Strategic Partnerships, Federations and Trusts – options for Barnet schools

June 2019 (to be reviewed in June 2020)

**Introduction: Partnerships in Barnet**

The partnership between the Barnet family of schools, the council and Barnet with Cambridge Education (the Education and Skills service) is built on a shared commitment to improving achievement, wellbeing and life chances for children and young people, and this moral purpose, accompanied by an outward facing vision, is paramount in overcoming future barriers to success.

A strength of Barnet schools in recent years has been the outward facing nature of the leaders and governors and the understanding of the real benefits in working collaboratively and in partnership with other schools. In 2014 the council consulted with schools on a “New Approach to School Improvement” where schools were encouraged to form informal partnerships with other schools. At the time 13 partnerships were created; the majority of which remain today in one form or another. Some of these partnerships have developed and matured and others have either faltered or have remained very much as an informal collaboration tool. Therefore, in Barnet, there are many informal collaborations that already make a successful contribution to the richness of the Barnet family of schools. Strategic Partnerships, whether they be informal/soft, e.g. local loose partnerships of schools, or formal/hard, e.g. federations and trusts, are strategic tools that support a self-led, self-improving school system that will ultimately secure the educational landscape across the borough. It is not anticipated that all schools will be in a Strategic Partnership/Federation/Trust, however school leaders and those responsible for governance need to consider the following:

1. Future strategic direction of the school *– a key driver for any strategic partnership decision*
2. Leadership and management, including the governing body *– would a strategic partnership arrangement improve leadership, management and governance e.g. a federated governing body with a new leadership structure across two or more schools*
3. School improvement and standards *– would a strategic partnership arrangement lead to improved quality of education*
4. Financial security with a long-term vision *– would a strategic partnership arrangement save money e.g.* *federation, amalgamation or trust with a less costly leadership structure*
5. Sharing of expertise and resources – *would this be enhanced in a strategic partnership arrangement e.g. staff shared across more than one school in a federation or trust*
6. Improved transition, especially for vulnerable groups – *would a strategic partnership enhance transition between schools e.g. no transition if infant and junior schools amalgamated; federated governing body or trust ensuring transition arrangements are effective between schools - infant to junior, primary to secondary.*

**New models of leadership: Potential benefits of Strategic Partnerships, Federations and Trusts**

Schools across the country are developing new models of leadership for many reasons and there is now a solid body of evidence that schools working together can drive up standards and improve outcomes for children and young people. Research undertaken by Manchester University on behalf of the National College of Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) indicates:

*….. there is evidence of impact on overall performance, in that while federation and comparator schools perform similarly at baseline, federation is positively related to performance in the years following federation.*

In its annual report for 2011/12 Ofsted noted that “strong partnership work between schools is improving standards” and that “the evidence from federations of two or more schools, led by an executive headteacher, is positive”. It went on to say:

*In a survey of 61 schools that had formed 29 federations we found that provision and outcomes had shown improvement. In each case the fact that the school had federated was a contributory factor to improvement.*

In its report Ofsted also noted the following:

*… successful in broadening and enriching the curriculum and care, guidance and support for pupils . . . and had also resulted in better achievement for different groups of pupils such as those whose circumstances made them vulnerable. Pupils’ enjoyment of school and their confidence were also increased because of greater opportunities open to them. As well as maintaining good quality teaching and learning these federations shared a greater pool of resources and expertise that could be used more flexibly across schools.*

Ofsted’s study *Leadership of more than one school (2011)* also highlights the advantages to pupils’ attainment, cost efficiency and governance.

**The benefits of working together within a strategic partnership, federated structure or trust can include:**

* Strengthened governance, while maintaining the individual identity and accountability of schools where shared arrangements of good practice are absorbed across the partnership/federation so that: “*working as a governor in a federation …. challenges you to think of a bigger picture and take in a different perspective… you have to remember that you are a governor of a federation and not a governor of a school in a federation” (Governing Matters 2013)* *“school leadership from institutional (school) to educational leadership where school leaders have a ‘moral purpose linked to the well-being of the wider community rather than just any individual school” (Chapman and Muijs, 2013)*
* Support schools through shared leadership and working arrangements leading to sustained improvements in teaching and learning, behaviour and outcomes for children and young people
* Cost savings and efficiencies regarding the sharing of staff across a partnership or federation e.g. headteacher, SENCo, Subject Leaders etc.
* Cost savings and efficiencies to back office systems, including the sharing of administrative functions and a school business manager, shared HR functions including pay arrangements, savings on maintenance contracts, purchasing and supplies *“cost-effective, sustainable collaboration requires a focusing or targeting of funds on a limited number of schools rather than dispersing a given amount of resource over a large number of schools. If funds are concentrated in this way, greater possibilities are created for what we have called ‘leverage and synergy’, the capacity to sustain, enhance and make best use of funding” (Woods et al, 2006)*
* Improved opportunities for staff with the sharing of good practice and expertise, joint planning and assessment, richer professional development and training, better recruitment and retention through improved career progression and opportunities to work across a range of schools and in a range of contexts. *“more powerful forms of professional learning, more learning-oriented and enquiry-hungry cultures, and increased leadership capacity. Alliances reap benefits of more trusting relationships and openness to sharing and critiquing practice” (Styoll, 2015)*
* Recruitment, succession planning & retention of staff – *“School partnerships provide a good context for supporting and developing aspiring and middle leaders. They enable emerging leaders to observe the style of leadership of leaders from institutions other than their own. They often have the opportunity to take on new responsibilities either in another school or across a partnership. There may well be joint leadership training with colleagues from other schools.” (Hill, 2010)*
* Extending the reach of the best leaders through talent spotting and the development and support of future leaders with the opportunity to work across the partnership/federation and be mentored by experienced leaders
* Improved opportunities for children and young people, including a wider and richer curriculum offering often including cross partnership/federation events in arts, sports, music etc. Improved behaviour, attainment and greater enjoyment of school

**Our recommendation is that all governing bodies consider, on an annual basis, whether their school would benefit by being part of a strategic partnership, federation or trust. Having considered this, a governing body may decide to take their thinking further by getting advice and support from the Education and Skills service.**

**Definitions of different types of partnership**

**Informal/Loose Collaboration:** a non-statutory collaboration that can be established without following regulations whereby each school has its own governing body and the group of schools meet on an ad hoc basis. Schools share common goals and work together on informal agreements and ad hoc issues. Unlikely to have shared staff. Funding is provided at school level based on a local funding formula. There are many of these informal collaborations/partnerships already operating in Barnet e.g. WEBB, FAB Partnership, SNAP Partnership etc..

**Soft Federation:** a non-statutory collaboration that can be established without following regulations whereby each school has its own governing body. The federation has a joint governance/strategic committee without delegated powers. Schools share common goals, joint committees can make recommendations, but individual governing bodies must authorise decisions and plans. There may be common management positions with protocol to underpin the shared posts. Funding is provided at school level based on a local funding formula. There are no current examples of these in Barnet.

**Soft Governance Federation**: established under statutory regulations made under the Education Act (2002), each school retains its own governing body, though the federation has a joint governance/strategic committee with delegated powers. Schools share common goals and maybe some management appointments (e.g. school business manager). Funding is provided at school level based on a local funding formula. There are no current examples of these in Barnet.

**Hard Governance Federation**: established under statutory regulations made under the Education Act (2002), the federation has a single governing body shared by all schools. Schools share common goals and often management and leadership appointments (e.g. an executive headteacher working across all schools). Funding is provided at school level based on a local funding formula. Examples of these in Barnet include: GoldStar Federation (Orion and Goldbeaters), Squires Lane Federation (Manorside and Tudor), CHCP Federation (Church Hill and Brunswick Park), BEYA Federation (St. Margaret’s, Brookhill and Hampden Way Nursery Schools).

M**ulti-academy trust (MAT)** is a single entity established to undertake a strategic collaboration to improve and maintain high educational standards across a number of schools. A group of schools form a single MAT which has overarching responsibility for their governance. The MAT is accountable for the performance of each school in the group, although each can still have their own governing body which operates subject to delegation of power from the MAT. A master funding agreement with the MAT, and supplemental funding agreements with each individual school, is signed by the Secretary of State for Education. Examples of MATs in Barnet include: AIM Academy Trust (London Academy and Deansbrook Junior), The Elliot Foundation Trust (Parkfield, The Hyde, Claremont plus other schools outside Barnet), JCAT (Sacks Morasha and Rimon plus other schools outside Barnet).

**Characteristics of different models of partnership**

|  | **Informal/loose collaboration** | **Soft federation / Collaborative Trust** | **Soft governance federation** | **Hard governance federation** | **Multi-academy trust (MAT)** | **Amalgamation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What is it and how does it work?** | Non-statutory collaboration between a group of schools. Meets on an ad-hoc basis. Schools share common goals and work together informally.  Schools retain their identity.  Collaboration can occur between maintained schools and academies. | Non-statutory collaboration between schools. Schools share common goals but individual governing boards authorise decisions and plans.  Schools retain their identity.  Collaboration can occur between maintained schools and academies. | An arrangement where two or more maintained schools retain their own governing board, but the federation has a joint governance committee with delegated powers.  Schools share common goals through a service level agreement (SLA) and protocol.  Schools retain their identity.  A soft governance federation cannot occur between maintained schools and academies. | An arrangement where two or more maintained schools share a single governing board.  Schools share common goals through a SLA and protocol. A single governing board allows for more efficient decision making.  Schools retain their identity.  A hard governance federation cannot occur between maintained schools and academies. | A MAT is a single legal entity with responsibilities for schools within it.  A school can join an existing MAT or work with other schools to set up a new trust. | This is where two or more schools merge together to become one school.  In maintained schools, the local authority or governing board (depending on the school’s category) can amalgamate 2 or more schools by:   * Either publishing a proposal to close two or more schools and publishing a proposal to open a new one (current government policy means this would need to be a free school) * Publishing a proposal to close one school and enlarge/change the age range/transfer site of an existing school   In academies, the trust must propose to close one (or more) school and propose to enlarge/change the age range/transfer site of an existing academy. |
| **Statutory/non-statutory collaboration** | Non-statutory collaboration. | Non-statutory collaboration. | Established under statutory regulations made under [section 26 of Education Act (2002)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/32/section/26)  Each school retains its DfE number. | Established under statutory regulations made under [section 24 of Education Act (2002)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/32/section/24)  Each school retains its DfE number. | Statutory. An application must be submitted to the DfE. | Maintained schools must follow a [statutory process outlined by the DfE](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/514556/16-04-06_FINAL_SO_Guidance_ED_Regs.pdf).  Academies must also follow a  [statutory process](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/504321/Making_significant_changes_to_an_open_academy.pdf). |
| **Governance arrangements** | Each school has a governing board. | Each school has a governing board.  The federation has a joint governance/strategic committee that can make recommendations however each board authorises decisions and plans. | Each school has its own governing board but can delegate functions to a joint committee. | Individual governing board of federating schools cease to exist.  Single governing board shared by all schools.  Procedures for hard governance federations are outlined in [The School Governance (Federations) (England) Regulations 2012](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/1035/contents/made) and The School Governance (Constitution and Federations) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2016). | The MAT consists of a board of members and a board of trustees.  The board of trustees govern the MAT.  The board of trustees can delegate to individual academies by establishing local governing bodies. | A new governing board must be created to replace the two (or more) existing governing board.  In maintained schools, these must be constituted under the [2012 School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/1034/contents/made).  In academies, the constitution of the new governing board will need to follow the new academy’s articles of association. |
| **Ownership of the budget** | Each school has its own budget. | Each school has its own budget. | Each school has its own budget but can pool budgets together as they see fit.  A joint committee may have budgetary powers delegated to it so it can make decisions for the group of schools. | Each school has its own budget but can pool budgets together as they see fit.  The single governing board can make budgetary decisions on behalf of the group of schools. | Each school within the trust has its own budget.  However, the MAT can collect a proportion of the general annual grant funding to form one central fund. | The new school will have its own budget. |
| **Budgetary implications** | None, although opportunities for shared staff and resources | None, although opportunities for shared staff and resources | None, although opportunities for shared staff and resources | Retains the lump sum given to each separate school in the budget. The current amount in Barnet is £120,783 for all schools irrespective of size/ phase. Federation retains the £120,783 per school.  Savings in staffing costs due to shared staff e.g. headteacher | A master funding agreement with the MAT, and supplemental funding agreements with each individual school. MAT usually holds back a percentage of the overall budget to fund statutory functions previously provided by Barnet e.g. Audit, Health and Safety | Loss of lump sum for the separate schools i.e. only £120,783 for the school rather than for each school. However, Barnet gives an 85% protection for the 1st year. Therefore amalgamated school gets 85% of the £241,566 for the first year then only £120,783 for subsequent years. Schools have found that they recoup that lost £120,000 and more in savings.  Savings in staffing costs due to reduced number of leadership posts e.g. only one headteacher |
| **Ownership of land** | No change in the ownership of land. | No change in the ownership of land. | No change in the ownership of land. | Land and property that was previously held by the governing board of a federating schools is transferred to the governing board of the federation. | The ownership of land will depend on how land was transferred when the individual schools converted as outlined in [land transfer advice](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/academy-land-transfer-advice). | Ownership of land will depend on the categories of schools amalgamating and the amalgamation process being followed. |
| **Sharing of staff** | Unlikely to have shared staff.  There is no change to employment conditions and who is responsible for employing staff. | May have common management positions but need to have protocol or contract to underpin commitment to shared posts.  There is no change to employment conditions and who is responsible for employing staff. | May have common management positions but need to have protocol or contract to underpin commitment to shared posts.  Who employs the staff will depend on the category of schools which are federating. It will not change as a result of federating.  Employment conditions will stay the same. | Often have common management positions agreed in a simple manner e.g. executive headteacher working across all schools.  Who employs the staff will depend on the category of schools which are federating. Employment conditions will stay the same. | All staff are employed by the trust.  Often have common management positions such as executive headteachers and will usually have a central administrative team.  The trust can deploy staff across different academies if their contracts allow. | The new school will have its own staff. Staff can be transferred from the previous schools. |

**Differences between federation and amalgamation of schools**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Federation** | **Amalgamation** |
| **Decision** | Schools propose. Schools decide after consultation. | LA and/or schools may propose. LA decides after consultation. |
| **Consultation** | 1 stage – 6 weeks | 2 stages – first usually for 6 weeks on the proposals. Then issue a statutory notice and allow 4 weeks for ‘representations’ |
| **School identity/legal status** | No school closures. All schools keep existing identity and name. | Involves closure of all but one school and expansion of the remaining school. End up with one expanded school. |
| **OfSTED** | Separate inspections for each school | Inspection of one amalgamated school |
| **OfSTED designation** | All schools keep existing designation (e.g. Requiring Improvement, Good, Outstanding) | Expanded school has designation of expanded school (e.g. Good or Outstanding) |
| **Governance** | One ‘re-constituted’ governing body for the federated schools. | One ‘re-constituted’ governing body for the amalgamated school. |
| **Headteacher** | Either separate headteachers for each school or one headteacher or executive head over the federated school, but other models are possible and could involve associate heads heading up certain functions or sites | Usually one headteacher or executive head over the amalgamated school, but other models are possible and could involve associate heads heading up certain functions or sites |
| **Staffing structure** | Either one staffing structure or separate ones for each site | Usually one staffing structure for the amalgamated school but other models are possible. |
| **Budgets** | Each school receives separate local authority funding but the governing body may then choose either to keep the budgets separate or to pool them all and manage them as one budget. | Amalgamated school funded as a single school |
| **Admissions** | Admissions are managed separately for each school | Admissions to the one school but distance criteria will take account of the distance from the nearest school site |

**Support available to schools in establishing a Strategic Partnership, Federation, amalgamated school or a MAT**

Any initiative of partnership should come from the headteacher and/or governors; or when a school and the LA/diocese have identified, through the annual self-evaluation of the school, that there is a need to establish a strategic partnership either due to school improvement or financial reasons. The Assistant Director (Head of School Improvement) will give initial support to the headteacher and governing body in exploring the idea of a strategic partnership looking at existing models within and outside of the borough. The School Improvement Team can support the school in finding other schools for the potential partnership. The School Improvement Team can arrange and broker, with potential partners, an opportunity to discuss the reasons for seeking a partnership, the potential vision and expected outcomes. However, the school may require and welcome additional support and this can be commissioned through the Barnet Partnership for School Improvement (BPSI).

The support available is listed in the following Appendix 1.

Appendix 2 is a recommended checklist for schools to use when considering entering into a strategic partnership, federation or trust. The checklist can be adapted based on the reasons and type of collaboration being considered and to meet the needs of the individual schools.

**Appendix 1**



**Support package through BPSI:**

**A. Introduction**

The package would support school leaders and managers, including governors to make the best decisions with regard to the constitution of their school, so as to bring about the best outcomes for their pupils. This is in the context of:

• restricted budgets

• a local authority where effective partnership working between schools is already well established

• issues with

o recruitment of headteachers

o fluctuating pupil numbers

• a mixed, ever changing and sometimes bewildering economy of schools, in terms of, for example, soft and hard federations, amalgamations, academies, multi academy trusts etc.

The package would consist of a range of interventions and materials to support schools at different stages in their development and thinking. The interventions would be offered internally by the Education and Skills service and/or externally through BPSI consultant support as is fit for purpose. Schools could buy in according to need. The interventions interlink, and could be commissioned bespoke, purchased ‘off the shelf’, in combination etc.

**B. Possible interventions and materials**

**1. Annual update**

**Client:** headteacher and chair of governors

Given the constantly changing educational climate, the headteacher and chair of governors should annually review whether the school is currently constituted in the best way to bring about the best outcomes for pupils.

The support would include a presentation on

• the current local and national climate

• available options – pros and cons of reconstitution or maintain the status quo, with supporting evidence for individual schools, or offered out as a training session for all schools.

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant or LA

**Duration/Cost:** 2 hours funded through BPSI consultancy hours

**Materials provided:** power point presentation

**2. Next steps**

**Client:** headteacher and governing body

If a school is at a point of potential change, for example (could be commissioned by more than one school), e.g.

• retirement/ moving on of headteacher

• retirement/ moving on of headteacher at neighbour/ partner school (infants/ juniors – school in partnership)

• potentially unsustainable budget

• at risk of underperformance

• RI or inadequate Ofsted inspection

• undersubscribed

• looking for opportunities for extension, further partnerships etc.

• high staff turnover

• recruitment issues

leaders and managers should consider models for the school’s constitution.

This would therefore be a presentation on

• the current local and national climate

• available options – pros and cons, with supporting evidence

• case studies of institutions in similar situations

• advice as to next steps

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant or LA

**Duration/Cost:** 2 hours funded through BPSI consultancy hours

**Bespoke materials provided:** power point presentation

**3. Preparing for change**

**Client:** headteacher/ SLT and governing body (could be commissioned by more than one school)

If a school or schools has(ve) decided in principle they want to change their constitution, or they are in the process of change, or have completed the change, this would be on-going one-to-one bespoke support with, for example

• setting up a governing body working group

• exploring options in more detail

• accessing expert support with financial, HR and legal due diligence

• reporting to stakeholders

• liaising with appropriate local and national agencies

• carrying out consultations

• planning for change

• carrying out change

• functioning effectively post-change

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant

**Duration/Cost:** to be negotiated on a case by case basis; schools could opt in at different points in their change process. Would use an agreed amount of BPSI consultancy hours

**Materials provided:**

Package consisting of

• working group terms of reference

• report template

• power point on key partners

• information on consultation, communication and mediation processes

• consultation template

• change plan template

• advice and support on post-change functioning

**Bespoke materials provided:**

• working group report

• consultation report

• populated change plan

• populated post-change plan

**4. Preparing for change - materials only**

**Client:** headteacher/ SLT and governing body (could be commissioned by more than one school)

If a school or schools has(ve) decided in principle they want to change their constitution, this would be an ‘of the shelf’ pack of materials, as above.

**Cost:** No cost to a BPSI member school

**5. Effective partnerships**

**Client:** school partnerships

If a schools’ partnership is interested in further partnership working to, for example, achieve economies of scale, greater efficacy with key functions, such as assessment, policy creation and moderation, this would be a presentation on possible ways forward.

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant

**Duration/Cost:** 2 hours funded through BPSI consultancy hours across the partnership

**Materials provided:** power point presentation

**6. Partnership review**

**Client:** school partnerships

If a schools’ partnership is actively exploring opportunities for further partnership, they should review current partnership working in terms of capacity, ‘hearts and minds,’ potential ways forward. This would be an analysis, series of interviews and consequent report

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant

**Duration/Cost:** 3 days (analysis, interviews, report writing) funded through BPSI consultancy hours across the partnership

**Bespoke materials provided:** report

**7. Due diligence**

**Client:** headteacher/ SLT and governing body (could be commissioned by more than one school)

Due diligence reviews in the light of potential change of status with regard to

• staffing

• finance

• statutory and legal status

This would be an analysis and consequent report

**Facilitator:** HR/ legal/ finance

**Duration/Cost:** Cost to be agreed with HR/legal/finance services

**Bespoke materials provided:** report

**8. Recommendations**

**Client:** headteacher/ SLT and governing body

Given the school(s)’ current situation, analysis, this would be an analysis and report giving recommendations for ways forward in terms of

• staffing

• finance

• statutory and legal issues

**Facilitator:** HR/legal/finance

**Duration/Cost:** Cost to be agreed with HR/legal/finance services

**Bespoke materials provided:** report

**9. Consultation/communication/ mediation**

**Client:** headteacher/ SLT and governing body

If a school or schools has(ve) committed in principle to changing their constitution, this would provide them with the materials and if necessary the support to carry out mediation, communication, consultation where necessary.

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant

**Duration/Cost:** to be negotiated on a case by case basis

**Bespoke materials provided:**

• information on consultation, communication and mediation processes

• consultation template

• communications plan

• consultation/mediation report

**10. Leadership and management review**

**Client:** headteacher/ governing body

If a school(s) is(are) in the change process, they should review current leadership and management in terms of capacity, ‘hearts and minds,’ potential ways forward. This would be an analysis, series of interviews and consequent report

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant

**Duration/Cost:** 3 days (analysis, interviews, report writing) funded through BPSI consultancy hours

**Materials provided:** report

**11. Change plan**

**Client:** headteacher/ governing body

If a school(s) is(are) in the change process, this would be the provision of a plan to facilitate the change.

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant

**Duration/Cost:** 2 days (analysis, interviews, report writing) funded through BPSI consultancy hours

**Bespoke materials provided:** populated plan

**12. Where next**

**Client:** headteacher/ governing body of reconstituted institutions

If a school(s) has(ve) reconstituted, this would be support for operating at full potential. The package could be bespoke, or a drop-down presentation

**Facilitator:** BPSI consultant

**Duration/Cost:** 2 hours, or negotiated on a case by case basis funded through BPSI consultancy hours

**Materials provided:** power point presentation

**Bespoke materials provided:** report on recommendations for next steps

**C. Commission (5 days - £500.00 per day).**

• Descriptors for each intervention

• Power point presentations (some of which would need updating on a bi-annual or annual basis) for

o Annual update

o Effective partnerships

o Where next

• Preparing for change package

• Guidance on

o Next steps

• Guidance and template for

o Partnership review

o Consultation, mediation and communication

o Leadership and management review

o Change plan

o Where next

**Appendix 2**

**Due diligence checklist – for schools to consider when entering a strategic partnership, federation or trust**

This template can be used as a checklist for schools considering entering into a strategic partnership, federation or trust. The checklist can be adapted based on the reasons and type of collaboration being considered and to meet the needs of the individual schools.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Notes** |
|  | **Strategic** |  |
| A1 | What is the school status (Community / Foundation / VC / VA / Trust) |  |
| A2 | School Improvement Plan |  |
| A3 | Curriculum Model |  |
| A4 | Analyse School Performance (ASP) Online Data |  |
| A5 | Latest OFSTED report and associated Action Plan |  |
| A6 | Latest Audit Reports |  |
| A7 | Most recent H&S Audit with Action Plan |  |
| A8 | Most Recent Fire Risk Audit with Action Plan |  |
| A9 | Copy of Risk Assessments |  |
| A10 | Governor Skills Audits |  |
| A11 | Scrutiny of the Board Meeting Minutes for the last 3 years |  |
| A12 | Review of the Website in terms of compliance |  |
| A13 | Review of the School Policies to ensure compliance |  |
| A14 | % of Staffing against Budget |  |
| A15 | Current pupil number on roll and 3 year projection |  |
| A16 | Can the school(s) continue to be sustainable if pupil numbers fall? |  |
| A17 | Copy of the Single Central Record |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Notes** |
|  | **Collaboration** |  |
| B1 | What current collaborations are in place with others school(s) and / or organisations / settings? For example – informal collaboration, teaching school alliance |  |
| B2 | Which area(s) of provision e.g. Sports partnerships, challenge partnerships, moderation? |  |
| B3 | What is the impact of collaborations on outcomes for children so far? |  |
| B4 | Which area(s) of provision could be improved by collaboration? |  |
| B5 | Which staff are involved, what is their role and frequency? |  |
| B6 | What is the impact of collaborations on staff? |  |
| B7 | How has the school made parents aware of current collaborations? |  |
| B8 | What opportunities exist to obtain parental views on current collaborations? |  |
| B9 | Are there any negative impacts of current collaborations? |  |
| B10 | How has the school developed its aims and vision in line with collaborative working practice? |  |
| B11 | How does the school currently meet its aims through collaborative working? |  |
| B12 | What collaborations are in planning for the near future? |  |
| B13 | What benefits for children might emerge from further collaboration? |  |
| B14 | What disadvantages might emerge from further collaboration? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Notes** |
|  | **Governance** |  |
| C1 | Which Governors are due to finish their terms of office in the next 3 years? |  |
| C2 | Are there current vacancies on the Governing Body? |  |
| C3 | Are there particular skills and/or experience which could help the Governing Body to do its work more effectively? |  |
| C4 | Could reconstitution help the Governing Body to do its work more effectively? E.g. a smaller Body, with co-opted governors holding certain skills and experience? |  |
| C5 | What links are there between Governors or Governing Bodies of other schools? |  |
| C6 | How does the current Governing Body secure the unique ethos of the school, including religious character where appropriate? |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Notes** |
|  | **Compliance** |  |
| D1 | Scrutiny of Complaints Register |  |
| D2 | Scrutiny of FOI requests received and responses |  |
| D3 | Scrutiny of Data Protection Breaches and Action taken |  |
| D4 | Review of H&S Audits |  |
| D5 | Review of all legal contracts including suppliers, leases and consultants |  |
| D6 | Review of potential liability claims and outcomes |  |
| D7 | Review of Insurance arrangements |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Notes** |
|  | **Finance** |  |
| E1 | Income and Expenditure Profile over the past 3 years |  |
| E2 | Budget position for the past 3 years and future known changes |  |
| E3 | Budget position for the next 3 years. Is the school viable if no changes are made to its' organisation? |  |
| E4 | Breakdown of the full income analysis |  |
| E5 | Breakdown of the full expenditure and commitments analysis |  |
| E6 | Cash Flow Analysis |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Notes** |
|  | **Human Resources** |  |
| F1 | Staffing Structure & Staff Salary Schedule |  |
| F2 | Details of staff on any support programmes or formal capability |  |
| F3 | Details of formal disciplinary’s undertaken in the last 3 years |  |
| F4 | Information regarding any settlement agreements over the last 3 years |  |
| F5 | Details of staff on secondments |  |
| F6 | Analysis of HR Contracts, including existing TUPE and/or special conditions/clauses |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Notes** |
|  | **Capital & H&S** |  |
| G1 | Inspection of the physical assets, include AMP Surveys |  |
| G2 | Strategic Condition Improvement & Maintenance Plans |  |
| G3 | Fixed Asset Register |  |
| G4 | Grant Funding and associated liabilities |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item** | **Notes** |
|  | **Additional considerations** |  |
| H1 | Location of the Schools |  |
| H2 | Do they share the same / similar vision and ethos? |  |
| H3 | What are the Strengths and weaknesses of the School |  |
| H4 | What are the Opportunities and the Threats? |  |
| H5 | Are there any current capacity issues? |  |