

Appendix 3

PROPOSALS

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 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

The majority of respondents (19) agreed with the proposal. One respondent questioned what success measurement will be used. It was also commented that this proposal would be logical, and had "strong potential for improving focus and challenge on pupil learning".

Only one respondent disagreed with the proposal, as the respondent believed that focussing on the aims and objectives of the teams is more important and could not see how regrouping teams would improve their effectiveness. One respondent stated that they would require further information before they could make a decision on whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposal.

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

All except one respondent agreed with this proposal, and a common theme throughout the comments received was value for money. One respondent commented that "regular re-visiting and re-evaluation of the Business Plan" should be a requirement to ensure it meets its customers' needs. Again, it was questioned how this proposal would be measured.

The respondent who did not agree with the proposal, did not feel they could agree or disagree without further information, however stated that they appreciated the support provided by the teams and wished to see these retained by the Local Authority.

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

All respondents agreed to this proposal in principle, building on informal school to school support. However there were questions as to how this would work in practice and the design of the system, with one respondent suggesting that it would “require strong LA intervention and guidance”.

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

This proposal was supported by all except one respondent, who did not feel they could agree or disagree without further information on what the options would be. The proposal was believed to be “an essential element of transformation” and “a basic requirement” of the Local Authority working in partnership with schools. Again, the success measures for this proposal were questioned.

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 e.g. ex-Learning Skills Council (LSC); School Teachers Pay and Conditions (STPCD); Soulbury – Education Improvement/Psychologists; National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government

For example

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

Response to Proposal 5

The majority of the respondents (17), agreed with the proposal. Four respondents did not agree or disagree with the proposal, commenting that more information was needed and raised a concern that it would affect staff salary and pensions.

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

All respondents agreed with the proposal and noted that monitoring the impact of changes, using "a robust and consistent set of measures", was "essential".

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

15 respondents agreed with the proposal and it was commented that it was "necessary in current climate". Two respondents disagreed with the proposal, one respondent stating that the Authority currently does not fund redundancies and another respondent stating that Early Retirement can be beneficial. The remaining respondents (four) did not agree or disagree.

Additional Comments

Several additional comments were received, which were widely varied. These are set out in appendix 1.