

A Guide to Models of School Organisation

(including formal collaborations, federations, amalgamations,
Trust Schools, Teaching Alliances and Academy Collaboration)
Updated April 2017 (v2)



Contents

Foreword	4
1.0 Purpose of this Guidance	4
2.0 What is collaboration?	6
3.0 Why collaborate?	6
3.1 Benefits and opportunities of collaboration	7
4.0 Context	8
5.0 Models of school organisation including formal	9
collaborations, federations, amalgamations and Trust schools	
5.1 Informal collaboration	9
5.1.1 Process	10
5.2 Formal collaboration	10
5.2.1 Process	10
5.2.2 Withdrawal	11
5.3 Federation	11
5.3.1 Process	11
5.3.2 Withdrawal	12
5.3.3 Governance	12
5.4 Trust Schools	13
5.4.1 Local Collaborative Trusts	14
5.4.2 Cooperative Trusts	14
5.4.3 Process	14
5.4.4 Governance	15
5.5 Amalgamation	15
5.5.1 Process	15
5.5.2 Governance	16
5.6 Teaching School Alliances	17
5.7 Post-16 collaboration	17
5.8 Academy collaboration	18
6.0 Possible challenges for collaboration	19
7.0 HR (staffing considerations)	19
8.0 Implementation Timescales	19
9.0 Conclusions	20
10.0 Case studies	20
11.0 Models of School Organisation	20
12.0 LA contacts	21
13.0 Further sources of information	21

List of Appendices

Appendix 1	
Audit Tool for School Leaders and Governors when considering collaboration	22
Appendix 2	
Ten lessons for schools on building effective partnerships	30
Appendix 3	
Examples of Different Models of Leadership	31
Appendix 4	
Post-16 Collaboration	32
Appendix 5	
HR Considerations – Alternative Models of Leadership/Collaboration	33
Appendix 6	
Models of School Organisation	34

Foreword

Schools in North Yorkshire provide a good education for the majority of our children and young people. Around 80% of all schools are rated as good or outstanding by Ofsted, and the results achieved by students in our secondary schools in particular are amongst some of the best in the country.

Several of our headteachers have been recognised as National Leaders of Education, we have a number of designated Teaching Schools and there are beacons of outstanding practice across our County recognised nationally by Ofsted and the Department for Education.

As an education community in North Yorkshire we have achieved a lot but we know that we have a lot more still to do.

The North Yorkshire Commission for School Improvement brought together school and local authority leaders in the Autumn term of 2013. The Commission published its report in January 2014. The response to the report by the education community has demonstrated the depth of school leaders' commitment across the County to work collaboratively to improve performance. The core idea of the report – that organic collaboration between schools is the engine of school improvement – can already be seen across North Yorkshire. The report concluded that all schools should be part of one or more collaborative arrangements as a means of driving educational improvement.

As an education community in North Yorkshire, we have a solid foundation of shared values on which to build. Together we are determined that every young person in our schools should have access to the right opportunities, experiences and support that they need to succeed. That is why we are committed to

working together to ensure that every school in our county is good or outstanding.

This guidance has been put together to support governors and headteachers to pro-actively explore a range of collaborative models. Collaborative working allows flexibility to suit each school – there is no blueprint, although there are models which can be observed as a starting point and inspiration. The guidance helpfully contains a self- evaluation “Audit Tool” for governors and headteachers to support governors with early visioning work and as a starting point for the development of effective partnerships.

I hope this guidance document will be helpful for all schools considering embarking on or further developing collaborative working.

Pete Dwyer - Director of Children and Young People's Services

1.0 Purpose of this Guidance

This guidance is part of a suite of documents available to schools considering their strategic direction in relation to acadimisation, federation, collaboration or amalgamation. The need to explore new ways of working has never been more important if we are to continue to provide a high standard of education for children across the County.

Maintained schools can use this guidance, and the sources referenced in the guidance, to explore the options available to them. NYCC Officers are able to support and advise schools on the detail of these options once there is commitment by governors to pro-actively explore them.

Collaboration supports North Yorkshire County Council's ambitions to:

- See all schools in North Yorkshire being judged as good or outstanding;
- See all schools working in partnership with others either through informal collaborations or through more statutory federations/trust arrangements;
- See a focus on overall educational arrangements across a geographic area rather than on simply protection of the current institutional status quo;
- Reduce the potential disruption to the education of children and young people through unnecessary points of transition;
- Recognise the significance of schools as part of a wider local community
- To avoid unnecessary prolonged travel arrangements for young people when quality affordable provision could be maintained locally through creative partnership arrangements;
- Prepare well for the projected growth in primary pupil numbers which may not be in the areas with current spare capacity;
- Enable governing bodies to provide in partnership with others a depth, breadth and quality of teaching and learning through successful recruitment of the best leaders and teachers to our local schools.

In 2013 the County Council launched a Commission for School Improvement which invited education leaders to consider how the above aspirations for school improvement could be met. The Commission found that effective collaborative schools systems exhibited some common features.

These were:

- A collective moral purpose that is shared by all the parties to the collaboration.
- Significant social capital – that is good quality relationships between the main stakeholders with high levels of trust, honesty and mutual respect.
- Joint practice development – that is a shared commitment to go beyond simple information sharing and to commit to learn together.
- Robust evaluation and challenge between partners, so that collaborations are meaningful rather than “cosy”.

This guidance seeks to support collaboration between schools and other partners which is underpinned by these principles.

The Audit Tool **Appendix 1**, available at <http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk>, will help governors to see clearly whether collaboration would be beneficial.

Other guidance available to support schools exploring new ways of working are:

- Models of School Organisation -HR guidance and toolkit: November 2016
- Joining or creating a formal partnership; federation or Multi Academy Trust (MAT). Advice for governing bodies: July 2016

These documents can be found at <http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk>

2.0 What is collaboration?

Collaboration includes partnership working of all kinds between schools, from informal partnerships, through sharing staff and/or services, to amalgamation. Collaboration can take place between maintained schools of different categories – community, voluntary controlled, voluntary aided, foundation and Special Schools. It can also involve working with non-maintained schools and providers e.g. Early Years settings, Academies, Independent Schools and FE/HE Providers.

Collaborative working allows flexibility to maximise benefit to each school – there is no blueprint, although there are models which can be observed as a starting point and inspiration. Some of these models will be shared within this guidance.

Where schools are already working in partnership successfully, the established arrangements are more important than the formally defined structure of the partnership, although structures can support the way that the partnership works.

At its simplest, collaboration is two or more schools working together to the mutual benefit of their pupils with the overall aim of improving outcomes for all. Collaboration has the potential to broaden opportunities and contribute to efficiencies it is important for governors to keep collaboration in their sights

3.0 Why collaborate?

Schools work in partnership for many reasons, and often with many different groups of schools. Being part of a formal collaborative structure does not prevent schools from entering into other less formal partnerships to achieve different goals. Many headteachers whose schools are part of a formal collaborative structure still see a great value in being part of a range of different networks. Far from being mutually exclusive, these different forms of partnership working often reinforce each other.

NYCC has an ambition for all schools to be working in partnership with others either through informal collaborations or through more statutory federations/trust arrangements and will support them to do so.

It is helpful for schools to pro-actively consider collaboration as early as possible. All schools find themselves in a challenging environment and too many schools wait until their headteacher has resigned or they are facing serious issues relating to pupil numbers, finances, governance or uncertain standards – this is often too late.

The starting position for the collaboration journey is clarity about the reasons why a school wants to move into partnership working. Stakeholder engagement in the process from the outset is vital. Governing bodies need to consider what will be gained by working within a partnership and any outcomes that cannot be achieved working on their own.

A successful partnership will be based on 'buy in' and shared ownership. Schools should consider how best to manage this and give thought to specific interventions which may be helpful depending on the context – e.g. resilience training.

Local Authority (LA) officers will support schools in considering the options open to them and in carrying out processes required for formal collaborations such as federation and amalgamation once governors have made a firm commitment to explore them. It is recommended that schools take some time in working through the audit tool (<http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk>) before involving LA officers, in order to get best value from their input.

Schools are working in a challenging context where partnership working can bring huge potential benefits for children and young people. The benefits for children must be the prime consideration for governors. Schools must be clear about what they see as the potential benefits for children, young people and the staff.

The Report of the North Yorkshire Commission for School Improvement (January 2014) highlights the importance of creating a culture and infrastructure for collaboration in North Yorkshire, which has the power to transform education and ensure every young person can attend a good or outstanding school.

“ We believe that every school in North Yorkshire should be an active member of a school improvement alliance or collaboration ”

Report of the North Yorkshire Commission for School Improvement – January 2014

3.1 The benefits and opportunities of collaboration

The potential benefits of collaboration will vary from one school to another dependent on its situation. A simple example is the extension of curriculum options e.g. where the collaboration of a number of secondary schools and colleges can extend the range and type of courses available, shared expertise or pooled resources can provide for particular special educational needs in the locality of the pupil, or small schools working together to extend the opportunities available to their pupils.

Benefits for pupils must be at the heart of collaboration. In the most general terms, by looking creatively at sharing knowledge and expertise, pupil outcomes can be raised through improved learning and teaching.

In some cases there will be benefits for parents such as simplified admissions processes and opportunities to access extended schools services.

Governors will have opportunities to influence developments and initiatives across a number of schools. Resources can be used more efficiently and effectively with the benefits of economies of scale and sharing of good practice e.g. shared procurement. Governors will also be part of a wider support network.

Benefits for school staff will often also benefit pupils. Recruitment of staff can be challenging, particularly in isolated communities where there is little opportunity for career development. Schools which are collaborating can provide a more attractive opportunity for prospective staff, with opportunities for career development and additional experience. Shared CPD can be

advantageous. A larger pool of staff allows for increased opportunities for succession planning. There will be access to colleagues with a wider range of curriculum expertise, opportunities to share and learn from good practice offering more flexible working and career development.

Although collaboration can bring benefits for schools of all size, there can be particular benefits for small schools and those that are rurally isolated.

CfBT Education Trust commissioned research in Spring 2013 to investigate partnership working in small rural primary schools. The main aim of the research was to investigate the most effective ways for small rural primary schools to work together in order to improve provision and raise standards. Usefully the report (Partnership working in small rural primary schools: the best of both worlds) identifies "Ten lessons for schools on building effective partnerships" see **Appendix 2**. The report also highlights key benefits of partnership working between schools which include:

- the introduction of sustainable models of headship
- broader opportunities for vulnerable learners and an enriched curriculum
- Improved lesson planning and peer-to-peer challenge and support
- The sharing of data and the benchmarking of practice
- access to a better range of professional development including classroom coaching and expert practitioners
- the development of leadership talent
- more effective business management

4.0 Context

The challenges facing all schools and small schools in particular, are increasing as the government raises the bar for school standards, expects schools to take more responsibility for their own improvement and relies increasingly on a school-centred approach to bring about school improvement.

Other factors include:

Funding changes

The impact of school funding change is expected to prove challenging for many schools. The national changes to school funding will be a challenge for some schools, particularly those small schools that do not qualify for sparsity funding. Although schools will be protected by the Minimum Funding Guarantee, some schools will need to review their organisational arrangements as a result of the introduction of the new formula.

The LA has committed to support these schools during the next 3-4 years (this timescale is based on the assumption that transitional arrangements will be in place during that time), and will be able to call on some reserves to help resource this support.

Demographic Changes

There is significant variation with regard to pupil numbers between and within different areas of the County. Across the County as a whole, after many years of falling pupil rolls primary pupil numbers are now growing. Primary numbers are predicted to increase by 6% over the next five years on average across North Yorkshire, although rural areas will continue to experience falling rolls. At secondary phase and Post 16

numbers will continue to fall a further 3% until 2015/16 beyond which initial growth will be slow and uneven and will only start to gather pace if significant housing comes forward. The LA produces pupil number forecasts for planning areas and individual schools which are available on request from the Strategic Planning Team within Children and Young People's Service. Understanding pupil number profiles going forward is an important consideration when looking at collaborations and partnerships.

Headteacher profiles in North Yorkshire

We are aware that in North Yorkshire almost a quarter of headteachers are 56 or over so either at, or approaching retirement. It is therefore important that schools consider succession plans and / or explore alternative leadership models in a planned way, rather than in response to a resignation or retirement. Alternative models of Leadership are detailed in **Appendix 3** including co-headship, part time head ship and executive headship. Further detail on these models, and others, can be found on the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) website www.gov.uk/government/organisations/national-college-for-teaching-and-leadership. If, having considered these models, you wish to actively explore one or more options, please contact the HR Advisory Service for further advice and guidance.

5.0 Models of School Organisation

including formal collaborations, federations, amalgamations and Trust schools

Collaborative models lie on a continuum from very informal arrangements between schools to amalgamation, where two or more schools merge to become a single school. It is governors, through a stepped planning process, who work out the detail of their collaborative work.

In addition to the main forms of structural collaboration outlined in this guidance, another option through which schools may develop stronger and deeper partnerships is by joining a Teaching School Alliance.

There is no one size fits all solution for collaboration and the design and operational workings of any collaboration will depend entirely on the circumstances of those individual schools and their communities and the focus or purpose of their partnership.

The fact that schools are working together is the key – the structure should support partnership working, rather than dictating the way that schools work together.

Information on some of the more widely used models is laid out below.

5.1 Informal collaboration

It is unusual now for schools to work in isolation without reference to other schools. Most schools are involved in working

informally with other schools, often through their local schools cluster. This may include, for example, staff training, shared residential visits and shared curriculum resources.

We encourage all schools to be involved in informal collaborative working as a minimum.

5.1.1 Process

No particular process is required for schools to start working collaboratively in an informal way although it can be helpful to lay out the arrangements in writing through a Memorandum of Understanding or Service Level Agreement. Clarity is needed about roles and responsibilities and any shared financial arrangements.

5.2 Formal collaboration - formerly known as Confederation or Soft Federation

These are formal partnerships with a strategic governance group across the partnership making policy decisions. This may include, for example, common policies, shared staff across a number of schools, work to improve the transition of pupils between schools at age of transfer. A written agreement sets out the basis of the collaboration, including the setting up of any joint committees and their terms of reference.

Each school retains an individual GB and retains its budget share. There can be workload issues as each GB must be serviced and each school will have a separate Ofsted inspection. Decision-making can be slow as information may be fed back to the individual GBs.

In North Yorkshire, there are several formal collaborations which have a single headteacher across the schools involved although a shared leadership is not a requirement.

The decision to collaborate formally is made locally by the governing bodies of the individual schools following a consultation process with their community and key partners.

NB This model can create considerable workloads for headteachers and may only be suitable for a short period of time for a specific purpose with a view to moving towards formal federation.

5.2.1 Process

Where governors decide to move forward with these forms of collaboration, LA officers are available to advise and support schools through the processes.

The decision to collaborate formally is made locally by the governing bodies of the individual schools. The decision to collaborate in this way can be significant, particularly where shared governance and staffing are involved. As such, we recommend that governing bodies follow the process below:

	Event
Stage 1	Governing Body (GB) considers scope for collaboration via Audit tool
Stage 2	GB decide to seek partner school/s
Stage 3	GB identifies potential partner school/s – LA Officers may be able to help broker discussions with potential partners
Stage 4	Joint meeting of GBs – church schools should invite the relevant diocesan officer. Agreement by GBs to explore collaboration options jointly
Stage 5	Creation of small Joint Steering Committee (JSC), comprising small number of governors from each school
Stage 6	Exploration of options by JSC. You may wish to explore curriculum, finance, staffing and governance.
Stage 7	JSC feedback to GBs

Stage 8	GBs decide to consult on formal collaboration
Stage 9	Consultation – with families, staff, wider community. This can be informal. It is helpful to have a meeting for parents, and for parents to have an opportunity to submit comments in writing.
Stage 10	GBs consider consultation responses and decide to enter formal collaboration
Stage 11	Collaboration agreement drawn up (it is recommended that legal advice is taken) and signed by Chairs of Governors
Stage 12	Implementation

5.3 Federation

Federation is a formal and legal agreement to bring together two or more governing bodies in one Instrument of Government. In many cases, a federation will have a single headteacher and shared staffing, although this is not a necessary part of federation.

Federation can involve a mix of maintained primary, special and secondary schools of any size. Federated schools retain the budget share which they would receive if they were not federated, although budgets can be pooled should governors wish to do so. Under the new national funding arrangements, no additional funding can be made available to support federations.

There will be a number of different reasons why schools decide to create a formal partnership through federation. Whilst many benefits of collaboration can be achieved through less formal partnership, federation provides a formal framework including shared governance which can be very positive. A challenge is that there can be workload issues, particularly for a single headteacher, as each school will continue to have a separate Ofsted inspection.

For some schools, federation may not be appropriate and a more radical solution may be appropriate.

5.3.1 Process

The decision to federate is made locally by the governing bodies of the individual schools following statutory consultation with their community and key partners. In order to form a federation, **schools are required** to follow the statutory process overleaf:

This process takes a varying amount of time, depending on how quickly governors wish to progress. In general, we would recommend that a minimum of two terms is allowed between Stage 1 and implementation.

In the case of informal collaboration it is expected that governors will carry out initial work and agree that collaboration merits serious consideration and will then seek specialist advice in respect of governance, HR, curriculum and finance.

Each model of alternative leadership or collaboration is likely to have some staffing considerations to a varying degree. It will be important to seek advice and guidance from the HR Advisory Service in order to explore the particular implications for each school, depending on preferred model and current context.

5.2.2 Withdrawal

The agreement between the schools will allow any school within an informal collaboration to withdraw from the arrangement after an agreed period of notice. It is recommended that the withdrawal period be agreed at the start of the collaboration and have a fixed period of time e.g. two terms minimum.

	Event
Stage 1	Governing Body (GB) considers scope for collaboration using Audit tool
Stage 2	GB decide to seek partner school/s
Stage 3	GB identifies potential partner school/s - LA Officers may be able to help broker discussions with potential partners
Stage 4	GBs informally agree to explore option of federation
Stage 5	Creation of small Joint Steering Committee (JSC), comprising small number of governors from each school
Stage 6	Exploration of options by JSC. You may wish to explore curriculum, finance, staffing and governance. LA Officers can assist by providing information and supporting themed meetings.
Stage 7	Report written for GBs. For consistency you may want the same report for each school, with school-specific sections if required
Stage 8	GB - must be an agenda item at a meeting for which at least 7 days' notice is given Each GB decides whether it wishes to proceed to consultation
Stage 9	Formal proposal prepared for consultation; content specified by Regulations
Stage 10	Formal proposal circulated to all relevant persons for comment; consultees specified by Regulations. Minimum 6 week consultation period
Stage 11	Joint meeting of GBs to consider responses
Stage 12	Individual GBs make final decision on whether they wish to proceed to Federation
Stage 13	Notification of LA and appointment/ election of new GB
Stage 14	Implementation

This process takes a varying amount of time, depending on how quickly governors wish to progress. In general, the process would take between 2 and 3 terms from Stage 1 to implementation.

In the case of federation it is expected that governors will carry out initial work and agree that federation merits their serious consideration. Local Authority officers would be available to support governors and provide specialist advice in respect of governance, HR, curriculum and finance at that stage.

Each model of alternative leadership or collaboration is likely to have some staffing considerations to a varying degree. It will be important to seek advice and guidance from the HR Advisory Service in order to explore the particular implications for each school, depending on preferred model and current context. Please refer to the Models of School Organisation, HR guidance and toolkit, November 2016 (<http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk>)

5.3.2 Withdrawal

In rare cases, the schools within a federation may decide that the federation is no longer appropriate. In this circumstance, the regulations allow a school in a federation to withdraw under certain circumstances, although a statutory process must be followed.

5.3.3 Governance

The GB of a federation must be reconstituted under the School Governance (Federations) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended by the School Governance (Constitution and Federations) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2016. The Regulations provide that the total number of governors in all schools must be no fewer than seven. There is no upper limit but it is recommended that the GB considers whether a smaller number of governors would allow business to be conducted more effectively.

The GB of all federations must include two parent governors, the head teacher of each federated school unless the head teacher resigns as a governor, one staff governor and one local authority governor.

In addition to the requirements considered in the preceding section, federations comprising foundation and voluntary schools are required to have partnership or foundation governors as follows:

- federations comprising only foundation and foundation special schools without a foundation must have at least two (but no more than one quarter of the total number of governors) partnership governors;
- federations comprising only foundation and foundation special schools that have a foundation but are not a qualifying foundation school must have at least two (but not more than 45% of the total number of governors) foundation governors;
- federations comprising only qualifying foundation schools must have up to two more foundation governors than all other governors;
- federations comprising only voluntary aided schools must have two more foundation governors than all other governors; and
- federations comprising only voluntary controlled schools must have at least two (but no more than one quarter of the total number of governors) foundation governors.
- federations comprising voluntary controlled schools and community, community special or maintained nursery schools must include at least one foundation governor;
- federations comprising more than one category of school including a foundation, foundation special or voluntary aided school must include at least two foundation governors or partnership governors as appropriate.

The GB may appoint as many co-opted governors as they consider necessary but the number of co-opted governors who are eligible to be elected or appointed as staff governors must not, when counted with the one staff governor and the headteacher, exceed one-third of the total membership of the GB.

5.4 Trust Schools

Introduced by the Education and Inspections Act 2006, Trust schools allow a maintained foundation school to be supported by a charitable foundation (referred to as “the Trust”). In return the Trust is able to appoint some of the Governors and bring additional expertise to support the school leadership. Trust schools are maintained schools, funded by the LA at the same level of funding as other maintained schools. The trust school is the direct employer of staff, owner of the school land building and other assets and its own admission authority. Trust schools have similarities to sponsored academies.

A church school (either Voluntary Community or Voluntary Aided) cannot acquire a new trust - it retains its own church trust.

Community schools cannot directly establish a trust without a change of status although they can convert an existing charitable trust for this purpose.

Trust schools can work in partnership with other trust schools in various ways.

A multi-school trust can be established with more than one school as a member with the aim of providing a structure for collaboration. All schools within the trust have trust school status. This is distinct from a multi-academy trust or umbrella trust where members are academies.

5.4.1 Local Collaborative Trusts

Local Collaborative Trusts are a particular model adopted by the Church of England. The structure allows groups of schools and academies including non-faith schools to collaborate. The Trust is a company and/or a charity and each institution is a member. No change of status is required, although community schools would need to set up a non-incorporated school charity that would appoint a member of the Local Collaborative Trust. This avoids School Company Regulations coming into play. Church schools are automatically charities and do not come under these regulations.

5.4.2 Cooperative Trusts

Cooperative Trusts are membership organisations based on common ownership or mutualism. They adopt a co-operative model for their structures and governance which usually involves adopting co-operative values and principles and ensuring that the key stakeholders such as parents, staff, learners and members of the local community have a guaranteed 'say' in the affairs of the organisation. People from the stakeholder groups can become members of the 'educational co-operative' for a school or cluster of schools. The members elect representatives to a "stakeholder forum", which then expresses the views of the wider group to the school leadership, while also electing trustees, who in turn elect some of the members of the school's GB.

This cooperative mutual model is based on open membership, equal democratic participation (one member, one vote) and clear accountability.

Cooperative trusts are now believed to be the largest grouping of all trust schools in England.

Each school within a Cooperative Trust must have Trust Status. A change to Trust status is a very significant undertaking requiring specialist advice and support as it affects responsibilities for buildings, staff and pupil admissions.

5.4.3 Process

A change to trust status requires a statutory process to be followed:

	Event
Stage 1	Governing Body (GB) considers scope for collaboration using Audit tool
Stage 2	GB initiates move to foundation trust status, including notifying LA and obtaining consent from trustees if applicable
Stage 3	Consultation – with families, staff, wider community.
Stage 4	Publication of Statutory Notices (4 weeks)
Stage 5	Report to GB on Representations – decision re trust status (School Adjudicator may take this decision in some cases)
Stage 6	Implementation

In general, we would recommend that a minimum of two terms is allowed between Stage 1 and implementation

It may be the case that several schools change status in an agreed way in order to create a co-operative trust of several schools. Each GB body must formally resolve to change status although consultation can be undertaken together by schools.

5.4.4 Governance

The GB of a newly converted trust school must be reconstituted under the School Governance (Federations) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended by the School Governance (Constitution and Federations) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014.

The Regulations provide that the total number of governors in all schools must be no fewer than seven. There is no upper limit but it is recommended that the GB considers whether a smaller number of governors would allow business to be conducted more effectively.

The GB must include: at least two parent governors, the headteacher, unless the headteacher decides not to be a governor, only one staff governor, only one LA governor; and foundation governors or partnership governors as specified below.

In addition to the requirements considered in the preceding section trust schools are required to have foundation/trust governors as follows:

- foundation school with a foundation that appoints a minority of the GB must have at least at least two (but no more than 45% of the total number of governors) foundation/trust governors;
- foundation school with a qualifying foundation has overall control of the GB and must have a majority of up to two over all other categories of governor.

The GB body may appoint as many additional co-opted governors as it considers necessary. The number of co-opted governors who are eligible to be elected or appointed as staff governors must not (when added to the one

staff governor and the headteacher) exceed one-third of the total membership of the GB.

Within these general partnership structures there are any number of permutations with the possibility of federated schools being part of a Trust or collaboration with other schools. More formal arrangements are generally preferred where a longer term commitment is required.

5.5 Amalgamation

Amalgamation is the creation of a single school from two or more schools. Under current funding arrangements, transitional funding is available to support the amalgamated school as it moves to a single budget. Split-site funding may be available to support single schools on two or more sites in the longer term.

The decision to amalgamate is made by North Yorkshire County Council following a statutory consultation process with the community and key partners. It is becoming increasingly common for Governors to approach NYCC to request that amalgamation is considered. The process below reflects the position where governors decide that amalgamation is the way forward.

In some situations, NYCC may initiate the amalgamation process following a review. This will always be discussed with governors locally.

5.5.1 Process

In general, an amalgamation consists of the technical closure of one or more school/s, and the expansion (and change of age range, if necessary) of one school. This means that, in school organisation terms, there are two (or three, if change of age range is required) linked proposals.

In order to create a single, amalgamated school the statutory process below must be followed:

	Event	
Stage 1	Governing Body (GB) considers scope for amalgamation using Audit tool	
Stage 2	GB decide to seek partner school/s – in some cases this will be self-evident	
Stage 3	GB identifies potential partner school/s – LA Officers may be able to help broker discussions with potential partners	
Stage 4	Joint meeting of GBs – church schools should invite the relevant diocesan officer. Agreement by GBs to explore collaboration options jointly	
Stage 5	Creation of small Joint Steering Committee (JSC), comprising small number of governors from each school	
Stage 6	Exploration of options by JSC. You may wish to explore curriculum, finance, staffing and governance.	
Stage 7	JSC feedback to GBs	
Stage 8	Any category of maintained school*	Voluntary and Foundation schools only*
Stage 9	GB Decision to seek amalgamation – request to NYCC	GB Decision to seek amalgamation
Stage 10	Executive Member approval to consult	GB approval to consult
Stage 11	Consultation Period (min. 6 weeks)	Consultation Period (min. 6 weeks)
Stage 12	Report to Executive on Responses – decision re publication	Report to GB on Responses – decision re publication
Stage 13	Publication of Statutory Notices (4 weeks)	Publication of Statutory Notices (4 weeks)
Stage 14	Report to Executive/ County Council on Representations – decision re amalgamation	Report to Executive/ County Council on Representations – decision re amalgamation
Stage 15	Implementation	Implementation

*LAs can publish proposals to close any category of maintained school within the LA. GBs of voluntary or foundation schools can publish proposals to close their own school.

In general, the process would take between 2 and 3 terms from Stage 1 to implementation.

5.5.2 Governance

If the GB body of the remaining school has not reconstituted under the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2012, then it must reconstitute under those Regulations when the change is implemented.

If the GB of the remaining school has already reconstituted under the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2012, then it may remain in place unchanged when the change is implemented. However, the change would be an opportunity for the remaining GB to consider building on the existing skills and experience of governors by engaging governors of the closing school. The GB of the closing school will be disbanded when the change is implemented.

The Regulations provide that the total number of governors in all schools must be no fewer than seven. There is no upper limit but it is recommended that the GB considers whether a smaller number of governors would allow business to be conducted more effectively.

The GB must include: at least two parent governors, the headteacher, unless the headteacher decides not to be a governor, only one staff governor, only one LA governor; and foundation governors or partnership governors as specified below.

In addition to the requirements considered in the preceding section, foundation and voluntary schools are required to have partnership or foundation governors as follows:

- foundation and foundation special schools without a foundation must have at least two partnership governors;
- foundation and foundation special schools that have a foundation but are not a qualifying foundation school must have at least two foundation governors;
- qualifying foundation schools must have up to two more foundation governors than all other governors;
- voluntary aided schools must have two more foundation governors than all other governors; and
- voluntary controlled schools must have at least two foundation governors.

The GB may appoint as many additional co-opted governors as it considers necessary. The number of co-opted governors who are eligible to be elected or appointed as staff governors must not (when added to the one staff governor and the headteacher) exceed one-third of the total membership of the GB.

5.6 Teaching School Alliances

In addition to the main forms of structural collaboration outlined in this guidance, another option through which primary schools may develop stronger and deeper partnerships is by joining a Teaching School Alliance. The Teaching School model gives outstanding schools a leading role in recruiting new teachers, the training and professional development of teachers, support staff and headteachers, as well as a key role in providing school-to-school

support. Schools will work together within a teaching school alliance – a group of schools and other partners that is supported by the leadership of a teaching school. Within the alliance, schools might act as strategic partners by providing support to other schools, running CPD provision, or taking ITT placements.

Schools might also act as alliance members and receive support, development or training. Alliances may be cross phase and cross sector, work across local authorities and may include different types of organisations.

As they develop, teaching schools working with other schools and universities will help to provide a strong supply of new teachers, develop leaders and the next generation of heads, and support schools in challenging circumstances.

There are likely to be limited opportunities for schools to apply to take a role as a teaching school in future, with priority given to schools in under-represented regions and phases.

A local example of a Teaching School Alliance is The Red Kite Teaching School Alliance which is partnership of schools and institutions sharing skills, experience, talent and capacity to help improve learning and achievement in schools across Yorkshire and the Humber.

5.7 Post-16 collaboration

In North Yorkshire there are some well-established and successful sixth form partnerships e.g. Tadcaster Grammar School and Sherburn High School and St Aidan's CE High School and St John Fisher Catholic High School Associated Sixth Form. Interest in forming a post-16 collaboration may be due to financial considerations, a desire to extend the curriculum options available to students in

the local area and/or to develop staff expertise by sharing good practice. The reasons will be many and varied and each partnership will be unique but the matters which need to be considered will share common threads.

There are many benefits of Post-16 collaboration. **Appendix 4** lists some of the advantages which staff in North Yorkshire involved in post-16 partnerships have compiled. Benefits include; a broader curriculum offer; appropriate courses for all learners leading to higher participation rates, new progression routes and reduced NEET numbers; financial benefits linked to efficient group sizes through pooling small numbers of students from different providers and best use of staff expertise and facilities.

5.8 Academy collaboration

The Academies Act 2010 gave all schools the chance to enjoy certain Academy freedoms. The Act also enabled new Free Schools to be set up in communities where there is demand from local parents for a good, new school.

The Academies Act 2010 laid the legal foundations allowing important structural changes to take place in the education system, by giving teachers, heads and other local people the powers and autonomy with the aim of raising standards.

The Education Act 2011 built on the significant structural changes made possible by the Academies Act, allowing the reforms made to the schools system to go even further.

Academies are state-funded but independently run schools. Academies may collaborate formally in multi-academy trusts or under umbrella trust arrangements. The strongest and most formal type of collaborative structure is the multi-academy trust (MAT) model where groups of academy schools working together under one Academy Trust. This model can be used for both sponsored and converter academies. MATs are in effect 'federations' for academies.

MATs are even more varied in their governance structures than local authority federated schools. The over-arching trust is the accountable body for all the schools, and in almost all cases each individual academy will have a local board, but the powers and functions of these local boards vary widely. This can be used for both sponsored and converter academies.

Under an umbrella trust, each academy is a separate legal entity with its own articles and funding agreement – the umbrella trust ensures collaboration through majority or minority control of individual academies.

Academies may also collaborate informally through collaborative partnerships. They made decide to agree a Memorandum of Understanding between themselves, but there is no shared governance arrangement required between them, and each academy retains its own Articles and funding agreement.

6.0 Possible challenges for collaboration

Locally managed schools have had extensive autonomy to determine their own priorities and identity for many years. Some schools may feel that there will be a dilution of this with more structured or formal arrangements of partnership or federation.

In small communities, there may be traditional separation which governors would need to work with the community to overcome.

There may be anxieties around the increased time commitment on already hard pressed staff. Central to this increased commitment is the need to establish good communications with all partners. It is generally the case that the less formal the collaboration, the greater increase in workload. For example, in a formal collaboration there is one GB and one Ofsted inspection for each school; in a federation there is one GB in total and one Ofsted inspection for each school; in an amalgamated school there is one GB and one Ofsted inspection in total.

Some partners may be wary of the stronger influence of larger schools, or schools which are perceived to be in a stronger position. Faith schools may find it challenging to identify an appropriate partner school.

7.0 HR (staffing) considerations

Each model of alternative leadership or collaboration is likely to have some staffing considerations to a varying degree. It will be important to seek advice and guidance from the HR Advisory Service in order to explore the particular implications for each school, depending on preferred model and current context. **Appendix 5** provides some examples of key staffing considerations for illustrative purposes including e.g. information on headteacher contracts, re-structuring due to amalgamation, Transfer of Undertaking (Protection of Employment) Regulations (TUPE) information, sharing staff across two sites but is not an exhaustive list.

Please also refer to the HR guidance and toolkit November 2016, which supplements the guidance within this document.

<http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk/hrpages>

8.0 Implementation Timescales

Timescales to consider what the schools needs are, will be different in every circumstance. Governors need to allow time to give this sufficient thought and planning as this is more likely to generate buy in from stakeholders and is more likely to lead to a successful partnership or leadership arrangement.

9.0 Conclusions

The emphasis for school improvement is now on a sector-led approach, bringing together teachers, governors, school improvement specialists and local authorities in partnership to develop innovative and collaborative approaches to improve the quality of schools and teaching.

The North Yorkshire Commission for School Improvement concluded that all schools should be part of one or more collaborative arrangements as a means of driving educational improvement.

The information in this guidance is intended to support governors to pro-actively consider collaboration and suggest that, as a first step, governors work through the attached Audit Tool. It is helpful to focus particularly on the potential benefits for children and young people.

If governors decide to develop their thinking further, LA officers will be able to support them in exploring their options. This support will be focused on providing specialist legal, HR, financial and other advice. The expectation is that governors will lead the process.

We are looking at ways of supporting schools, in conjunction with partners in the Dioceses. Whilst informal collaboration, formal collaboration and federation can be taken forward by governors with support from the LA, these options may not always be the answer. Amalgamation may be seen as an extreme solution by some governors, but we have seen an increasing number of GBs coming forward to ask that the LA progresses amalgamation proposals. We would advise that governors take an open-minded approach to looking at all options in the best interests of children and young people.

Governing bodies may find the document *Joining or creating a formal partnership; federation or Multi Academy Trust (MAT). Advice for governing bodies: July 2016* helpful when considering entering a formal partnership with another school, group of schools or Trust. <http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk/federation-and-collaboration>.

10.0 Case studies

The NCTL website www.gov.uk/government/organisations/national-college-for-teaching-and-leadership has a number of helpful case studies focusing on collaborations and partnerships.

NYCC conducted a research project in 2013 on 'Models of School Organisation/ Collaboration' The report contains a number of case studies and examples which may be of interest to governors pursuing collaboration available at <http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk/federation-and-collaboration>.

11.0 Models of School Organisation

A helpful summary of different models of school organisation is provided at **Appendix 6**.

12.0 LA contacts

In the first instance, you may wish to discuss collaboration with your Education Development Adviser (EDA). Other LA contacts are detailed below:

Subject	Section	Contact	Telephone
General advice on collaborative working	Strategic Planning Officer	Mark Ashton	01609 533229
	Strategic Planning Officer	Matt George	01609 533058
	Strategic Planning Officer	John Lee	01609 533182
	Strategic Planning Officer	Sue Turley	01609 797631
	Strategic Planning Officer	Juila Temple	01609 533242
Finance	Head of Finance - Schools and Early Years	Sally Dunn	01609 532308
Governance	Governance Manager	Alison Johnston	01609 532160
HR	Your HR Adviser		
Curriculum	Your EDA		
Schools Admissions	Admissions Manager	William Burchill	01609 536798
	Admissions and Appeals Officer	Karen Crossland	01609 534950
	Admissions and Appeals Officer	Jill Wilson	01609 534825
	Admissions and Appeals Officer	Vickie Hemingway-Allen	01609 535481
	Admissions and Appeals Officer	Rachel Conyers	01609 533005

13.0 Further sources of information

National College for Teaching and Leadership - The governance of federations August 2014
www.gov.uk/government/organisations/national-college-for-teaching-and-leadership

The Schools Co-Operative Society - Co-operative trusts
<http://www.co-operativeschools.coop/>

Ofsted report - Leadership of More Than One School (2011)
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/leadership-of-more-one-school>

House of Commons Education Committee - School Partnerships and Cooperation (2013)
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmeduc/269/269.pdf>

North Yorkshire Commission for School Improvement - Final Report
<http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk/school-improvement-partnerships>

Partnership working in small rural primary schools: the best of both worlds - Research report - Robert Hill, Kelly Kettlewell and Jane Salt - <http://www.cfbt.com/research>

Models of School Organisation HR guidance and toolkit November 2016 <http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk>

Joining or creating a formal partnership; federation or Multi Academy Trust (MAT) Advice for governing bodies: July 2016 - <http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk/federation-and-collaboration>

Governors' Handbook - publications.gov.uk January 2017 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/582868/Governance_Handbook_-_January_2017.pdf

Appendix 1

Audit tool for school leaders and governors when considering collaboration

The audit tool is designed to enable the school to explore the current opportunities and possible challenges to future collaboration with other schools. It has been developed for use by School Leaders and Governors as part of their “pre-collaboration” audit. Local Authority experience indicates that this background exploration of the key areas is a vital part of any consideration and will support the planning processes.

It is recommended that the audit is completed prior to any formal discussions taking place with the Local Authority. The audit tool draws together information that is already held by the school, but enables them to begin to look at it from a collaboration perspective. The Local Authority may be able to provide support in some areas if additional information is needed that the school does not hold.

It is suggested that the audit tool is completed by staff and governors in a working party, or it might be possible to use current committee structures to undertake the work. The working party will need to set aside sufficient time to explore all the key issues and to complete the document and take the follow-up actions required. It is important to stress that collaboration is not a quick and easy process but does have the potential to bring many positive outcomes for children.

The key aim of any collaboration is to provide benefit for children, so please try to keep outcomes for children at the heart of your thinking.

A Word version of this Audit Tool document is available for download at <http://cyps.northyorks.gov.uk>

SCHOOL FACTS AND FIGURES	NOTES	NEXT STEPS	OUTCOMES SECTION / IMPROVEMENTS
What is the school status (Community / VC / VA/Trust)			
What are our pupil numbers currently and projected for the next 3 years? Can we cope with additional pupils expected? Can we continue to be sustainable if pupil numbers fall?			
Who are our geographical neighbours? Do we have any 'natural' partners - e.g. similar schools, schools we already have a particularly strong relationship with?			
What are travel links to nearest neighbours/natural partners? How far away is the school? Is travel difficult at certain times of year? How long does the journey take?			
COLLABORATION	NOTES	NEXT STEPS	OUTCOMES SECTION / IMPROVEMENTS
What current collaborations are in place with others school(s) and / or organisations / settings? For example - informal collaboration, teaching school alliance			
Which area(s) of provision e.g. Sports partnerships, challenge partnerships, moderation?			
What is the impact of collaborations on outcomes for children so far?			
Which area(s) of provision could be improved by collaboration?			
Which staff are involved, what is their role and frequency?			

North Yorkshire County Council Children and Young People's Service

COLLABORATION (continued)	NOTES	NEXT STEPS	OUTCOMES SECTION / IMPROVEMENTS
What is the impact of collaborations on staff?			
How has the school made parents aware of current collaborations?			
What opportunities exist to obtain parental views on current collaborations?			
Are there any negative impacts of current collaborations?			
How has the school developed its aims and vision in line with collaborative working practice?			
How does the school currently meet its aims through collaborative working?			
What collaborations are in planning for the near future?			
What benefits for children might emerge from further collaboration?			
What disadvantages might emerge from further collaboration?			

GOVERNANCE	NOTES	NEXT STEPS	OUTCOMES SECTION / IMPROVEMENTS
Which Governors are due to finish their terms of office in the next 3 years?			
Are there current vacancies on the Governing Body?			
Are there particular skills and/or experience which could help the Governing Body to do its work more effectively?			
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?			
What links are there between Governors or Governing Bodies of other schools?			
How does the current Governing Body secure the unique ethos of the school, including religious character where appropriate?			

North Yorkshire County Council Children and Young People's Service

FINANCE	NOTES	NEXT STEPS	OUTCOMES SECTION / IMPROVEMENTS
What is our financial projection for the next 3 years? Is the school viable if no changes are made to its' organisation?			
Is the school currently receiving MFG protection? Would the school be viable without this protection?			
Do Governors have a good level of understanding of financial issues?			
Are there any potential additional factors where the full details are not yet clear – i.e. proposed new housing, changes in the funding system, primary pupil numbers profiles going forward?			

STAFFING	NOTES	NEXT STEPS	OUTCOMES SECTION / IMPROVEMENTS
Headteacher			
What are the current Headteacher's career plans for the next 3 years?			
What are we doing with regard to succession planning? Is there anything further that we can do?			
What are the benefits to us and others of extending the responsibility of the Headteacher beyond our school?			
How do we support the Headteacher's professional development?			
When looking at our school do we know what the current challenges for our Headteacher are - how have we addressed these to date?			
Do we know how our Headteacher views their work - life balance and what support they might like in this area?			
Do we support the Headteacher to work beyond the school and with other schools e.g. collaborative working?			
What networks does the Headteacher work with?			

North Yorkshire County Council Children and Young People's Service

STAFFING (continued)	NOTES	NEXT STEPS	OUTCOMES SECTION / IMPROVEMENTS
Teachers			
What is the current teaching structure, including responsibilities held and how are individuals held to account? Is this structure sustainable for the next 3 years?			
Are any staff due to retire over the next 3 years?			
Are any staff expected to move on / promotions in the next 3 years?			
Are any staff expected to ask to reduce hours over the next 3 years?			
Are any staff interested in leadership and promotion opportunities internally? Are any staff aspiring leaders?			
Which staff have taught successfully across FS1/KS1/ KS2/KS3/KS4/KS5 and which staff are able to take on leadership responsibilities and / or other teaching areas?			
Are any staff specialists who could apply their expertise in other schools as well as ours?			
Is there specialist expertise missing from the school? Could it be provided by specialist staff from other schools?			

STAFFING (continued)	NOTES	NEXT STEPS	OUTCOMES SECTION / IMPROVEMENTS
Support staff (Admin, Teaching Assistants, Clerk to Governors, Site staff (Caretaking Cleaning), MSA and Catering)			
What is the current support staff structure? Is this structure sustainable for the next 3 years?			
Are any staff due to retire over the next 3 years?			
Are any staff expected to move on / promotions in the next 3 years?			
Are any staff expected to ask to reduce hours over the next 3 years?			
How much of the finance / budget management is undertaken by an admin officer / the Headteacher / FMS support officers/ School Business Manager and are there plans to change this over the next 3 years?			
Does the admin post have a strategic management role - i.e. managing other support staff? Could it be developed with current post holder?			
Is current clerk to GB a school appointment or part of the Clerking Service? Do they currently work across more than one school?			

Appendix 2

Ten Lessons for Schools - CfBT Education Trust – *Partnership working in small rural primary schools: the best of both worlds*

Ten lessons for schools

1. Build on existing partnerships and relationships - partnership grows out of partnership.
2. Keep partnerships geographically focused - distance inhibits the frequency and intensity of schools' joint work.
3. Develop strong headteacher relationships, shared values and commitment by meeting regularly, visiting one another's schools, phoning and emailing frequently and welcoming new headteachers to a partnership school.
4. Be clear about governance arrangements, funding and accountability, and involve governors in school-to-school development and training.
5. Ensure that the leadership of partnerships reaches down to involve middle leaders and coordinators.
6. Use action plans to prioritise and clarify what partnerships will do together.
7. Focus partnership activity on improving teaching and learning through teacher-to-teacher and pupil-to-pupil engagement and learning - including the use of digital contact between staff and pupils.
8. Focus any dedicated resources on providing dedicated leadership or project management time to organise activity and/or cover transport costs.
9. Be prepared to engage in multi-partnership activity and for the form and membership of partnerships to evolve over time.
10. Monitor and evaluate the impact of partnership activity

Reference: CfBT Education Trust – *Partnership working in small rural primary schools: the best of both worlds* – www.cfbt.com

Appendix 3

Examples of Different Models of Leadership

Co-Headship

What is co-headship?

A co-headship is one of many alternatives of school leadership that are different from the traditional one school, one headteacher model. A co-headship exists where more than one person works to cover a full-time headteacher post – effectively as a job-share.

Schools must have a full-time equivalent (FTE) headteacher. The Governing Body (GB) may organise the split as they wish, but this should not exceed the equivalent of 1.0 FTE.

Establishing the work pattern is an obvious starting point (is it two days and three days, or alternate weeks or some other pattern). Although it is not necessary for either headteacher to be on site throughout every school day (any more than it is necessary that a single headteacher be on site all day, every day), it is essential that there is an identified headteacher on duty at all times.

Co-Headship may be a worthwhile model to explore as a planned recruitment and retention strategy, for example in order to increase potential fields of applicants. A vacant post could be advertised as full-time but specifically state that co-Headship may be considered – clearly this would depend on having two suitable candidates who wish to work part-time. Once in place, this model would need to be reviewed on the departure of one or both postholders.

Part Time Headship

There has been a lack of clarity about whether these arrangements are permissible under the School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document but recently the DfE have clarified that schools are free to make part-time appointments as long

as they appoint and reward an acting head on the days when the headteacher does not work. As there needs to be someone with headteacher responsibility at all times, the equivalent of 1.0 FTE, it is recommended that part time headship is only used as part of a co-headship arrangement. A nominated teacher may be the 'first point of contact', where headteacher is out of school but the headteacher will assume ultimate accountability, even in their absence.

Executive Headship

What is Executive Headship?

Executive Headship is normally where one headteacher leads two or more schools.

Each school that shares an Executive Headteacher remains a separate entity, has its own governing body, receives its own delegated budget and is inspected separately.

It is different from federation in that Federation is a statutory arrangement whereby two or more schools share a single governing body. Often schools in a federation will share an Executive Headteacher, but not always. Similarly, it is possible for schools to be in an Executive Headship arrangement but not be in a federation.

Further detail on these models, and others, can be found on the NCTL website. If, having considered these models, you wish to actively explore one or more options, please contact the HR Advisory Service for further advice and guidance.

Appendix 4

Post-16 Collaboration

The Benefits

There are many benefits of Post-16 collaboration. The lists below were compiled by staff in North Yorkshire who are involved in post-16 partnerships or who are considering working together with other institutions in their area. The lists include some advantages which will benefit the whole institution and not just post-16 students.

Benefits for the curriculum

- Broader curriculum offer
- Appropriate courses for all learners at all levels leading to higher participation rates, new progression routes and reduced NEET numbers
- Increased access to options (e.g. overcoming clashes)
- Broader extra-curricular provision (e.g. pooling resources to run courses such as lifeguarding, Mandarin)
- Shared fieldwork, trips

Financial benefits

- Efficient group sizes (e.g. pooling small numbers of students from different providers)
- Opportunity to collapse some A2 groups which will give some financial benefit and will also allow students to complete their course
- Joint appointments of staff
- Best use of staff expertise and facilities
- Flexibility in staffing (e.g. can reduce annual fluctuations in staffing requirements)
- Benefits for teaching staff
- Joint CPD e.g. joint department meetings, training days

- Can create opportunities for more staff to be involved in A level teaching
- Overcoming the isolation of the sole A level teacher
- Opportunity to use peer review approach to support provider self-evaluation

Benefits for students

- Overcoming student parochialism
- Providing a halfway house between school and university
- Improving student motivation and enthusiasm
- Developing independent learning skills e.g. can be a driver for using e-learning
- Raising achievement
- Generating a learning community
- Raising achievement overall - a driver for improvement, for evaluating quality, for sharing good practice
- A driver for student voice - 'you have to do it'

Appendix 5

HR Considerations – Alternative Models of Leadership/Collaboration

Each model of alternative leadership or collaboration is likely to have some staffing considerations to a varying degree. It will be important to seek advice and guidance from the HR Advisory Service in order to explore the particular implications for each school, depending on preferred model and current context.

1. Headteacher contract

- What is the impact on the headteacher's contract – schools should seek guidance regarding how to set the contract up where the headteacher is being shared (for example: decide which school will officially administer the contract, how will the two schools work together to manage the headteacher e.g. performance management)
- Consideration of how recruitment of a headteacher under these circumstances fits with the national guidance and considers local need i.e. 'good reason not to advertise'

2. School Staffing Structures

- Payment of headteacher – there may be differing ISRs for each school and there needs to be consideration of this at the outset. The complexity of the arrangement will need due consideration – for example, managing two schools adds complexity to the role which should be factored into pay considerations. Advice and benchmarking data can be sought from the HR Advisory service.
- TLR structures, Leadership arrangements etc where two schools are amalgamating – consider what the impact of this will be. If the school is considering amalgamation, a whole school staffing structure will need to be considered and this may lead to the need for some level of restructuring. HR advice should be sought if this is the case and this will need to be factored into timescales.

3. Processes

- Some of the models involve more complex HR processes e.g. Trusts, where a Trust is the employer TUPE is likely to apply which will require HR guidance through the process.
- Timescales for any staffing changes is required

4. Entitlements / considerations

- If travel is required between sites – arrangements for payment and agreement between two schools
- Contractual arrangements for staff – consideration of who will be the lead employer? Also need to consider how these elements will be managed if the two schools cross Local Authority borders / different employers.

5. HR policies and procedures

- If staff are to be shared across two or more sites, this is much simpler where both schools' HR policies and procedures are aligned e.g. model pay policy, disciplinary, capability etc.

NOTE: The above is not an exhaustive list

NB: A comprehensive toolkit is currently being developed to advise and guide GBs on the different models of school organisation outlined in this document.

Appendix 6 Models of School Organisation

Model	Description	North Yorkshire Position as of July 2014
Individual maintained school	Includes: Community, VC, VA, Trust or Foundation School – may be working informally with other schools to a greater or lesser extent on a range of issues.	This represents the majority of North Yorkshire schools. Individual schools may be amalgamated through closures and expansions to form individual educational establishments e.g. mergers of infant and junior schools, creation of all-through schools. This is governed by the School Organisation regulations and requires statutory processes.
Individual Academy	Includes: Individual voluntary Academy converters with or without sponsors, University Technical Colleges (UTCs) and Studio Schools and 'forced' sponsored Academies. They may be working informally in partnerships with other schools or academies on a range of issues. Can have single 'cooperative academies'. UTCs focus on 14-19 and may have university/employer sponsors. They are free standing.	This represents the majority of Academies in North Yorkshire. There are no 'forced' converters, UTCs or Studio Schools. There are formal procedures required for conversion. It is expected that all new schools will be Academies or Free Schools although new VA schools can still be created. There are statutory processes for the creation of new schools. Government approval (5 August 2014) has been given to open a UTC in Scarborough from September 2015. The UTC will specialise in advanced engineering and design and control. The Scarborough UTC is sponsored by Unison Ltd, McCain Foods (GB) and Dale Power Solutions along with the University of Hull and a host of other employer partners.
Individual Free School	Includes: new Free Schools or previously independent schools. May have sponsors or partners including Dioceses if they have a religious character.	There are currently no Free Schools in North Yorkshire. They are approved by DfE with no formal consultation with the LA.
Collaborative clusters of maintained schools	May have some agreements about the sharing of resources or services e.g. business support. Individual schools may operate across a number of clusters and informal shared arrangements with other schools.	All North Yorkshire schools operate in clusters but the extent of collaborative working varies. Some shared services and procurement e.g. Business Management. These arrangements can be governed by MOU and SLAs or contractual arrangements.
Pairs or groups of schools in 'soft' federations or collaborations	May have shared leadership and some joint governance. Governed by the School Governance (Collaboration) Regulations 2003 under the Education Act 2002. May also collaborate with FE colleges under the 2007 Regulations.	There are several pairs and trios of primary schools or secondary schools in this category in North Yorkshire. There is one primary/secondary collaboration. There are no collaborations with FE colleges. The decisions are taken by individual governing bodies of schools following informal engagement with stakeholders.

Model	Description	North Yorkshire Position as of July 2014
Pairs or groups of schools or Academies in formal federations	Single governing body and shared leadership but separate budgets, PAN etc. Governed by the School Governance (Federations) Regulations 2012.	There are a number of primary and secondary schools in federations. There are no federations between primary/secondary or special schools. There are no federated academies in North Yorkshire. There are formal consultation processes required – decisions are taken by school governing bodies. Maintained schools and Academies cannot federate with each other. Schools cannot federate with FE colleges.
Multi-Academy Trust (MAT or MAC)	Single trust body covering a number of Academies. A single set of members and directors. Master funding agreement with trust and supplemental funding agreement for each Academy. There is usually no mixing of converting VA and VC/Community Schools.	There are currently 312 'chains' nationally mostly with between 2-9 schools. Almost 40% of Academies are in a chain or some form of collaborative partnership. There are no multi-academy trusts within North Yorkshire although Outwood Ripon is part of the Outwood trust group.
An Umbrella Trust with a number of member Academies (LUT)	Individual Academy Trust for each school with representatives on an umbrella trust body. Also called a Local Umbrella Trust (LUT). Can include single Academy Trusts and Multi Academy Trusts.	There are no umbrella trusts in North Yorkshire.
Diocesan Umbrella Trust (DUT)	May also be known as a Diocesan Educational Trust or Diocesan Academies Trust. An umbrella trust for faith academies. The trust can provide services to member academies on a traded basis.	There are no Diocesan Umbrella Trusts in NY.
Academy 'Collaborative Partnership'	Individual Academy Trust for each school. No umbrella trust body but each school working together. May have some formal or informal agreements for joint working	Harrogate High is in partnership with Skipton Girls High School.
A Cooperative Trust with a number of member schools either with Trust School status or Academy status	Trust body operating on cooperative principles with representatives of each member school. Cooperative Trusts can convert into Cooperative Academy Trusts (either as a multi academy trust or as an umbrella trust). Can have a single school cooperative trust, a cluster trust or a hybrid model. Supported by Cooperative College in Manchester.	No Cooperative Trusts or Cooperative Academy Trusts in North Yorkshire. Maintained schools wishing to form Cooperative Trusts must individually decide to change status to Trust Schools. There are formal processes required including statutory consultation.
Local Collaboration Trust (LCT)	A particular model adopted by the Church of England which allows groups of schools and academies including non faith schools to collaborate. The trust is a company and/or a charity and each institution is a member. No change of status is required. Can sit above a multi academy trust or federation.	There are no LCTs in North Yorkshire, although some interest.

Note: Formal collaborations are not possible between Academies and Maintained Schools but they can work together collaboratively by sharing Memoranda of Understanding or SLAs. Collaborations can be linked with Federations - this can be a way for VA schools to collaborate with VC/community schools where federation is difficult.

Updated April 2017 (v2)

Contact us

North Yorkshire County Council, County Hall, Northallerton, North Yorkshire, DL7 8AD

Our Customer Service Centre is open Monday to Friday 8.00am - 5.30pm
(closed weekends and bank holidays). Tel: **01609 780 780**

email: **customer.services@northyorks.gov.uk** web: **www.northyorks.gov.uk**

If you would like this information in another language or format please ask us.

Tel: **01609 780 780** email: **customer.services@northyorks.gov.uk**