

RESTRUCTURING AND THE INTRODUCTION OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RESPONSIBILITY (TLR) POSTS

A REPORT ON PROGRESS IN SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS

THE REPORT'S PURPOSE

Restructuring and the introduction of Teaching and Learning Responsibility allowances in January 2006 has had a significant impact on South Gloucestershire schools. It has posed a considerable challenge for school leaders in managing the change, which must be fully implemented by January 2009. It is important that the local authority monitor and evaluate these changes because:

- They are statutory and the local authority needs to know where to direct support for schools in implementing and sustaining changes
- Schools have developed innovative solutions and emerging good practice and key learning points need to be disseminated
- Ofsted, in the December 2005 report on implementing the National Workforce Agreement, recommended that Local Authorities should:
 - gather accurate information about the progress schools are making in order to target support and training for those who need it most
 - monitor and evaluate the impact of their actions on the quality of education and standards in schools.

South Gloucestershire Council commissioned this evaluation to gain a general picture of the response to restructuring and to look in more detail at how a sample of schools had approached the issue. Case studies on each of the schools visited are available on the South Gloucestershire website at:

<http://www.learningwithsouthglos.org/ChangeManagement/index.htm>

It is hoped school leaders will find this report useful in reviewing their own practice and in considering the further development of effective leadership structures.

HOW MONITORING AND EVALUATION WAS ACHIEVED

- School Improvement Advisers / Partners gathered basic information about primary schools' response to restructuring during their school visits in the summer of 2006.
- Tony Cleaver, Remodelling and Leadership Consultant, reviewed the information from SIA/SIPs and consulted the Local Authority's senior advisers in order to select schools to visit. Previously, he had visited all secondary schools between September and November 2005 speaking to Heads about their plans for restructuring and this also informed the choice of schools to follow up.

- Nine primary schools and two secondary schools were visited in February and March 2007. They were selected as case studies on the following criteria:
 - a geographical spread across South Gloucestershire
 - a proportion of primary to secondary schools roughly equal to the total number of schools in the LA
 - a mix of primary schools of different sizes, types and catchment areas
 - a bias towards selecting schools with apparently more innovative approaches to restructuring, as these should be of more interest to others
 - schools which had not been visited for the evaluation report on Planning, Preparation and Assessment time (PPA) in 2006.

- In each school visited, the Head and a TLR post-holder were interviewed. (In one case, an Assistant Head rather than a TLR was interviewed – the case study will make it clear why this was so.)

The surveys and subsequent interviews form the basis of this report.

THE BACKGROUND TO RESTRUCTURING

One of the TLR post-holders interviewed for this report said she believed that workforce reform and the removal of admin tasks had made restructuring inevitable. This was certainly the view of the national Workforce Agreement and Monitoring Group (WAMG) which, in the wake of the signing of the National Agreement in 2003, initiated a review of the structure of allowances held by teachers for undertaking management responsibilities. If teachers were no longer to carry out administrative tasks and were to focus their professional energies on teaching and learning, then allowances for additional responsibilities needed redefining along these lines. Indeed, the Rewards and Incentives Group (RIG), an off-shoot of WAMG, stated that the status quo was not an option.

There was also a view that the system of management allowances (MAs) was no longer fit for purpose, particularly in secondary schools. The School Teachers' Pay and Conditions document had stated that management allowances were for teachers "who undertake responsibilities beyond those common to the *majority* of teachers" (STPCD). Yet 54% of teachers were in receipt of an allowance, including over 70% of teachers in secondary schools. There was evidence that some allowances had been awarded for administrative tasks that had little to do with teaching and learning (managing the use of the school mini-bus was an example in one local school.) Some South Gloucestershire secondary headteachers have commented on one result of this overwhelming use of management allowances – a culture where staff were reluctant to take on any additional task unless paid an allowance. This contrasts with the typical position in primary schools where around 30% of teachers received management allowances and staff have habitually taken on the management of subjects (particularly foundation subjects) without additional pay.

The first stage of the review of allowances was the agreement over Upper Pay Spine and Leadership Group pay in 2004 and this was followed by the announcement of new Teaching and Learning Responsibilities (TLRs) to replace management allowances. To introduce TLRs schools were required to go through a "restructuring" process, including full consultation with staff and the publication by 1st January 2006 of a school structure plan showing how Leadership Group and TLR responsibilities were to be distributed. The new structure was to be introduced within three years

(evidence gathered for this report shows that the great majority of South Gloucestershire schools had introduced the new structure within the first year).

Although plans for TLRs and restructuring were announced well in advance, feedback from South Gloucestershire schools suggests that the impending change made little impact until the summer of 2005 and in many schools, work on restructuring got underway only after September 2005, leading to a tight timescale for consultation and the publication of plans. The main reason for this pressure seems to be the huge change agenda impacting on schools (and particularly on headteachers) at that time, including the new Ofsted framework, the Self Evaluation Form, Every Child Matters and Extended Schools as well as restructuring. It says a great deal for South Gloucestershire heads, governors and staff that so many were able to respond creatively and effectively to restructuring and to seize the opportunity to further school improvement.

KEY FINDINGS

These findings have been arrived at by analysing the general information available from schools and the facts and views gathered during visits to the eleven schools.

General to both primary and secondary schools:

- **The process of restructuring** meant schools had to undergo major change, involving considerable workload for leaders and anxiety and uncertainty for many teachers. Words like “downhearted” and “apprehensive” were used to describe how staff felt in the run up to restructuring. Some schools had few applications for new TLR posts at first – staff saw the process as “daunting” and there were some fears about workload.
- Despite staff anxieties, the feedback from the TLR post-holders interviewed suggests that **staff felt properly consulted** in the run up to restructuring and were now generally happy with the way new structures were working. One commented that the outcome for most has turned out to be much better than expected and this seems to represent the situation in most schools visited. One Head thought staff would be de-motivated but said the opposite has been the case.
- Feedback from schools suggested that **local authority support** had been valuable – from general briefings and one-to-one personnel advice on restructuring itself to other aspects of LA work such as development groups and projects for leaders and teachers and advice for governors.
- The ease or difficulty of **filling TLR posts** has varied considerably. Most advertisements have been internal only but some schools have advertised externally (the latter has not necessarily meant more applicants). Some schools have had an ample supply of able applicants but other schools have found staff reluctant to apply because of concerns about workload. In some cases this has meant delays in implementing the model envisaged. However, most Heads interviewed were very pleased with the work of their TLRs and felt the school had moved forward.
- There was some evidence in schools visited of rapid promotion, of appointments to new posts being made on ability and potential rather than experience (an NQT in one case). These teachers did not seem to find the additional responsibility an issue.

- Many of the **innovations** identified in this report did not originate with restructuring. Innovations such as collaborative working, workforce reform, whole-school themes, the Self-Evaluation Form (SEF), Every Child Matters, Assessment for Learning, accountability and personalised learning have all been “in the air” over recent years. Restructuring was essentially an **opportunity** to introduce or develop these trends in schools – an opportunity grasped by many school leaders.
- **Assimilation or change?** Feedback from School Improvement Advisers/SIPs suggests that in South Gloucestershire primary schools roughly 40% of schools assimilated their existing structures, 20% adapted or adjusted existing structures (e.g. swapping responsibilities or creating one new post) and 40% introduced innovative structures that were significantly different. The more complex structures in secondary schools makes a division into similar categories difficult – most schools changed some part of the structure – but it is clear that more posts were assimilated than newly created. Some heads reported that restructuring was carried out in the context of pressure from professional associations to assimilate existing posts.
- **Staff turnover:** In some schools restructuring coincided with senior staff leaving or retiring, enabling Heads/Governors to revise roles, create new posts and bring on new talent. It is notable in the case studies that Heads who developed more innovative structures were able to take advantage of such staff changes.
- Staff turnover to enable new structures was not always entirely a matter of chance - in some cases Heads supported and influenced staff decisions about their future. Falling rolls and the need for savings and redundancies often provided the context for restructuring.
- **Loss of posts?** National surveys suggest that there are now fewer promoted posts available to teachers. This was perhaps inevitable in secondary schools where over 70% of staff were previously in receipt of a management allowance or on the leadership spine.
 - The feedback from South Gloucestershire **secondary schools** confirms this loss of posts. Typically, middle management structures have been “thinned out” with posts such as assistant year head and second in department disappearing. There is a trend to differentiate between departments, giving higher TLR posts only to leaders of core or specialist subjects, and to create larger faculties, groupings of related subjects with a single leader on a higher TLR or leadership scale (thereby re-introducing a trend of the 70’s and 80’s which tended to be reversed in the 90’s with a greater stress on individual subjects).
 - Several secondary heads regret the loss of opportunities for younger staff with the passing of First Management Allowance (MA1) posts. One head linked this clearly with lower staff morale. On the other hand, the same head acknowledged that the distribution of MA1 posts had been “inequitable” and needed reviewing. School leaders generally supported the focus on teaching and learning represented by TLRs.
 - In the schools visited, the great majority of management allowance post holders now hold posts in the new structure, either because their post was assimilated or because they were successful in obtaining a new post.
 - The picture regarding the loss of posts in South Gloucestershire **primary schools** is much less clear. Falling rolls and tight budgets have in any case meant a reduction in promoted posts in recent years. Sometimes Heads and Governors used restructuring as a further opportunity to bring the management structure into line with a smaller number of pupils but this

tended to be the reasoning behind the loss of posts rather than the introduction of TLRs. There is a fear that further falling rolls could have an impact on new TLR posts.

- An increase in **accountability** was one outcome of restructuring identified by both Heads and TLR post-holders in primary and secondary schools. Job descriptions have often been revised to make expectations clearer.
- When those interviewed described expectations of new TLR posts, there was a greater stress on **leadership**, rather than **management**. TLR post-holders are expected to contribute to school improvement and raising standards through leading, supporting and monitoring colleagues, rather than simply carrying out maintenance tasks such as managing resources.
- In both primary and secondary schools which had revised or expanded **membership of the senior leadership team**, enthusiasm was expressed for the change. Meetings were seen as more “dynamic,” even exciting, with an opening up of discussion and sharing of ideas. One head had monthly meetings with SLT off-site to encourage this.
- Restructuring was seen as helping to **develop leadership capacity** in schools. In primary schools with TLRs in leadership roles there were more people to tackle issues, observe lessons and chase up work. Developing leadership capacity was the key aim of one secondary head who had created a large number of assistant headships, each with whole-school responsibilities.
- There was a remarkably consistent view across schools visited that **restructuring was having a positive impact on school improvement**. One Head quoted his school’s recent Ofsted report: “A commitment to everyone being involved in decision making has built a strong staff team to move the school forward.” Some felt test results were already showing improvement and attributed this to the new structure and more effective leadership. For most it was too early to see a direct impact on standards but many felt this would come. This confidence was partly linked to accountability – as one TLR said, it was now clear to staff that “we can and should impact on all pupils”. Others pointed out the much sharper focus on Teaching and Learning (T&L) – structures in several schools, both primary and secondary, have been built round the needs of T&L and curriculum delivery. Other reasons were greater consistency and clearer expectations.
- **Workload**. This is a contentious issue and a range of views were expressed but overall, no clear evidence was found that restructuring had increased workload. If anything, **the overall impact appears to have been neutral**.
 - A common view from staff in new posts was that, compared to their previous management allowance posts, they had greater responsibility and more to do but they could delegate work to their new team and share concerns, making the job less stressful.
 - Some said they were given additional non-contact time to do the extra work so workload had remained the same. (It is worth pointing out that in some schools it has been found that inadequate non-contact time was allocated initially to TLRs or assistant heads and this has either been increased or there are plans to do so.)
 - There were some TLRs who felt workload had increased but they stressed they were content with this as they now had more senior posts. Others felt work was now more challenging but it was also more exhilarating and rewarding – particularly being involved in whole-school issues or as members of SLT. Some of these teachers were ambitious and saw more demanding work as a step towards further promotion.

- It was pointed out that the increased teamwork in some primary schools required more time for meetings but it was felt this was worthwhile – “hours increased but load decreased” as one put it.
- A view expressed by one post-holder was that the new flexible TLR job-descriptions (see Primary Schools section below) were a concern because they had “no limits” – you could be handed anything.
- There were varying views about **SLT and heads’ workload**. Workload had been considerable during restructuring and this has continued for some heads because of the need to train and develop TLRs in new ways of working. Some primary heads, by contrast, were enthusiastic about their new, enlarged senior teams, believing they could now delegate more and focus on strategic issues.
- But there was a view strongly expressed by both primary and secondary heads that **workforce reform in general had increased senior leaders’ workload**. A primary head cited having to cover and organise PPA time while a secondary head said that workforce reform had made schools much more difficult to manage.
- There was some evidence (though only in two primary and one secondary school of the eleven visited) of **stress** linked to TLR responsibilities. In two schools staff originally appointed to TLR posts had asked to relinquish them – the heads believed this was because of the stress of increased accountability. In a third school the issue was continuing.

Primary Schools

(These findings were more clearly seen in primary schools as a consequence of restructuring but may not be exclusive to them.)

- **Flexibility** in TLR job descriptions and key responsibilities is an important development. It is a characteristic of new TLR posts in many schools that they are now **task focused or “enquiry based” rather than role focused** (as subject or key stage leader posts are). Responsibilities are **whole-school in nature** and the tasks and projects led by TLRs are **linked to the School Development Plan or SEF**– this means priorities change from year to year and this is built into job descriptions. Such TLR posts may still include subject leadership but this is typically additional to the post’s core purpose. In these schools subject leadership is taken on by most teachers (often all but NQTs and sometimes including the Head) so is not in itself a reason for a TLR. One Head commented that staff could clearly see that subject leadership was not the core purpose of a TLR’s job – it was something all teachers did. The heads of these schools were very clear about the advantages of this flexible approach – one said it was better than being “trapped in a subject”. Flexibility meant that TLRs could lead on whatever was a current priority for the school. This flexibility could in some cases lead to uncertainty about who does what but this was seen as a minor issue compared to its advantages.
 - It is interesting to compare this trend towards task focused posts with Charles Handy’s analysis of management cultures in schools (*Understanding Schools as Organisations*). He sees the strength of a task-focused culture as one where professionals collaborate and form shifting ad hoc teams to deal with each new challenge. **Such a culture is therefore very good at adapting and dealing with change**. Two other Handy cultures are commonly found in schools – the power or “club” culture, where a charismatic leader dominates and takes all decisions and a role culture (essentially a bureaucracy) where managers have clearly defined and inflexible roles and responsibilities within a settled hierarchy. Both of these cultures can stifle individual initiative and the role culture is poor at coping with change, as staff find it difficult to work outside their limited role. New TLR

posts in some schools seem to represent a shift towards a task culture – perhaps a key development in an era of rapid change.

- There is often a strong stress in restructuring on **whole school leadership**. TLR posts are seen as a way of expanding leadership capacity and developing senior leaders. “**Like an assistant head**” or “**like a mini-headteacher**” was how a TLR post was described by some primary heads. (By way of a parallel development, it is interesting that one secondary school visited has created a large number of **assistant head posts** – subject leaders who each have whole school developments to manage which can change with shifting priorities.)
- **Collaborative working**. An increase in collaborative working in many schools has been a key feature of restructuring. Members of school teams, both senior leadership teams (SLT) – which now tend to be larger and include TLR posts – and teaching staff teams work together on whole-school projects and subject development. Collaborative working is seen to have significant advantages over staff carrying out responsibilities individually.
- Restructuring has been used to **organise staff into new teams** in many schools, a trend linked to the move to more collaborative working. Typically, teaching staff will be divided into three cross-curricular teams, perhaps led by a Deputy Head and two TLRs. Each team will be delegated a number of subjects, including a core subject, and whole-school projects such as Healthy Schools. Interviewees suggested staff in teams have more opportunities to lead, can support each other and contribute a wider range of ideas. Team leaders gain experience of leading staff and can delegate tasks. Teams (whether subject or leadership teams) tend to focus more on leadership themes of carrying forward the school vision and raising standards. Individual staff working alone are more likely to be confined to maintenance management tasks. One benefit mentioned in some schools was that teams were cross-phase, so KS1 or Early Years staff worked with KS2 teachers – this was said to help planning for progression and give a broader perspective. Some schools include teaching assistants or governors in their teams.
- There was some concern that the introduction of teams had **disempowered subject leaders** – one head pointed out that there has been a great deal of focus in recent years in building up subject leadership skills.
- Despite the innovations mentioned above, many schools chose to **assimilate** previous structures to TLR posts. Schools have between 0 and 5 TLR posts but by far the greatest number of schools have either two or three. TLRs held by key stage coordinators is one common model; another is leaders of core subjects – both very recognisable from before restructuring.
- Restructuring has brought **fresh staff enthusiasm and motivation** in some schools. This is partly because new TLR post-holders are often in their first promoted posts but long-serving staff often seemed re-energised. This may be because TLR posts have gained higher status through greater responsibility and involvement in whole-school leadership. In some cases, Heads report classroom teachers are more positive and purposeful. The key reason seems to be the new stress on team working. All feel ownership of school issues and feel their contribution is valued. One school had used a questionnaire from the local authority’s (LA’s) Creative Leadership Project and this provided evidence that staff confidence and positive attitudes had increased.
- Restructuring offered schools **the chance to review ways of working** and start afresh. “We needed a shake up” as one TLR post-holder said, “the old structure was ineffective.” A head said it was a “chance to get away from the old unchanging burden of work”. In this sense it was the opportunity to change that

mattered rather than whether TLRs are better or worse than management allowances.

- Two heads pointed out that the increased status and responsibilities of TLRs could be a threat to the traditional primary school **deputy head's role**. One said she took care to give her deputy worthwhile developmental opportunities.

Secondary schools.

(These findings were more clearly seen in secondary schools as a consequence of restructuring but may not be exclusive to them.)

- The appointment of a **large number of assistant heads** in one school is an interesting parallel to the flexible nature of TLR posts in some primary schools. The reason these subject leaders have been given assistant headships rather than TLR1 posts is so they can lead whole-school themes and contribute to whole-school leadership – much like their primary TLR colleagues. In both cases key responsibilities are likely to change with time.
- It was clearer in secondary schools than primaries that restructuring had taken place in **the context of wider workforce reform** – e.g. replacing an assistant head with a non-teaching HR manager; removing second in department posts, partly because of extra administrative support; learning mentors/pastoral supervisors taking the place of assistant year heads who were teachers.
- Reforming **the pastoral structure** was a common feature of restructuring across secondary schools.
 - Several schools have removed assistant year heads' posts as a job for teachers, partly because they were usually paid on management allowance 1 and schools could not afford to convert them all to higher paid TLRs and partly because non-teaching staff were now performing similar roles.
 - Some schools have also removed year heads' posts, replacing them with Key Stage leaders or staff managing two year groups together. (One head predicted that year heads would also be replaced by non-teaching staff in the future.)
 - Pastoral roles are now related much more closely to teaching and learning with year heads seen as learning managers or some similar title.
- The **curriculum structure** has been much less affected by change with a subject-based departmental model still evident in schools. Yet there are now fewer second-tier departmental posts such as second in department or subject key stage coordinator. There is a trend towards greater differentiation of subject leaders' pay, related to the curriculum time allocated to a subject and the relative importance of exam results.
- Both secondary schools visited had similar posts – called T&L advisers in one and advocates in the other - whose specific role was to support colleagues in **improving teaching and learning practice** across the school.
- Restructuring caused **staff anxieties** in both primary and secondary schools but this was perhaps stronger in secondary schools if the schools visited were representative. Deep resentment at nationally imposed change was reported and morale as suffering because there were now fewer opportunities for promotion. This level of feeling may be because there were proportionately so many more promoted posts in secondary schools so more staff had more to lose.

To see detailed case studies of the 11 schools visited, please visit the website:
<http://www.learningwithsouthglos.org/ChangeManagement/index.htm>

CASE STUDIES

ST MARY'S PRIMARY SCHOOL, YATE. (Head: Mary Baskerville)

Outline of structure:

- New Leadership Team: Head, Dep Head (KS1 and FS), TLR 2b (KS2 Coord), 2x TLR 2a, SENCO (on SEN allowance).
- First 3 posts above from previous team, last 3 posts are new.
- Previous team had, in addition to first 3 posts above, Literacy Coordinator, Maths Coordinator, SENCO (MA1) + 1 other MA1 (so one post saved)

Headteacher's perspective:

- The new team was put into place quickly, from Jan 06. Three of old SMT were leaving (2 early retirements and 1 promotion to headship) so there was an ideal opportunity to restructure and bring on new talent.
- The new Leadership Team is "enquiry based," focused on teaching and learning. The aim was to get away from static roles (though there are still KS leaders) and create greater flexibility and the capacity to take on enquiries as needed. Two examples: school part of LA development group so reps from SLT attend; school leads MFL network and TLR coordinates this.
- The new emphasis is on leading the school forward rather than carrying out maintenance tasks. The roles of Deputy Head and KS2 Coordinator have expanded – the KS2 Coordinator previously had basic management tasks, now has a leadership role for T&L, checking work programmes and scrutinising work. This long-serving post-holder has been re-motivated by the change. The Deputy Head's profile and status have been raised.
- The Head feels the previous structure was "stuck in aspic" from the past and prevented the promotion of good teachers. The Head encouraged good young teachers to apply for TLR posts who had not seen themselves in leadership roles.
- The change has had a great impact on staff. The Head believes all are now more purposeful. Because the leadership team have an enquiry based approach, all staff see themselves as learners.
- There has been a great impact on T&L. "Everything we do now is looking at the outcomes of learning."
- Recent Ofsted graded Leadership and Management as good – the Head believes restructuring contributed to this outcome and there is potential to become even better.
- The new structure has evolved in the light of experience:
 - Leadership Team members began by working separately on individual responsibilities – it has been decided it is more effective to work together and roles have been reviewed to move towards this;
 - Subject leaders now lead a team. There are teams for each subject (ten in all) and each teacher belongs to six teams. English and Maths teams meet through the year and the others as required. Initially, it was planned to have each team led by a TLR but it was felt better to develop staff by giving them opportunities to lead a team – now every teacher (except NQTs) leads a team. Each team includes a member of the Leadership Team.
- Workload – the Head feels there is no real difference. There is more for leaders to do but more time has been freed up to do it. PPA time gives "a feeling of space"

and has supported a collaborative ethos. Savings from restructuring has allowed occasional time for management work. PPA has increased the Head's workload because of the need to organise it.

- There are no plans to revise the structure. In the future the SENCO's role may be reviewed and a TLR post considered. Other changes may occur as staff change – e.g. maternity leave gives an opportunity for others to take on acting roles which is important for development.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (David Wells):

- The new subject team structure is working well because all staff have an input across the school, in both key stages. The new approach is time-consuming, however, and teams don't get through all they wish to.
- David's own role as KS2 Coordinator has changed. Work is now on a team basis with others to contribute ideas and take on tasks. "Two years ago there was just me." His role now has more leadership compared with management with more monitoring and an overview of all subjects. David is enjoying his new role.
- The Leadership Team working on tasks in pairs has been very successful – better than working alone or the team of six trying to decide everything.
- The new ethos is a combination of new staff and the new structure. The new Head's style is also important – giving opportunities to others and encouraging contributions. Her approach enables experienced staff to get involved in supporting and guiding others.
- Workload – the work is different but overall workload is about the same. There is more delegation so less direct work and less stress. But more time is taken up with meetings.
- Impact – standards are certainly improving (as seen in SATs results and scrutiny of pupils' work) but it's hard to be sure how much is down to the new structure. The culture has changed – staff share problems and work together. Staff are now willing to say when there are issues. There is much less of an "Us and Them" feeling.
- What changes would you make? More time to get into classes and observe; more time for subject teams to meet.

RIDGE JUNIOR SCHOOL. (Head: David Beeley)

Outline of structure:

- Head, DH, 2 TLRs and SENCO – implemented in Sept 06.
- Responsibilities linked to SEF. TLR posts created to reflect areas of the SEF
- Previous SLT was Head and DH only. Permanent MA post-holders left before Ofsted inspection in 2003. Head then used temporary allowances only – this left a clear field for restructuring
- Previous structure was subject based.

Headteacher's perspective:

- The Head got together with two other junior school heads to discuss possible new structures.
- New TLR posts were advertised internally and there was a competitive process
- There is no clear demarcation between new SLT posts – responsibilities are flexible and based on teamwork. TLRs are not "trapped in a subject" but able to

respond to current challenges. This works well generally but sometimes causes uncertainty.

- Such a flexible structure can be a threat to a traditional Deputy's role as there are others sharing leadership.
- The two TLR post-holders are leading the bid for Investors in People status – the Head sees this as good for their development, giving them a whole school perspective.
- New SLT post-holders are able to give colleagues tough messages where necessary – therefore these are not now coming from the Head alone. They also drive the Head with their enthusiasm. The new structure has meant a spreading of power and decision making. There are more people to influence staff and chase up work.
- The Head feels he has been released to play a more strategic role, especially handling data. He is able to feedback to staff on the progress of each child and ensure intervention strategies are in place.
- A key feature of the new SLT is an off-site afternoon meeting each month. This has led to a genuine sharing of ideas. There is an annual programme of key topics which is flexible. The Head regards the cost of supply cover as a worthwhile investment – SLT meetings under the old system were brief, tokenistic with no real discussion.
- The school has an effective SENCO (paid on the SEN scale) who is part-time and does not have a class. This is not currently an SLT post.
- New staff teams have been created. Each team is a cross section of staff so everyone is represented and all contribute to solving problems – everyone is committed. The Head feels the old subject-based system imposed a “hierarchy of subjects”. Team meetings have to have a clear agenda.
- Link with school improvement. From 2004 results went up dramatically and will rise again in 2007. The Head believes the new SLT has made the school far more focused on improvement because all are contributing as a team.
- Workload. The Head feels this has increased for SLT members – e.g. the Head covers some PPA time. But the TLR structure has reduced the Head's load in terms of responsibilities and tasks.
- Future development. There are no plans to change the structure which is working well. Changes will depend on staff leaving for promotion but the school has able people who can step into their shoes.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (Julie Spooner):

- Julie's new TLR job title is Personal Development and Well-being Manager, responsible for Schools for Health initiative, School Travel Plan and School Council. She has an overview of personal, social and moral education and of the progress of vulnerable learners. She also leads on attendance, bullying, discrimination and behaviour.
- Monitoring, evaluation and reporting are very important aspects of the post. Julie contributes to the SEF.
- Issues: SEF drove new job descriptions but this has created uncertainty as to who takes the lead. This has led to additional details added to job descriptions to clarify matters. The Deputy Head may feel parts of her role have been spread to others.
- The new system is better than the old – there is a greater capacity to tackle issues. TLRs came at the right time to reflect the direction the school was going in.

- Subject leadership is attached to the TLR role, not integral to it – i.e. could be changed.
- Impact: the school is benefiting. Accountability has increased – there are now four people monitoring and following up. There is greater teamwork and other staff apart from SLT have taken on leadership roles. (E.g. TLR is responsible for Gifted and Talented (G&T) but is supported in this role by a young teacher.) Too early to judge impact on standards but it seems likely to be positive as so much is being developed and improved.
- Restructuring has led to a clearer line management structure, linked to posts, not people.
- Workload. There is more to do but that's part of the new job. Leaders have higher expectations of themselves and come to the work fresh and purposefully. Julie enjoys her new role.

SHIELD ROAD PRIMARY SCHOOL. (Head: Nick Moss)

Outline of structure:

- Head, Dep Head, 2 TLRs and SENCO (on SEN allowance – has significant amount of SEN teaching). Implemented Jan 06.
- One TLR post currently leads on the creative curriculum and the other on formative assessment.
- The job descriptions of TLRs are tied closely to the School Development Plan. TLRs are responsible for leading major agreed priorities from the SDP. These can change from year to year.
- Old structure: Management allowances for SEN, English and ICT (Dep Head was Maths Coordinator). Now one TLR's responsibilities include English, the other's ICT.

Headteacher's perspective:

- The new structure has made a positive impact on the SLT – it has become more dynamic. The Head enhances SLT with other teachers when required.
- Reasons for new structure. Standards are a key priority for the school so the Head decided to take the TL of TLR literally and ensure this was the focus of staff development/meeting time. This would streamline the system and ensure subject leaders were not pulling in different directions.
- Staff were “downhearted” at first by restructuring. They felt the change was a blow to opportunities. They have now accepted the change and are getting on with their work. The main concerns are the Head's (see next two points):
- One drawback of restructuring has been that subject leaders have been to some extent disempowered. Yet prior to restructuring, the Head had invested time and energy into building up the effectiveness of subject leadership.
- TLR post-holders are requesting additional time to undertake tasks, more than was originally anticipated.
- The new TLR posts were open to any staff to apply but there was some reluctance because of concerns about workload. The existing management allowance holders were appointed.
- Structures are currently being discussed by SLT which is considering forming teams to take on subjects. This could mean deciding on a different subject priority each term and giving time to that.

- Impact. Practice has moved forward because there is a more focused link with development plan priorities. There is no discernable general effect on attainment but real gains were made in 2006 with boys' writing which the Head attributes to the new system enabling the school to focus on this. A TLR post-holder can take on the responsibility for making such a priority work.
- Workload. The Head feels his own workload has increased for the moment as he is still supporting the TLRs and continues to be very committed to developing T&L.
- No revisions are planned though there is the issue of whether a 1 f.e. school can afford 2 TLR posts.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (Jill Jenkins):

- Jill previously held a management allowance for English but her new TLR role is wider – she is responsible for T&L, initiating and monitoring change (currently leading on Assessment For Learning, looking at pupil self-assessment) as well as English.
- Jill applied for the TLR post because she wanted to maintain a management role. Like all staff she had doubts about workload (which was why few staff applied).
- Strengths of new structure: there is more collaborative work and cross-over between themes. The structure brings subjects and developments together in SLT. New membership of SLT has brought in fresh blood. The concept is that where one TLR leads a development, the other will monitor (but this is taking longer to implement than planned).
- Personal advantages: more interesting to get involved in other areas and team leadership is enjoyable. Non-contact time of 5 days per (new) term is useful.
- Disadvantages: workload has increased. TLR job description is too broad - there are no limits and you can be handed anything. (But on balance Jill feels she has gained from the change.)
- The School is considering whether to develop staff teams – 3 teams, led by DH and the two TLRs. But there is a concern that as subject leaders would lose non-contact time (and possibly motivation), less monitoring would go on.
- Impact – too soon to judge as changes are not yet embedded – but there should be a positive impact. DH and TLR now monitor pupils' work every 4 weeks (partly because Jill is doing NPQH). This is beneficial.
- Jill would prefer more TLR posts to spread workload and a more specific job description to protect workload. She thinks a middle management scale (below TLR) is needed to motivate colleagues and share leadership.

BROADWAY INFANTS SCHOOL (Head: Sue Tanner)

Outline of structure:

- New SLT: Head, Dep Head, Progress Leader (TLR 2a)
- School had Acting Head and Acting Dep Head from 2003 until Jan 06 when new Head took up her post. Previous structure had one management allowance for Foundation Stage but this had been unused since 2003 as post-holder was Acting Dep Head (now permanent DH).
- New Head inherited restructuring proposal for 1 TLR post but changed TLR's job description.

Headteacher's perspective:

- The Head was due to take up post in January 2006 so inherited a restructuring proposal. She was unhappy about the job description of the TLR post (literacy coordinator) so put forward to staff and governors a more flexible job description. She felt literacy was too narrow – other aspects of the school would need priority at times.
- The Head was also concerned that SEN was not properly recognised so included this in the new job description. Title “Progress Leader” covered all this – it was important not to tie it to a subject. (NB TLR is still literacy coordinator but it is not the core of her role.)
- TLR post was advertised externally. An internal appointment was made on merit.
- The TLR post also has line management responsibility for HLTAs and TAs and provides liaison between SLT and TAs
- It was important not to undermine the Deputy Head's role in the new focus on the Progress Leader and to give the Deputy good leadership experience. She is currently leading on assessment, data and monitoring. This means that TLR leads on T&L developments and DH monitors their impact.
- The Head sees the key difference with the old management allowance is that the TLR post is “firmly embedded in the leadership and management structure of the whole school”. Content of TLR's responsibilities will change – as with the Head and Deputy, priorities are tied to the SDP.
- Impact: TAs say they feel more valued and involved through the link with the TLR. HLTAs and TAs have team meetings led by the TLR and are given time to develop their specialisms.
- School is part of LA's Creative Leadership Project which is giving quality time together for the new team and the chance to work with experienced leaders on joint projects.
- Head's aim is to create a Professional Learning Community and the new SLT has enhanced this – now 3 people are proposing ideas, leading training and enthusing colleagues. This collegiate approach means the Head is also challenged.
- Too early to judge impact on standards but staff confidence and positive attitudes have certainly increased (confirmed by questionnaire from Creative Leadership Project).
- It has proved beneficial to remove subject leadership from core purpose of TLR post. Now staff perceive that subject leadership is for everyone to do, including the Head.
- Workload: Head has to take care TLR not overloaded. Originally no non-contact time allocated but it was clear it was needed – now TLR has 1 hour per 2 weeks. Both TLR and DH are enthusiastic to take on more but Head encourages them to delegate to teaching staff and TAs. Head also feels more able to delegate which helps her workload. At SIP's suggestion governors have now introduced Dedicated Headship Time.
- Future changes? Head is considering changing subject leadership (apart from literacy and numeracy) to generic headings such as “Knowledge and Understanding”. Similarly would like generic school policies and far fewer of them.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (Sarah Titley):

- As Progress Leader (TLR 2a), Sarah leads the “progress team” of HLTAs, TAs and a support assistant. This team focuses on the progress of the individual child.

- Sarah sees her core purpose as checking pupil progress and making progress happen where needed. E.g. the current focus is on G&T (following Ofsted and the SEF).
- The key challenge has been to create a “cross-curricular feel” – leading staff to think round the whole curriculum experience, not to be confined to a narrow subject focus and to consider alternative approaches.
- The role of literacy coordinator is valuable in enabling Sarah to lead staff meetings and experience whole-school leadership.
- She stressed the informality of discussions with staff. Staff share views openly and she believes the new structure has helped them feel more involved and able to contribute. Staff often come to her to ask for issues to be raised at SLT meetings.
- Sarah applied for the post because she is interested in whole school issues and wanted to try leadership. She is enjoying the role.
- Impact: the new post has raised awareness of the importance of progress. The link with support staff has been very important – they feel empowered and consulted. The change to TLRs has been welcomed – it gave the school a fresh start. “We needed a shake up.” The old structure was seen as ineffective. Staff seem more enthused.
- The structure is working well. There are three active leaders and “we’re getting things done.” Leaders are now **task focused rather than role focused**, looking at anything that needs doing. This has become the culture of the whole school.
- Impact on standards: too early to tell but more individual pupils have been identified and supported.
- Workload: there is a lot to do and it’s impossible to do it all. The post-holder would like to do more but finds herself at the limits of her time and energy. The newly arranged L&M time of one hour per fortnight should help. (NB The LA SENCO conference had good ideas on provision mapping which should cut down work.)
- What changes would you make? More time for research and access to consultancy – contact with “experts” who know about successful change.

COURTNEY PRIMARY SCHOOL (Head: Keith Ledbury)

Outline of structure:

- Head, Dep Head, Senior Teacher (on TLR 2b) – these form the SMT. Dep is SENCO and responsible for assessment, Senior Teacher looks after ICT, PHSE, NQTs and student teachers.
- Also 2 TLR 2a posts. One is KS1 and Maths Coordinator, the other is KS2 and Literacy Coordinator. Other teachers have responsibility for foundation subjects.
- New structure implemented in Sept 06.
- Old structure had several management allowances, including two MA2 posts, so new structure represents a significant saving, linked to falling rolls.

Headteacher’s perspective:

- Change was difficult but the Head felt fortunate that staff turnover created possibilities. Because of falling rolls redundancies had to be made in each of the three years before restructuring – three redundancies were of staff holding MAs and one MA2 retired.
- Two key factors underpinned decisions on restructuring – further falling rolls and moving to a new school. It was therefore important to develop a clear long term

strategy and to review the whole school structure, including TAs and Lunch Break Supervisors, as well as TLRs and SMT.

- The Head wanted to build in support for himself and the DH – a higher TLR post achieves this. She is recognised as the No 3 in the school. This post-holder held a MA2 before but her TLR role is different, being more that of an Assistant Head (NB she is doing NPQH).
- In the Head's view the old structure had people stuck in post doing very little beyond classroom teaching.
- The new structure is graduated with clear responsibilities. The Head aimed to build in succession planning with a clear route for people to move up internally. The structure includes the school's first HLTA and a TA has been appointed as Senior LBS.
- One teacher on MA1 was not appointed as a TLR. The Head encouraged her to apply for an AST post in Science with the LA, which she achieved. This suited her interests as she did not want to become a senior school leader so it was an ideal outcome.
- A part-time teacher (0.2) provides cover for all TLR non-contact time.
- Impact on improvement: the Head was concerned about the negative impact of restructuring, demotivating staff. This has not happened. SATs results have improved. The team is working well. (Underperformance of one post-holder needed addressing but this has been achieved.)
- Workload: huge for the Head while going through restructuring! TLRs have felt overloaded – the Head has now built in extra non-contact time. All work very hard but this is needed to maintain high standards.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (Theresa Gee):

- Theresa had been at the school for 9 years and held a 2nd management allowance. She was keen to apply for a TLR post to further her career (she is doing NPQH and wants to achieve Deputy Headship). Her new TLR (2b) role is different – much more whole school. E.g. includes carrying out performance management of both KS1 and KS2 staff and involvement in remodelling the curriculum.
- Advantages of restructuring: it came at the right time for the school when staff were leaving. (It has not been a contentious issue at this school.) There are fewer posts so they have more kudos and performance has been raised. TLR post-holders, as well as Head and Dep Head, play a role in monitoring and supporting staff performance. Succession planning is a positive aspect.
- Disadvantages: fewer posts so this may limit future opportunities for staff (own TLR 2b post may not last in the future because of financial pressures).
- Workload: Because there are fewer TLRs, they have to work harder (but performance is higher too). Personally, post -holder sees work as different rather than more.
- Impact: seen as significant. There is greater staff accountability with a strong focus on what is being delivered for children.

ST AUGUSTINE'S RC VA PRIMARY SCHOOL (Head: Pete Upton)

Outline of structure:

- Old structure – Head, Dep Head (i/c KS2), and 3 MA1 posts: KS1 Coordinator, SENCO and Standards and Assessment Coordinator. (This structure evolved over last 9 years as school grew from c. 200 to over 300 on roll.)

- Proposed model for restructuring: Head, DH, Standards and Assessment Coordinator (on MA2) and 3 MA1 posts – SENCO, KS1 and KS2 Coordinators. This structure was introduced as a trial before TLRs, using temporary management allowances.
- Final TLR structure: Head, DH and Standards and Assessment Coordinator (TLR 2b) + 2 TLR 2a posts – one for Learning, including SENCO role (and filled by previous SENCO) and one for Teaching (the latter post delayed until Jan 07).

Headteacher's perspective:

- Restructuring provided the opportunity to think carefully and imaginatively. It also gave the opportunity for a new member of staff to fast track her career development. She was appointed in Sept 06, was developing very well and got the TLR post for Teaching.
- Job descriptions were deliberately kept general. E.g. the TLR for Teaching has a leadership brief to focus on key areas emerging from Ofsted, the SEF or the school development plan. On the management side she looks after supply staff. Current focus is on achieving consistency, including expectations of supply teachers and consistency in marking, display etc. (Ofsted in 2006 commented on consistency issues so the new structure has enabled the school to address them.) ICT will be the next priority.
- The other TLR for Learning has broadened her role well beyond that of SENCO, to include G&T and behaviour issues (the school now has a positive behaviour club). So the TLR post has strengthened learning.
- NB it is clearly acknowledged that TLR post-holders can only deal with some areas at a time because of workload.
- Impact: too early to be sure but feedback from supply staff suggests clear improvement – the TLR greets them, briefs them on the class and individuals and debriefs them at the end of the day. TLRs are members of SMT so are developing a whole school perspective.
- Subject leadership is distributed among the whole staff, including SMT (core subjects = one per teacher, foundation subjects = two per teacher). So subject leadership is not part of a paid allowance.
- Workload: slightly better for the Head and DH because of fewer concerns about supply staff and broadening of TLR's roles. Hours have increased (because of more discussion with post-holders) but load has decreased. TLR workload has increased compared with management allowances because there are more tasks to do such as briefing supply staff.
- Non-contact time. The Chair of Governors returned from an LA briefing on the importance of Dedicated Headship Time and felt strongly the Head ought to take it. So the Head began to take one day a fortnight at home (in practice this was taken only once in the Autumn Term). The Deputy Head has 0.5 days a week + PPA, TLRs have PPA time.
- There are no plans to change the structure which is proving to be exactly right for the school.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (Kee Ingar):

- Kee's job description enables her to focus on key priorities. It's good to have a varying focus every year which shifts with the school's priorities. Kee shares the coordination of literacy with an infant teacher and finds this also links with her current focus of seeking consistency.

- She has found taking on responsibility early in her career not to be a problem and staff have responded well. This is helped by the school's ethos which is open to new approaches and where people's strengths are recognised and encouraged.
- Strengths of new structure: SMT is larger so there is better cover if the Head and/or Deputy are absent. There are more to share responsibility. New roles are working well.
- Weaknesses: unsure as yet but it is difficult to decide priorities and therefore postpone other issues – e.g. ICT has had to be postponed as a priority.
- Impact on standards: this is positive. E.g. staff have responded positively to INSET and new ideas on literacy.
- Workload: there are more meetings and post-holder has time each day with supply teachers. But she feels workload is under control.

RAYSFIELD INFANTS SCHOOL (Head: Alison Wood)

Outline of structure:

- New structure: Head, Dep Head, 2xTLR (2a) (implemented April 06)
- One TLR is responsible for literacy, early years, PHSE and PE, the other for numeracy, ICT and Play. Dep Head coordinates DT and Science.
- Old structure: Head, Dep Head and 2 management allowances – one for literacy and one for numeracy and ICT
- New structure has same post-holders and is essentially an assimilation model, introduced by previous Head (new Head in post from Sept 06.)

Headteacher's perspective:

- Head is concerned that TLRs are permanent. She would rather give temporary allowances and move them around because priorities change and there is a need to reward people when they are needed to lead developments.
- One TLR is currently on maternity leave. The SENCO has stepped in to cover this post and the Head regards this as an excellent development opportunity and would want this teacher's development to continue after this temporary post ends (she has started the NCSL Leadership Pathways course and is part of an LA project on problem solving).
- Previous Head was keen to maintain the structure in the face of falling rolls – which meant no money for CPD or development time. The new Head is earning consultancy fees and these are being fed back into the school to provide leaders with time for planning and coordination. The Head feels strongly that anyone undertaking a role must have time to do it and know clearly what is expected of them. (Ofsted, which graded the school as outstanding, commented on how every member of staff knows what their role is and what the school's purpose and direction is.)
- Time allocated: TLRs have 0.5 days every 3 weeks. Every so often they get an afternoon in common for joint planning. Next year the budget will be tighter – the Dep head will have 0.5 days a week and the TLRs will be able to bid for this time.
- Head has been coaching the TLRs to develop a leadership approach. The school's tradition has been that the Head leads everything and the TLRs have been operating as coordinators, managing rather than leading – they need more empowerment.
- Other teaching staff coordinate the subjects not covered by SMT.

- What would the Head do differently? The new Head would not have assimilated the old structure but would have looked to create vacancies and invite applications. She wants more distributed leadership so TLRs become genuine team leaders, with a whole school perspective – currently the Head leads all teams.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (Chris Stewart):

- A great deal of discussion took place in the school in the run up to restructuring. It was decided to transfer responsibilities straight from management allowances to TLRs as it was felt the existing MA posts met the TLR criteria.
- The TLR roles have expanded with the new Head and time has been allocated for this – e.g. work sampling, pupil tracking, monitoring action plans.
- Impact of new structure: this has been positive (just look at Ofsted!). Staff are now action focused – “we are much more focused on what needs to be done and how to do it.” Skills of analysing and using data have improved.
- Workload has increased because there is more going on – e.g. Chris is involved in the PE primary link initiative and all national strategies are changing.

CHARFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL (Head: Stefan Frontcsak)

Outline of structure:

- Head (ECM, Ex Schools), Dep Head (Data, AFL, English,), TLR 2a (Arts + Maths), TLR 2a (Science)
- Staff work in 3 teams, one led by the Deputy Head, the others by the TLRs. Each team looks after a number of subjects and whole-school strands.
- Teams will have governor and teaching assistant representatives.

Headteacher's perspective:

- Head saw restructuring as an opportunity to get away from the “old, unchanging burden of work”.
- Restructuring came at a good time – with several staff changes and new build in 2004. Also Ofsted had said KS1 needed some improvement, particularly in writing. “Being under pressure makes you review carefully the resources you have.”
- Literacy, although improving, was lagging behind Maths and Science in SATs percentile ranking. So the TLR opportunity was a question of how to kick start new developments in literacy and other areas
- The initial plan was to create a TLR post to manage the curriculum. But feedback from staff was that workload would be too heavy so governors accepted the Head's plan to create two TLR posts, one responsible for Arts and the other for Sciences.
- Three teams were created, led by the Deputy Head and the two TLRs. The Head's aim was to take the burden away from a single post-holder, sharing expertise and workload across the team and achieving a consistency of approach. An action plan for each team will be decided each new term so teams can respond to priorities.
- The existing management allowance holder took one TLR post but with different responsibilities. No-one came forward for the other TLR until Term 4, 06/07, when an appointment was made. This has held up the introduction of the team structure.

- The TLRs have been briefed on the expectations of leadership – they are essentially team leaders rather than subject coordinators. This means leadership rather than merely management – taking on issues such as aims, delegation and monitoring. TLRs have clear job descriptions which have built into them that responsibilities may change from year to year. They have a higher profile and membership of SLT – an excellent stepping stone to promotion.
- The Head sees the new TLR posts as like “mini-headships” and hopes they will encourage more to go for senior leadership.
- It is too soon to judge the impact on school improvement but it is likely to be considerable. The new TLR is a pace-setter who brings a fresh input. The school has a wider focus with three priorities running at the same time. Priorities are agreed by the team, generating a feeling of ownership. The school is now taking its own agenda forward rather than one externally imposed. The school was recently judged by Ofsted as good with outstanding features – with the new structure the aim is to be outstanding.
- The Head plans to “gallery” the progress of each team on a board in the staff room. At the end of term staff meeting each team will feedback on its work.
- Workload is probably greater for TLRs but they are happy with this (they have a higher profile and SLT membership). They can delegate work to the team and reduce workload. The Head’s and Deputy Head’s workload should improve as there are more people to lead on key priorities.
- First priorities are to review English and Maths to match the new national strategies which allow more flexibility and creativity – this is exactly in line with the spirit of the new structure so timing has worked out well.

TLR Post-holder’s perspective (Jess Gainer-Lane):

- Jess is responsible for Science, PHSE, RE, Healthy Schools, ICT software, PE (she stressed the link to science and health) and Humanities.
- She was unsure about applying initially. What changed her mind was covering for the Dep Head in her absence, including attending SLT and looking at assessment issues. She enjoyed this experience and it led her to apply for the TLR post. She is now keen to move on to Deputy Headship.
- Previously individual subject leaders were all trying to further their own initiatives and taking on the whole workload for the subject. Now, with three teams, work will be prioritised and workload shared. Work will be more focused with a clear end in view which can be monitored at the end of each term. This also means working with staff you would not normally work with, which Jess sees as beneficial.
- Jess sees the challenges as working with a range of people, getting long-serving staff to change, selling the priorities and getting the team to agree.
- Workload: she feels this will be less as she currently looks after a lot of areas alone but will be able to share work with the team. The stress will be less on management and more on leadership.
- The new structure is better for the school. It is more focused and will enable more flexibility and a more topic-based approach. It will be beneficial to have TA and governor input too.

CONISTON PRIMARY SCHOOL (Head: Bob Callicott)

Outline of structure:

- New structure: Head, Dep Head, three team leaders (two on TLR 2a, one, who is also KS1 leader, on 2b), SENCO (TLR 2a). In place Jan 06. N.o.r. now 232.

- Previous structure: SLT - Head, Dep Head, Head of Nursery (MA2 – including one protected point), Head of Infants (MA2). Also had four MA1 posts for literacy, numeracy, science and SENCO. N.o.r. then 265 + 52 in nursery.
- Numeracy Coordinator took early retirement, so school reduced by one MA post. Other MA holders gained TLR posts.

Headteacher's perspective:

- Head had set up a School Change Team to consider PPA and used this to discuss restructuring. He also had a series of meetings with all staff and governors. Once the structure was agreed, the remaining MA holders (following retirements) were transferred to TLR posts with new job descriptions.
- Chief aim was to shift to working in teams so that expertise was not confined to one person who then might leave. The school was already moving in this direction so the arrival of TLRs was opportune. Each of the three teams has two or three staff in addition to the team leader. Each team looks after a core subject and a number of foundation subjects. There is a governor for each core subject and they meet regularly with team leaders.
- The Dep Head leads the team leaders, meets regularly with each team and agrees targets for each subject. Job descriptions have altered so that team leaders' priorities change from year to year – all team members have an input into deciding these priorities. A TLR's job description is to lead a team so the Head has flexibility to shift team leaders and subjects around.
- INSET days and staff meetings have been restructured to give teams time to meet.
- After initial uncertainty, the system is working well. There is greater collaboration among staff and particularly more cross-phase cooperation so all staff have an insight into pupil progress right through the age range. Staff have greater ownership of developments. The three new team leaders have developed new skills of team leadership and data analysis. Leading a staff meeting is seen as less threatening as the team now does it together.
- Ofsted commented: "A commitment to everyone being involved in decision making has built a strong staff team to move the school forward."
- Workload. The Deputy Head's workload has decreased because before she met with each subject coordinator one by one – now she meets only the three team leaders. New team leaders have had worries about increased work but they have learned to delegate and this is now working. Non-contact time is allocated to each team and they decide how to use it – for monitoring etc. So the overall impact on workload has been neutral.
- Disadvantages? No one person is now focusing on a subject so possibly depth of knowledge is less – but the Head feels the benefits of sharing outweigh this.
- To form teams the Head sent questionnaires to all staff to ask which subjects they wanted to be involved in. He ensured each KS was represented in each team. Some adjustments have been made as new staff start.
- Staff response has been mainly positive after initial apprehension. The main area of concern was gaining delegation skills.
- Impact on standards. The Head believes restructuring has contributed to the school's improving standards. Staff have a greater understanding of progression and observation is more focused.
- The Head plans no changes to the leadership model – he believes it is best for the school. He had not realised other schools were thinking on similar lines.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (Anita Starfield):

- Anita holds a TLR 2b post as Head of Infants and team leader. Her team of 3 other staff currently looks after literacy, RE, PSHE and history.
- Anita was literacy coordinator previously and takes a lead with literacy now. She feels the other teams are currently more collaborative than hers but this will develop as staff change.
- The change to the new system went well as the school has a good collaborative culture and staff were prepared to try a new way of working.
- It works well for teams to have staff from each phase as they can share expertise and “bat ideas off each other”.
- Teams can be creative about the use of non-contact time – e.g. Anita has worked collaboratively with a colleague to monitor literacy. This flexible use of non-contact time for monitoring is having a very good impact.
- Workload – no change. Meetings are held in INSET or curriculum time. The Deputy Head manages the system and plans out each team's commitment to spread the load. “I don't think anyone here feels overloaded by the TLR system.”
- Weaknesses? Maternity leave means shifting team membership – one of the team seems to change every few months which sometimes puts developments on hold. The budget won't allow a teacher to attend training in a subject which is in the remit of another team.
- An impact on standards seems likely. When leading a staff meeting “you know you have the team behind you” – there is someone from each key stage supporting the team leader with first-hand knowledge of their age group. Every team has someone doing data-analysis – this has an impact on standards. On INSET days, while one looks at data, other team members monitor sample books.
- Anita feels that workload could be spread better across the year, particularly with data collection and work sampling. She suggested the Deputy Head and team leaders meet to map planned activities across the year.

THE RIDINGS HIGH SCHOOL (Head: Rob Gibson)

Outline of structure:

- Senior Management Board: Head, 2 Dep Heads, 6 Ass't Heads, Bursar.
- From Sept 07 SMB will reduce by one as Senior Dep Head is retiring. School has developed policy of succession planning – so it is likely 2nd Dep Head will become Senior Deputy and Ass't Head become 2nd Dep Head.
- Retiring Deputy's post will be replaced by HR Manager, acknowledging that senior leaders have admin and personnel issues as part of their work. The school has set up an HR department.
- School now has 4 faculties (reduced from 6) and several departments. Faculties are the three core subjects + ICT.
- Departments are divided into “specialist” departments and others. Specialist departments are those of particular significance to the school – technology (the school's specialism), vocational education, international education (which runs the International Baccalaureate) and Modern Foreign Languages (MFL). The school has International School status.
- Each faculty and specialist department has a head, deputy and a T&L Coordinator, other departments have a head of department only.

- The school also has 3 T&L advisers, outside subject areas and coordinated by an Assistant Head, who carry out lesson observations and provide feedback. They provide support to all departments.
- English, Maths and Science also have a TLR post relating to Learning Support.
- The previous pastoral structure has been assimilated, with head and assistant head of each year group.
- The school now has 3 faculty administrators whose work averages out over the year as 40% cover, 40% administration and 20% invigilation.
- The new structure was fully in place by Sept 2006.

Headteacher's and Senior Deputy Head's perspective:

- The current structure has grown from the Futures thinking the Head led the school through in 2003. Restructuring presented an opportunity to move this vision forward.
- The aim was to achieve a rational, open structure. This meant that the old structure could not be replicated as it was not rational. Examining the curriculum made clear the major role of core subjects and the link between specific subjects and the school's vision. The number of TLR posts in each faculty or dept followed rationally from this analysis.
- The structure was designed to answer the Ofsted question "How do you know?" and to deliver school improvement. The Head saw this as "fundamental".
- Appointments were made by moving staff across from management allowance posts where there was a close match. Other posts were advertised internally. The biggest change was in faculties – e.g. in Science, 2 MA1 posts for KS3 and KS4 were replaced by one T&L consultant.
- All old MA1 posts for post-16 subjects were removed. In all, 17 or 18 posts were removed from the old structure.
- It has been made clear to staff that TLR post-holders are accountable for the performance of students and the development of colleagues – clearly more so than before.
- Staff generally responded well to restructuring. Most accept the climate has changed (e.g. the use of data and consequent accountability). Many could see that the use of MA1 posts in the school was inequitable. Staff appreciated that the changes were all openly discussed.
- However, the Head and Senior Deputy Head were strongly of the view that staff morale has fallen as a result of national workforce reform as a whole – e.g. the removal of MA1 posts caused staff resentment. The school regularly surveys the views of staff, students and parents so has clear evidence of lower morale – staff are typically positive about the school but more negative about their own job.
- The Head's overriding concern was that the reduction of promoted posts has limited professional progression opportunities for teachers and that fewer opportunities means lower morale.
- The Head and Senior Deputy Head were also of the view that workforce reform has made it more difficult to manage schools. It has undermined leadership, putting extra hurdles in the way of leaders who are wary about asking staff to take on tasks. For their part, teachers have become more job-focused, more likely to say "that's not my job". The Head sees this as a less professional attitude.
- Other issues include the Upper Pay Spine, where schools have had to pick up a national mess, the pressure of successive waves of innovation, the "no detriment" clause - which penalises schools that have been generous with staff non-contact time in the past - and the lack of HLTA posts in secondary schools.

- Workload. It was felt that the workload of senior leaders has increased and there are greater expectations of Year Heads and their deputies because of their new roles, with an increasing focus on supporting student learning.
- There are no plans to revise the structure – it was carefully developed and needs to bed in – but it will probably need reviewing after 3 years. The pastoral structure in particular may need to be re-examined.

TLR Post-holder's perspective (Natalie Coad):

- Natalie's previous post was a management allowance 1, responsible for KS3 MFL (she also held a separate MA1 as Ass't Year Head). Her new post is as Deputy Head of MFL department / Head of French on TLR 2c. She was interested in the T&L Adviser post as she has gained AST status but decided to apply for the Deputy Head of Dept post as she wanted to help turn the department round. Four staff applied for this post.
- Restructuring was initially daunting. Natalie was in her 5th year of teaching and felt she was doing well so was concerned about the fate of her two MA posts. She could see her role in her faculty had disappeared. Many staff were equally apprehensive but the change has turned out for most to be much better than expected. A small number of staff have found it difficult to come to terms with restructuring.
- There was relief among staff that the pastoral system was being kept as it was.
- The change process was handled very well by SMT.
- Natalie believes that workforce reform and the removal of admin tasks made restructuring inevitable.
- She feels her new role is similar to the old but she is much more accountable. The MFL dept was very pleased to emerge as a "specialist department" and now has more admin support. She believes the new structure is generally working well.
- Accountability is now much more evident. It is now clear to staff that "we can and should impact on all pupils". Strategies are being put in place to support key groups of pupils and clear targets are being set. Natalie is leading work on 6 targets – e.g. raising the achievement of those in Y9 with low value-added ratings. There is now a greater stress on good practice in the classroom.
- Workload. The post-holder feels she has taken on more responsibility but sees this as something she wanted for career development. She spends more time supporting other teachers – e.g. team teaching or dealing with behaviour issues – but feels this is the job of a deputy head of department and not specifically because she is a TLR.

SIR BERNARD LOVELL SCHOOL (Head: David Turrell)

Outline of structure:

- Restructuring introduced a large number of new Assistant Headships – 12 posts, paid on Leadership Spine range 7-11, still based in the 3 learning domains. These are replacing the previous Curriculum Director posts paid on Leadership Spine point 15.
- Previous structure created 8 years ago. The school was organised in 3 "domains" of learning, each led by a Curriculum Director (Assistant Head) + a fourth Curriculum Director for e-learning. The new structure retains the domains and the new Assistant Heads are based in a domain or in e-learning.

- Each new Assistant Head is responsible for a learning area and has a whole school responsibility – e.g. the Head of Maths is responsible for data across the school, the Head of Science leads Assessment for Learning and the Head of English looks after literacy and G&T. (The whole school responsibility is not fixed and is likely to change roughly every two years.)
- The Senior Leadership Group consists of the Head, one Deputy (the other is currently on secondment to TDA), Senior Assistant Heads (pt 15) and Assistant Heads (pts 7-11)
- Within the subject faculties led by Assistant Heads, there are TLR posts for KS3 and KS4.
- Pastoral structure: Year Coordinators (Year Heads) have been retained but Assistant Year Head posts are being phased out and being replaced by non-teaching admin assistants/mentors. The pastoral structure is under review.

Headteacher's perspective:

- The Head stressed that the school's context was important in understanding the leadership structure adopted. He spends 2 days a week working with the Kingswood 14-19 partnership (involving 6 local secondary schools). The school is a national 14-19 Pathfinder. These and other initiatives bring in additional funding and it is a key part of the Head's philosophy that this funding is used to create leadership capacity in the school.
- Because of the various initiatives in which the school is involved, the new structure looks bigger than it really is. A number of staff are involved in the Kingswood Partnership or other schemes (e.g. the assistant head for e-learning works only 1 day a week in school and 4 days a week for the Partnership; see the post-holder's perspective below for another example).
- The Head believes a school's organisation should reflect its approach to learning – hence the creation of learning domains.
- In the two years leading up to restructuring, much work had been done in school to develop distributed leadership – the creation of new Assistant Head posts is seen as a logical culmination of this. David Hargreaves' book, "Personalising Learning" informed the new whole-school roles.
- The model adopted by governors was only one of a number of models proposed for discussion. It was favoured by the Head as it promoted distributed leadership. The Head said it was not initially supported by the professional associations and some post-holders.
- Of the twelve assistant headships, five were advertised nationally and many internal staff applied. A mix of internal and external applicants were appointed – in the case of internal staff, because they were the best. Several staff were leaving, creating vacancies that could be advertised.
- The Head tried wherever possible and appropriate to move staff on management allowances across to TLR posts. Only three MA holders did not get TLRs – and two of these have moved on or retired.
- The Head sees the new structure as effective but needing time to develop. The Leadership Group meets weekly with an agenda that alternates between business items one week and development issues the next. Members lead on the areas for which they are responsible and present papers to the meeting. Residential have proved successful in encouraging a great sense of strong leadership.
- The Head stressed the new system is evolving. He has explained the vision to staff and stressed to them that the structure is being phased in.

- The chosen range for assistant heads of points 7-11 in the leadership spine is proving tight in giving progression for staff who were on high management allowances. The range 8-12 may be used in future.
- A new Assistant Head is taking over responsibility for Human Resources. The Head feels it is better that a teacher leads this – with experience of teaching and learning giving professional insight in leading CPD and increased credibility with staff.
- It was decided to retain Year Coordinator (Year Head) roles to provide some stability, bearing in mind all the other changes. Non-teaching admin assistants / learning mentors are being phased in as staff leave to replace assistant year heads.
- The Head can foresee the possibility of Year Coordinators also being non-teaching staff, with senior leaders having oversight as KS3 and 14-19 coordinators. Another possibility is changing the year system to a course tutor system (as in FE) for the 14-19 age range, linked to the introduction of new diplomas, with Year Coordinators looking after KS3.
- The structure is designed to be cost-neutral by the end of three years – but should add greater value. Future changes might include reducing to one Deputy Head or one fewer senior Assistant Heads. The Head believes that the ability to change and evolve the structure is very helpful.
- Workload – there has been no increase as a direct result of restructuring. The additional funds the school attracts (e.g. from the government) will be used to provide more non-contact time for Assistant Heads and additional admin support. This money will also be used to build intellectual and emotional capacity through CPD and school based enquiry groups. Many staff work as “advocates,” leading professional enquiry, and they will be given additional time for their work.

Assistant Head’s perspective (Barbara Wood):

- Barbara is an Assistant Head responsible for professional learning and school based enquiry in the new structure. She is about to take on responsibility for HR and will be Director of Professional Learning and HR. She also manages the Training School (school-based teacher training). Her previous post was Curriculum Leader for English and she was also seconded for one day a week to the International Learning Centre based at the school to do research work
- Barbara had been considering applying for promoted posts in other schools so was not keen to take on the assistant headship for English in the new structure – she wanted a change. Barbara was excited by the new post for professional learning and applied, along with several others, in response to an internal advertisement.
- Process – the Head took a lot of time to explain and consult and made it clear he was happy to talk to any individuals. But staff were worried, especially about the fate of their own jobs. It took a while for staff to understand the concept of distributed leadership and the large number of assistant heads but once the structure became clear they were more reassured.
- Barbara feels the new system is generally working well. She enjoys being part of the Leadership Group, dealing with the bigger picture. There is great camaraderie and sense of purpose which creates a dynamic, exciting atmosphere. She sees SBL as an innovative school which constantly creates opportunities and new challenges for staff.
- Strengths of the new structure – having so many subject leaders on the Leadership Group means those at subject level are involved in key decisions. This greatly improves communication and a sense of ownership of key

developments. Staff have a wide choice of whom to talk to, knowing issues will be taken back to the Leadership Group.

- Drawbacks – Assistant Heads need more non-contact time to manage a subject and a whole school role. The loss of MA1 posts may limit opportunities for staff (the school's Advocate roles offer some development and are given time but no pay.)
- Workload – probably a greater workload for TLRs who are KS3 and KS4 leaders within faculties, compared to their previous roles as second in departments. This is because their subject leaders now also have whole school roles.
- Impact on standards – there is now a much clearer focus on T&L. There are fewer posts so greater consistency. Expectations are clearer. There is no evidence as yet of a direct link between restructuring and standards.
- Barbara would not make any key changes – she feels the new structure is evolving and needs to bed in. Flexibility is needed with whole-school responsibilities. The school needs to find out what students think. She would recommend the SBL model and believes if schools want to break new ground with T&L, this is the route to take.