

APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM STAFF

Proposal 1

Align and integrate teams and personnel so that the structure enables efficient and effective service delivery and removes duplication. Where staff and teams are pupil facing; improve outcomes.

For example:

An aspect of the Early Intervention Grant/Early Years EIT is to move 3 teams – the Specialist Learning Team; LACE Team (Looked After Children in Education) and Returners (Redhill) from Complex and Additional Needs to School Effectiveness. This proposal would ensure that due attention is paid to ensuring that these teams are appropriately integrated into School Effectiveness.

This proposal could include a recommendation to make the most of the Workforce Development staff resource involving links with schools; social care; health; private and voluntary sector under the overall umbrella of Children’s Workforce.

Through this proposal we could strengthen the focus on Governor Development

Response to Proposal 1

Four respondents disagreed with the proposal and four respondents did not agree or disagree. The links that need to be maintained between the Specialist Learning and Complex and Additional Needs teams was raised by several of these respondents, with one response requesting reassurance that this would not be lost in the wider school effectiveness agenda. There was also requests for clarification of the statement ‘through this proposal we could strengthen the focus on Governor Development’ and the potential for job losses.

Two of the responses received agreed with the proposal, one of which came via discussion at a team meeting. Numerous reasons for why the proposal was seen as positive was given, including:

- Brings a cohesive service, everyone understands what support is available
- Logical rationalisation of specialist learning team, LACE to Redhill to the more school facing service. There already are links.
- New proposed alignment would offer opportunities for measuring impact of work, avoiding repetition

The team also requested more information about the current roles and responsibilities of the LACE teams.

Proposal 2

Review and strengthen business models for “buy back” services so that we can compete with other providers of the same services.

For example:

A number of services within School Effectiveness are detailed in the single Prospectus of Services to Schools e.g. Governor Support; Schools ICT Unit; Workforce Development and School Improvement. These services are designed as effective business models to enable them to compete in the service market and meet the needs of schools.

Response to Proposal 2

Five responses agreed with the proposal, believing “value for money for customers must be ensured”, and that the strengthened business model not only made the service “indispensable” to schools with the LA boundary, but also “could be bought by other local authorities”. It was also questioned whether different models were needed between schools and settings and a concern was raised that if the LA does not get this it may lead to an increase in illegal child minders and a decrease in Ofsted rating.

The remaining five responses neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal, with two responses questioning whether there were other providers to compete with the service. One response also noted that “the service model requires review and strengthening”.

Proposal 3

Design a “whole system” school improvement model, rooted in collaboration with Stockton Schools so that we can build capacity for school to school support and include a cost recovery mechanism for the LA and participating schools.

For example:

By “whole system” we mean one that addresses the improvement agenda in all schools and embodies the CAMPUS Stockton ethos of schools working with schools, to support each other in a structure partnership model that is designed with openness to cost recovery. It will enable the opportunity to develop a model that is consistent with emerging LA and school role in relation to School Improvement.

Response to Proposal 3

Three respondents agreed with the proposal, with respondents believing that this could “improve struggling schools and spread good practice”, and that “failure to have a whole school model may result in schools going their own way”. It was recognised that the model needed to be flexible to react to changing needs and ensure that schools are properly resourced to ensure the “supporting” schools are not weakened.

The majority of the responses (6) did not agree or disagree to the proposal, and respondents requested further information before they could make a judgement. Similarly, only one respondent disagreed with the proposal, and stated that they were not opposed to the proposal, but needed further clarification on what the ‘whole system’ would look like.

Proposal 4

Bring forward options that create capacity and resources in business planning and commissioning and that will support schools in what they see as strategic partnership priorities.

For example:

The aim of this proposal is to develop options for a cost effective business planning and commissioning function and to consider the school view of gaps in strategic priorities, for example, support for safeguarding in schools.

Response to Proposal 4

The majority of the responses (7) did not agree or disagree with the proposal, believing it to not be relevant to their service or needing further clarification. Three responses agreed with the proposal, believing it to be “appropriate for the environment we are now working in”.

Proposal 5

To review terms and conditions/contractual arrangements currently within the School Effectiveness (Children, Schools and Complex Needs) Service as there are employees on a range of different terms and conditions.

For example

Through the Review we could ensure that staff are on appropriate terms and conditions.

Response to Proposal 5

Five responses did not agree or disagree with the proposal, stating that they needed to understand how the recommendation would impact on staff before agreeing/disagreeing. It was also questioned whether this would take into account budgets from which teams are paid from. Three responses disagreed with the proposals, stating the same reasons as noted above.

One response agreed with the proposal, and one response both agreed and disagreed. The reasons given for agreeing to the proposal included that a review of terms and conditions was overdue and this would clarify conditions for staff. It was also noted that “salaries for LA staff working with schools need to be sufficiently aligned to school salaries to attract competent staff”.

Proposal 6

To monitor the impact of other reviews/changes on service levels and outcomes for children.

For example:

Take account of the Inclusion Review; Early Years strand of EIG; Children’s Social Care Review

Response to Proposal 6

The majority of responses (6) agreed with the proposal, noting the importance of monitoring the impact of reviews. It was also noted the importance in involving all stakeholders, in both informing stakeholders how the changes would impact on them and receiving feedback on how they were working.

The remaining four responses neither agreed nor disagreed, with one response stating they needed further clarification before making a decision.

Proposal 7

Re align premature retirement and redundancy costs

For example:

Reduce budgetary provision by £200k per annum reflecting decreasing payments to the pension fund and a lower call on the use of the funds from schools

Response to Proposal 7

Two responses agreed and two responses disagreed with this proposal. The remaining six responses did not agree or disagree. There was concern that it was not an appropriate time to decrease payments to the pension fund when the majority of staff in one team were over 50.

Additional Comments

The majority of the additional comments received were regarding the timescales for the consultation. As noted above, in response to these comments the timescale were extended to give staff more time to fully consider the proposals and discuss them with their colleagues, union representatives, etc.