



Broadwaters Inclusive Learning Centre
Adams Road
N17 6HW

16th May 2018

Dear Marilyn,

RE: Leadership Structure Consultation

The NEU - NUT section membership strongly opposes the proposal on the following grounds:

All our members are committed to the BILC vision, but do not believe that the proposed restructure is the way to realise this vision. No costing exists for the proposal at all and there have been no reassurances about funding going forward. We believe this could be a very costly error in a time of considerable, cumulative central government funding cuts and other financial challenges for schools. It is difficult to see how this proposal would be wise in this financial climate. We would also be very concerned about the financial stability of the BILC in the future with a cost which we believe to be huge but which in any case the governors remain silent about, and as such members feel that there could be detriment to their terms and conditions or job security in the future should the appointment trigger the need for a restructure.

We have not been given any reassurance that terms and conditions, and job security, will not be affected. There is indeed the strong possibility that if the SLT is restructured, that staff restructuring will follow. This is alluded to in the letter from the Willow's Senior Leadership to staff and parents on the 11th of May where they state; *"It is not necessarily the case that the proposal would cost more. This totally depends on the structure placed underneath the Executive Headteacher and the salary scales given to all posts."* I'm sure you can understand why this is seen as a direct threat to staff currently undertaking those roles and their salary in the future. This is exacerbated by the number of staff in The Brook in interim positions, or on fixed-term contracts who are most likely to be adversely affected by the financial implication of the creation of an executive Headteacher role given the inherent insecurity of their contractual status. Members in The Brook feel so strongly about this that they recently voted to move to an indicative ballot for industrial action over the issue of potential detriment to their Terms and Conditions.

Members feel that there are other, more prudent, more efficient, less expensive, and more inclusive ways to achieve the aims of the federated governing body as set out in the consultation document. Members believe that inclusion and participation for all stakeholders could be improved by developing and refining the current structure. Indeed, if the BILC can afford to expand the cost of its senior leadership group then it has the money for teaching time release for co-planning or assessment between settings, fixed term TLR3 projects to improve inclusion,



Haringey Teachers' Association

T: 020 8489 4525 ■ M: 07510 964 608 ■ E: edharlow@haringeynut.org.uk

provide high quality CPD for staff, allow exchanges between settings so that staff can experience mainstream or special sector teaching and learning. This is alluded to in point iii on the consultation paper: "Enable staff in both the schools to develop their skills and expertise to the benefit of the pupils, families and the community." The funding available for these activities for all staff would be hugely diminished under the proposed structure. Members feel that there is no reason that a renewed focus on inclusion between the schools couldn't be incorporated into both schools' development plans and also be built into performance appraisal targets for all senior leaders across the campus. Had the governing body consulted the staff rather than a consultant on how best to develop all aspects of inclusion, strengthen the leadership and enable staff in both schools to develop their skills, it seems clear the suggestions would have differed significantly from that in the consultant's report.

The local authority has no policy that justifies the use of promotion and additional remuneration for its own sake in a time of shrinking budgets and potentially falling rolls. The only policy that currently exists is one which covers amalgamation of Infant and junior schools when the headship of one or other of the schools falls vacant. In this case, governors must consider the issue of amalgamation but they are free to reject the idea. However, this policy is clearly intended to provide a financially prudent option to schools and is not intended for the creation of additional layers of unnecessary school management. Council policy favours JMIs and the decision to amalgamate was taken long ago when the Willow was Broadwater Farm Infants and Juniors.

It has been greatly concerning that the Senior Leadership team of The Willow has seen fit to write to staff and parents during the consultation period espousing the benefits of the proposal. The letter is framed as additional information that had not been provided to stakeholders at the outset of the consultation in order to inform opinion. However, it is clear that the intention of the letter is to promote the Executive Headship model and to argue that the stated aims of the Governing Body cannot be met under the current structure: *"if the true purpose of Broadwaters is to be outstandingly inclusive, this would be very difficult to achieve without that overall strategic leadership."* I'm sure you would agree that this promulgation, from senior staff who could easily be demonstrated to have a potential conflict of interest in this process, was injudicious.

In conclusion, members feel that the governors' proposals as they stand deliver nothing that is not already being delivered, or that could not be delivered under the current structure.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Ed Harlow", written in a cursive style.

Ed Harlow
Branch Secretary