

North Yorkshire County Council**Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee****17 April 2015****Update on the North Yorkshire Commission for School Improvement****1.0 Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 To update members on the Commission for School Improvement, the recommendations and their implementation, including an update on the restructure of the School Improvement Service

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The work of the Commission for School Improvement is reflected and summarised in the following paragraph:-
- 2.2 Our collective vision in North Yorkshire is for every child and young person to go to a school or setting that is good or outstanding. Our ambition is also that all outcomes in North Yorkshire will be above national averages and on improving trends. We want the visionary, strong and ambitious leadership from North Yorkshire schools and settings to drive forward school improvement. Partnerships between schools that are focussed on improving outcomes already exist across the County. Our collective vision is that these organic partnerships will be absolutely key to achieving our ambition within the context of an Education Partnership and Improvement Partnerships. Alongside sector-led leadership will be a high quality School Improvement Service that supports Improvement Partnerships, more localised organic partnerships and individual schools.
- 2.3 The Commission for School Improvement brought together school and local authority leaders in the autumn term of 2013. The Commission was asked to consider how a collaborative system for effective school improvement could be developed, ensuring that every school in North Yorkshire is good or outstanding.
- 2.4 The challenge for the Commission was to develop proposals that deliver long-term and sustainable improvement in school performance, enabling every young person in North Yorkshire to achieve more, regardless of their background or where they live. In addition the Commission firmly stated that all children and young people should go to a school or setting that is good or outstanding. The challenge was how did we collectively achieve this ambition?
- 2.5 The Commission said that we believe that primary responsibility for improvement rests with schools and that the LA also has a key leadership role in developing effective partnership working, building collaborative

relationships between schools, sharing knowledge, brokering school to school support, facilitating peer learning and upholding accountability.

- 2.6 The Commission published its report in January 2014. Its recommendations were opened to a wide-ranging consultation with Headteachers and governors across the county
- 2.7 The Commission's Report from January 2014 said, "Schools in North Yorkshire provide a good education for the majority of our children and young people. Around 80% of schools are good or outstanding and KS4 outcomes compare very favourably against national figures. As an education community we have achieved a lot but we know we have a lot more still to do". The report went to Executive Members for Schools on 14th January 2014.
- 2.8 At the end of April 2014, the Commission met for a final time to consider the results of the consultation. The Commission produced a follow up report from that session which summarised feedback from the education community in North Yorkshire and makes specific recommendations for moving forward. These can be read in Section 3.
- 2.9 The restructure of the School Improvement Service sits alongside the implementation of the recommendations from the Commission for School Improvement. It was intended that some of the resource that was previously funding the service would fund a school improvement model that incorporated school leaders, schools and LA colleagues

3.0 Updates on the Recommendations

- 3.1 The Commission for School Improvement response to consultation was written in May 2014. It described responses to the consultation on the Commission's initial proposals.

A summary of the recommendations from May 2014 as written in the consultation paper and updates since then are as follows :-

- 3.2 **Recommendation 1.** We recommend re-naming commissioning groups as "Improvement Partnerships" – signalling that they are clearly focused on school improvement.
- 3.3 **Update-** this recommendation was implemented.
- 3.4 **Recommendation 2.** We recommend that Improvement Partnerships have a sharper remit than that proposed for Commissioning Groups. Then, we proposed ten functions. In light of consultation, we propose reducing these to five. These are:
 - to facilitate challenge and support to ensure that all schools are good and outstanding. Improvement Partnerships review school performance data and ensure that every school in their area benefits from external challenge, ideally through robust arrangements in a school-led collaboration.
 - to ensure that every school in their area is an active member of a school improvement alliance or collaboration.

- to commission and/or broker the support that the schools in their area need to become (or remain) good and outstanding.
- to engage with schools facing challenge, working with the local authority to deploy specialist support to secure rapid improvement.
- through their membership of the Education Partnership, to influence school finance and organisation policy so that it is compatible with school improvement planning.

3.5 **Update**- this recommendation was agreed

3.6 **Recommendation 3.** We recommend that five Improvement Partnerships are formed on a geographical basis, each covering the primary schools in their areas. A sixth Improvement Partnership will cover all the County's secondary schools in a single group.

As a Commission, we are deeply committed to effective cross-phase working. We set out the benefits of this in our report. However, we are convinced that the most effective place for such collaboration to take place is in local, organic collaborations. With their revised, sharply focused remit for school improvement, we believe that the Improvement Partnerships will work more efficiently as single phase bodies. This also addresses points made during the consultation that cross-phase bodies may not sufficiently address particular school improvement needs

As an interim measure, we propose that special schools form a shadow Improvement Partnership of their own, pending further discussion about how they might be integrated with wider service structures to support their needs.

3.7 **Update** - There will be five Primary Improvement Partnerships based on the current five geographical areas. There will be one Secondary Improvement Partnership and additionally one Early Years Improvement Partnership and one Special School Improvement Partnership, (not a Shadow Partnership). These three Partnerships are across the whole of the County.

3.8 **Recommendation 4.** We recommend that Improvement Partnerships are made up of a Chair who must have experience as a headteacher; five serving headteacher members; and a governor. (In most cases, we would expect Chairs of Improvement Partnerships to be serving Headteachers; in some cases, we accept that it may be appropriate to consider a former headteacher for the role). Local authority officers will be deployed to work with each Partnership. Existing local authority school improvement support will either be brokered by Improvement Partnerships, or traded directly with schools.

3.9. **Update** - At the time of writing, there are nominations for Chairs of two Primary Improvement Partnerships, the Secondary and the Early Years Improvement Partnerships. There are no nominations currently for the Special School Improvement Partnership. We are currently exploring other leadership arrangements including recently retired or external colleagues or leaders within Teaching School Alliances to chair the Partnerships.

Lead Improvement Advisers and School Improvement Advisers will be deployed to work with the Improvement Partnerships.

There will also be an Improvement Partnership Board comprising of the Chair, the Lead Improvement Adviser, the chairs of local school improvement clusters (between 5-10) and two governor representatives.

3.10 **Recommendation 5.** We recommend that the local authority is charged with the responsibility for drawing up an implementation plan for the creation of Improvement Partnerships, reporting to the School Forum (and its replacement Education Partnership) to ensure school leaders have sign off on proposals. The implementation plan should include a model role description for Chairs of Improvement Partnerships and a proposal for the recruitment of headteacher members.

3.11 **Update** - This recommendation was implemented.

The role of the Chair was further reduced in autumn 14 as feedback indicated that the original list of responsibilities was too long. The role was significantly slimmed down to a far more strategic; overseeing role and the potential for other colleagues other than a serving Headteacher to act as Chair has been firmed up.

This meant that the Lead Improvement Adviser role was revised to incorporate a greater level of strategic responsibility and a greater capacity to facilitate the Board and to support the Chair. Whilst it is not possible for the Chair to know all the schools in the Partnership (approx. 60-65 for primary) the Improvement Adviser, as the Lead Adviser does currently, will be able to advise through the Risk Assessment of priority schools. Additionally, the School Improvement Advisers and members of the Board will be able to provide intelligence.

3.12 **Recommendation 6.** We recommend that the Education Partnership is in place by December 2014 and Improvement Partnerships are in place before the end of the spring term, 2015

3.13 **Update** - The Education Partnership will now be in place by July 2015 and the Improvement Partnerships likewise. The delay was caused by the longer feedback period given than originally intended.

3.14 Additionally, in the next phase of implementation, we would expect to see:

- completion of planning work for the transfer of resources from the local authority to Improvement Partnerships as described in our initial report, together with clarity on the nature of the local authority school improvement service in the future.
- an accountability framework explaining how the local authority can hold Improvement Partnerships to account for the impact of their work using allocated funding and how the local authority fulfils its statutory responsibilities for school improvement

3.15 **Update** - Work has been finalised on the funding and resources that each Improvement Partnership will have. £1.5m has been shared between all eight Partnerships based on a funding formula that takes into account the number of schools, size of schools, number of schools requiring improvement as

judged by Ofsted, prior attainment, the percentage of children and young people eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) and the level of deprivation.

3.16 Accountability will be through a Risk Assessment and an Improvement Plan for each partnership which will show priorities, agreed performance outcomes, how impact will be measured and how resources will be used. The Lead Improvement Adviser will Quality Assure (QA) progress against this Improvement Plan. All Chairs will also write a report for the meetings of the Education Partnerships, and the Assistant Director, Education and Skills will have half-termly meetings with all eight Chairs and also with the Principal and Lead Improvement Advisers.

3.17 Additionally, each Improvement Partnership will have a Lead Improvement Adviser and School Improvement Advisers attached to it.

The School Improvement Adviser will visit a school for a set number of days according to the shared assessment of the current position of the school i.e. outstanding, good, requiring improvement (RI) or a concern. There is the opportunity to buy more days if the school or Improvement Partnership so wishes. Outstanding schools will have one day, good schools three days, RI schools three days and as appropriate for schools causing concern. This applies to maintained schools and academies and is part of the monitoring role of the LA.

There will be a more transitional approach with the School Improvement Service. The funding for Improvement Partnerships will also be transitional to partly support the transitional School Improvement Service and partly to allow the Partnerships to evolve and embed. There will be formal times to review progress and to shape the way forward accordingly.

Details of the new and approved School Improvement Service restructure can be seen in Annex 1.

4.0 Consultation

4.1 There has been extensive consultation with Headteachers and Governors. This was through School Improvement Network meetings in summer 2014 and autumn 14, mini-conferences in January and February 2015. The School Improvement Service was also consulted as were CYPLT. Responses were collated and used to inform next steps with regard to the implementation.

5.0 The restructure of the School Improvement Service.

5.1 The restructure of the School Improvement Service for September 2015 is required due to

- The move towards sector-led leadership and eight Improvement Partnerships having responsibility for driving school improvement and improving outcomes in their areas
- The need to improve outcomes at all key stages
- To fulfil our collective ambition for all schools and settings to be good or outstanding
- The necessity to make £1.7m savings

- 5.2 The restructure of the School Improvement Service was planned to support the developments of sector-led improvement through the Improvement Partnerships. The new structure was approved by Full Executive on 17th March 2015. This paper can be seen as Annex 1. The agreed structure enables the Local Authority to carry out its statutory duties, its QA and monitoring responsibilities and to work with the Improvement Partnerships as they embed. There is also the opportunity to trade some services and to grow this for the future.
- 5.3 It was approved that a transitional approach for two years should be adopted both for the restructure of the School Improvement Service and also the implementation of the Improvement Partnerships. This would enable the Partnerships to evolve and embed both strategically and operationally. The transitional funding for the School Improvement Service structure will support this two year approach
- 5.4 The approved structure in Annex 1 para 9.6 comprises 62 fte established posts and is shown in tabular form. This structure has been drawn up to take the School Improvement Service past September 2017. However, as illustrated through the table in Annex 1 para 9.7 sustaining most of the 23 of the posts will be dependent on establishing a successful traded service by 2017. Therefore there is the potential for further reductions in staffing if the traded service is unable to provide the projected returns. These posts will be supported by the transitional funding to September 2017 and / or traded income.
- 5.5 The service remains one School Improvement Service team. There is the opportunity for Improvement Partnerships to become embedded and for roles within those Partnerships to be clarified. The traded element of school improvement (including governance) will be refined, becoming clearer and sharper.
- 5.6 Another review of the structure will be needed for September 2017 as the Improvement Partnerships develop and as the traded service evolves. There will also be a review in spring 2016 to see if any arrangements need to be “tweaked”. This will not be a restructure. The effectiveness of the new structure will also be considered as the Improvement Partnerships arrangements are reviewed.
- 5.7 The new base budget for the LA team, after achievement of the required savings, will be approximately £2.4m. This will cover all the on-going posts going forward. Traded income and one-off funding will be required to resource the transitional period and this will come from a variety of sources including reserves, Invest to Save and the phased delegation of the School Improvement Partnerships Funding. This will partly address issues raised during the consultation, but it will also allow the service some time in which, working closely within SmartSolutions, to enable it develop a sharper more refined traded arm over the next two years. As part of this, it is clear that some posts will not form part of the structure post-September 2017 unless they can be funded from traded income, purchased from Improvement Partnerships or meet a priority as identified by changed national education policy

4.0 Recommendations

- 4.1 Scrutiny committee is asked to consider the progress made as summarised in this report, in reshaping our approach to school improvement. Scrutiny is asked to debate and raise any questions concerning that progress..

Author of report: Jill Hodges
Assistant Director, Education and Skills

20th April 2015

Annexes

Annex 1 The restructure of the School improvement Service

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICE
8th DECEMBER 2014

RESTRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SERVICE

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consult formally, with staff and trade unions, on a proposed restructure of the School Improvement Service.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 This report describes the proposed restructure for the School Improvement Service for September 2015.

2.2 The restructure of the School Improvement Service for September 2015 is required due to

- The move towards sector-led leadership and eight Improvement Partnerships having responsibility for driving school improvement and improving outcomes in their areas
- The need to improve outcomes at all key stages
- To fulfil our collective ambition for all schools and settings to be good or outstanding
- The necessity to make £1.7m savings

This paper provides

- Our vision and ambition
- The Commission for School Improvement context
- Context
- Current staffing structure and proposed staffing structure and costs
- The rationale for the proposed model and costs
- Summary of the financial background

Accompanying papers on the website:-

- Engagement Session paper from 23rd October
- Engagement Session and general feedback
- Revised role of the Chair of the Improvement Partnership
- School Improvement restructure timetable
- Equality Impact Assessment
- Proposed structure diagram
- Current structure diagram
- Proposed ring-fencing arrangements

3.0 VISION

3.1 Our vision in North Yorkshire is for every child and young person to go to a school or setting that is good or outstanding. Our ambition is also that all outcomes in North Yorkshire will be above national averages and on improving trends. We want the visionary, strong and ambitious leadership from North Yorkshire schools and settings

to drive forward school improvement. Partnerships between schools that are focussed on improving outcomes already exist across the County. Our collective vision is that these organic partnerships will be absolutely key to achieving our ambition within the context of an Education Partnership and Improvement Partnerships. Alongside sector-led leadership will be a high quality School Improvement Service that supports Improvement Partnerships, more localised organic partnerships and individual schools.

4.0 THE COMMISSION FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

4.1 “Schools in North Yorkshire provide a good education for the majority of our children and young people. Around 80% of schools are good or outstanding and KS4 outcomes compare very favourably against national figures. As an education community we have achieved a lot but we know we have a lot more still to do”. Commission Report, spring 2014

4.2 The challenge for the Commission was to develop proposals that deliver long-term and sustainable improvement in school performance, enabling every young person in North Yorkshire to achieve more, regardless of their background or where they live. In addition the Commission firmly stated that all children and young people should go to a school or setting that is good or outstanding. The challenge was how did we collectively achieve this ambition?

4.3 We believe that primary responsibility for improvement rests with schools and that the LA also has a key leadership role in developing effective partnership working, building collaborative relationships between schools, sharing knowledge, brokering school to school support, facilitating peer learning and upholding accountability.

4.4 The Commission produced a report in spring 2014 that described four pillars that will underpin our collective approach to school improvement

- A collective moral purpose;
- Robust evaluation and challenge;
- Joint practice development;
- Significant social capital.

4.5 Recommendations describe that there would be an Education Partnership that replaces Schools’ Forum, five Primary Improvement Partnerships, one Secondary Improvement Partnership, one Early Years Improvement Partnership and one Special Improvement Partnership. The Chair of each Improvement Partnership will be a serving or recently retired Headteacher although there may be other transitional arrangements in place as Improvement Partnerships embed.

5.0 CONTEXT FOR THE RESTRUCTURE

5.1 The restructure reflects planned changes to the portfolios of Assistant Directors within the Local Authority’s Children and Young People’s Service. This parallel work has now been completed following consultation led by the Director. The outcome of that review will see more coherent senior leaderships and specifically relevant to the consultation surrounding school improvement:

- A greater alignment of strategy and services to support those with behaviour challenges and special education needs within a more coherent portfolio of Assistant Director Inclusion
- A retention of responsibility for intervention in improving specific early years settings within a 0-11 Principal Advisory function in Education and Skills

operating alongside a wider Early Years' Service within Strategy and Commissioning

- A desire to see systems more strategically in place in Education and Skills in the ELAC agenda without changing reporting arrangements of that service

5.2 There has been extensive consultation and feedback at School Improvement Network (SINs) meetings and mini-conferences in the summer and autumn 2014. These focussed on the role of the Chair, the Improvement Partnerships and the role of other members of the Board. The Commission proposals must sit alongside the restructure of the School Improvement Service as the two are inextricably linked. Details of previous papers can be found on the Consultation website.

5.3 There was also consultation with the Setting Leadership Forum (SLFs) during the autumn term, focussing on the proposals around Early Years

5.4 The Engagement Session on 23 October 2014 and feedback since has also helped to inform this proposal for consultation.

5.5 It must be noted that the School Improvement restructure is one of three major pieces of work

- The proposals from the Commission for School improvement
- The restructure of the School Improvement Service
- The sharpening and refocusing of the traded service

6.0 THE RATIONALE FOR POSTS WITHIN THE NEW RESTRUCTURE

6.1 Within the context of improving outcomes at all Key Stages and with the ambition for all schools and settings to be good or outstanding the following factors were crucial in reaching draft proposals for the restructure:-

1. The LA's statutory responsibilities 0-19 and in the case of Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) 0-25 i.e. what must be secured
2. The posts that are best placed to drive school and setting improvement, improve outcomes and support schools and settings in moving to at least good in terms of Ofsted
3. The LA's priorities as described in CYPP and Education and Skills Plan
4. The strategic, QA and monitoring role of the LA in the future including accountability for monitoring all school and setting performance

Additional factors that were taken into account are:-

5. Feedback from the School Improvement Service, CYPLT and JDP
6. The strategic role of the LA working with Improvement Partnerships
7. The posts that would support a "bottom up" approach to school and setting improvement i.e. working with classroom teachers, middle leaders, lead practitioners and Teaching School Alliances
8. The LA traded offer and the posts that will fulfil this aspect
9. An appropriate number of Behaviour and SEN Advisers and within the context of a possible move to Access and Inclusion
10. The degree of "readiness" for robust partnerships and the range of existing clusters from well-developed to very embryonic
11. The need of Improvement Partnerships to build, evolve and develop capacity to support other schools

- 6.2 Early Years, primary, secondary and special sectors are in different stages of development and readiness for their Improvement Partnerships. It is proposed both within the feedback around Improvement Partnerships and the restructure that there should be a transitional period of two years to see how the Partnerships evolve and embed both strategically and operationally. The transitional funding for the school improvement service structure will support this two year approach.
- 6.3 There has been a huge amount of feedback from colleagues within the School Improvement Service. This feedback was very much appreciated. Feedback was through the Engagement Session and also through team meetings, 1-1s with the Assistant Director and through emails. There were some common features but also areas where there was clearly not a consensus at all.
- 6.4 The proposed structure on pages 4 and 7/8 comprises 57 fte **established** posts and is shown in tabular form. This structure has been drawn up to take the School Improvement Service past September 2017. However, as illustrated through the table on page 7/8, sustaining 19.5 of the posts will be dependent on establishing a successful traded service by 2017. Therefore there is the potential for further reductions in staffing if the traded service is unable to provide the projected returns. These posts will be supported by the transitional funding to September 2017 and / or traded income.
- 6.5 The service remains one school improvement service team. There is the opportunity for Improvement Partnerships to become embedded and for roles within those Partnerships to be clarified. The traded element of school improvement (including governance) will be refined, becoming clearer and sharper.
- 6.6 Another review of the structure will be needed for September 2017 as the Improvement Partnerships develop and as the traded service evolves. There will also be a review in spring 2016 to see if any arrangements need to be "tweaked". This will not be a restructure. The effectiveness of the new structure will also be considered as the Improvement Partnerships arrangements are reviewed.
- 6.7 Some feedback from the Engagement Session suggested that if the transitional funding could be front-loaded then that could provide a greater opportunity for additional posts to demonstrate trading capability. Having explored this way forward in depth, it was felt that one year would not be long enough to establish trading capability
- 6.8 The new base budget, after achievement of the required savings, will be approximately £2.4m. This will cover all the on-going posts going forward. Traded income and one-off funding will be required to resource the transitional period and this will come from a variety of sources including reserves, Invest to Save and the phased delegation of the School Improvement Partnerships Funding. This will partly address issues raised during the consultation, but it will also allow the service some time in which, working closely within SmartSolutions, it can develop a sharper more refined traded arm over the next two years. As part of this, it is clear that some posts will not form part of the structure post-September 2017 unless they can be funded from traded income

7.0 PROPOSAL FOR FORMAL CONSULTATION

7.1 These posts take the School Improvement Service past September 2017.

Post	Fte	T&C	Salary range
AD	1	AD	
Principal Adviser 0-11	1	Soulbury	26-28+3
Principal Adviser 11-19	1	Soulbury	26-28+3
Early Years Improvement Adviser 0-5	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Primary Improvement Adviser 0-11	5	Soulbury	17-20+3
Secondary Improvement Adviser 11-19	3	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Behaviour 0-19	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Wellbeing 0-19	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser SEND 0-25	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Strategy and Performance 0-25	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Maths 0-19	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser English 0-19	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Governance Service 0-19	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Early Years Adviser 0-5	4	Soulbury	10-13+3
School Adviser 0-11	5	Soulbury	10-13+3
Behaviour Adviser 0-19	3	Soulbury	10-13+3
Learning beyond the Classroom Adviser 0-19	1	Soulbury	10-13+3
Early Years Consultants 0-5	6	NJC	Band 16
Total FTE	38		

COSTS	
Total cost including on-costs	£2,447k
Budget	£2,446k
Difference	£1k overspend

7.1.1 Rationale

7.1.2 There are two Principal Advisers posts – one for Early Years and Primary (0-11) and one for Secondary (11-19). These roles will be very similar to the roles currently carried out by the Principal Advisers with the addition of a QA role on the impact of the Improvement Partnerships, their improvement plans and the impact of the funding. A change from the Engagement Session option is that the Principal 0-11 Adviser will also be responsible for Early Years, given that an increasing number of schools are taking / considering 2, 3, and 4 year olds, and this will also ensure co-ordination and integration.

7.1.3 Principal Advisers will also have County-wide strategic responsibility for Pupil Premium pupils, Closing the Gap, leadership and QA. There will be also opportunities for other posts to be significantly involved.

7.1.4 The five Primary Improvement Advisers 0-11 will fit with the model of five Primary Improvement Partnerships. There are also five School Adviser 0-11 posts. These

are attached to each Primary Improvement Partnership and will work closely with schools in much the same way as the EDA currently does. There are additional five School Adviser posts supported by the transitional funding giving a total of 15 posts working with primary clusters / schools.

- 7.1.5 This rationale also applies to the 5 Early Years Advisers, one for each Improvement Partnership. However, one of these posts will have an enhanced role as Improvement Adviser Early Years who will be the strategic lead and the key link with the separate EY Improvement Partnership. These posts are focussed on performance and improvement, settings requiring improvement and those causing concern. They will work closely with the lead practitioners linked to the Teaching School Alliance.
- 7.1.6 Additionally there are six Early Years Consultant posts on NJC terms and conditions, working with localities and Children's Centres, and to be part of the strategic team within the Strategy and Commissioning Service.
- 7.1.7 There will be an Early Years leadership team consisting of the Head of Early Years, the Early Years Improvement Adviser, the Head of Inclusion, the Early Years Advisers and Early Years Consultants. The first two posts will also meet regularly to ensure complete co-ordination and integration between the different elements of the service. The Early Years' Service works with private, voluntary and independent settings (PVI) and childminders not just schools and nursery schools, so the number of posts reflects the number of 302 PVI settings and 200 funded childminders. In total there are 777 funded and non-funded settings, including childminders in North Yorkshire.
- 7.1.8 Feedback asked why there were 5 Behaviour Advisers and that the number was disproportionate. However there is no funding being given to schools for this work and there are a number of statutory responsibilities that the posts carry out. However, in response to feedback, the number of posts, although not reduced, is now funded as follows -three funded by the base budget and two posts supported by transitional funding.
- 7.1.9 Questions were asked around why there were five Improvement Advisers for secondary. It is proposed that should be three posts funded by the base budget. This recognises the fact that the Secondary Improvement Partnership is in a stronger place to move forward from April 2015. However, it must also be recognised that secondary schools causing concern are more challenging to turn around and therefore an additional two posts are included in the transitional funding group. One of these will be funded by the allocation to the Secondary Improvement Partnership. It is also recognised that these Improvement Adviser roles have both a strategic and more operational aspect as there is very limited capacity within the service to work with secondary schools.
- 7.1.10 There is a Lead Adviser post for Strategy and Performance which also includes data, curriculum and assessment.
- 7.1.11 There is no Lead Adviser for QA as feedback suggested. Instead responsibilities around reviews, health-checks and inspection preparation will be one of the strategic responsibilities of the Principal Advisers.
- 7.1.12 The LA currently has a statutory role in National Curriculum moderation, monitoring and training. With the ending of NC levels it is not clear what the future responsibilities of the LA will be. The LA is also responsible for SACRE and acts as the appropriate body for NQTs. The School Improvement Service would continue to

manage these responsibilities but capacity would need to be bought in for some aspects of this work.

7.1.13 There is a new strategic post to support the work around the leadership of schools' Governance. Governance has a much higher profile than before and the team requires additional capacity to meet need. Other governance posts are not funded through this budget. In response to feedback this will be a Soulbury post with the need for a school improvement background. This post will be the Head of the Governance Service and will line manage the Governance Support service.

7.1.14 There was mixed feedback round generalist and subject specific School Adviser roles. This paper proposes keeping the two elements separate to focus on the specialism working with middle leaders or classroom teachers and the School Advisers working with Headteachers.

7.2 The posts funded by transitional funding until September 2017

Post	fte	T&C	Range
Secondary Improvement Adviser 11-19	2	Soulbury	17-20+3
School Adviser 0-11	5	Soulbury	10-13+3
Behaviour Adviser 0-19	2	Soulbury	10-13+3
SEND Adviser 0-19	1	Soulbury	10-13+3
Wellbeing Adviser 0-19	1	Soulbury	10-13+3
Maths Adviser 0-19	3	Soulbury	10-13+3
English Adviser 0-19	3	Soulbury	10-13+3
Science Adviser 0-19	1	Soulbury	10-13+3
School and Settings Improvement Professional Officer	1	NJC 16 2 yr ftc	Band 16
Governance Support Officer	0.5	NJC 14	Band 14
Total FTE	19.5		

COSTS	
Total cost including on-costs for 2 years	£2445k
Budget over two years	£2420k
	£25k overspend over 2 years

7.2.1 Feedback was very clear about the number of Advisers for English and Maths given they were the crucial measures on which performance was judged; not the only ones but the crucial ones. Feedback also suggested that there should be a Science Adviser post given the Skills and STEM agenda, also Health and Safety responsibilities. Statutory responsibilities and priorities within the CYPP and Education and Skills Service Plan are the rationale for posts for SEN and Wellbeing Advisers. The adviser posts could be part-time subject to minimum service requirements of 0.5 fte

7.2.2 There is a new post, the School and Settings Improvement Professional Officer post which will be funded by Invest to Save for two years. The post will support the AD and Principal Advisers given that the number of Principal Advisers is reducing from four to two. This is a NJC Band 16 post and will support the scheduling of reviews, line manage the traded service, deal with complaints, HR issues, budgets, pay, and other high level organisational responsibilities.

7.2.3 There is an additional post, Governance Support Officer, to support the work of the Governance Service. This will be a NJC Band 14 post.

8.0 TERMS AND CONDITIONS

8.1 All posts are proposed as Soulbury Officer Education Improvement Professional pay and conditions unless clearly stated as National Joint Council for Local Government Services conditions of service. This means LGPS as a pension scheme for all posts.

8.2 The Engagement Session paper suggested that all posts should be based at County Hall. It is being proposed, following feedback, that this could only apply to new posts depending on service needs at the time.

8.3 Three days leave in term-time will still be allowed but only one day in each week. Although some feedback did not agree with this proposal it is to reflect the sharper focus of our traded work and to provide a full service throughout the term. This only applies to Soulbury staff, not NJC.

9.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The current School Improvement Service budget is £6.2m. This includes the staff costs colleagues within School Improvement, Behaviour, Special Needs, Vulnerable Learner teams, Early Years, overheads.

	Costs
Current budget	£6.2m
Savings required	£1.7m
Overheads	£0.6m
Improvement Partnerships funds	£1.5m
All other SI staff	£2.4m approx.

9.2 Please note the following posts are NOT included in the restructure as they are funded by separate budgets.

Not included in restructure		
Professional Services Officer (Traded Service)	1.0	Traded budget
Commissioning and Development Officer 14-19	0.8	Separate budget
Head of Early Years	1.0	Separate budget and sits within Strategy and Commissioning
Head of Governance Support	1.0	Separate budget but to be brought across into E&S
Head of Clerking Service	1.0	Traded
Governance officer	1.0	Separate budget but to be brought across into E&S
Head of Adult Learning and Skills Service	1.0	Separate budget
Adult Learning and Skills Service		Separate budget
Music Service		Separate budget
Outdoor Learning Service		Separate budget

10.0 CURRENT STRUCTURE

The current structure is as follows:

Post	Fte	T&C	Salary range
AD	1	AD	
Principal Adviser 0-11 Learners	1	Soulbury	26-28+3
Principal Adviser 11-19 Learners	1	Soulbury	26-28+3
Principal Adviser Vulnerable and Targeted Learners	1	Soulbury	26-28+3
Principal Adviser Standards and Support	1	Soulbury	26-28+3
Senior Lead Adviser Early Years	1	Soulbury	19-22+3
	6		
Lead Adviser Early Years	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Advisers Primary	5	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Advisers Secondary	5	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Behaviour	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Wellbeing	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser SEN	0.8	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Standards and Research	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Maths	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser English	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Workforce Development & Leadership	1	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Curriculum and Partnerships	0.8	Soulbury	17-20+3
Lead Adviser Curriculum and Development	0.8	Soulbury	17-20+3
	19.4		
EDA Early Years	5.8	Soulbury	10-13+3
EDA Primary	20.7	Soulbury	10-13+3
EDA Support and Development	17.4	Soulbury	10-13+3
EDA Behaviour	6	Soulbury	10-13+3
EDA Vulnerable Learners	2.4	Soulbury	10-13+3
EDA SEN	1	Soulbury	10-13+3
EDA Assessment	1	Soulbury	10-13+3
Learning beyond the Classroom Adviser	1	Soulbury	10-13+3
	55.3		
EY Teaching and Learning Consultants	14.2		
DofE Officer	0.5		
	14.7		
Total FTE	95.4		

11.0 HR IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 All affected staff (with few exceptions) attended the staff engagement day on 23 October 2014 where information and suggested options were shared. Feedback from staff on the day and over the course of the subsequent 3 weeks has greatly assisted the formulation of these proposals. Please see accompanying papers.
- 11.2 The proposed restructuring is being carried out in accordance with the NYCC Reorganisation and Redundancy Policy and Procedure and the Redeployment Policy. It includes proposals to change the terms and conditions of some posts, from Soulbury or Teachers' pay and conditions to NJC for Local Government Services

Staff terms and conditions. The proposed implementation date is 1st September 2015.

- 11.3 Staff will be ring fenced on the basis of their existing substantive roles in the service.
- 11.4 Assimilation to the final structure will be in accordance with the Council's policies & procedures and, subject to consultation, is likely to be a combination of suitability interviews and competitive interviews.
- 11.5 Job descriptions have been drafted for all posts and will be evaluated in accordance with job evaluation requirements where applicable. These will be on the consultation website.
- 11.6 There are 95.4 fte in the full establishment. However with vacancies, there are 78.2 fte occupied posts affected by these proposals. The proposed new structure comprises 57.5 fte posts; resulting in a reduction of 20.7 fte posts. Protection arrangements and additional travelling expenses will apply to some staff
- 11.7 In line with NYCC policies and procedures redeployment opportunities will be sought for displaced staff, through 2020 Supporting Staff, and will include more specialist redeployment solutions which are currently being sourced in recognition of the specialist nature of this particular staff group.

11.8 2020 Workforce

The proposed restructure takes into account the need for more efficient working practices including increased mobile and home working to support flexibility in the workforce. However, it is expected that new posts will have a County Hall base. This will be kept under review.

- 11.9 A post-implementation review will be undertaken in spring 2016 so after 6 months, with a more formal post implementation review carried out in September 16.

12.0 CONSULTATION

- 12.1 There will be a formal 70 day consultation with staff, the recognised professional associations and Unison on the proposals. The consultation time period would normally be 45 days in accordance with NYCC policy and procedure. However, taking into account 14 days of Christmas holidays where meaningful consultation would be diminished, and the complexity of the review in terms of a shift in focus of school improvement to one that is sector led, along with the need to develop a traded service, 70 days should allow for meaningful consultation to take place.
- 12.2 An outline timeframe is one of the accompanying papers.
- 12.3 Intranet pages have been set up where all consultation documentation will be placed. A generic email address has been created to be overseen by the Project Manager who will ensure questions/queries/ comments are responded to in an accurate, timely and consistent way.

13.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

The Equalities Impact Assessment for this restructuring is one of the accompanying papers.

Report prepared by Jill Hodges, Assistant Director, Education and Skills

5th December 2014