

Appendix C

Criteria for the Evaluation of Proposals for Partnership

Proposal Name	School Audit Framework and Proposal
Proposal Submitted by	Campaign Group ‘Save Our Sussex Schools’ – a local campaign group set up by parents in response to the consultation of the proposed closure of the school
Date submitted	27 May 2016
Governing Body Approval?	The Governing Body is not aware of the proposal.
Evaluation Date	June 2016
Overall assessment	<p>The proposal sets out a commitment from the ‘Save Our Sussex Schools’ group to endeavour to secure the future of the school, but the plan is not sufficiently robust to show how this will be achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This is not a credible proposal because:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ It does not address the challenges the school faces of low pupil numbers and financial instability, whilst demonstrating sustained pupil performance.○ No business plan has been submitted as part of the proposal to demonstrate financial viability○ The plan includes the statement that: <i>‘we accept that the school has areas it needs to improve on to help it run as an efficient and modern primary school’</i> but provides no solution to the issues identified.• The proposal is heavily reliant on fundraising and contributions from parents which is not sufficiently robust to ensure the proposals can be achieved. Part of this fundraising is to secure improved quality of provision and teaching. This is therefore not a sustainable approach to school improvement.

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The objective to seek a partnership/federation with another school would offer a more sustainable model, though no specific school is identified in the proposal and no budget plans presented.• The proposal does not set out how the school's Ofsted outcome, November 2015, will be built on and sustained, other than the continuation of current teaching and learning methodology. Without an evolving curriculum, the needs of the pupils at Rodmell will not be sufficiently met.• There is no strategy for addressing safeguarding or reference to 'Keeping Children Safe' in terms of the number of additional adults each child will encounter regularly, especially with regard to the proposals for bus transport. |
|--|---|

Criteria for Evaluation:

All proposals will be assessed against the key areas set out below.

1. **Vision**
2. **Education Plan**
3. **Capacity and Capability**
4. **Evidence of strong track record**
5. **Financial Sustainability**

	Criteria	Comments
1	Vision	
	Is there a clear vision set out for the partnership?	The vision is set out in very broad terms, mainly based on the need to secure the continuance of the school, but it is not robust and it is not clear how this will be achieved.
	Is there evidence that leaders of both schools are committed to the vision?	No. No other specific school partners are named.
	Is the vision appropriate for the particular context of the schools?	The objectives reflect some concerns raised as part of the proposed consultation on the closure of the school. Examples include the need to secure a new headteacher and increased pupil numbers. However, there is no indication of how this will be achieved.

	Criteria	Comments
2	Education Plan	
	Is there a curriculum plan which is consistent with the vision and pupil intake?	<p>The proposal indicates that no changes will be made to teaching and learning. <i>'We feel that the teaching side of the school is performing exceptionally well and will not be looking to review this or have any input as this will be left in the capable hands of the wonderful teachers and staff at the school and the (hopefully soon) incoming headteacher.'</i></p> <p>This indicates that the needs of the pupil intake will not be reviewed which will impact negatively on the quality of provision and outcomes. This is a particular weakness in the proposal given that the school will be reorganised from 3 classes to 2 which will have major implications for curriculum planning and delivery. The proposal does not refer to this re-organisation of classes or consider the impact of this.</p>
	Are the key issues/priorities for improvement clear?	Objectives are set out however they lack clarity as to how they will impact on outcomes.
	Does the proposal make reference to key issues from the most recent Ofsted inspection and/or external review?	<p>The only reference to key Ofsted issues is the acknowledgement of the school's 'Good' rating in November 2015. The areas for improvement following the inspection have not been identified as objectives.</p> <p>The idea put forward that the group will: <i>'Support teachers and staff and aim to raise funds for things they feel they need to achieve the outstanding Ofsted rating'</i> shows a</p>

	Criteria	Comments
		lack of understanding of teaching and learning and what is required to secure an 'Outstanding' Ofsted judgement.
	Does the proposal identify activity that will address the issues identified in the school's self-evaluation and, in particular, issues raised by the most recent data analysis?	No reference is made to the school's self-evaluation or data analysis. No reference is made to the recent adviser visits.
	Are targets set for attainment, progress, attendance and quality of teaching, including for vulnerable groups?	No. There are no measurable criteria in the proposal.
	Are there short-term targets of interim milestones?	No. There are no short term targets in the proposal.
	Is it clear how actual performance will be measured against targets?	No. There is no detail in the proposal which reflects how actual performance will be measured against targets.
	Are clear success criteria/practice indicators identified for improving the quality of provision in the school?	No. This is a significant weakness of the proposal.
3	Capacity and Capability	
	Is the leadership structure detailed, is there sufficient capacity?	The plan identifies the need to recruit a new headteacher but it gives no indication of any recruitment strategy or how a new headteacher will be secured, other than a reference to the: <i>'(hopefully soon) incoming headteacher'</i> . The plan does not consider the salary implications given the current budget position or the challenges around recruitment to small schools. The leadership proposals do not include detail around partnership, executive

	Criteria	Comments
		headteacher or head of school roles which also need budget considerations.
	Is there a clear staffing structure proposed?	No. There are no plans to deviate from the current structure. However the school's current 3 year budget plan reduces from 3 to 2 classes due to falling pupil numbers and budget constraints. Therefore, this plan needs to clarify the number of classes and delivery model.
	Is there a detailed plan for the implementation of the proposal?	No. Objectives only are set out but there is no detailed plan for their implementation. The proposal recognises that it is not ' <i>a formal proposal but will hopefully form the building blocks for a review of Rodmell CE School and help us put together a business plan</i> '.
	Are there timescales for actions?	No. There is reference to a five year plan only and this is not included in this proposal. No business plan has been included with the proposal.
	Is it clear who is leading on each aspect of the proposal?	No. No personnel are referenced.
	Is it clear how the proposal will be monitored, and by whom?	No. There is no monitoring built into the proposal.
	Is it clear how the impact of the proposal will be evaluated, and by whom?	No. There is no evaluation built into the proposal.
	Is the role of governors in evaluating progress clear?	No. There is no governance built into the proposal.
	Is the proposal manageable and achievable?	No. The proposal is not significantly robust to be either manageable or achievable.

	Criteria	Comments
	Will the proposal enable the school to move up to the next inspection category within the agreed timescale?	No evidence is provided in the proposal to suggest how this can be achieved.
	Is there a clear partnership agreement in place, or a timetable to ensure an agreement is in place?	There is no school identified for the agreement, or a timescale for this identification, implementing a partnership agreement or working in partnership.
4	Evidence of Strong Track Record	
	Do those submitting the proposal have a strong track record in successful partnership working?	No evidence of a good track record of partnership working from those submitting the proposal.
	Do those submitting the proposal have a strong track record of improving pupil outcomes, including for vulnerable groups?	No evidence of a good track record of improving pupil outcomes from those submitting the proposal.
	Do those submitting the proposal have a strong track record of financial management?	No evidence of a good track record of financial management from those submitting the proposal.
5	Financial Sustainability	
	Is it clear how the proposal will be financially affordable for the next three years?	<p>The proposal is heavily reliant on fundraising from parents and other potential sources. There are only 38 families that send their children to Rodmell - this is a very small number who would be tasked with a long term challenge to secure a sustainable income for the school. This is not a sustainable model for the future.</p> <p>One of the objectives is to seek a federation/partnership with another school – this may provide a more financially secure model. However the Council’s Area Review</p>

	Criteria	Comments
		<p>process concluded that this would not necessarily secure financial sustainability for the school as it is so small and a federation would not help resolve the issue of there being so few children living in the community area or the constraints of the building which restrict the school's capacity to increase pupil numbers.</p> <p>There is no budget plan submitted with the proposal. The local authority is providing financial resources to the school to enable it to balance its budget for this year. The significant reduction in resources that the school have planned for the next three years means that there is no contingency or flexibility built into the school's budget. The plan's statement that the group will: '<i>Look to implement savings on running costs and areas parents can help out in</i>' does not provide a robust financial model for the school. There are no further efficiencies that can be made to the budget and fundraising is not a sustainable approach to running a school.</p> <p>The local authority is conducting monthly monitoring in the current financial year of the school's budget given the vulnerabilities and lack of flexibility in the current budget.</p>
	<p>Is it clear how the proposal will have a positive impact on the schools' financial income/increase pupil numbers?</p>	<p>The proposal sets out a desire to increase the capacity of the school to 75-80 pupils (48 pupils on roll at January 2016) by re-configuration and parent fundraising. However, pupil forecast data does not support the demand/need for places from the local community area.</p>

	Criteria	Comments
		<p>Fundraising is not a robust approach to school expansion projects given the significant costs involved.</p> <p>The proposal is reliant on fundraising which is not a robust basis for sustained school improvement.</p>