

The Blueprint for Education 2012-17 – Supplementary Information and Issues Summary

This paper came about because the Parent Councils of the Junior High Schools got together and agreed to respond to an SIC Councillor's invitation to get to grips with the figures and make alternative suggestions to the Blueprint. The paper describes some significant concerns with the Blueprint and then describes a number of alternatives. The necessity to reduce education spending in Shetland is fully acknowledged – this document is *not* about pleading a special case for education.

Concerns include:

- Shetland will have the **highest rates of halls of residence usage in Scotland**. The current cost per pupil per year of the Janet Courtney Hall is **£18,700**.
- **Shetland** will have the **longest secondary school travel times in Scotland**.
- Combining Scotland's highest travel times and hostel rates is a clear sign that Shetland post-Blueprint will simply **not have enough secondary schools**.
- The Blueprint does not discuss or cost the future of **education in the North isles**. Following through the Blueprint's contention that all the other Junior Highs are deemed too small to be viable, Mid Yell School will either have to close, or be upgraded to a High School. If it closes, where will the pupils go, as the Anderson will by then be full? The cost of this needs to be added to the Blueprint costs.
- The Anderson will become **one of the largest schools in Scotland (in the top 11%)**. There can be a new Anderson building without needing to fill it with over 1,200 pupils.
- The Blueprint is **financially very risky** – it is unlikely that all the savings will be realised.

Alternatives include:

- **Apply existing Scottish formulas to current staffing of all schools. (This paper shows how almost every school in Shetland was over-staffed according to such a formula.) Benchmark** all spending against other local authorities. For secondary schools this would potentially save about £1.8 million from 2011/12 staffing levels; more when primary schools are included.
- Establish a **directly-funded, federated Junior High School of Shetland** with one head and 5 (or 6) sites. Give it a post-cuts budget – i.e. 81% of the present budget for those schools. This would give an institutional structure to the **hub and spoke model** and for the **creative use of IT**.
- **Set reasonable targets for Additional and Special Needs spending**. Savings of £1.5 million would still leave Shetland as a very high spender in this area.

Do not proceed with the school closure consultations. These are not a level playing field – they start with a presumption of closure. We do not believe that the Blueprint makes a financial or educational case for the decimation of Junior High Schools; we do believe that there are attractive and viable alternatives that recognise the geographical realities of Shetland.

The Blueprint for Education 2012-17 – Supplementary Information and Issues

Introduction

The Blueprint for Education 2012-17 is an extremely radical document which recommends the almost complete dismantling of the network of Junior High Schools in Shetland. Such a far-reaching recommendation should be supported by a comprehensive analysis of the education system and the choices available.

This document contributes to the overall analysis of education in Shetland by providing some facts and alternatives not considered in the Blueprint. It is not a comprehensive document – in particular it concentrates on secondary, not primary, education. The necessity to reduce education spending in Shetland is fully acknowledged – this document is *not* about pleading a special case for education.

This paper came about because the chairs of the Parent Councils of the Junior High Schools got together and agreed to respond to an SIC Councillor's invitation to get to grips with the figures and make alternative suggestions. Drafts of the paper have been shown to educationalists and parent groups in Shetland and Scotland for fact-checking and critical feedback.

Sources and explanations are given for all the data quoted. In this way we hope to be transparent about the numbers we use – there may be mistakes, but the figures have been compiled with a great deal of care.

The paper is organized into **eight facts about the Blueprint for Education**. It then considers viable, affordable alternatives to the Blueprint.

- 1. If the Blueprint is implemented, Shetland will have the highest travel times and hostelling rates in Scotland; one exceptionally large and one exceptionally small high school; and a costly bill to make education for the North isles consistent with the rest of Shetland.**

High travel times and high rates of hostelling

Table 1 shows that the three most sparsely populated local authorities in Scotland are Western Isles, Highland and Argyll/Bute. These are the local authorities which we might reasonably expect to feature most in the councils with the highest travel times and halls of residence usage. In fact it is only Shetland (post-Blueprint) which features in both top-three lists:

- Post-Blueprint, Shetland will have the **highest rate of halls of residence usage in Scotland**.
- If we accept the findings of the Aith Parent Council, **Shetland will also have the longest travel times for secondary pupils in Scotland**. Even with the figures in the Blueprint (65 minutes), Shetland will have the second longest travel times. Travel times can be reduced to some extent – for example through the provision of multiple feeder buses - but this substantially increases costs.

Of course Shetland's geography poses challenges. But for Shetland to have both the highest travel times and highest hostel usage clearly suggests that it will not have enough secondary schools.

Endnote 1 explains the sources for these numbers.

Table 1 Geography, halls of residence usage and travel times in Scotland

	Lowest population densities in Scotland (people per square km)	Top three halls of residence rates in Scotland	Top three secondary school travel times in Scotland
1 st	Western Isles (8.5 people per sq km)	Shetland (post Blueprint) (31/1000 secondary pupils)	Shetland (post Blueprint) (80+ minutes)
2 nd	Highland (8.6)	Orkney (29/1000 secondary pupils)	Aberdeenshire (75 minutes)
3 rd	Argyll and Bute (12.9)	Argyll and Bute (12/1000 secondary pupils)	Western Isles (60 minutes)

Shetland has 15.3 people per square kilometer.

One exceptionally large and one exceptionally small High School

Post-Blueprint, Shetland will have one exceptionally large and one exceptionally small High School. The word “exceptional” is used quite literally - with a roll of over 1,200, Anderson will be in the top 11% of the largest High Schools in Scotland. Brae will be in the smallest 9%. The average size of a secondary school in Scotland is 810 pupils.

There needs to be a discussion about whether or not this is a sensible balance of high school provision. To have the most centralised secondary education system in Scotland (81% of pupils in one school) is to go against Shetland’s geography.

See Endnote 2 for the sources of these numbers.

What will happen to schooling in the North Isles and how much will this cost?

A major argument of the Blueprint is that the Junior High Schools are alleged to be too small to be effective. The years 2013-6 will be spent arguing this point for Aith, Sandwick, Skerries and Whalsay. Clearly it will be untenable then to keep the Junior High School in Mid Yell. There are two options for Mid Yell:

either

- Close Mid-Yell school and send the North Isles pupils to.....where? By that time Anderson and its halls of residence will be full. So Brae will have to be expanded and halls of residence built there. How much will this cost?

or

- Convert Mid-Yell into a High School. How much will this cost?

The case of Mid Yell shows why it is important to think about the Shetland-wide location of schools as a whole *now*.

2. Why is it said that Shetland can only afford three secondary schools? – the answer lies in Shetland-wide staffing levels.

The Blueprint proposal to have only 3 secondary schools in Shetland is extremely radical – Table 2 shows that no other local authority operates with so few secondary schools. It is this small number of schools – and the big distances between them – which causes the high travel times and hall of residence usage.

So we need to ask: *why is it thought that Shetland can only afford 3 secondary schools?* Even after all the cuts described in the Medium Term Financial Plan, Shetland will still have a higher than average spend per pupil on schools.

Various resource allocation formulas are used in Scotland to decide on appropriate levels of staffing for schools. Here we compare staffing in Shetland with the situation in Highland Council. Highland has formulas for secondary and primary school staffing – these are given on the Council’s website so that the allocation of staff is a transparent process. We chose to use Highland’s formula because of this transparency and because it is the most rural authority which we know about which uses such a formula for all sizes of school. Highland is a relatively low spending council –just below £6,000 per pupil (primary/secondary combined). Note that the Highland formula allows for an almost four-fold variation in average costs between small and large schools. (Differences in average cost per pupil are a major point in the Blueprint.) Such differences are an inevitable consequence of geography.¹

Table 2 Secondary schools in island local authorities

Council	Number of secondary schools	Population	Population per secondary school	No. of islands with population greater than 1000 & not linked to mainland	Description of the schools
Eilean Siar/Western Isles	8	26,190	3274	2	4 schools S1-6 4 schools S1-2
Orkney	6	20,110	3351	0	2 schools S1-6 3 schools S1-4 1 school S1-2
Shetland before Blueprint	8	22,400	2800	2	2 schools S1-6 6 schools S1-4
Shetland after Blueprint	3	22,400	7467	2	2 schools S1-6 1 school S1-4

Applying the Highland formula to Shetland schools shows that **every school in Shetland is over-staffed** (except Aith and, by definition, the single-teacher schools). Tables 3 and 4 show the Highland staffing formula applied to Shetland’s secondary schools. Table 3 looks at absolute numbers of teachers; Table 4 is about promoted posts. Applying the Highland formula to the secondary schools would save about £1.8 million – and more if the same was done for primary schools as well.

¹ To illustrate the point, imagine a class of children in the Anderson which consists of Lerwick children who walk to school and some children from Fair Isle. The average cost of educating the Lerwick children is about £6,600 per year (Blueprint). The average cost for the Fair Isle children is closer to £25,000 (because of hostel and travel costs). This is equitable in the sense that they are receiving exactly the same education.

Table 3 Highland Council staffing formula applied to Shetland's secondary schools²

Secondary schools	Pupil roll	# teachers by Highland formula	# FTE teachers, 2011	Additional teachers above Highland formula
Anderson	894	63	89.7	26.7
Brae	219	25	34.7	9.7
Baltasound	26	7.25	10.0	2.75
Aith	100	14.5	14.1	- 0.4
Whalsay	57	10.5	13.3	2.8
Sandwick	168	20.5	21.1	0.6
Yell	37	8.25	10.3	2.05
TOTAL		149	193.2	44.2 = about £1.8 million

Table 4 Highland Council staffing formula for principal teacher numbers in secondary schools

Secondary schools	Actual principal teachers (excluding heads/deputy heads), 2011	Highland formula – number of recommended principal teachers
Anderson	24	16
Brae	13	6
Baltasound	1	2
Aith	3	3
Whalsay	2	2
Sandwick	4	4
Yell	1	2
TOTAL	48	35

An obvious question about Table 3 is this: how do we go from this analysis to the dominant narrative in the Blueprint that the Junior Highs are using up all the resources to the detriment of the High Schools? Staffing costs are high throughout Shetland - but the only high cost area mentioned in the Blueprint is the cost of small schools. The overwhelming focus of the Blueprint is the cost of the Junior Highs, even though the threatened Junior Highs only account for 11% of total spending.

The Scottish Government publishes a comprehensive database of schools, which allows for comparisons of similarly-sized schools across Scotland. Size for size, Anderson had the highest staffing of any school in Scotland. The same is true for Brae – size for size it had the highest staffing of any school in Scotland. Shetland doesn't always come off badly in these size-for-size comparisons – Sandwick has fewer teachers than the only comparable school in Scotland (Pitlochry).

It is not that Shetland has an excessive number of schools – it is that almost all the schools are very expensive, particularly in terms of staff. Unsustainable levels of staffing are an issue across the *whole* school system in Shetland. This applies to all sizes of schools – Orkney shows us that very small Junior High Schools can produce excellent exam results with lower staffing levels than in Shetland. It is because of over-staffing that such high savings can be claimed for closing schools – much higher savings than is usual in Scotland. Staffing levels as *the* central issue in education spending was a major point in

² Skerries is excluded because the formula does not apply to single-teacher schools.

the very first Blueprint work but gradually became less and less prominent in subsequent versions of the Blueprint as attention moved towards the school estate.

The numbers and sources are explained in Endnote 3.

3. Halls of residence are expensive – the current cost is over £18,000 per pupil per year.

Scotland as a whole is moving away from boarding school-children in halls of residence. The rate of hostel places per 1,000 pupils in Scotland fell from 0.9 to 0.6 between 2006/7 and 2011/12. The Blueprint goes against trend because it will more than double the number of hostelled children in Shetland. Moreover all the 50+ additional children in the hall of residence will be in the age range 11-15 years old. Currently there are only a handful of children (from Foula and Fair Isle) in this age-group who hostel. One of the main reasons that the Junior High Schools were developed in the 1960s – before the oil boom – was to avoid the problems caused by children leaving their communities at such an early age.

The running cost of the Janet Courtney Hostel in 2011/12 was £899,022. Just over 40% of this was property costs/depreciation. With 48 pupils, this is an **average cost of £18,700**. Clearly the average cost would be lower if there were more pupils, because property and other costs would be spread over more pupils. On the other hand, two factors will cause an upward pressure on costs. First, the average age in the halls of residence will be lower post-Blueprint, with a much higher percentage of 11-16-year olds. Second, the chances of the residents including a high-dependency special needs pupil who requires constant supervision will be higher.

Shetland receives additional grant-aided expenditure (GAE) because of its halls of residence places. This money was never intended to subsidise school closures (which is what would happen for Whalsay) and future payments to Shetland beyond the current agreement may well be hotly disputed. The reliance on GAE money needs to be analysed as a risk of the Blueprint proposal.

These very significant financial issues related to the halls of residence are not discussed in the Blueprint. The Blueprint simply uses the figure of **£548** as the additional costs of a pupil staying in the hall of residence.³ In practice this would not even cover meal costs.

The numbers and sources are explained in Endnote 4.

4. The ASN spend per child aged 5-15 is 2.4 times the Scottish average.

Shetland's ASN spending per 5-15 year old in 2008/9 was the highest in Scotland **and almost two-and a half times (2.4) the national average**. The second highest spending council (Highland) only spent 75% as much. The Western Isle spend was 68% of the Shetland level and the Orkney spend was 28%. Total ASN spending was 52% higher than it was in 2004/5. In the same period total education spending grew by 24%. ASN costs are not given or discussed in the Blueprint, yet clearly form an important part of the overall budgetary picture. (2008/9 is the latest available information for comparison. Since then, Shetland's spending has increased slightly to just over £6 million.)

³ See the table *Current indicative savings on the closure proposals in Shetland Islands Council's Plan for Delivering Education 2012-2017* in Appendix 1 of the Blueprint.

The difference between the Scottish average and Shetland levels of spending is about £3.6 million. Clearly it is difficult to reduce this spending quickly, but a reasonable and modest ambition could be to be the joint-highest-spender on ASN, rather than the highest spender. Even this would reduce spending by about £1.5 million.

We are aware that work is planned on ASN staffing and that there is a guidance figure of £500,000 in savings. (Children's Services Directorate Plan) This work needs to systematically benchmark ASN spending against other local authorities and show the relationship between proposed school closures and ASN spend. If an ASN pupil who requires an escort and separate transport needed to stay in the hall of residence, what would this cost?

The sources for this information are given in Endnote 5.

5. Junior High Schools have excellent exam results

A central idea in the Blueprint is that Junior High Schools are said to be too small to be effective. Exam results are not mentioned. In fact, there is evidence from Scotland as a whole, and from Shetland itself, about the very good exam results of Junior High Schools.

In 2009⁴ a study of 25 small rural secondary schools in Scotland (including the Shetland JHSs) investigated the quality of education provided at these schools. The study found that the percentage of students gaining 5 or more credit grades at S4 in these small schools was considerably higher than the Scottish average. And this was not because the smaller school populations were less deprived – this was controlled for. In 24 out of the 25 schools examined, the average attainment outperformed their local authority average. The study also found that the most deprived children gained most from attending a small school.

The statistics in Shetland paint a similar picture, as shown in Table 5. JHS results make a crucial contribution to Shetland's good exam results.

Table 5 Percentage of S4s achieving five or more awards at SCQF Level 5 (Standard Grade Credit level or equivalent) or better

⁴ Actually the report is undated, but we assume it dates from 2009 or 2010.

	Percentage of exam passes by end of fourth year		
By end of S4	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Anderson High School	40%	50%	45%
Brae High school	45%	40%	36%
Aith Junior High school	68%	58%	59%
Sandwick Junior High School	52%	49%	63%
Shetland	46%	47%	48%
Scotland	35%	36%	36%

Date sources are given in Endnote 6.

6. Shetland citizens will not be properly consulted about the future of Junior High Schools; at no point is the Council due to sit down and debate the future of Junior High Schools as a whole.

Councillors will vote on the future of the Junior High Schools in a piecemeal way, one school at a time, spread over three years — this is a flawed approach when what needs to be discussed is the future of Junior High Schools *as a whole* and the implications of the centralised model.

In the first half of 2012 a “consultation exercise” was carried out about savings to the education budget. A questionnaire was distributed to Community Councils, Parent Councils and School Staff Groups. 78% of responses objected to the consultation process (“tick here is you want to close school X”) and refused to tick the boxes. Some respondents who refused to tick boxes did, however, make suggestions in the comments section. These suggestions – which included feasibility work on the greater use of information technology and reviewing the status of Brae – were not responded to in the Blueprint.

Future consultations will be on a school-by-school basis and will focus on local issues, meaning that there has been no effective consultation about the future of education as a whole in Shetland. Comparisons have been made with the ferries review, which described options for all the ferry routes.

It is often said that debate needs to stop and we need to start making savings. But the Blueprint’s recommendations are radical and irreversible and ignore other viable options – these *must* be properly debated by councillors and citizens.

See Endnote 7 for sources.

7. The course of action described in the Blueprint is financially extremely risky.

There is no substantive risk analysis of the Blueprint as a whole.⁵ But the Blueprint strategy is extremely risky in a financial sense. Risks include:

- **Some of the schools earmarked for closure will not close** because of decisions either by councillors (as happened for Skerries in 2011) or by the Scottish Government (as happened for Burravoe in 2011). This is a risk for two reasons:
 - years will have passed and the financial savings will not be realized
 - Shetland may well be left with an essentially arbitrary geographical distribution of schools based on unrelated, separate decisions. The Scottish Government has the final say on which schools can and cannot close.
- **The savings will not be as large as predicted.** Parent Councils believe that both hostel and transport costs are under-estimated – transport costs are significantly lower than estimates from mainland Scotland. Also, there seems to be a double-counting of savings, with some savings in the “additional savings package” overlapping with the Blueprint savings.
- The energy devoted to school closures is a **distraction from the key task of tackling the huge staffing costs throughout the school system**. We know that savings are being made, but there is not the systematic, transparent benchmarking which is required.
- **High hostel and transport costs bring their own risks.** According to the Blueprint’s statistics, the percentage of the schools budget spent on transport will rise from 6% to over 9%. (Actually, we believe the figure will be significantly higher.) This is about half of the non-salary budget. This is an extremely risky strategy, given the upward trend in fuel prices and the likelihood of a monopoly supplier because it will be difficult for more than one firm to have enough buses.
- The **costs of moving the North Isles pupils** or upgrading Mid Yell School need to be added to the Blueprint.

This should be an exciting time for Junior High Schools as Shetland works out how the Junior High schools can best deliver the Curriculum for Excellence. But this challenge is not being widely debated — instead we are stuck with a focus on closures. Recruitment is extremely difficult in the current circumstances, especially when temporary and part-time professional posts are advertised. Some parents have likened the current situation to asset stripping – parents will be forced to move their children away from Junior Highs because some very real policy issues are being neglected.

Sources for figures are given in Endnote 8.

8. The budget for schools will drop at exactly the same rate as the overall Council budget.

⁵ The only risk discussed is the short-term risk of delay because of the Appeal in the Court of Session and the report from the Commission on Rural Education.

We made clear at the start of this paper that this was not about special pleading for schools. Our suggestions below will work even without a change in the Medium Term Financial Plan. But it is worth pointing out that the Plan states that “critical services for children” are a core Council priority. This is not reflected in the schools budget which drops at exactly the same rate as the overall Council budget.

In 2017/18 the Council's overall spending will be 81% of what it is now.

In 2017/18 the Council's spending on schools will be 81% of what it is now.

Moreover, Shetland spends a lower percentage on schools than many other local authorities. For example East Renfrewshire spends 56% of its budget on education, even though a reasonable percentage of pupils there attend private schools. Western Isles spends 41% on education. According to the Medium Term Financial Plan, Shetland will spend 34.5%.

See Endnote 9.

There ARE viable alternatives to the Blueprint

The Refreshed Blueprint for Education does not include a full analysis of the sector – instead it hones in on the high unit costs of Junior High Schools and concludes they should close, without analyzing other high-cost areas and without acknowledging the known educational strengths of JHSs. Alternatives are not discussed.

In practice there are many alternatives to the dismantling of the Junior High School network:

- **Apply existing formulae** to current staffing of all schools; **benchmark** all spending against other local authorities. (This was recently done for parent council clerks and a 20% saving was made overnight.) For secondary schools this would potentially save about £1.8 million from 2011/12 staffing levels; more when primary schools are included.
- Establish a **directly-funded, federated Junior High School of Shetland** with one head and 5 (or 6) sites. Give it a **post-cuts budget** – i.e. 81% of the present budget for those schools. Ensure that work starts immediately on a business plan for such a school. This would give an institutional structure to **the hub and spoke model** and for **the creative use of IT**. Lessons can be learnt from the story of Jordanhill when setting this up; this is a good opportunity to boost local resilience.
- **Compare ASN spending with other local authorities. Set reasonable targets** compared with these authorities. Consider ASN as part of the restructuring of schools as a whole – it is not a separate issue. Savings of £1.5 million would still leave Shetland as a very high spender in this area.
- **Consider why the new Anderson has to have so many pupils in it** – does Shetland really want a school in the top 11% of Scotland's largest schools? The Blueprint talks about problems with small schools. A quick Google about the size of schools reveals many more concerns with the anonymity of large schools – and the post-Blueprint Anderson would be a very large school.⁶

⁶ The Times Educational Supplement has leaked a draft of the Rural Schools Commission report. This says that there is a frequent misconception that it is a problem when a low percentage of a school's capacity is used. There

- **Consider other possible configurations of Junior High School.** What are the pros and cons of having JHSs with S1-3?⁷ What would it cost to develop some into High Schools and reduce the numbers at the halls of residence? (In mainland Scotland, many sparsely populated areas are served by a full High School – there are 12 full High Schools in Scotland which have fewer pupils in total than Sandwick.)
- Explore **synergies with Shetland College** and its new buildings – the Curriculum for Excellence encourages close links between the older secondary classes and colleges.
- Think about the future of **Brae**. Does it make sense to have such a small High School? Why are all the pupils from closed schools going to the Anderson? Should Brae revert to a Junior High School and S5s and S6s stay at the hall of residence? Why is Brae a High school when there are more S1-4 pupils in Sandwick than in Brae?
- **Consider joint management** – Baltasound and Mid-Yell is one obvious candidate. The Blueprint dismisses without a reference shared management costs over more than 2 sites, but does not even explore shared management costs over two sites.
- **Do not proceed with the school closure consultations.** These are not a level playing field – they start with a presumption of closure. We do not believe that the Blueprint makes a financial or educational case for the decimation of Junior High Schools; we do believe that there are attractive and viable alternatives that recognise the geographical realities of Shetland.

We fully recognise the need to make decisions about savings now. In the slighter longer term, there is an urgent need to develop an Educational Strategy for Shetland. Before this has been developed, it is very risky to take radical and irreversible decisions about the school estate.

Contact can be made with all the Junior High school chairs, including

Catriona Waddington, catriona.waddington@hlsp.org

Jeremy Sansom, jpsansom@btinternet.com

John Irvine, vaegapiddi@gmail.com

is no reason why 100% of capacity has to be filled if there are not enough pupils living close enough to a particular school.

⁷ The Blueprint dismisses this, saying that the idea was rejected by staff and parents. This is true when the choice was S1-4 versus S1-3. The actual choice of S1-3 or no Junior High School was not posed.

ENDNOTES

Endnote 1.

Size and population of local authorities from *Scottish Local Government Financial statistics, 2010-11*, Table 1.1.

Travel times – from the Refreshed Blueprint, Appendix 1. Travel times were given for the Councils which responded to SIC's request for information.

Information on hostel places. Orkney information halls of residence numbers (78) from a freedom of information request. Shetland information from the Blueprint. Argyll and Bute information from the Scottish Government's Green Book on Grant Aided Expenditure. All numbers use 2011 secondary pupil numbers as the denominator.

Endnote 2.

The Shetland school roll numbers are from Appendix A on school rolls in the Blueprint.

The percentages are worked out by looking at the Scottish Government's school contacts database (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/SchoolEducation/schoolcontactdetails>) and sorting secondary school rolls by size.

Endnote 3.

(<http://www.highland.gov.uk/learninghere/supportforschoolstaff/devolvedschoolmanagement/05budgetcalculation-secondary.htm>)

Average spend per pupil is compared with other local authorities based on an article in the Times Education Supplement <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6183065> .

The Highland formula can be found on <http://www.highland.gov.uk/learninghere/supportforschoolstaff/devolvedschoolmanagement/05budgetcalculation-secondary.htm>

Teacher numbers are from the Scottish Government's school contacts database 2011 (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/SchoolEducation/schoolcontactdetails>). Promoted post numbers are from the SIC Schools Service Annual Return 2011/12.

Junior Highs as a % of total spending - Refreshed Blueprint Appendix Ci.

The size-for-size comparisons are from the database (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/SchoolEducation/schoolcontactdetails>)

This table shows the schools in Scotland with the most comparable school rolls – all the secondary schools with 10 pupils more or less than Anderson.

	Secondary roll	Teachers (FTE)
Cumnock Academy	884	78.1
Broxburn Academy	885	75.2
Glenwood High School	889	71.3
Westhill Academy	890	77.5
Dunoon Grammar School	894	69.2
Anderson High School	894	89.7
Kinross High School	895	67.4
Ardrossan Academy	896	69.6
Hazlehead Academy	896	72.6
Banff Academy	899	76.5
Leith Academy	901	76.4
Inverness Royal Academy	901	77.8
St Machar Academy	902	80.1
Harlaw Academy	903	67.2
Average		76.3

This one does the same for Brae – there are fewer comparable schools because Brae is a more unusual size.

	Secondary roll	Teachers (FTE)
Islay High School	213	24.2
Glen Urquhart High School	216	21.7
Brae High School	219	34.7
Average		26.9

It is harder to make comparisons for the Junior High Schools because the JHS model is rare in Scotland. The one comparison that can be made is between Sandwick and Pitlochry.

Schools with S1-4 only	Secondary roll	Teachers (FTE)	
Pitlochry High	156	21.9	
Sandwick Junior High	168	21.1	

The Orkney schools referred to are Sanday, Westray and Stronsay which are three of the four smallest secondaries in Scotland.

Endnote 4.

The information on hostel costs comes from a Freedom of Information request to the SIC. The answer was “The total cost of running the Janet Courtney Hall of Residence in 2011/12 is £899,022, this can be broken down as follows:

Staff costs & training - £482,359
 Property costs - £259,492
 Meal supplies (meal preparation is included in staff costs above) - £82,264
 Administration costs - £6,518
 Income receivable - £58,154
 Recharges - £14,551
 Depreciation - £111,993
 No transport costs are included in these figures.”

The fall in hostel rates is calculated from the Argyll and Bute information from the Scottish Government's Green Book on Grant Aided Expenditure.

Endnote 5.

Information on ASN spending can be found at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/05/11134917/12> . The Scottish average was £807 pounds per total number pupils. Shetland was £1952. Highland was £1,460; Orkney £551.

See also table below from the Local Finance Returns.

Year	Total special education budget from LFR01s £000
2004/5	3945
2005/6	4372
2006/7	4906
2007/8	5081
2008/9	5920
2009/10	6139
2010/11	6187
2011/12	6004

Endnote 6.

The study of small rural secondary schools in Scotland can be found at Ref: <http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/ellc/inquiries/Schools%20Bill/documents/ScottishRuralSchoolsNetworksupplementary.pdf>

The statistics on exam results come from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/09/27142058/7> and related pages.

Endnote 7.

Source: Own analysis of copies of Blueprint consultation responses provided by Hayfield House.

Of the 82 questionnaires issued, 58 were returned. Of these:

- 45 objected to the process as a whole – 31 did not take part in the process at all, 14 provided written responses about the issue in general but not to the tick-boxes

- 11 completed the boxes
- 2 did not tick the boxes and provided a general response, but did not specifically object to the proposal.

The Blueprint claims that the response rate to the questionnaire was 70.7% (58/82). But given that 45 of these responses were simply a statement of “we object to this process and will not be giving a substantive response”, the meaningful response rate was at best 27/58 (46%) and in fact only 22% (13/58) responded without an objection to the process. Only 19% (11/58) responded to the main body of the questionnaire – the tick-boxes. Anderson High School distributed 825 questionnaires to parents/guardians and received 41 completed replies (5%).

Endnote 8.

Percentage of the schools budget spent on transport – this uses the figures in the Blueprint. 6% at present. 9% is the additional transport costs listed in Appendix 1’s appendix 1 divided into the schools budget. This will be an underestimate because it does not include increases in special education transport budget. Special education accounts for about 17% of the total transport budget. Non-salary budget calculated from Local Finance Return 2011/12. Out of £42m, £34m is on staff, i.e. 81%

Endnote 9.

The Council’s overall spending figure for now and 2017/18 comes from the Medium Term Financial Plan. The school spending figures for now and 2017/18 come from the file on Children’s Services savings that was distributed at the Parent Councils meeting in November 2012.

Target budgets	2012/13 £000s	2017/18 £000s
Whole council - target operating budget	121,793 (= baseline 100)	98,783 (=81)
Schools/quality improvement	35,758 (=baseline 100)	29,066 (=81)