching staff is approximately £880,110.

The combined costs for Teaching staffing is £4,073,069.

In the joint model, the combined the Headteacher salary is Job Sized as DHT16/T33, an increase of three salary scale points.

The staffing allocation for the classes in schools remain the same, as does the Depute Headteacher posts. This model delivers a flexible budget available to the Headteacher of approximately £73,303. The budget is allocated in full to the Headteacher. This may allow the Headteacher to create an additional Depute Headteacher post, or multiple Principal Teacher post (approximate cost of £16,691 per post), to support transition between the schools.

3-18 Model

Secondary School 3,192,959 Budget Allocated

Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	105,101	DHT13/T30	Non teaching
Depute Headteacher	1	83,097	DHT06/T23	
Depute Headteacher	1	80,868	DHT05/T22	
		269,066		
Balance of Budget		2,923,893		
		3,192,959		
Primary School				
Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	88,000	DHT08/T25	Non teaching
Depute Headteacher	2	151,158	DHT03/T20	0.5 teaching commitment each
Class teachers	11.23	640,952	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
		880,110		
Individually		4,073,069		
Joint Model				
Staffing Allocation	FTE	Oncosts		
Headteacher	1	119,798	DHT16/T33	Non teaching
Depute Headteacher	1	83,097	DHT06/T23	
Depute Headteacher	1	80,868	DHT05/T22	
Depute Headteacher	2	151,158	DHT03/T20	0.5 teaching commitment each
Primary Class teachers	11.23	640,952	MT05/T07	Top of scale teacher salary
Balance of Secondary Budget		2,923,893		
		3,999,766		
Cost of model		(73,303)	To be utilised by the Headteacher	