

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

COMMITTEE: Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Resources and Governance Overview and Scrutiny Committee

DATE: 5 February 2008
7 February 2008

REPORT OF: The Manchester Education Partnership Joint Sub Group

SUBJECT: **Findings of the Manchester Education Partnership - Joint Sub Group**

Purpose of Report

To inform Members of the work of and recommendations from the Manchester Education Partnership Joint Sub Group.

Recommendations

1. That members note the report
2. That Members endorse the next steps table in Appendix 1 and add the referred items to the committee's work programme.

Contact officers

Susan Orrell
City Solicitor

Tel: 0161 234 3087
s.orrell@manchester.gov.uk

Courtney Brightwell
Scrutiny Support Officer

Tel: 0161 234 3071
c.brightwell@manchester.gov.uk

Background Documents

NONE

Wards Affected

ALL

Glossary

MEP – Manchester Education Partnership
SEO – School Effectiveness Officer
LSO – Learning Strategy Officer
PCT – Primary Care Trust



MANCHESTER
CITY COUNCIL

Manchester Education Partnership Review

**Report of the Joint Working Party of the
Children and Young People and Resources and
Governance Overview and Scrutiny
Committees**

February 2008

Introduction by Councillor Alistair Cox and Councillor Mary Watson, Joint Chairs of the Sub-Group

This report outlines the work undertaken between Aug 2006 - Dec 2007 by the MEP Joint Sub Group. The Sub Group was made up of Elected Members from the Resources and Governance, and Children and Young Peoples Overview and Scrutiny Committees. The Chairs of these two Committees acted as Co-Chairs of the Sub Group. As the current Co-chairs, we would wish to put on record our thanks for the hard work and commitment shown by the officers servicing the Committee and the Elected Members of the Committee - not least for their willingness to read and scrutinise the mountains of papers that were circulated to them.

It is certainly true to state that when the MEP Review was first proposed there were widespread concerns both about its achievability within the stated time scales and about some of its proposed methodology. From a financial perspective Members queried whether the required savings would be made in the necessary timescale, and whether the Human Relations issues would be dealt with effectively. And from a practice perspective, there were concerns about whether the quality of services to young people would be not only maintained but also improved through the radical changes being proposed.

It was to test the reality of these concerns that the Joint Sub Group was established. Our task was to scrutinise the detailed implementation of the Executive's proposed direction of travel. We believed that the Sub Group would provide significant evidence of the positive role of Scrutiny in influencing the detail of policy implementation, thereby holding the Executive to account in a constructive way.

1.0 Context

1.1 In order to achieve attainment levels consistent with the aspirations of the Community Strategy, the Executive, at its meeting of 26 July 2006, agreed that:-

- All current MEP budgets are in future delegated to schools except strategy, core functions (city wide functions that focus on supporting and improving educational outcomes) and school improvement support.
- Local Authority services will be delivered via 3 groups :-
 - planning/core
 - challenge and support to schools
 - traded services
- School improvement support and delivery of services to schools will be undertaken through the district structure which will also be the prime vehicle through which integrated children's services are delivered.

1.2 At meetings of the Children and Young People and Finance and General Purposes Overview and Scrutiny Committees held in July 2006 broad agreement had been given to the general direction of travel with regard to the review of the Manchester Education Partnership; the committees had accepted the necessity for rapid and radical change but expressed the wish to scrutinise the specific impact on finance, staff and services of the approach being taken by the Executive.

1.3 As a result of the concerns identified by both Overview and Scrutiny Committees a Joint Sub Group was established. Its role was agreed as being two-fold. Firstly, that of monitoring the detailed implementation and management of the staffing processes and other issues emerging. Secondly, ensuring that the challenging agenda was appropriately implemented in each service area in order to make the step-change necessary in securing improvements in pupil attainment.

2.0 Membership

2.1 2007/8 – The membership of the Sub Group was as follows: -

Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillors Cox (Co-Chair) Keller and Parkinson

Resources and Governance Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillors Andrews, Isherwood, Sandiford, Smith and Watson (Co-Chair)

2.2 2006/7 – The membership of the Sub Group was

Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillors Cox (Co-Chair) Keller and Parkinson

Finance and General Purposes Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillors Andrews, Isherwood, Priest (Co-Chair), Trafford and Watson

- 2.3 We would like to convey our thanks to all supporting officers, particularly Pauline Newman, Strategic Director of Children's Services and Pete North, Manchester Improvement Programme Director, for providing us with the necessary evidence to carry out our investigation. We would also like to thank the Executive and Assistant Executive Members who have been involved, particularly the Executive Members for Children Services, Councillor Jeff Smith (for the municipal year 06/07) and Councillor Sheila Newman (for the current municipal year), and for Finance and Human Resources, Councillor Sue Murphy (for the municipal year 06/07) and Councillor Bernard Priest (for the current municipal year) for their contribution. Finally our thanks go to Kate Brown and Courtney Brightwell for Scrutiny Support.

3.0 Remit

- 3.1 Our remit was set out at our first meeting on 8 August 2006 and was intended to marry the concerns of the two Overview and Scrutiny Committees. The remit was established as follows: -

- To test the evidence base that delegation would assist in improving attainment and reinforcing district collaboration and to investigate the impact of delegating various budgets to schools. To explore the educational and financial risks and implications of schools choosing not to buy back certain services.
- To explore funding arrangements and the consequences of delivering services on a traded basis.
- To oversee how the £0.5M for management development would be spent and how its effectiveness would be measured.
- To oversee the delivery of value for money in the service improvement project.
- To explore how staffing changes will be delivered, and the effect that this has on the culture of the service and the motivation of the staff.

4.0 Methodology

- 4.1 We met on 12 occasions between 8 August 2006 and 17 December 2007. In addition to this final report the Sub Group reported back to the relevant parent Committees in December 2006 and March 2007.
- 4.2 In order to inform our work we requested and received evidence from officers in report and oral format. The Sub Group investigated the following areas: -
- Trading Services
 - Human Resources
 - Financial Implications
 - As-Is Business Models
 - To-Be Business Models
 - District Working Structures (including the district working pilot)
 - Detailed Designs
- 4.3 In overview we commenced by scrutinising the effects of trading services on outcomes for young people, resources and staff and then during the second half of our investigation turned our attention to how individual services would be developed and delivered in the new climate.

5.0 Outcomes

- 5.1 We made recommendations on the following areas: -

5.2 Trading Services

- 5.2.1 We sought to test the evidence base that suggested that delegating budgets to schools led to enhanced performance at GCSE level. Statistical evidence was brought to the Sub Group which demonstrated the relationship between the level of delegated budget in other local authorities and both performance at GCSE level and conversion of average or above average performance at Key Stage 1 into 5 or more A* - C grade GCSEs. We found that the information provided was not conclusive but did demonstrate how offering services on a traded basis might act as a catalyst to bring about improved attainment. We stressed the need to ensure that valued services were not jeopardised in the process; this remains a continuing concern that will be scrutinised within CYPOS.
- 5.2.2 We also explored the effect of delegating budgets to schools on the relationship between schools and the Council. Members noted that the Education and Inspections Bill proposed greater powers for the authority to intervene where outcomes for children were not being met to provide assistance in a more effective manner. Members noted that this relationship appeared to be effective during the district working practices pilot and referred the matter to Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee for further scrutiny following the closure of the Sub Group.

5.3 Human Resources

- 5.3.1 We monitored the issues raised by the Finance and Human Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee, notably that changes to the staffing structure should be done through a managed process and that measures would be in place to ensure that there was not an unavoidable loss of the most valuable staff through the process and that disruption to staff morale was kept to a minimum.
- 5.3.2 We also received reports due to be submitted to Personnel Committee setting out proposals to establish senior posts within the new Education Services to underpin the new service delivery model. This gave the Sub Group an opportunity to comment on the establishment of new posts before they were submitted to Personnel Committee for consideration.
- 5.3.3 We monitored progress towards the target of a reduction of 140 Full-Time Equivalent posts and the Sub Group noted in its final meeting that a reduction of c.137 posts would be achieved. The Sub Group noted that this was a substantial achievement and supported the proposed staffing structure attached at Appendix 2.

5.4 Financial Implications

- 5.4.1 We contributed views on how the service improvement programme would lead to value for money from council services within education, and monitored progress towards the achievement of the savings target of £5 million per annum.
- 5.4.2 We noted, with regret, in August 2007 that the time scale for the achievement of the savings had been altered with the effect that it will not now be achieved until the financial year 2009/10, a year behind the original schedule.
- 5.4.3 We stressed the importance of challenging schools' expenditure of delegated budgets where it was not leading to improved outcomes for children.
- 5.4.4 In the final meeting of the sub group we referred further scrutiny of the financial implications of the MEP Review to the Resources and Governance Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

5.5 As-Is Business Models

- 5.5.1 We received 'As-Is' Business Service Models demonstrating the current structure of a selection of existing services within Education awaiting redesign. Members submitted comments on the existing services to highlight areas that should be amended as part of the MEP review. The following As-Is Business Models were received: -

- Link Advisers
- Strategy Consultants Service
- Learning and Behaviour Support
- Fair Access Arrangements
- Exclusion and Pupil Referral Unit

5.5.2 We commented that structured client feed-back from schools across a range of services would be beneficial for the creation of 'to-be' business models.

5.5.3 We commented that the Learning and Behaviour Support services appeared to be hampered by a lack of clarity regarding key contact points both for officers and members of the public.

5.5.4 In relation to Fair Access Arrangements members commented that the revised service would have to address the inconsistent practices amongst schools in notifying the Council when children are out of school.

5.6 To-Be Business Models

5.6.1 We received 'To-Be' Business Service Models demonstrating the revised structure for a selection of services within Education. Members submitted recommendations on the business service models. The following To-Be Business Models were received: -

- School Improvement
- Curriculum Support
- Education Other Than At School (EOTAS)
- Learning and Behaviour Support
- Special Educational Needs Casework
- Health Education Services
- Sensory Services
- Excellence in Cities
- Creative and Physical Education
- Teacher Recruitment and Development
- Parent Partnership Service
- Diversity Services

5.6.2 We highlighted the importance of a strong well-trained and well-supported body of governors able to effectively challenge schools to the success of School Improvement Services. A further report on this is shortly to be considered at the Resources and Governance Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

5.6.3 In response to notification that headteachers had highlighted EOTAS as presenting the greatest challenge a quarterly report was referred to the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee monitoring the numbers of pupils moving to different schools and cases where permanent

exclusion had been avoided due to action taken through the In-Year Fair Access Protocol.

5.6.4 In relation to Health Education we stressed the importance of ownership of the problem of teenage conceptions by schools and recommended that data should be recorded demonstrating levels of teenage conceptions for each school, and that schools should take an appropriate response where statistics demonstrated a particular problem. The report on Business Service Models for Health Education Services (HES) also presented three options for the revised service, these being: -

- **Option 1** – Integrate the work of the HES Team into the LSO (Learning Strategy Officer) role incorporating strong links with the PCT;
- **Option 2** – Integrate the work of the HES Team to the Healthy Schools Team in the PCT;
- **Option 3** – Remain a distinct team with improved links to LSO role.

We stated a preference for Option 1.

5.6.5 On the Teacher Recruitment and Development business model we reinforced the need both for identification of national best practice and records of the reasons for teachers leaving employment being kept to contribute to greater retention of teachers.

5.6.6 As regards Diversity Services we recommended that a high level of monitoring would be necessary to identify best practice amongst different schools and to monitor equality of access to the schools. We referred consideration of administrative support for the Diversity Services team to the Human Resources Sub Group.

5.6.7 Members recognised the important role that Ghyll Head played in contributing to Outdoor Education in Manchester. On this basis officers proposed a service delivery model for Ghyll Head that reflected the decision of Executive in July 2006 (see 1,1 above). Proposals to implement this are currently being prepared for presentation to the Executive, after first being scrutinised by the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

5.6.8 The Sub Group considered and commented on proposals about a significant number of services, and made detailed comments on a number of these, including Parenting, EMAG and Music Services

5.7 District Working Structures

5.7.1 Members noted that a pilot of the District Working Practices would be run between September 2007 and March 2008 in Higher Blackley to learn as much as possible about the experience of delivering services at a district level before the model is rolled out across the city. The pilot would involve qualitative monitoring of the reaction of pupils to the changes as well as the impact on schools in terms of leadership and the effect on lessons.

- 5.7.2 In our final meeting members received a report back on the initial experiences of the pilot from a School Effectiveness Officer (SEO) involved in the pilot. The Sub Group noted the benefits that had been realised by placing SEOs in district teams as they were able to feed in a wide range of community views from housing, regeneration and ward co-ordination officers into schools. The Sub Group also noted the value of the role in ensuring all school activity was organised to deliver better outcomes for children.
- 5.7.3 An ongoing concern through the life of the sub group has been the impact of the accumulation of a wide range of roles and responsibilities on senior posts - in particular SEOs and LSOs. This is an area that requires detailed monitoring in the district pilot and in the wider implementation and we have asked that the detail of these roles (job descriptions, person specifications and number of posts) be referred to the HR Sub-group of the Resources and Governance Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 5.7.4 We referred any further scrutiny of the district pilot to the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

5.8 Detailed Designs

5.8.1 In our final meeting we considered the 5 detailed service designs for Education; these encompassed the full breadth of services offered under the Manchester Education Partnership. The following detailed service designs were considered: -

- Commissioning Services
- Inclusion Service
- Children and Parents
- District Working
- Traded Services

We supported the framework within which education services would be delivered.

6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1.1 We are aware that there is still much work to be done to bring our education services to a standard expected of a City the size and importance of Manchester. We are also aware that concerns remain about the impact of the changes on staff and on children and young people consequent upon the review that we have scrutinised. It is for this reason that this Report outlines those areas that will require further monitoring and scrutiny from the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Resources and Governance Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 6.1.2 The detailed work undertaken by the Joint Sub Group has convinced us that radical changes are required in order to make the step-change necessary for securing long-lasting improvements in pupil attainment and making best use of the resources available. We broadly agree with the changes that are now being implemented.
- 6.1.3 The children and young people of Manchester have every right to expect an education service that supports their highest aspirations as the next generation of Manchester's citizens.

Appendix 1 Next Steps

The Joint Sub Group has recommended that the following items be referred to the following committees and sub groups for continuing scrutiny: -

Referred to:	Items:
Children and Young People	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposals for the future delivery of Ghyll Head• Quarterly report on the In-Year Fair Access Protocol showing pupil movements and where permanent exclusions had been avoided.• Further experiences from the District Working Practices Initial Implementation• The new relationship between schools and the Council in light of the power to challenge schools on the effectiveness of their spending.• External evaluation by Manchester University of the District Working Practices pilot.
Children and Young People (Ofsted Sub Group)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Selection of strategy consultants
Resources and Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• School Governance Support• Finance
Resources and Governance (Human Resources Sub Group)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staffing proposals• Roles of SEO and LSO posts• Administrative Support proposals