

East Cleveland Cooperative Learning Trust

(A mutual schools co-operative membership trust)



The East Cleveland Co-operative Learning Trust.

Schools Consulting initially:

**Badger Hill Primary, Belmont Primary, Chaloner Primary, Galley Hill Primary,
Highcliffe Primary,**

Lingdale Primary, Lockwood Primary, Handale Primary, Whitecliffe Primary.

in partnership with:

**Freebrough Academy, Huntcliff School, Kilton Thorpe Specialist Academy,
Laurence Jackson School, St Peter's CofE Primary, Skelton Primary, Saltburn
Primary School, St Paulinus RC Primary, St Joseph's RC Primary.**

Report on the Consultation

Governing Body Meetings: 5pm Thursday 6th June 2013

Introduction

This document summarises the feedback from the East Cleveland Co-operative Learning Trust public consultation exercise for Badger Hill Primary, Belmont Primary, Chaloner Primary, Galley Hill Primary, Highcliffe Primary, Lingdale Primary, Lockwood Primary, Handale Primary and Whitecliffe Primary.

This consultation report was produced on behalf of the Governing Bodies of each of the nine Schools by the Co-operative College who also facilitated the consultation. The purpose of the consultation exercise was to allow each Governing Body to seek the views of their school communities (and any others with an interest), on the proposals to change their school's category from community to foundation and for them jointly to establish the East Cleveland Co-operative Learning Trust.

The report on the consultation process has been written against the following regulations and accompanying statutory guidance.

- The Education and Inspections Act 2006 (sections 18 to 24.)
- The 'SOPAM' Regulations 2007; i.e. The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007); ('The Regulations') and
- Trust School Proposals; A Guide for Governing Bodies and Local Authorities ('The Guidance'), to be read in conjunction with
- Changing School Category to Foundation (A Guide for Governing Bodies).

The Regulations specify who is to be consulted (para 5 of Schedule 1). As the Guidance says (para 42), the Regulations do not otherwise prescribe the consultation to be carried out but the Guidance itself says that 'the Governing Body should consult all interested parties, allow adequate time, and provide sufficient information for all those being consulted to form a considered view on the matters on which they are being consulted.' This is statutory guidance so governing bodies must have regard to it, when consulting on proposals (regulation 8.)

Copies of consultation documents were published and distributed widely to Consultees including parents/carers, pupils, staff, teacher associations and support staff trade unions, local Headteachers and Governors, East Cleveland Council as the Local Authority and the serving local MP. Parish councillors, local religious organisations and various local community and voluntary groups are represented on Governing Bodies.

In addition consultation meetings were held for Unions, staff and their representatives, as well as for parents/carers at each of the consulting schools. Additionally a general public meeting for anyone with an interest was held. These meetings were well publicised in the documentation supplied to Consultees.

This document summarises the responses received for the consultation as a whole, as well as the results for each school (see Appendices A1 to A9). All responses for each school will be made available to that school's Governing Body for examination when they consider this consultation.

Please note: for environmental considerations, as well as avoiding potential information overload, only the overall summary and the appropriate school appendices will be circulated to individual Governing Bodies. However all Chairs and Headteachers will have a copy of the full Report and further copies are available on request from each consulting school's office. Additional copies will also be available at the June 6th meetings.

Contents

1. Executive Summary	Page 5
2. Overview of the Consultation Feedback	Page 6
3. Recommended Action	Page 10

Appendix A – Summary of Response Forms

Appendix A1 – Summary from Badger Hill Primary School

Appendix A2 – Summary from Belmont Primary School

Appendix A3 – Summary from Chaloner Primary School

Appendix A4 – Summary from Galley Hill Primary School

Appendix A5 - Summary from Handale Primary School

Appendix A6 – Summary from Highcliffe Primary School

Appendix A7 – Summary from Lingdale Primary School

Appendix A8 – Summary from Lockwood Primary School

Appendix A9 - Summary from Whitecliffe Primary School

Appendix B – Consultation Documents – attached separately as PDFs

Appendix C – Notes from Meetings – presentation slides are attached separately as PDFs

Appendix C1 – Notes from Meeting with Teaching Associations and Union Representatives

Appendix C2 – Notes from Joint Staff Meeting (all Schools)

Appendix C3 – Notes from Joint Public Meeting (all Schools)

Appendix C4 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Badger Hill Primary School)

Appendix C5 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Belmont Primary School)

Appendix C6 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Chaloner Primary School)

Appendix C7 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Galley Hill Primary School)

Appendix C8 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Highcliffe Primary School)

Appendix C9 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Lingdale Primary School)

Appendix C10 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Lockwood Primary School)

Appendix C11 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Handale Primary School)

Appendix C12 – Notes from Parents Meeting Whitecliffe Primary School)

Appendix D – Local Authority Assurances Letter

Appendix E – Draft Governing Body/Trade Union Protocol

Appendix F – UNISON/SCS and NASUWT National Agreements – attached separately as PDFs

Appendix G – Proposed Reconstituted Governing Body Structures

Appendix H – Written representations received

Appendix I – Clarifications on Comments made in the questionnaires.

Appendix J – Clarifications on Questions raised at Consultation Meetings.

1. Executive Summary

The proposal for this Trust arises from a desire to build upon the very strong existing collaborative arrangements amongst the nine Consulting Schools, and the additional nine schools identified as Partners. It is useful to set out the vision that is at the heart of these proposals.

The vision is that the proposed changes will improve the life chances of the children and young people across East Cleveland, by:

- supporting each and every school within the trust to further raise standards
- ensuring that all have equality of opportunities in each and every aspect of their education
- ensuring that all have a voice
- building a coherent and inspiring learning journey for all
- increasing engagement and ownership of the schools within the their respective communities (including local, regional and specialist communities)
- working in partnership with other schools and colleges to promote best possible outcomes

The values and ethical principles of the Co-operative Movement, especially the ideals of self help and social responsibility, as well as active membership, will underpin the work of the schools – and the Trust.

A great deal of consultation has taken place with regard to these proposals.

i) In outline the timescale was as follows:

- a. At the start of the consultation a summary information leaflet was circulated to all required Consultees, providing details of the forthcoming consultation exercise and clearly setting out the process to be followed. It was accompanied by the response questionnaire and an explanatory letter/email. This outlined the background to the proposals as well as the reasons for putting them forward and the implications of the proposed legal changes. It also explained how to respond to the consultation.
- b. The explanatory letter/email and information leaflet clearly gave details of the consultation document, Booklet One, and how a hard copy could be obtained from each School. An additional Question and Answer document (Booklet Two) was also made available to anyone who requested a copy (see consultation documentation in Appendix B – attached). All of the documentation was also available for view and/or download from each of the participating School's websites.
- c. The consultation was promoted widely and approximately 2000 consultation packs were distributed when the consultation officially opened.

- d. A meeting was held with representatives of the local teacher associations and trade unions early in the consultation period, at Huntcliff School on 2nd May 2013.
 - e. A joint meeting was held for the staff of all the consulting schools on the same day, 2nd May, at Huntcliff School
 - f. An evening meeting for the general public on behalf of the 9 schools was held at Huntcliff School on 2nd May.
 - g. Parent meetings were held individually at each school.
- ii) There were 80 response questionnaires returned of which 69 (86%) were supportive. no responses were received which were against the proposals with 8 respondents being unsure. The highest rate of return came from Lockwood School (9%), but 5 schools received a return of over 4%, which is considered a good response rate. The questionnaires returned also contained a reasonable number of written views and comments.
 - iii) In order to collect the views of learners, a general awareness raising exercise has already been taking place via assemblies and a range of other communication mechanisms within each school. The response from learners was positive in all schools.
 - iv) A letter for the Local Authority to obtain the required employment assurances for staff has been prepared (see Appendix D) in the event of the Governing Body of a participating School(s) deciding to proceed to the next stage of the consultation process. In addition, a staffing protocol (see Appendix E) developed with Unions and Teaching Associations and which has been adopted by Governing Bodies in most other Co-operative Trusts has also been proposed.
 - v) Each Governing Body is also requested to note the UNISON/SCS National Agreement for school support staff as well as that for teachers between NASUWT and SCS.

2. Overview of the Consultation Feedback

In most consultation exercises, responses (particularly written) tend to be made by those who are concerned about aspects of the proposals and not by those who accept the proposals being put forward. In this case the level of responses was comparable with recent consultation exercises carried out elsewhere. The vast majority of the feedback to the consultation was in favour of the proposals.

Regarding the specific questions asked in the questionnaire: Appendix J – Clarifications on Questions raised at Consultation Meetings.

- i) Changing Status

There was only one respondent who did not support the change in category. Relatively few comments were made and the concerns noted were really to do with any expense and the practicalities of a perceived additional layer of governance.

ii) Proposed Partners

Seven respondents did raise concerns, but these were not consistent. Some suggested that additional schools should be part of the Trust – one of which is actually a proposed Partner. This school is already part of an existing Trust and therefore does not have the option to make our proposed trust its legal foundation. Other respondents were concerned that the Trust might be too large to manage and that the ‘stronger schools’ would carry too much of a burden in supporting other schools.

iii) Vision

There were few comments made and these were generally of a constructive nature.

iv) Trust Representation

Again, there were few comments, although those that were submitted seemed to reflect some perhaps understandable confusion regarding the relative roles of Trustees, Governors and Trust-appointed Governors. There were only 2 responses unsupportive of the proposal.

v) Additional Comments

These were generally repetitive of previous comments. Some surrounded the size and role of the Trust and the independence of Governing Bodies. The existing strong collaborative ethos was recognised and there was a question about whether arrangements for stakeholder involvement could be put in place without the formality of a Trust.

For more information see Appendix I – where detailed clarifications on comments made in the questionnaires are provided.

Please see Appendix J, Clarifications on Questions raised at Consultation Meetings, for questions that weren’t answered at the time and/or need additional clarification.

During the consultation there were inevitably some questions that were raised, many of them outside the remit of the consultation exercise. It is important nevertheless for each Governing Body to note these and address them as appropriate. Each Governing Body will note that some questions will have already been answered during the meetings with those being consulted.

Some of the issues highlighted were caused by a lack of clarity around governance, the partners and how the Trust and schools will operate. These will need to be further clarified and the proposed reconstituted Governing Body structure for each School will be published as part of the process for those schools deciding to proceed to the next stage, the statutory period.

It is important to stress however given some of the questions asked at the consultative meetings as well as in written comments received, that each School will retain its own Governing Body which will continue to run the School in the same way as now – albeit it with some additional powers and responsibilities. Each Governing Body would take on new responsibilities (i.e. becoming the admissions authority and also the legal employer of staff.) In

reality, the Governing Body becoming the legal employer, from experience elsewhere, has not made any difference with regard to staff pay and condition matters. Each school that becomes a foundation school within the proposed trust will still remain a maintained school writing the Redcar and Cleveland Local Authority family of schools.

Additional opportunities arise from the charitable nature of the Trust and there may be benefits in working together for some projects to access additional resources. The most frequently raised concern, expressed by parents as well as staff, is the impact the proposals would have on employee terms and conditions and this often arises as a result of a certain confusion between maintained foundation schools with a Trust, which remain fully within their local education authority; and academies which don't in effect become independent state funded schools outside of the Local Education Authority

In fact, in this consultation, in questions raised by staff and their representatives, there were few concerns, but reassurance was sought and given around staff terms and conditions of employment. Staff associations are generally in favour of the co-operative model, rather than moving to other models. There is a preference, amongst these associations, for remaining within the local authority structure. The co-operative model maintains an important link with the local authority, as well as providing a process for stakeholder views to be heard.

Going by the small number of staff questionnaires received (17) the level of response is much smaller from staff than in many similar exercises, so it would seem that almost all staff feel reassured with little or no concerns about the proposed legal change of employer and associated matters. It should be noted that there was an excellent attendance at the joint Staff Consultation (attended by 92 staff) and very few questions were asked.

It was made clear throughout the consultation period that terms and conditions for teaching staffs will not change as a result of this transfer of the legal employer role from the LEA to the appropriate governing body; and furthermore that terms and conditions for support staff will also be maintained. This will be further strengthened by the governing bodies receiving the necessary LEA employment assurances requested - v (see Appendix D, the "assurances letter to the Local Authority".) It will be important to ensure each Governing Body also agrees to protect the local rights of employees by remaining within existing arrangements within in the Local Authority for agreeing local school staff pay and conditions matters - (see Appendix E, 'the Governing Body / Trade Union Protocol).

They are also asked to subscribe to the spirit behind the UNISON/SCS and NASUWT/SCS National Agreements (see Appendix F), insofar as they apply to their situation.

Schools used their usual arrangements to inform, explain and receive feedback from their students. This would invariably involve student councils and assemblies. All schools report a positive response.

The context at which these proposals are being made is one where it is recognised that all the schools wish to 'future-proof' and strengthen their existing relationships and partnership working and speed up progress and mutual support. To this end part of the rationale is to formalise and extend existing partnerships to accelerate and further develop their school improvement strategies.

The proposed Trust is built upon a very strong informal partnership, contributed to by successful schools that have a clear vision for further improvement. The initial involvement of the Co-operative College as a founder partner and its experience in developing school co-operative membership trusts will also be important in the medium to long term in securing sustainability for the school's own school improvement strategies. It is widely recognised that the unique stake-holding model greatly assists in securing more effective levels of parental engagement and addressing low or differential levels of aspiration across a school community.

The proposals to move to Co-operative Foundation Trust status and establishing the East Cleveland Co-operative Learning Trust reflects the strong commitments to becoming self improving schools by working with other Co-operative Trust schools. This includes, taking advantage of the potential benefits of being part of the Schools Co-operative Society (SCS), the country's fastest growing schools network. SCS is also developing a strong regional presence across nearby Yorkshire and Humberside as well as locally. Another clear benefit is the importance of maintaining and building on the schools' existing strong links to their communities.

Through a focus on school to school models of school improvement, a local 'community eye' view of how to more effectively (via commissioning) deliver on the Every Child Matters Agenda against a local 'Children's Plan,' and by virtue of growing increasingly strong local roots through membership engagement, we would expect to see aspiration and achievement improve, particularly so in some of the more socially deprived communities served by the schools. Being school owned and run, the services brokered and provided via co-operative school trusts, are making money go further (very important in a time of declining resources) as well as being more effective in terms of impact. Vitally school owned co-operatives provide what schools need, not what someone else thinks they need - and co-operatives school trusts do not seek to 'short change' their schools. Any savings via joint procurement etc will stay in the local school system, not be extracted from it by the market/private sector.

The Trust is a mutual co-operative membership trust which is democratically accountable to its members consisting of pupils, parents/carers, staff, local organisations and others interested in supporting the Schools. This membership base will strengthen the links with each local community and lead to greater involvement with the local communities through the co-operative nature of the trust.

The three statutory requirements each Governing Body should satisfy itself that it has met in considering whether or not to proceed with their proposals in the light of the consultation feedback are:

- To enhance (and definitely not adversely) affect standards
- That the consultation exercise complied with regulations and guidance
- The views and comments from respondents have been properly considered

As can be seen from the summary above, all the statutory requirements were more than met. The schools reacted positively to any concerns expressed by those being consulted and provided additional information to staff upon request.

The very low level of concerns expressed and opposition to these proposals are likely to have stemmed from the confidence built up by existing collaborative arrangements, the support of the Local Authority and the inclusive ethos pervading the process.

3. Recommended Action

The number of response questionnaires from some schools was low; however this can be viewed as being positive as there is no significant body of concern or indeed opposition to the proposals. (Legally in these matters a non response is taken to mean that one is 'content' with the proposals and definitely not concerned about, or opposed to them.)

The attendance at the staff consultation meetings was good -and there was a feeling that with their favourable attitude towards the proposals, this would be of great encouragement in assisting with the Trust's mutual co-operative membership development in the future.

It is clear that the additional clarifications and ongoing discussions that have taken place in the consultation period have largely addressed the few concerns raised by some staff.

There is no need to hold additional consultation.

Recommendations.

It is recommended that no alterations are made to the proposals and that a joint Statutory Notice be issued for the nine schools.

It is also recommended that:

- Authority is delegated to the Head and Chair to finalise and issue the statutory papers.
- Each Governing Body should communicate the assurances requested from the Local Authority concerning pension matters and also regarding the application of existing policies around potential redundancy costs and related matters. The positive dialogue that has been established between the Schools, staff, Unions and Local Authority should continue to allay the natural concerns of those involved about their future pay and conditions.
- Each Governing Body is also recommended to formally adopt the recommended Governing Body / Trade Union protocol (see Appendix E), plus note the UNISON / SCS and NASUWT/SCS National Agreements (see Appendix F).
- That each Governing Body formally confirms its reconstituted composition if it is to go ahead and become a foundation school with the proposed trust as its legal foundation:
- That this full report including its summary of responses to the consultation, as well as those for each school, are put on the consulting schools' websites as part of the full Statutory Proposals.

Appendix A – Summary of Response Forms

A total of 80 questionnaires were received following approximately 2000 consultation documents being sent to all parents, staff and governors of the schools as well as to a significant number of interested parties.

The questionnaires received were comprised as follows – 57 from parents and 18 from staff, 3 governors and 2 who were not identified.

The number of responses for each question is given below. **The totals may not always be the same as it was possible for respondents to indicate multiple answers to questions or to omit answering a question or questions.**

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	48	17	3	0	2
I am not sure and would like more information.....	8	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a co-operative Trust because.....	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a co-operative Trust because.....	1	0	0	0	0

Q2. How do you feel about the partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
These are the right partners	49	18	3	0	0
I am concerned about the school working with because.....	6	0	0	0	0
I think the school should also think about working with.....	1	0	0	0	0

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
This is right for the school	54	18	3	0	0
I do not think..... should be a priority in the vision because.....	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see included in the school's vision.	1	0	0	0	0

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's governing body. This will link the Trust more closely to each school's governing body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Yes – this sounds like a good idea.	49	18	3	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about..... and I will want more information to be sure about the proposals.	4	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more governors because.....	1	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because.....	1	0	0	0	0

Appendix A1 - Badger Hill

Summary of response forms

A total of 3 questionnaires were received following over 170 consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties. These broke down as follows – 3 from parents; 0 from staff; 0 from ‘others’. There were no additional written responses. Copies of these questionnaires are available for governors’ perusal.

In addition all pupils were consulted via the School Council and the response was positive.

The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	2	0	0	0	0
I am not sure and would like more information ...	1	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

Concerned about Badger Hill losing out on funding

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	1	0	0	0	0
I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	1	0	0	0	0

I think the school should also think about working with ...	1	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

Comments received:

I think you should work with Hummersea Primary School

Unsure how Badger Hill will benefit from this as it has been run well in the past . Would not like Badger Hill to lose out on funding/ resources to another school.

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/Care rs	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q3. This is right for the school	2	0	0	0	0
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	0	0	0	0	0

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	2	0	0	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because...	0	0	0	0	0

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

Appendix A2 - Belmont Primary School

Summary of response forms

A total of 15 questionnaires were received following over 303 consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties. These broke down as follows – 5 from parents; 8 from staff; 2 from ‘others’. There were no additional written responses.

In addition all pupils were consulted via the School Council and the response was positive. Children were also consulted through a question and answer session in assembly.

The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing their legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	2	8	0	0	2
I am not sure and would like more information ...	2	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	1	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

I support the change of category but not acquiring a trust because of the partners (see comment on question 2)

I am not sure and would like more information particularly on which costs could be shared and how much this would in reality benefit the pupils. Would there not be additional costs associated with the Trust being responsible for premises and grounds?

I am not sure and would like more information particularly on why add an extra tier of governors, who they may be/ how selected. Also whether the move is necessary? Can't the schools involved simply share an ethos without this step? If change is necessary, why not go the whole way and come out of the LA altogether. I'd also like some assurance that staffing levels won't be affected adversely; particularly at senior levels and that each school is able to keep its own identity and individuality.

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	4	8	0	0	2
I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	1	0	0	0	0
I think the school should also think about working with ...	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

I am concerned about the school working with schools outside Guisborough because each town has their own situations and challenges. I believe the trust would be more cohesive if from the same town.

These are the right partners but can primary schools achieve the 'economies of scale' without a secondary partner? Would more collaboration require more admin/school business manager time – actually taking more time and autonomy away from individual schools?

I think the school should also think about working with Laurence Jackson rather than possibly a Saltburn/Huntcliff federation.

I think the schools should also think about working with other East Cleveland schools.

These are the right partners, especially as it means all Guisborough primary schools are included.

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/Care rs	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q3. This is right for the school	5	8	0	0	2
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

They are generic school visions so all okay but it is how they are embedded within the individual schools and the equality of the schools in the partnership that counts.

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	2	8	0	0	2
Yes, but I am concerned about...	2	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	1	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because...	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

I would prefer the Trust to appoint more governors because each school within the Trust should have their own representative in each school governing body. Your school's vision could differ from the Trust's representative.

Yes but I am concerned about – who they (Trust governors) would be and the amount of influence they would hold.

Yes but I am concerned about – will the governors be paid and if so where will the budget to do this come from? Also how will they be chosen / elected?

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

Comments received:

I trust the judgement of the Governing Body to make the most appropriate choice for the school, pupils, teachers and the community.

Why actually change if you are doing it already? What are the financial and political gains? How will our children actually benefit. This is my children, as well as children in other schools. I will research further on line and will attend a consultation meeting.

Appendix A3 - Chaloner Primary School.

Summary of response forms

A total of 8 questionnaires were received following over 200 consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties.

These broke down as follows –1 from parents; 7 from staff; 0 from ‘others’. There were no additional written responses.

In addition all pupils were consulted via the School Council and the response was positive

The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	0	7	0	0	0
I am not sure and would like more information ...	1	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

Parent: I am not sure whether changing to a co-op trust means that school would not be made to change again to become an academy in the future.

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	1	7	0	0	0

I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I think the school should also think about working with ...	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

Parent: I think that the school should also think about working with LJS as main feeder secondary school to improve primary secondary transition even further. Their staff would learn a lot from primary specialists and subject specialisms of LJS would be extremely beneficial for primaries?

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/Careers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q3. This is right for the school	1	7	0	0	0
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

Parent: I would like to see (wherever humanly possible) equality of opportunity for learners regardless of which school they are in (eg if Galley Hill take part in cross country, all children do?)

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	0	7	0	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about...	1	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	0	0	0	0	0

No, I do not like this proposal because...	0	0	0	0	0
--	---	---	---	---	---

Comments received:

Parent: I am concerned about recruitment. Will a school like Chaloner have “equal” representation as Galley Hill for example; parents are entirely different who would be suitable to be a “trust” governor?

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

Comments received:

Parent: If schools already have Governing Bodies and Local Authorities are still providing funding etc do schools need another “layer” of organisation in the form of a trust?

How is a Co-operative trust different to a Federation of schools?

Would there be any changes to term time and holidays across the trust (would the trust have the “authority” to change this or would this still be based on LA policy?)

Appendix A4 - Galley Hill Primary School

Summary of response forms

A total of 12 questionnaires were received following over 268 consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties. These broke down as follows – 9 from parents; 0 from staff; 3 from ‘others’.

In addition all pupils were consulted via the School Council and the response was positive.

The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	7	1	2	0	0
I am not sure and would like more information ...	2	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

What the other schools in the Trust would bring to the Co-operative?

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	6	1	2	0	0
I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	3	0	0	0	0

I think the school should also think about working with ...	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

Comments received:

I am concerned about the school/s working with a group that becomes too big (in the future) because it will dilute the focus on the needs of Galley Hill/Guisborough Schools.

I am concerned that such strong schools will end up carrying the weaker schools. Do all schools have the enthusiasm?

This is a wide socio-economically diverse group , could it not be that some schools will need for more funding than others?

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q3. This is right for the school	8	1	2	0	0
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	1	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

I would like to see an emphasis on health and wellbeing – activity and sports. Healthy body – healthy mind.

However surely the aims are unchanged?

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	7	1	2	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about...	1	0	0	0	0

No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because...	1	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

I am concerned about the possibility that trust governors might veto something that the school governors are in favour of.

The Governing Body should appoint its members who's to say who will be appointed? Or is The Trust the group of schools and therefore staff of the group of schools?

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

My only concern, regarding choice of partners for the proposed trust would be if the number of partners were to increase dramatically and the Trust became too big and impersonal.

I don't feel that more than 2 Governors would be appropriate to be on the Trust Board, as generally speaking, the more representatives there are, the harder it becomes to actually agree and make any decisions.

My main concern is how much control would the trust have over the direction each individual school takes.

I think generally it is a positive proposal but it is important that each school retains its individual philosophies. Would the formation of the trust mean 'sharing of facilities/staff etc? Will the formation of the trust mean more emphasis on parental support, raise money?

This feels like a huge step and decision, a move from a 'comfort zone', the aims seem obvious and do not appear, new ideas/visions.

I wonder what happens to staff pensions, do they remain unchanged and what do staff feel about it?

I am unsure of the benefits of changing, all schools are reported to be working together already, the only differences which I can see are:-

- 1. Setting up a Members Forum – could this not be done anyway to communicate across the schools?*
- 2, Grounds and buildings are 'responsibility' of Trust? More financial pressure than currently*
- 3. Staff – Legally employed by Governing Body? Appropriateness of this, interviews already done by Governors are they?*

In short, I'm not sure!

Appendix A5- Handale Primary School

Summary of response forms

A total of 2 questionnaires were received following over consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties. These broke down as follows – 2 from parents; 0 from staff; 0 from ‘others’. There were no additional written responses.

In addition all pupils were consulted via the School Council and the response was positive

The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	1	0	0	0	0
I am not sure and would like more information ...	1	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	2	0	0	0	0
I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	0	0	0	0	0

I think the school should also think about working with ...	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

Comments received:

All children are then aiming for the same goals etc. Through Redcar and Cleveland

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/Care rs	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q3. This is right for the school	1	0	0	0	0
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	0	0	0	0	0

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	2	0	0	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because...	0	0	0	0	0

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

None received.

Appendix A6- Highcliffe School

Summary of response forms

A total of 2 questionnaires were received following over 450 consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties. These broke down as follows – 2 from parents; 0 from staff; 0 from ‘others’. There were no additional written responses. The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

In addition all pupils were consulted via the School Council and the response was positive.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	3	1	0	0	0
I am not sure and would like more information ...	0	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	2	1	0	0	0
I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	1	0	0	0	0
I think the school should also think about working with ...	0	0	0	0	0

Comments received:

I am concerned about the school working with so many partners because it may be difficult for the Trust to make decisions. I support the Guisborough schools working more closely.

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	NOT KnowN
Q3. This is right for the school	3	1	0	0	0
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	0	0	0	0	0

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	3	1	0	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because...	0	0	0	0	0

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

"I think this is a really good idea and am very pleased with the mix of schools involved. Anything that will hopefully improve the already high standard at Highcliffe can only be a good thing. We look forward to seeing the impact that these proposed changes will make." (parent as part of questionnaire).

"The school Governing Bodies will be taking a number of new responsibilities. They need to be provided with any relevant training/support." (parent)

Appendix A7- Lingdale Primary School

Summary of response forms

A total of 6 questionnaires were received following over 100 consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties. These broke down as follows – 7 from parents; 0 from staff; 0 from ‘others’. There were no additional written responses. Copies of these responses are available for governors’ perusal.

In addition all pupils were consulted via school assemblies and the response was positive.

The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	5	0	0	0	0
I am not sure and would like more information ...	1	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	6	0	0	0	0
I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I think the school should also think about working with ...	0	0	0	0	0

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/Care rs	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q3. This is right for the school	6	0	0	0	0
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	0	0	0	0	0

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	6	0	0	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because...	0	0	0	0	0

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

Comments received:

Good luck

Appendix A8- Lockwood Primary School.

Summary of response forms

A total of 15 questionnaires were received following over 200 consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties.

These broke down as follows –15 from parents; 0 from staff; 0 from ‘others’. There were no additional written responses.

In addition all pupils were consulted via the School Council and the response was positive

The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	16	1	1	0	0
I am not sure and would like more information ...	0	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	16	1	1	0	0
I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I think the school should also think about working with ...	0	0	0	0	0

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/Care rs	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q3. This is right for the school	16	1	1	0	0
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	0	0	0	0	0

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	16	1	1	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because...	0	0	0	0	0

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

Comments received:

Is this the first step towards Privatisation?

Appendix A9- Whitecliffe Primary School

Summary of response forms

A total of 11 questionnaires were received following over 150 consultation documents being sent to all parents/carers, staff and governors of the school as well as to a significant number of interested parties. These broke down as follows –12 from parents; 0 from staff; 0 from ‘others’. There were no additional written responses.

In addition all pupils were consulted via the School Council and the response was positive

The number of responses for each question is given below together with the comments received. The background of the respondent, where known, is also given.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing its legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
I support the proposals	12	0	0	0	0
I am not sure and would like more information ...	0	0	0	0	0
I do not think the school should change category and acquire a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0
I support the change of category, but not acquiring a Trust because ...	0	0	0	0	0

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q2. These are the right partners	11	0	0	0	0
I am concerned about the school working with ... because ...	0	0	0	0	0

I think the school should also think about working with ...	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

	Parents/Care rs	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q3. This is right for the school	12	0	0	0	0
I do not think ... should be a priority in the vision because	0	0	0	0	0
I would like to see ...Included in the school's vision.	0	0	0	0	0

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

	Parents/ Carers	Staff	Governors	Other	Not Known
Q4. Yes – this sounds like a good idea	11	0	0	0	0
Yes, but I am concerned about...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I would prefer the Trust to appoint more Governors because...	0	0	0	0	0
No, I do not like this proposal because...	0	0	0	0	0

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

Comments received:

Comment 1

I believe that if the proposals are in the best interests for the children attending the school it would be a good idea.

I fully support Whitecliffe 100% on what they decide to do.

My child has been going to Whitecliffe since September after living abroad and I can honestly say that the school already uses the proposals I have read.

Comment 2

You should try to get the parents involved as well.

APPENDIX B – Consultation Documents

These are available as a separate bundle.

APPENDIX C - Notes from Meetings

Appendix C1 – Notes from Meeting with Teaching Associations and Union Representatives

Notes from consultations 02.05.13.

Union meeting

Present

Ken Hall, Sean Rogers, Cooperative College

Chris Shannon, Whitecliffe Primary

Hans Ruysenaars, ATL

Andrew Tickle, UNISON

Gordon Douglas, NASUWT

Heather Rowe, Badger Hill Primary

Grant Hopkins, Lockwood Primary

Question	Answer
HR - wary of local arrangements compared to national arrangements	SR- outlined that the protocol offered was about maintaining local LA arrangements for negotiation with all school staff unions around local matters
GD-made the point that the cooperative approach is the best way forward.	KH and SR welcomed this positive acknowledgement.
HR- Are you confident on getting LA assurances?	SR. They have the obligation to get these assurances. It is part of the consultation process to get these assurances from the local authority. The cooperative college will provide the local authority a standard letter.
HR- What influence from the cooperative college be brought upon these schools?	SR. We are looking at supporting a supportive signposting system to support the schools. It's filling the gap filled by LA shrinkage. The model can show evidence of raising standards across the trust schools. There is no money being taken out of the schools by the cooperative college. Self sufficiency is the model that is being seen across the country.
HR- Is there a move to move away from the current admissions arrangements	SR- Value driven but faith neutral. By and large the schools will stay with LA arrangements.

<p>HR – What has been the staff reaction in other co-op schools?</p>	<p>KH gave the example of his former high school in Leeds. As a Headteacher he made sure that staff had been well prepared as to why the changes were being proposed and that their pay and conditions would not be adversely affected by this legal change of employer. This was very different from an academy situation.</p> <p>SR stated that this was borne out in literally ‘hundreds’ of co-op schools now and he was sure it would also be the situation in East Cleveland.</p>
--	---

Appendix C2 – Notes from Joint Staff Meeting (all Schools)

A presentation was given to all staff present (92), by Ken Hall (Co-operative College), followed by an opportunity for questions and clarifications.

Sean briefly outlined the very strong employment assurances that staff could be sure of when a school becomes part of a co-operative foundation school trust and where the residual legal employment powers transfers from the LA to the respective GB. Totally different from the academy situation. He also explained the differences between ‘TUPE and TUPE-Like’ and the key advantages and safeguards for staff in the latter.

Staff Comments

All schools are of different sizes etc - do schools have equal voice?

Ken: yes all schools who have the trust as their legal foundation have 2 trustees on The Trust Board, even large secondary schools. Partners schools normally nominate 1 trustee each. All the governing bodies retaining their own independence and do not have liabilities for any financial issues in another school.

A questioner asked what could go wrong?

Sean responded that in his extensive experience this was by far the safest model around due to its co-operative membership nature and ways of working, including its democratic mutual structure. It was also bottom up and school owned and gave an opportunity for schools to develop even stronger local roots and stakeholder engagement. The only disadvantage really is to ‘over-egg’ what will happen and to promise too much at the outset. However it was really an organic process building on existing informal partnerships and relationships. That's up to us and need to take it slowly. We are starting from a strong place. Future-proofing what we already have.

Ken thanked staff for attending and stated that it was clear that staff had been well prepared by their Headteachers as to why the changes were being proposed and they were obviously reassured that their pay and conditions would not be adversely affected by this legal change of employer.

Appendix C3 – Notes from Joint Public Meeting (all Schools)

This meeting was not attended by members of the public, but several members of the various Governing Bodies were present. A presentation was given, by Ken Hall (Co-operative College), followed by an opportunity for questions and clarifications.

Public Comments

GH: Governor support have asked are we going to put some of our governors on other schools GBs

Sean: Hasn't heard of this before - perhaps a misunderstanding but could help if struggling to get new governors. No swapsies needed! LA gobs drop to 1. You will need to think about what your GB composition is going to look like.

GH: Governor services suggested that most staff governors will stay.

Sean: easiest way is will keep 1 as staff and also the Headteacher place and have 2 as co opted. You can continue with the old GB for up to months after the legal Implementation Date which currently is proposed as September 1st.. Only 2 people need to 'change hats' in effect..

AH has been told by GB support that she needs to add 2 more to the GB.

Sean: Looks like your GB support don't fully understand the system. By the end of the full consultation process we need to have agreed a draft re constitution instrument of government to the LA to check it is ok.

Gov: Terms and conditions of support staff concerned that they are not as well supported by this as the teaching staff are?

Sean: - explained how things would stay the same for support staff too. (see previous notes.)

The fact the process is not 'TUPE but TUPE-Like' is very important in this regard. LA assurances will further help ensure that everything currently in place as a community school stays in place as a co-op foundation school. In existing co-op 454 schools- no complaints from support staff.

SP: some parents have asked why if you are already doing this networking, are you going down this route.

Sean and Ken: LA shrinking so schools need some firm foundation. Basically a legal 'hub' with charitable status.

Sean: this collaboration is already strong. Schools stepping into the gap left by the forced shrinkage of the local education authority. Schools stepping in mutually and ethically to take authority. We can jettison the 'white elephants' from the current LA system.

SP (Head of Belmont PS): also important that this is reversible where as academisation isn't.

Sean: latest evidence is that September 12 more secondary failing schools are academies so government's theory that it will improve schools is not true. However a foundation trust school can't revert to being to a community school. Trust does not own land and assets, 'per se' but holds them in trust for that school's GB. Each GB has a veto on the sale of land and assets for their school. Part of the role of the Trust is to seek to ensure that GBs do not try to do anything against the co-operative ethos of the trust.

A questioner asked how the process would be decided on.

Sean: 4 different voting options

- Abandon
- Amend
- Pause
- Agree

Sean: next meeting for governing bodies- Co op provide standard agenda and we can clerk our own GB at the next meeting.

Appendix C4 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Badger Hill Primary School)

Badger Hill Parents Meeting.

2 parents attended to hear the presentation

Questions	Answers
Is there a minimum number to those agreeing in each school?	People can comment via the questionnaire – send in additional written views or via online.. Change legal character GB decide after taking into account of all feedback. 5% about the average responses rate for primary school clusters such as this, but it does vary quite a bit.. If you don't respond you are taken as 'content'. Staff, parents, governors should all be encouraged to respond. And the views of learners also sought. It is not a referendum or a ballot however – the GBs must determine their proposals 'on their merits', including taking the range and weight of opinion into account. There will also be a second chance to submit view – during the statutory period if that is where some or all of the schools want to go.

Appendix C5 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Belmont Primary School)

Consultation on changing the school's status to Foundation Status and joining the East Cleveland Co-operative Trust

Parent Consultation Meeting

Belmont Primary school

8th May 2013

6pm

Notes on the meeting

Parent/carers attending: 10, including two staff members who are also parents of pupils at the school and one parent governor

Also present: 4 other governors from the school, Mrs S Porteus (Head Teacher) and Mrs A Hull (Head Teacher, Chaloner Primary)

S Porteus presented a power point overview of the proposal, including details of how a co-operative trust is organised and why the schools had decided to consult on this proposal.

There followed a wide ranging question and answer session. The following main questions and concerns were raised:

1. Would each school still decide on matters such as how the National Curriculum was delivered in their school?
 - A. Yes. The Trust would have no say or influence over how each individual school delivered the curriculum or in the organisation, leadership, staffing or management of the school. These remained the responsibility of each individual school's governing body.
2. You said (*in the presentation*) that all of the Guisborough schools were proposing to join the Trust. Doesn't that mean that parents will no longer have a choice if they are unhappy?
 - A. Whilst they might all join the Trust, each school would retain its own identity, staff would be employed directly by each school's governing body, which would be responsible for the leadership of the school, as now. The ethos and organisation of each school would still remain very personal to the school. If a parent decided a particular school was not right for their child they could still seek to change schools and could expect to find the same similarities and differences as they would now.
3. Why are you proposing to change the school's status at all? Can't you achieve the same aims by continuing the informal collaboration that you have now?

A We do work well together as a group of schools, although we have worked together in different ways to date. Guisborough schools have focussed primarily on the extended schools agenda, with some professional development. Other East Cleveland schools have had a more specific school improvement agenda, having previously been part of an Education Action Zone

(EAZ).The representatives of the Co-operative College have said that this is the strongest collaboration that they have so far worked with. As such it is true to say that we have already shown that we can work well together informally. The schools feel that, rather than being a reason to stay as we are, this gives us a strong basis on which to build a more formal arrangement. We believe that forming a Co-operative Trust will enable us to strengthen our community links, it will provide a clear focus and a framework (agreed by all) for school improvement and mutual support, including if one of the schools began to show weaknesses. *(There was some discussion about how schools become categorised as 'failing schools' and the possible effects of this, including 'forced' academisation. SP said that governors and the schools felt that this formal arrangement would make 'forced' academisation less likely for members as they would be part of a strong partnership committed to raising standards and mutual support) A DFE representative had made it clear at a local meeting that it would not be sufficient for schools in that position to say that they were part of an informal group.)*

4. Is the formation of a Trust and acquisition of Foundation status a 'halfway house' to becoming an academy?
 - A. Definitely Not. (This response was confirmed by governors present.) The parent governor present explained that governors had carefully considered alternative models for partnership working and the Co-operative trust model had been the preferred model. Discussion had been robust. Mrs Porteus noted that one governor, the Head of a secondary school in another Local Authority, had asked very challenging questions about the various options at the time and was now actively considering the same Co-op trust model for his school.
5. You said that the Trust would be able to make savings buying goods and services jointly. I haven't found this to be the case in my experience.
 - A. SP felt that the number of schools in the Trust would give them opportunities to buy goods, services and training in a more cost effective way, providing better value.
6. Won't this proposal mean more administration and more time commitment, for meetings and organisation, with no particular benefit?
 - A. We don't believe that administration costs will rise. There may be some administrative costs but these will be replacing costs currently spent on Local Authority services and administration. *(As part of the presentation it had been said that Redcar and Cleveland LA was currently required to make very substantial cost savings through substantial reductions in the services they can provide to schools)* Representatives from the schools already attend meetings as part of our other collaborations and most of these would be replaced.
7. You have talked about more joint training opportunities. How realistic do you think it is to get schools to coordinate training days? In my experience with even a few schools this is not easy.
 - A. SP and A Hull contributed that the schools have had joint training days in the past and working through the Trust would clarify dates well ahead of time. Schools could join in or not as they wished.
8. Will this mean teachers being out of their classes more often to go on the training?
 - A. No. Schools already have to balance of the need for professional development against the possible negative effect of them being out of their classroom and each school would continue to do this, opting into training opportunities only when they felt it would be beneficial. Working together the schools would be able to provide more specialised training that perhaps only one or two staff in each school needed to access.

9. To get the best from this partnership won't you need to employ someone to co-ordinate / administrate activities?
- A. That is one way of working. Guisborough schools currently employ a part time co-ordinator of our extended services. We have found this to be a cost effective and efficient way of expanding the services on offer and making sure they run smoothly. Schools would have to make decision as to whether they felt something similar was needed for the Trust but there were no such plans at the moment. Currently the LA, which is actively encouraging local schools to explore ways of working together and which it is proposed will be a partner of the Trust, is making available one of its employees to support the process. The Co operative College does have to seek to recover its costs in providing professional support during the consultation and trust establishment process – this works out at around £1,000 per consulting school and represents real value for money given the scale of the exercise and the amount of work involved. It also means that the time spent in the process and the work involved for the schools is minimised. Going forward the College continues to support co-operative schools at little or a no cost. *(SP outlined set up costs as £900 for legal fees and, in a future financial year approximately £1500 for the transfer of land and assets.)*
10. Wouldn't even this money be better spent on teachers, Teaching Assistants? Isn't that what parents would prefer?
11. These sorts of sums would not go very far at all towards employment costs. They can be met from money previously retained by the LA and now delegated to schools. *(SP outlined that changes in the funding formula at the start of this financial year had resulted in some much more significant impacts on the school's budget than these sums, including changes in the way school meal subsidy was calculated. Some of the school's budget was used to subsidise each school meal, which parents might also think was not the best use of money. One parent then suggested that the governors had the ability to enter into a different catering contract. SP agreed. The change had only come to light as budgets were issued in March. The school was currently tied into a contract however governors would be looking for an alternative. Being part of a possible 18 strong school trust would put the schools in a much better bargaining position.)*
12. Staff are extremely important to the success of a school. How do staff feel about these proposals?
- A. Staff are happy with the proposal. They have been consulted and have questionnaires to complete and there are so far no dissenting voices. *(SP asked the two parent/staff representatives to comment and they both said that they were happy with the proposal).*
13. Will it be possible to make someone leave the Trust if they don't play a full part?
- A. The circumstances in which schools can leave or join the Trust will be clearly set out in the legal agreement. It is possible for any school to leave the Trust by a reverse consultation process but they would remain a Foundation school.
14. You have said *(during the presentation)* that very few parents have attended the consultation meetings. How do you really know what their views are? You could argue that they should attend the meetings but perhaps they are not confident to attend or do not understand the issues.
- A. That may be true. It is difficult to know why small numbers attend most consultation meetings. Other parents have completed questionnaires and some have spoken to me personally. We can only offer the opportunities to contribute to the consultation.

The meeting ended t 7:20pm.Mrs Porteus thanked parents/carers for attending.

Appendix C6 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Chaloner Primary School)

No parents attended.

Appendix C7 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Galley Hill Primary School)

CO-OPERATIVE TRUST MODEL - PARENTS MEETING- GALLEY HILL Tuesday 7th May 6.30pm

11 Parents 4 Governors

Responses from:	Mark Hirst	HT Galley Hill	(MH)
	Jackie Woodhead	HT Highcliffe.	(JW)
	Paul Kirkham	(Chair Of Govs)	(PK)

Questions followed a brief explanation of the current position for schools and the demise of Local Authorities. It was generally agreed that we `had to do something`!

What elements of the Local authority have gone?

An explanation was given regarding the cutting of services previously available and what services remained as statutory for the LA. It was explained that school would have to source any required services from elsewhere and that working as a group could be advantageous in terms of quality of provision and cost. (MH, JW)

Will Galley Hill's funding improve?

Funding has always been an issue at our school and it was explained that funding would still come directly through the LA, but we would have slightly more choice and freedom in how we spent our money. (MH, JW, PK)

Will staffing stay the same?

Yes basically, staffing would not be compromised in any way and we would respond to the current needs of our school. (MH)

If a school is part of the Trust, who pays for redundancies?

Individual schools would be responsible for their own staffing/redundancies etc (PK)

NB: however the LA still has responsibilities as the mandatory compensation agency in line with its current responsibilities to the consulting schools as community schools.

Who will control admissions?

Galley Hill is always oversubscribed and there was a long discussion regarding school admissions. It was made clear that any admissions would still be bound by the Schools Admissions Code. (MH)

Have any schools already made the decision and got Trust status?

This referred to the local picture. The national situation was explained and there was some discussion regarding Academies, Academy Chains etc. One parent questioned whether as an Outstanding school, we would be better to go for Academy Status. It was explained that we had considered all options and that we felt this was the best way forward for the school community. (MH, JW, PK)

If more schools join, will it dilute what is trying to be achieved?

A couple of parents queried whether the proposed Trust could end up as a mini LA and the strengths of Trust status would be 'diluted' away from a local model. It was explained that as a Trust we would have strong control over how we progressed as a group and the management and ambition would be very much in our hands.

How does it affect the role of Governors – is it more work?

Explained how the governance of the Trust would operate. Governors could be as involved as they wanted to be, much like the present! (MH, PK)

What would be different if we became an Academy?

This provoked a long discussion regarding Academy Status. Several parents were teachers and gave their views! External sponsorship was discussed and also the political pressures to convert. The key fact that we would still be allied to the LA seemed to prove popular with parents present. (MH, JW, PK)

How much is the set up fee for transferring land and assets?

It was indicated that it would cost far less than converting to an Academy and that costs were minimal due to the number of schools proposing to move forward. A figure of £1500 for the school was suggested. (MH, PK)

Are any changes seen for fundraising?

There was a concern that fundraising might be affected. Would funds be raised for Galley Hill or the Trust? It was reiterated that we retain our individuality and day to day activities would remain the same.

There could be some joint fundraising events, as had happened previously with other Guisborough schools. (MH)

NB. The Trust as a registered charity is a better place to engage in fund-raising, submit bids etc than the schools currently are as community schools.

If the new build goes ahead, would any funding from Building Firm go to Trust or school....who would benefit?

There is a possibility of a large building programme in the school catchment area and this had already prompted the LA to draw up plans for building an extension to the school. It was explained that this would all be controlled by the LA and any money given by the building company would be directed exclusively to our school. (MH,PK)

Was there any evidence financially, breakdown of costs, expenditure that showed that this would be the best way forward?

No. Evidence of expenditure in other Trusts could possibly demonstrate this, but we have none to hand! (MH)

NB. The Co-operative College can supply evidence from a significant number of co-operative trusts across the country which demonstrates increased value for money and the impact of joint provision being more effective. Additionally the savings made are recycled back into the schools rather than being extracted from the school systems by the growing number of private providers who are trying to get into the growing vacuum in the schools 'market' left by the rapid and drastic shrinkage of many LEAs since the Coalition Government started to roll out its schools policies. Certainly each school working independently would result in duplication and a distraction for Headteachers from the leadership[of Teaching and Learning of their school, their prime responsibility.

Paul Kirkham (Chair Of Gofs) asked for feedback. Parents were reassured that Galley Hill would maintain the same ethos and that little would change in the day to day running of school. The majority of those present thought that a Trust model was a good idea and that we should move forward with it. The 'local nature' appealed and there was a general agreement that it would be beneficial to be part of a group of 'like minded' schools. The potential to work with other partners, including Colleges and Universities was also popular. Three parents were undecided and felt that they needed more information.

Meeting closed at 7.30pm

Appendix C8 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Highcliffe Primary School)

Parents' meeting – Highcliffe Primary 07-05-13 5.00pm

Present:

Jackie Woodhead, HT, Highcliffe

Mark Hirst, HT, Galley Hill

2 Highcliffe governors

3 Highcliffe parents/carers

Questions raised:

- Does the governance structure change?

It can change if this suits the school by reconstituting, but does not need to – governors may just need to change category. (JW)

- Does funding change so that staff are employed by the Trust not the school?

No, existing staff are employed by the Governing Body. It is possible that the Trust may decide to directly appoint shared staff for a specific purpose, if required in the future eg an Education Welfare Officer. (JW)

- Will uniform or term times change?

No. Schools will retain their own identity. Schools could already negotiate changes to uniform, times of day without joining the Trust, but would do so in consultation with parents and carers. Highcliffe has no intention of doing this, at present. (JW)

- Does the school's identity stay the same?

Yes, the Trust offers the opportunity to maintain a school's individual identity and ethos, whilst offering greater opportunities for formalised collaboration, building on existing practices eg GEL. (MH)

- What is the "catch"? How does the Co-operative College benefit?

There does not appear to be a "catch" – there is no financial gain to the Co-operative College. They are interested in supporting schools and communities to uphold co-operative values. (MH, governor)

- Is the size of the Trust too big?

We are still likely to work closely with the schools in Guisborough for issues that need a smaller group, but a larger group can bring other perspectives and economies of scale for purchasing, for example. (JW, MH, governors)

- Who will be the partners? Will the University be approached?

The Local Authority will be a partner. The Trust will be interested in other local partners, and would probably be happy for the University to be approached (parent who works at University was interested in pursuing this). (JW)

The meeting closed at 5.50pm

Appendix C9 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Lingdale Primary School)

No parents attended the meeting

Appendix C10 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Lockwood Primary School)

Lockwood Primary School

Present:

Mr G Hopkins

Miss N Oxtoby

1 Parent Governor

1 Parent

Mr Hopkins presented the Co-operative Trust Powerpoint.

Mr Hopkins reiterated the mutualisation message and that the Headteachers of East Cleveland had extensively discussed a number of alternative options but believed this was the best route to formalise collaborative work. It also provided some solutions to the reduction in school budgets and the LA reduction in capacity.

Question: How would this help schools if they had less money?

Mr Hopkins stated that the schools intended to tender for services as a group and that this would ensure that a saving could be made. He also stated that the Headteachers would need to meet in the Summer Term in order to formalise this process.

Question: Will my child's teacher be working in other schools. I don't know how this will help our school.

Mr Hopkins stated that schools would be working together collaboratively and this would include children and staff. He also stated that this is a continuation of the excellent collaborations that already exists and would continue to facilitate positive transitions from Primary to Secondary School.

Question: Do all schools have an equal voice?

Mr Hopkins stated that all schools would have two representatives irrespective of size.

Appendix C11 – Notes from Parents Meeting (Handale Primary School 13.05.2013)

Questions Asked

- If there is not going to be a LA why are we choosing them as partners?
Answer: We would still like to work with the LA and especially on statutory matters.
- Will the school be still held accountable for standards etc. if there is no LA?
Answer : Yes
- Will the children need new uniform and a new badge?
Answer: No, everything remains the same
- What is the difference between a foundation school and an academy?
Answered using the presentation
- You mentioned no changes to school teachers pay and conditions but what about TAs and other staff?
Answer: We will ask about this
- What are the benefits of going down this route?
Answer: This is about formalising what is already a strong partnership
- Why aren't Hummersea doing this?
Couldn't answer this one

Appendix C12 – Notes from Parents Meeting Whitecliffe Primary School)

Questions from parents' consultation meeting held on 13th May 2013.

1. Why don't Hummersea want to be part of this Co-op?
We don't know.
2. Can the trust make us sell our school field?
No – they hold our land in trust but our Governors are responsible for what happens to the land.
3. Who decides which partners join with us?
The co-operative membership.
4. Does all funding still come from the LA?
Yes
5. What would happen if a school in the Co-operative went into the red? Would we have to use our budget to bail them out?
No we are a limited company and so are each liable for £1 (we think).
6. If another school needed some major building work, would we have to contribute to the cost?
No our budgets remain separate.

Appendix D – Local Authority Assurances Letter

Dear Director (*insert name*)

Assurances from the Local Authority regarding Pension Arrangements, Costs of Early Retirement and Redundancies and related matters.

I write as Chair of the Governing Body of (*name of school/s*). You will be aware that we have been consulting on changing our school category from community to foundation and at the same time acquiring a charitable trust. The proposed change will mean that governing body becomes the employing body on implementation day (*Insert*)

This process is not TUPE, but somewhat similar taking place under The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007) provide for all rights, powers, duties and liabilities to transfer existing staff from the Local Authority to the Governing Body of the school.

Employees will be employed by the school's Governing Body instead of the Local Authority and it will continue to recognise the same teachers' associations and trade unions. The existing rights of teachers will be fully protected if the school acquires a Trust as the Governing Body will still be bound by the School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document.

The Governing Body will set terms and conditions for its own support staff. However, terms and conditions will be safeguarded as per the prescribed regulations for existing staff and our support staff will maintain the same employment rights as Local Authority employees.

The Governing Body also agree to abide with the existing local agreements and policies currently in place for school staff, that have been negotiated by teacher associations and trade unions with the Local Authority. Ditto for recognition matters and payment towards facilities time.

However there are now a number of matters we require written assurances on from the Local Authority. These are as follows:

A). Liabilities affecting the governing body in respect of employment matters.

The governing body may, as employer, in some circumstances have to appear at an Employment Tribunal to defend ourselves, if, for example, candidates for a post at the school complain that a governing body's decision or procedure discriminated against them, or if an employee complains that they had been dismissed unfairly.

We would like an assurance in writing that the local authority recognises that in cases of dismissal, it has to pay any compensation or legal costs awarded by an Employment Tribunal unless it can show that it has good reason to charge the school's delegated

budget (for example, if the local authority had previously advised the governing body that an Employment Tribunal was likely to decide a dismissal was unfair).

B). Responsibility for the cost of premature retirements and compensation for redundancy.

The governing body, as the employer, can grant premature retirement to the staff either for reasons of redundancy or can terminate a member of staff's employment in the interest of the efficient discharge of their employer function. The governing body also decides on the level of compensation to grant any member of staff they may make redundant.

We would like an assurance in writing that the local authority recognises that it, as the "compensating authority" has to pay "mandatory compensation" towards a teacher's annual pension and retirement lump sum if they are granted premature retirement by the governing body. We do recognise that the local authority has the power to take the costs of premature retirement from a school's delegated budget if the authority has not agreed to the premature retirement. Similarly, the authority is empowered to take the costs of discretionary compensation for redundancy from a school's delegated budget if they have good reason to do so (an example of this might be if the local authority thought the discretionary payment in a particular case was too high in relation to its own policy).

C).Pensions of support staff.

Support staff at foundation schools are allowed to continue to be in the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) if the local authority, with the consent of the school governing body, has by a statutory resolution specified them to be eligible to belong to the scheme. Otherwise, the support staff will no longer be members of the LGPS and it will be for them and the school governing body to make alternative pension arrangements. In our case, the governing body has resolved to seek to ensure continuity of pension arrangements for support staff through the local authority and the LGPS. We are now formally seeking written assurances that

- i) That the local authority will agree as a matter of urgency the statutory resolution specifying that support staff currently in the LGPS will continue to be eligible to belong to the scheme. We would ask for a copy of the actual resolution and the minute of the meeting where it was agreed.
- ii) That the local authority will also agree to support staff currently not in the LGPS, continue to have the right to join it going forward and that a similar offer be made to new support staff joining us in the future.

Your sincerely,

Chair of Governors

Appendix E – Draft Staffing Protocol

A Protocol on Employees' Terms and Conditions and Union Relations (DRAFT)

1. The school will continue to adhere to the national and local conditions of service currently in place for its existing employees and will continue to employ new staff on these terms. All employees' continuity of service will continue, and contracts will only change in that the employer will become the Governing Body. Other contractual details will remain the same.
2. Recognition of the same trade unions and professional associations will continue, and the school will engage with the Unions in the same way in the future, in line with existing local agreements.
3. The school believes that trade unions help ensure good employee relations, will encourage employees to become union members and will inform new appointees accordingly. The school will, on request, provide the trade unions with names and work locations of new appointees.
4. The relevant unions are the teacher unions (ASCL, ATL, NAHT, NASUWT, NUT and VOICE) and the unions representing support and other professional school staff (GMB, UNISON and Unite).
5. Consultation on internal procedural matters and working and organisational arrangements will be dealt with in the first instance by discussions with union representatives within the school, who may ask for support from their local or regional officers if they think this is necessary.
6. If the school in the future considers varying existing terms and conditions, or not adopting variations agreed through the mechanism for negotiating between the Local Authority and its employees, it will notify the Local Authority representatives of the recognised unions, and will negotiate with them, through a forum consisting of representatives of the school and internal and/or external representatives of each of the recognised unions. In the unlikely event that there is a breakdown in negotiations on terms and conditions, the matter may be referred to the Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) in order to seek resolution of the issue. Either party may determine that a matter is referred to ACAS for conciliation. Both parties may subsequently agree, where necessary, that a matter is referred to ACAS for arbitration. Whilst these procedures are being followed the school will honour the status quo ante.
7. The school will write to all employees at the date of transfer to inform them that their new employer is now the Governing Body and that their conditions of employment will not change.

Appendix F – UNISON / SCS and NASUWT National Agreements

These documents are attached separately as PDFs

Appendix G - Proposed Reconstituted Governing Body Structures

From 1 September 2012, the governing body of a foundation school with a 'minority' Trust as its foundation, which is what we are proposing, has to be composed as follows;

- The headteacher;
- One staff governor;
- At least two parent governors;
- One Local Authority governor;
- At least two, but no more than 45% of the total, foundation governors appointed by the named Trust; in our case we are proposing the legal minimum of two.
- As many co-opted governors as the governing body consider necessary. The total number of co-opted governors who are also eligible to be elected as staff governors must not exceed one-third of the total membership of the governing body, you must also count the headteacher position in this figure.

In our case we are proposing that changes should be minimal when compared with the 'old' (Pre-September 2012) composition of our Governing Body.

The proposed structure of each school will be set out in the Statutory Proposals.

Appendix I – Clarifications on Comments made in the questionnaires.

Q1. How do you feel about the school changing their legal status and joining a co-operative Trust?

Badger Hill

Concerned about Badger Hill losing out on funding

Belmont

I support the change of category but not acquiring a trust because of the partners (see comment on question 2)

I am not sure and would like more information particularly on which costs could be shared and how much this would in reality benefit the pupils. Would there not be additional costs associated with the Trust being responsible for premises and grounds?

I am not sure and would like more information particularly on why add an extra tier of governors, who they may be/ how selected. Also whether the move is necessary? Can't the schools involved simply share an ethos without this step? If change is necessary, why not go the whole way and come out of the LA altogether. I'd also like some assurance that staffing levels won't be affected adversely; particularly at senior levels and that each school is able to keep its own identity and individuality.

Chaloner

Parent: I am not sure whether changing to a co-op trust means that school would not be made to change again to become an academy in the future.

Galley Hill

What the other schools in the Trust would bring to the Co-operative?

Clarification on points raised by Q1:

There is no reason why funding would be affected – the funding mechanism remains the same, via the. The Governing Body of each school remains responsible for the management of the premises and grounds

The governance of the schools remain separate. There is not an extra tier of governors, although their categories will change and, it is proposed, two governors on each Governing Body will be Trust appointments.

Schools in a co-operative trust may still become academies

Schools would collaborate to raise achievement across the common community.

Q2. How do you feel about the proposed partners in the Trust?

Badger Hill

I think you should work with Hummersea Primary School

Unsure how Badger Hill will benefit from this as it has been run well in the past. Would not like Badger Hill to lose out on funding/ resources to another school?

Belmont

I am concerned about the school working with schools outside Guisborough because each town has their own situations and challenges. I believe the trust would be more cohesive if from the same town.

These are the right partners but can primary schools achieve the 'economies of scale' without a secondary partner? Would more collaboration require more admin/school business manager time – actually taking more time and autonomy away from individual schools?

I think the school should also think about working with Laurence Jackson rather than possibly a Saltburn/Huntcliff federation.

I think the schools should also think about working with other East Cleveland schools.

These are the right partners, especially as it means all Guisborough primary schools are included.

Chaloner

Parent: I think that the school should also think about working with LJS as main feeder secondary school to improve primary secondary transition even further. Their staff would learn a lot from primary specialists and subject specialisms of LJS would be extremely beneficial for primaries?

Galley Hill

I am concerned about the school/s working with a group that becomes too big (in the future) because it will dilute the focus on the needs of Galley Hill/Guisborough Schools.

I am concerned that such strong schools will end up carrying the weaker schools. Do all schools have the enthusiasm?

This is a wide soci economically diverse group, could it not be that some schools will need for more funding than others?

Handale

All children are then aiming for the same goals etc. Through Redcar and Cleveland Authority

Highcliffe

I am concerned about the school working with so many partners because it may be difficult for the Trust to make decisions. I support the Guisborough schools working more closely.

Clarification on points raised by Q2

Schools in the Trust can continue to work with other schools, including those outside the Trust. One of the schools mentioned (Laurence Jackson) will be a partner in the Trust.

There is an understanding, embedded in the co-operative values, that all schools will support each other. This is intended to be to the benefit of all.

The Trust does not make decisions on a day to day basis, in fact it has a well defined role. It is the Governing Body of each school, along with the school leadership, that has responsibility for how the school collaborates.

School Governing Bodies retain their independence and there is no joint financial responsibility.

Q3. How do you feel about this vision?

Belmont

They are generic school visions so all okay but it is how they are embedded within the individual schools and the equality of the schools in the partnership that counts.

Chaloner

Parent: I would like to see (wherever humanely possible) equality of opportunity for learners regardless of which school they are in (eg if Galley Hill take part in cross country, all children do?)

Galley Hill

I would like to see an emphasis on health and wellbeing – activity and sports. Healthy body – healthy mind.

However surely the aims are unchanged?

Clarification for points raised by Q3

Good schools will have a strong ethos. It is quite likely that the ethos of many schools will reflect co-operative values. Adopting co-operative trust status embeds these values, including a commitment to equality and fairness.

Q4. We propose that the Trust would appoint the legal minimum of 2 governors to each school's Governing Body. This will link the Trust more closely to each Governing Body.

Belmont

I would prefer the Trust to appoint more governors because each school within the Trust should have their own representative in each school governing body. Your school's vision could differ from the Trust's representative.

Yes but I am concerned about – who they (*Trust governors*) would be and the amount of influence they would hold.

Yes but I am concerned about – will the governors be paid and if so where will the budget to do this come from? Also how will they be chosen / elected?

Chaloner

Parent: I am concerned about recruitment. Will school like Chaloner have “equal” representation as Galley Hill for example, parents are entirely different who would be suitable to be a “trust” governor?

Galley Hill

I am concerned about the possibility that trust governor might veto something that the school governors are in favour of.

The Governing Body should appoint its members who's to say who will be appointed? Or is The Trust the group of schools and therefore staff of the group of schools?

Clarification for points raised by Q4

The Trust will appoint two Governors to each school's Governing Body. These appointees are not necessarily Trustees and there is an expectation that the Trust will consult with schools on the matter. There is no suggestion that Governors will be paid, as a result of becoming a co-operative trust school. Indeed, expectations and regulations around financial interests are clear. Trust appointed Governors have no more authority than other Governors and do not possess a 'veto'

Q5. Do you have any other comments, concerns or suggestions that we should think about before we publish formal proposals?

Belmont

I trust the judgement of the Governing Body to make the most appropriate choice for the school, pupils, teachers and the community.

Why actually change if you are doing it already? What are the financial and political gains? How will our children actually benefit. This is my children, as well as children in other schools. I will research further on line and will attend a consultation meeting.

Chaloner

Parent: If schools already have Governing Bodies and Local Authorities are still providing funding etc do schools need another "layer" of organisation in the form of a trust?

How is a Co-operative trust different to a Federation of schools?

Would there be any changes to term time and holidays across the trust (would the trust have the "authority" to change this or would this still be based on LA policy?)

Galley Hill

My only concern, regarding choice of partners for the proposed trust would be if the number of partners were to increase dramatically and the Trust became too big and impersonal.

I don't feel that more than 2 Governors would be appropriate to be on the Trust Board, as generally speaking, the more representatives there are, the harder it becomes to actually agree and make any decisions.

My main concern is how much control would the Trust have over the direction each individual school takes.

I think generally it is a positive proposal but it is important that each school retains its individual philosophies. Would the formation of the trust mean 'sharing of facilities/staff etc? Will the formation of the trust mean more emphasis on parental support, raise money?

This feels like a huge step and decision, a move from a 'comfort zone', the aims seem obvious and do not appear, new ideas/visions.

I wonder what happens to staff pensions, do they remain unchanged and what do staff feel about it?

I am unsure of the benefits of changing, all schools are reported to be working together already, the only differences which I can see are:-

1. Setting up a Members Forum – could this not be done anyway to communicate across the schools?
2. Grounds and buildings are ‘responsibility’ of Trust? More financial pressure than currently
3. Staff – Legally employed by Governing Body? Appropriateness of this, interviews already done by Governors are they?

In short, I’m not sure!

Highcliffe

“I think this is a really good idea and am very pleased with the mix of schools involved. Anything that will hopefully improve the already high standard at Highcliffe can only be a good thing. We look forward to seeing the impact that these proposed changes will make.”

(parent as part of questionnaire)

“The school Governing Bodies will be taking a number of new responsibilities. They need to be provided with any relevant training/support.” (parent)

Lingdale

Good luck

Lockwood

Is this the first step towards Privatisation?

Whitecliffe

I believe that if the proposals are in the best interests for the children attending the school it would be a good idea.

I fully support Whitecliffe 100% on what they decide to do.

My child has been going to Whitecliffe, since September after living abroad and I can honestly say that the school already uses the proposals I have read.

You should try to get the parents involved as well.

Clarification for points raised on Q5

As stated previously, Governing Bodies will retain their autonomy. It is for them to decide, with the school leadership, to what extent they might share resources and how this might benefit their school. A Federation would be a more formal partnership, introducing joint responsibilities, possibly under a single Governing Body. The Trust would not be a Federation.

Premises and grounds are managed by the relevant Governing Body, not the Trust.

Staff are employed by the Governing Body, but pay and conditions remain as before. Staff and their representatives are supportive of the proposal. The school remains a Local Authority school – it is not a step towards privatisation. Indeed there is considerable local accountability. It is true that there is no reason why a non-Trust school could set up a Stakeholder Forum, but the purposes and processes set out in the Consultation formalise this accountability and give it credibility.

Appendix J – Clarifications on Questions raised at Consultation Meetings.

Parents' meeting – Handale Primary 13-05-13 5.30pm

It is up to the individual schools, but the intention is that pay and conditions remain the same and there are a number of agreements and protocols that will be put in place to re-assure staff.

Other schools not participating in the Trust will have opportunities to join, should they wish. No school within East Cleveland is excluded.

Parents' meeting – Highcliffe Primary 07-05-13 5.00pm

Questions raised:

Q. Does the governance structure change?

A. Only in that 2 new places have to be created in the Governing Body structure, to represent the Trust. Most times these are simply existing governors 'changing hats' as it were.

Q. Does funding change so that staff are employed by the Trust not the school?

A. No. The budget stays with the GB who become the legal employer of staff. The basis on which the school is funded also stays the same, except for an 80% reduction in rates, but in effect this is cost neutral as the LA reduces that element of its funding by a similar amount.

Q. Will uniform or term times change?

A. These are GB matters, not for the Trust.

Q. Does the school's identity stay the same?

A. It does not have to change its name or its notepaper, signage etc, but legally its designation changes – from being an LA maintained community school to a maintained foundation school with a local co-operative trust as its legal foundation. In this new legal structure it does become much more difficult to close it or push it where it doesn't want to go.

Q. What is the "catch"? How does the Co-operative College benefit?

A. There is no 'catch' as such. The College is the education 'arm' of the Co-operative Movement in the UK. There are over 5,000 co-operatives in the UK of all shapes and sizes, covering a great number of activities. Not all are businesses or commercial, e.g. credit unions, housing co-ops, Traidcraft, the Fairtrade co-operative. The College originally developed and rolled out the model under the last Government and it benefits basically from seeing the development of a co-operative education model for schools who wish to work mutually and ethically together in a manner that reflects co-operative principles and ways of working.

Q. Is the size of the Trust too big?

A. If all the consulting schools and partner schools decide to establish the Trust it will start life as the second largest nationally. However because of its history and the fact of such a large number of schools within a relatively small authority such as Redcar and Cleveland, it is likely that it will become even

bigger and become a virtual mini school owned co-operative LEA. It is likely to develop models of working and delivery which reflect its member schools' needs well.

Q. Who will be the partners? Will the University be approached?

A. The partners are as identified in the consultation documentation including the partner schools. It is likely that more will be added as the Trust develops and maybe even expands. The suggestion of the University is useful as are a number of other suggestions that have been made through the consultation and doubtless will be looked at by the Trust after it is established.

Galley Hill Parents' Meeting. May 7th.

Q. If a school is part of the Trust, who pays for redundancies?

A. Individual schools would be responsible for their own staffing/redundancies etc (PK)

NB: however the LA still has responsibilities as the mandatory compensation agency in line with its current responsibilities to the consulting schools as community schools.

Q. Are any changes seen for fundraising?

Q. There was a concern that fundraising might be affected. Would funds be raised for Galley Hill or the Trust? It was reiterated that we retain our individuality and day to day activities would remain the same. There could be some joint fundraising events, as had happened previously with other Guisborough schools. (MH)

NB. The Trust as a registered charity is a better place to engage in fund-raising, submit bids etc than the schools currently are as community schools.

Was there any evidence financially, breakdown of costs, expenditure that showed that this would be the best way forward?

No. Evidence of expenditure in other Trusts could possibly demonstrate this, but we have none to hand! (MH)

NB. The Co-operative College can supply evidence from a significant number of co-operative trusts across the country which demonstrates increased value for money and the impact of joint provision being more effective. Additionally the savings made are recycled back into the schools rather than being extracted from the school systems by the growing number of private providers who are trying to get into the growing vacuum in the schools 'market' left by the rapid and drastic shrinkage of many LEAs since the Coalition Government started to role out its schools policies. Certainly each school working independently would result in duplication and a distraction for Headteachers from the leadership [of Teaching and Learning of their school, their prime responsibility.

Whitecliffe Parents' Meeting; 13th May 2013

Schools have made their own decisions about whether to consult on Trust status, but the intention is to have opportunities for schools to join, as Trust Schools or Partners, at a later date.

The Trustees can approve additional Partners.

There is no financial liability for another school's budget.