

APPENDIX 4 – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM HEAD TEACHERS AND GOVERNORS

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 below.

List of All Comments

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.		
	Agree	Comments
1	Y	This has strong potential for improving focus and challenge on pupil learning, especially if it results in governor 'take-up' of development in meeting the needs of unteachable pupils.
2	Y	How will you know if this will be successful – what measurements can you take? Risk that the outcomes have already been identified and that further additional / better improvements may not be identified
3	Y	
4	N	Struggle to see how regrouping teams will improve their effectiveness. Is it a physical regrouping, moving them together to improve communication? Believe that what is more important is the Aims and Objectives of these groups and the regular re-assessment of these A & O to ensure that they meet the needs of their customers (both internal & external). Shouldn't need a 3 year EIT exercise to remove duplication. Can't see how regrouping teams will "strengthen the focus on Gov. Development".
5	Y	
6	Y	
7	Y	
8	Y	
9	Y	
10	Y	
11	Y	
12	Y	
13	Y	I have no knowledge of the implications to the staff involved or the probable costs. It would appear to be a logical proposal.
14	Y	
15	Y	
16	Y	
17	Y	
18	Y	
19	Y	
20	Y	
21	NA	I can't really agree or disagree with this proposal. Perhaps I should know this, but I'm not sure I know what the LACE team or Returners (Redhill) are. But if the proposal is to move some teams into School Effectiveness, then wouldn't they be integrated into School Effectiveness by definition? Would this move have any implication for employment of staff in those 3 teams? I think I'd need some more explanation of the proposal before I could comment further.

List of All Comments

<p>Proposal 2 Review and strengthen business models for “buy back” services so that we can compete with other providers of the same services.</p>		
	Agree	Comments
1	Y	These services represent very good value for money relative to the market in general
2	Y	How will this be measured? (Time / cost / quality)
3	Y	I welcome this proposal as I feel that schools wish to work wherever possible with LA providers. However, as identified in the above example, the service market will determine where best value for money will be found.
4	Y	Should not need a 3 year EIT exercise to carry this out. Regular re-visiting and re-evaluation of the Business Plan for the Prospectus of Services to ensure that it meets internal and external customer needs is a “given” requirement of its management(at least it would be in the commercial{non-educational} world).
5	Y	
6	Y	
7	Y	
8	Y	
9	Y	
10	Y	
11	Y	Whilst in principle I agree there is insufficient detail at this stage to make a meaningful decision.
12	Y	
13	Y	Very necessary from a school perspective. Schools will only work in partnership with the La if it is cost effective. Governing bodies have a legal requirement to ensure Best Value.
14	Y	
15	Y	Schools should be encouraged to buy back where possible to enable better understanding, between schools and the Local Authority
16	Y	
17	Y	
18	Y	
19	Y	
20	Y	
21	NA	Again, I can't really agree or disagree, since I'm not sure what the proposal is proposing. What does 'review and strengthen business models' mean? Make them cheaper? Offer a wider range of services? And in any case, how is it proposed to carry this out? My only comment here is that I believe our school is very appreciative of the services provided by the above-mentioned units – governor support, school improvement – and would like to see these retained as LA services.
<p>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.</p>		
	Agree	Comments

List of All Comments

1	Y	As someone who has been involved in good partnerships I wholeheartedly support this ethos but we must also learn from procedural lessons related to the protocols for how such partnerships are brokered – an agreed protocol across all schools would be helpful – but needs flexibility too!
2	Y	
3	Y	I strongly support this proposal. I feel that Campus Stockton can best be promoted through Stockton schools supporting each other and developing collaborative solutions to improve education for all in the authority.
4	Y	Surely, this is just Federation on a larger scale?
5	Y	
6	Y	
7	Y	
8	Y	
9	Y	
10	Y	
11	Y	What does structure partnership mean. Consolidation of staffing/governor structure?? Good idea in principle but in practice I suspect ego's will get in the way. Having experienced this twice it has good intentions but fails due to insufficient discipline and would require strong LA intervention and guidance.
12	Y	There is already much informal school to school support which would need to be maintained without cost recovery: reciprocal arrangements are in place within clusters and head teachers appreciate the support this arrangement offers.
13	Y	Agree with reservations depending on design of system. An interesting proposal but one that raises many questions. Apart from failing schools which other schools would take part? Recently a secondary school's assistance cost £650,000 when in special measures. Who pays the bill? Would failing schools have to pay large sums of budget to the LA for assistance?
14	Y	
15	Y	
16	Y	
17	Y	
18	Y	
19	Y	
20	Y	
21	Y	Tentative agreement! If this means that we can keep school improvement under LA governance, then I'm in favour.
<p>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.</p>		
	Agree	Comments
1	Y	Capacity to respond to emerging strategic issues that a critical mass of schools share will be an essential element of transformation.

List of All Comments

2	Y	What benefits does the business case suggest that will be gained from this investment? How will you measure the benefits?
3	Y	
4	Y	Poor example-Safeguarding is a necessary individual requirement in every school, irrespective of this Proposal. What are "strategic partnership priorities" if they are not Federations, unless this relates to the sharing of administration services, such as Business Managers(Bursars)?.
5	Y	
6	Y	
7	Y	
8	Y	
9	Y	
10	Y	
11	Y	The largest failing between schools across the LA is inconsistency. LA should offer much more support/intervention around gap analysis and gap closure across all functions but particularly leadership and management.
12	Y	This is needed for ALL schools not just the top 20. In spite of years of experience as designated officer and regular CPD, there are still so many occasions when talking a complex issue through will lead to additional advice being offered which subsequently clarifies the way forward.
13	Y	This would appear to be a basic requirement for the LA in it's role of working in partnership with schools.
14	Y	
15	Y	
16	Y	
17	Y	
18	Y	
19	Y	
20	Y	
21	NA	Sorry, but again I'm not at all sure I understand the proposal. What could those options be?
<p>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.</p>		
	Agree	Comments
1	NA	Cannot comment – not enough knowledge
2	Y	
3	Y	I feel that this is long overdue. However, I do not underestimate how difficult it is to undertake such a review.
4	Y	OK, provided that the intention is not to raise everyone to the highest common denominator.
5	Y	

List of All Comments

6	Y	
7	Y	
8	Y	
9	Y	
10	Y	
11	Y	A definite requirement. I thought we had done this once before and lack of HR intervention have allowed things to get out of synchronisation.
12	Y	
13	Y	This would appear logical but I have no information as to the legal, financial and union aspects of such a review.
14	Y	
15	Y	
16	Y	
17	NA	On going function of LA
18	NA	
19	Y	
20	Y	
21	NA	It isn't possible to agree or disagree unless there is some definition of what constitutes "appropriate terms and conditions". I could be wrong, but I presume that the subtext is to pay less to some staff and to reduce pension liability.
<p>Proposal 6 To monitor the impact of other reviews/changes on service levels and outcomes for children.</p>		
	Agree	Comments
1	Y	
2	Y	Presumably monitoring will be done using a robust and consistent set of measures?
3	Y	
4	Y	This should be ongoing irrespective of a 3 year EIT review.
5	Y	
6	Y	
7	Y	
8	Y	
9	Y	
10	Y	
11	Y	
12	Y	
13	Y	This is a basic requirement of any organisation. Monitoring the impact of changes is essential.
14	Y	
15	Y	
16	Y	
17	Y	On going function of LA
18	Y	

List of All Comments

19	Y	
20	Y	
21	Y	I agree that changes should be monitored, and the bottom line is whether or not we collectively continue to provide a good education for children. But I would like to see some detail on who does the monitoring, how often, and how it is reported.
Proposal 7 Re align premature retirement and redundancy costs		
	Agree	Comments
1	NA	
2	Y	
3	NA	I feel that I would like more information on this proposal and its impact on the workforce.
4	N	Don't understand this Proposal-we re-structured management in one school last year and had to fund the departure of an AHT ourselves. The LA refused, so how can you reduce the cost further when you are already not funding redundancies?
5	Y	
6	Y	
7	Y	
8	NA	Unsure about this one, don't fully understand what it means
9	Y	
10	Y	
11	Y	
12	Y	
13	Y	This would appear to be a sensible proposal to increase funding for the education of pupils. I have no knowledge of the legal, financial or union aspects of such proposed changes.
14	Y	
15	N	Early Retirement in some cases is beneficial to staff and school (pupil education
16	Y	
17	Y	Necessary in current climate
18	Y	
19	Y	
20	Y	
21	NA	I think I would need a good deal more background before I can comment on this proposal.
Additional Comments		

List of All Comments

1		<p>My observations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each proposal has an example outcome already provided. This may stifle further robust analysis that is necessary to ensure maximum benefits• Is there a Benefits Plan identified for each of the themes?• Linked to the Benefits Plan, what measures are in place to track delivery and effectiveness? <p>Transformation of any organisation will most likely deliver a change in behaviour of its people; improvements in end to end processes; possible IT system solutions and possibly a change in culture. None of the proposals above mention either of these steps – is this really Transformation?</p>
2		
3		
4		<p>Sorry to be so negative, but this whole EIT Review looks like an sham exercise being undertaken to satisfy some form of governmental criteria.</p> <p>Most of the activities detailed in the Proposals should already be being undertaken by the managers/directors of a professional organisation.</p>
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		<p>As far as I can see the proposed changes will only benefit and improve the current processes etc in school.</p> <p>Our main concerns at present as you already know is the increased workload for the Head and Deputy due to the number of Child Protection issues / conferences and the difficulties regarding the new SLA booklet / process which currently has not improved our purchasing process. We will also be researching Academy status.</p>
20		

List of All Comments

21		<p>Our GB meets on 22nd February, after the date for response to this consultation. However, I will circulate the document to other governors and discuss it at that meeting, since I note that another draft will be produced between February and March.</p> <p>All of the above comments reflect my personal views as Chair of a Governing Body, and are not necessarily representative of the views of other governors or our HT.</p>
----	--	---