

Post-16 Governance Options – Workstream Evaluation Against the Investment Objectives

Document Date:

15th December 2020

Document Purpose:

This document provides a summary evaluation of the three Governance Options for post-16 provision. This is a summary of the agreed evaluation of the options against the Investment Objectives.

The w/s was divided into three groups and each group wrote one of the Governance Options papers (Status Quo, Joint Governance, Independent Governance). These papers were then presented to the w/s and subsequently each group took away a different paper to evaluate as a team. Once this review was complete, each w/s member was asked to complete an individual and anonymous evaluation questionnaire using Microsoft Forms. The questionnaire results were automatically collated by the software and the results formed the basis for the final evaluation tables below. The w/s met to review the collated results and focused the discussions particularly on those elements which did not have a strong majority agreement on the criteria of 'meets, partially meets, does not meet'. As a result some of the investment objectives also have an evaluation narrative.

Results Tables:

The tables below provide the evaluation results

Status Quo: Majority does not meet

General note: This is not a judgement of any particular school or course. This is a universal assessment of Powys-wide provision.

| Investment Objective | Evaluation Narrative | Evaluation Result |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1 To ensure that all Powys learners have access to their appropriate and aspirational | | Does not meet |

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| <p>learning and career pathways, ensuring that all learners are effectively supported to thrive</p> | | |
| <p>2 Provision that is likely to be sustainable and deliver value for money</p> | | <p>Does not meet</p> |
| <p>3 All provision is of the highest standard and learners are supported to achieve outstanding academic, vocational and extra-curricular outcomes of the highest level</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not a judgement of any particular school or course. When viewed across the whole of Powys “does not meet” applies however no single institution or course is singled out here – some provision is of a high standard whereas some requires improvement | <p>Does not meet</p> |
| <p>4 To ensure that provision meets the needs of the local economy</p> | | <p>Partially meets</p> |
| <p>5 Powys post-16 provision will foster and develop close links with all Powys schools, other learning providers and learners</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Develop close links with all Powys schools” does not happen with all provision. • There are some schools which do have strong links between each other | <p>Does not meet</p> |
| <p>6 To ensure delivery of Learner Entitlement via excellent, state of the art, outstanding and modern facilities including excellent IT infrastructure</p> | | <p>Does not meet</p> |
| <p>7 To ensure delivery of Learner Entitlement through robust leadership and governance arrangements</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This doesn’t mean there isn’t robust leadership and governance in some of our schools but this isn’t necessarily universal • There aren’t currently universal standards for our schools and the statement is also about the Powys-wide governance and oversight of education provision in the county • Estyn reports on many of our secondary schools uphold the view that leadership and governance is not strong enough. • There is also no common standard across providers for all learners in Powys and we want all learners in Powys to have the same entitlement and therefore it does not meet | <p>Does not meet</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Counter to this evaluation, the current governance arrangements have not yet had the opportunity to meet the Learner Entitlement statement that has just been written• There is a recognition through the Estyn report and the Transformation Strategy that we aren't delivering on "learner entitlement" within the strategy | |
|--|--|--|

Joint Governance: majority = meets

| Investment Objective | Evaluation Narrative | Evaluation Result |
|--|--|---|
| <p>1 To ensure that all Powys learners have access to their appropriate and aspirational learning and career pathways, ensuring that all learners are effectively supported to thrive</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counter to “meets” - clusters are inherently more local • Support to “meets” - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every cluster would have to meet the same criteria in each of the areas and this would be non-negotiable. Any learner in any part of Powys would be able to access the same provision regardless of their location. • Currently there are 12 schools doing their own thing, under the joint governance model there is a single governing body controlling the standard and they are comparing the standards between 3 different clusters – if one of these does something different / outside of the standards it won’t be sanctioned • Strategic management makes this more secure | <p>Meets</p> |
| <p>2 Provision that is likely to be sustainable and deliver value for money</p> | | <p>Meets</p> |
| <p>3 All provision is of the highest standard and learners are supported to achieve outstanding academic, vocational and extra-curricular outcomes of the highest level</p> | <p>Meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a dual-pronged approach to quality control – at the school and management board level, giving extra surety that standards will be monitored and upheld • Centrally standardised protocol, a commissioning model, everyone signs up to those principles, a set of standards for each of the LE criteria that everyone is happy with and that every cluster has to meet and if they don’t meet they don’t get the funds. • Commissioning expected to be on a yearly basis – either the teacher would have to change for a course to run to A2 or it would be unable to run to A2. You need to know that if you don’t produce the standards then you won’t be able to continue to run the course. | <p>Split decision: meets / partially meets</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Under the commissioning model it is the school that is being commissioned to deliver the course. The teacher remains to be the employee of the school – the member of staff and their capability remains a school issue as that teacher might be excellent at delivering up to GCSE. It is the school which loses the funding for the course and the course would be commissioned from another provider. This means that a HR issue doesn't come into it – that member of staff might just be removed from teaching A Level courses• At the beginning we would start with the proven established teachers in the established schools – this would then be broadened out.• There may be different component parts of a course delivered by different providers thus reducing the potential for the course to be removed and building resilience within the commissioning model• In most schools a good A level is often taught by 2 teachers. In Newport they commission from whoever delivers the best results in each of the schools <p>Partially meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If things aren't going well it still needs to go through a significant process for a teacher who is not delivering to standards – could foresee that there would be stumbling blocks in this model in terms of meeting the standards. You are commissioning for a period of time and if the standard can't be guaranteed it would be difficult to stop part way through.• Where will you find a replacement, high standard geography teacher, if you need to replace someone who isn't performing to a high standard• There may be HR barriers in place for removing teachers from delivering courses if they aren't performing (see above for counter argument) | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>4 To ensure that provision meets the needs of the local economy</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built-in is a set of criteria that each cluster must adhere to and that must then be agreed centrally. For example the north might be partnering with Shropshire College whilst the south might be looking at a southern provider to partner with. • Retains local view whilst having a Powys-wide strategic overview | <p>Meets</p> |
| <p>5 Powys post-16 provision will foster and develop close links with all Powys schools, other learning providers and learners</p> | | <p>Meets</p> |
| <p>6 To ensure delivery of Learner Entitlement via excellent, state of the art, outstanding and modern facilities including excellent IT infrastructure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is relative uncertainty around funding for capital improvements • Whilst we can't do this immediately, it would govern our decisions going forward around the standards of provision and environment. • We still need to define what this means e.g. "a place to work quietly" might be better than the overarching statement we have written | <p>Partially meets</p> |
| <p>7 To ensure delivery of Learner Entitlement through robust leadership and governance arrangements</p> | <p>Partially Meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the joint governance really be able to give the broad options for the ALN and WM learners? Could it really be guaranteed for all? • Teeth? Unsure about the legal basis at this current point. Understanding that this model does work. • What we have to be careful of is that if the funding is removed from a school it is not the school which loses out but the students and this impacts on learner entitlement. <p>Meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Management Board would be setting gold standards for careers, ALN, WM – these have to be in each cluster therefore you have to meet it or you don't receive the funding. • This model is built on the assumption that it will have the necessary supporting legal basis. • With multiple heads working together they will all be keen to improve the standards of a particular course because their learner may be taking that course as well | <p>Split decision: meets / partially meets</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a very collaborative atmosphere and will at the moment among schools to work together | |
|--|--|--|

Independent Governance: majority = meets

| Investment Objective | Evaluation Narrative | Evaluation Result |
|--|--|--|
| <p>1 To ensure that all Powys learners have access to their appropriate and aspirational learning and career pathways, ensuring that all learners are effectively supported to thrive</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern is unsure that this will be as positively viewed as the previous model (this will be left for the SWOT) | <p>Meets</p> |
| <p>2 Provision that is likely to be sustainable and deliver value for money</p> | | <p>Meets</p> |
| <p>3 All provision is of the highest standard and learners are supported to achieve outstanding academic, vocational and extra-curricular outcomes of the highest level</p> | <p>Partially meets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is missing the expertise that are at the baseline of delivery – concerns about the context that staff would be employed by a new 6th form across Powys – not sure that will work and therefore have concerns about the practicalities of this. <p>Meets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This model could probably secure a greater level of expertise in our teaching. Political appetite and schools appetite for this model may lead to significant disruption for learners (this will be captured in the SWOT) | <p>Meets</p> |
| <p>4 To ensure that provision meets the needs of the local economy</p> | <p>Meets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The governance structure would look for the breadth of input into the structure. <p>Partially Meets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You lose the local knowledge, too centralised You lose the local input into the decision making and the local ownership. Concern about the possible loss of local input from schools that have been operating in the areas for such a long time. | <p>Split decision meets / partially meets</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>5 Powys post-16 provision will foster and develop close links with all Powys schools, other learning providers and learners</p> | <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be the least palatable to heads and the governance element would have to be very carefully written. There will inevitably be a reduction in links with Powys schools to start with and relationships would have to be built up. • We run the risk of losing students here as this will be a new model but with least knowledge of parents (may run the risk of losing students at secondary as well as 6th form) <p>Additional comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are elements where this would meet more easily and elements where it wouldn't. Whereas on the one side it would be easier for 1 learning organisation to foster links with schools (rather than 12) there are also pros for learners belonging to one 6th form | <p>Meets*</p> <p>*Strong concern noted from JP that this partially meets rather than meets</p> |
| <p>6 To ensure delivery of Learner Entitlement via excellent, state of the art, outstanding and modern facilities including excellent IT infrastructure</p> | | <p>Partially meets</p> |
| <p>7 To ensure delivery of Learner Entitlement through robust leadership and governance arrangements</p> | | <p>Meets</p> |

Additional Notes:

- Worth taking into consideration the combined figures of responses as well e.g. “partially meets + meets” is stronger weight towards an ability to meet the requirements than the combined figures of “partially meets + does not meet” which is weighted the other way
- Need to consider the legalities around employment of staff across two centres under the Independent Governance option
- State of the Art facilities are unable to be fully commented on at this stage