

COMPLETE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH ELLIOTT SCHOOL, PUTNEY AS A NATIONAL CHALLENGE TRUST SCHOOL

1. This proposal is published by the Interim Executive Board of Elliott School to establish the school as a National Challenge Trust School. The Trust will comprise three partners:

- Chestnut Grove School, as the lead partner
- Ernest Bevin College
- Roehampton University.

(a) School Details

The name, address and category of the school for which the Interim Executive Board are publishing the proposal is:

Elliott School
Pullman Gardens
Putney
London
SW15 3DG

It is proposed that the school will be a Foundation School with a Majority Trust.

(b) Dates

The proposed starting date (the "implementation date") for the Trust school to be established is:

1 September 2010

(c) Objections and comments

Any person wishing to comment on, or object to, these proposals should send their comments by e-mail to elliottconsultation@wandsworth.gov.uk or by post to the address below, to be received by Thursday 8th July 2010.

Elliott Consultation
Lorraine O'Reilly
Chair of Elliott School Interim Executive Board
c/o Children's Services Department
Wandsworth Council
The Town Hall
Wandsworth High Street
London
SW18 1PU

Following the close of the four week period for representations on 8th July 2010, the Interim Executive Board will review any comments and decide whether to proceed to implement the proposals.

Tribal Education
1-4 Portland
Square
Bristol
BS2 8RR

T 08456 40 40 40
enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
www.ofsted.gov.uk

25 February 2009

Ms Margaret Peacock
Headteacher
Elliott School
Pullman Gardens
London
SW15 3DG

Dear Ms Peacock

Special measures: monitoring inspection of Elliott School

Following my visit with Michael Milton and Robert Smith, additional inspectors, to your school on 9 and 10 February 2010, I write on behalf of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services and Skills to confirm the inspection findings.

The visit was the second monitoring inspection since the school became subject to special measures in March 2009. The monitoring inspection report is attached and the main judgements are set out below.

Progress since being subject to special measures is satisfactory. Newly qualified teachers may be appointed at this stage in the department of modern foreign languages and mathematics, with the relevant support in place.

This letter and monitoring inspection report will be posted on the Ofsted website. I am copying this letter and the monitoring inspection report to the Secretary of State, the chair of the interim executive board and the Director of Children's Services for Wandsworth.

Yours sincerely
Meena Wood
Her Majesty's Inspector

Special measures: monitoring of Elliott School

Report from the second monitoring inspection on 9 and 10 February 2010

Evidence

Inspectors scrutinised the school's work through observing lessons, a review of documents and pupils' work, and met with the headteacher, senior and middle managers, groups of students, and two representatives from the local authority.

Context

Since the last monitoring visit in September 2009, the school has continued to experience staffing turbulence in certain areas of the curriculum. The senior leadership team has now stabilised, comprising three deputies and four assistant headteachers with joint pastoral and academic responsibilities. The school has experienced staff changes in its middle leadership team in the areas of information and communication technology (ICT), mathematics and modern foreign languages, and this has led to some instability in provision and outcomes for students. The executive headteacher, who took up post in June 2009, is headteacher of Chestnut Grove School, a Leadership Partnership School, and continues to work four days at Elliott School. A substantive headteacher has now been appointed to join the school by April 2010.

The interim executive board continues in its support of the school, and, in addition, there is a partnership that meets regularly, comprised of representatives from the local authority, London Challenge advisors, and other sources of external support from Graveney and Chestnut Grove schools. The school's plans to achieve Trust Status as a National Challenge Trust School with Ernest Bevan and Chestnut Grove Schools are firmly in place. When the school has attained Trust status, it will continue to benefit from the excellent leadership skills of the current executive headteacher, as it is envisaged that she will be appointed as Chief Executive of the Trust.

The school continues to face considerable challenges that include a falling roll and a constrained budget, largely due to the falling roll; although, since the last visit, morale amongst staff and students has much improved. Plans are in place to commence Building Schools for the Future works in 2011.

Pupils' achievement and the extent to which they enjoy their learning

The school evaluates students' attainment as broadly within national averages and the quality of students' learning and progress as satisfactory. Inspectors found a more variable picture. According to the school's own data, while the school has shifted to setting more rigorous targets for pupils based on three levels of progress,



as opposed to Fischer Family Trust Data (FFTD), students in Year 11 are not currently predicted to meet the challenging five A*-C GCSE including mathematics and English, targets set for them, but are broadly projected to attain the FFTD targets or slightly exceed these. However, current Year 10 students, whose only target is based on three levels of progress, are on track to exceed the five A*-C GCSEs and almost on track to attain the five A*-C GCSEs (with English and mathematics). Progress data for Years 7, 8 and 9 demonstrate that progress is improving year on year. Indications are that there is better progress this year than last year with students in Year 7 making better progress than those in Years 8 and 9. Within these headline figures, there are significant variations between the core subjects with students in science and English making significantly better progress than in mathematics.

The school continues to have a strong focus on targeted interventions for students who are underachieving. However, monitoring of students at the additional subject revision and consolidation sessions reveals that only 30%-50% of students attend these. Although the school has involved parents and carers in this process, staff have not yet emphasised the mandatory nature of these sessions, so that all students who need to attend, do so. Assertive mentoring continues for all students identified as underperforming, along with support and targeted interventions for Year 11 students from London Challenge consultants. The impact of this continues to be monitored by the school, but owing to the non-attendance of some of the students at intervention sessions, not all of them originally predicted to attain a grade D or below, are now effectively working at grade C level.

Managers have focused much more systematically on appropriate teaching and learning strategies in the classroom and emphasise the use of students' performance data by teachers in planning activities and tasks. This has improved considerably since the last visit. All lessons observed by inspectors demonstrated clear lesson planning with learning objectives. However, the quality of the lesson planning of activities and tasks in line with students' abilities and levels vary significantly from subject to subject and within subjects. In science and English lessons, inspectors observed lessons where students were making satisfactory and good progress and often attaining the standards they should in line with their potential. But in mathematics, information and communication technology, and modern foreign languages, expectations of students are low and the pace of teaching and the content and staging of activities are often pitched inappropriately. In these lessons, more able students are not challenged and those that need greater support are not given sufficient help to complete tasks successfully.

Progress since the last visit on the area for improvement:

- ensure that students' progress is effectively monitored using accurate information so that all students make at least the progress expected – satisfactory.



Other relevant pupil outcomes

Students' attendance is at national averages at 92%. The impact of the full-time education welfare officer and more rigorous follow up of absence by tutors has resulted in reducing persistent absence even further to 5%, since the last visit. This also testifies to the current attendance policy that emphasises the increased responsibility of tutors to meet with students individually during the morning tutorial time to follow up academic tracking and pastoral issues. However, a minority of students were observed by inspectors not to appreciate the importance of punctuality to lessons. The behaviour management policy with both parents and carers and managers involved in the process has been successful in reducing exclusions.

Although low-lying disruptive behaviour in lessons has decreased, where this happens, it is usually because teachers do not plan activities and tasks that sufficiently engage students. Additionally, in modern foreign languages lessons, older students have too many gaps in their knowledge and skills, and lack the confidence and problem-solving skills to work independently on the tasks set. As a result, these students get restless, when disengaged and insufficiently challenged. However, staff and students affirm that all aspects of behaviour have much improved, in most subjects, since the last visit. Behaviour around the school is now much better than at the last visit, with a greater staff presence in corridors at movement times, to facilitate speedier and safer arrival of students in lessons.

Progress since the last visit on the area for improvement:

- devise, and implement consistently, attendance and behaviour management policies in order to improve attitudes to learning – good

The effectiveness of provision

Since the last visit, robust monitoring and support systems that focus on teaching and learning are beginning to have an impact. However, lesson observations and scrutiny of students' work showed that the intended impact of these on students' learning and progress has yet to be seen across all subjects. In addition, support staff are not always involved closely enough in the planning of in-class support in all cases, and do not always work effectively with individuals and groups of students.

The school is fully aware of the areas of particular weaknesses in the curriculum. In information and communication technology, the school has tried to develop teachers' capacity in improving the quality of teaching, but is short of subject expertise in its staffing base. The school's pilot of the BTEC qualification is more suited to students' interests and abilities and is being successfully taught. A significant proportion of students are developing collaborative skills and they are predicted distinctions in their outcomes. In science, students were observed developing investigative skills. However, in mathematics, weaknesses observed at last visit continue, as very little

use is made of everyday contexts in enabling students to understand how to transfer their skills and knowledge to real-life situations. In many lessons observed, there was too much teacher talk, copying from the whiteboard and limited opportunities for students to engage in paired and group work.

Across all subjects, with a few exceptions, too little use is made of assessment activities that can inform teachers of the progress that individual students are making and very little use is made by teachers of assessment activities to check students' learning before moving on to the next activity or input. These characteristics were evident in a significant proportion of lessons observed during the inspection, of which a sixth was deemed inadequate, with the majority as satisfactory. A greater proportion of lessons were judged as good than at the previous monitoring visit and a smaller proportion were judged as inadequate. In the good lessons observed, especially in English and science, students were more aware of what they needed to do to progress and improve their work. Assessment processes underpinned the planning of learning so that students were challenged and well supported and aspired to higher levels of attainment.

The English department has developed new schemes of work that incorporate the assessing pupils' progress framework. While some good practice was observed, the use of this to enable all students to work at their own levels is not yet consistent in all lessons and the school has not yet fully embedded strategies to share and disseminate this good practice to other core areas in the curriculum. Assessment for learning across subjects is still at early stages of development. Through work scrutiny and discussion with pupils in lessons, a number of older students with well-below average reading ages displayed poor literacy skills. Although a promising start had been made to address this through the literacy programme in the Year 7 transition curriculum, this initiative has not yet been extended across the school and year groups.

The quality of feedback students receive in class is still inconsistent. Academic guidance now has improved since the last visit, but across one third of subjects, still lacks a consistent foundation in the accurate assessment of students' learning. Scrutiny of students' work revealed the positive impact of the school marking policy but the area that the school needs now to focus on, is ensuring that all students know what they need to do to improve in their written work. Even where marking is helpfully detailed, teachers do not consistently ensure that students catch up on work missed or redraft work as necessary. Not all students know what they need to do to reach their targets in individual subjects, although Year 11 students, when questioned, showed greater awareness of their specific areas of improvement during this visit, than the last one.

Progress on the area for improvement:

- ensure that teaching meets the full range of individual needs in all lessons, so that all students are engaged, motivated and enabled to make good progress –satisfactory

The effectiveness of leadership and management

The senior leadership team, skilfully led by the executive headteacher, has continued to transform the academic and pastoral ethos of the school and create a positive team spirit amongst staff through further embedding of polices. This has consolidated improvements and the speed of these improvements, in some areas of the school, has been impressive, for instance, in science and English. However, the critical challenges faced by the school in its recruitment of suitably qualified and experienced teachers and, more importantly, middle managers in information and communication technology, mathematics and modern foreign languages, have significantly impeded progress in these subjects.

The senior school leadership team's actions have successfully ensured greater awareness by middle leaders of accountability and good self-evaluation skills, and most heads of department, with support from senior leaders, are able to identify challenging performance targets for their subjects. Rigorous internal reviews, initiated by the executive headteacher, with external support from the local authority, and in the case of modern foreign languages, with specialist linguistic input from the Central Institute for Languages Teaching, have successfully identified the strengths and areas for improvement in all subjects. Tracking of students' achievement continues to be strengthened through observations of teachers and work scrutiny undertaken by heads of department, as part of a revised assessment policy. In the last year, advanced skills teachers have supported and modelled teaching and learning working alongside staff. Owing to reduced staffing, this is not, however, sufficiently embedded and the school needs to focus on developing greater capacity in its teaching and managerial staff, through greater inter-department support and systematic peer observations.

Strengthened quality assurance systems are now in place. These focus much more on the quality of assessment that lies at the core of teaching and learning, and there is now a good shared understanding in the school's team by quality assurers about the criteria used to judge learning and progress.

Setting higher aspirations for staff and students is now the case through the school's challenging targets in all subjects based on the three levels of progress from key stages two to four. The school's self-evaluation of the progress it has made to date is accurate and evaluative and gives a fair description of the school's position at this point and the challenges it faces in the coming year. By the time of the next monitoring visit, the school will need to demonstrate the impact of its actions in ensuring rapid improvement, firstly, in the area of assessment and the impact of this

on accelerating students' learning and progress, and secondly, and most critically, through strengthening middle leadership, capacity and teaching expertise in the weaker areas.

Specialist school status

The school's specialist status in modern foreign languages, owing to staffing shortages and weaknesses in provision, has not been well developed since the last visit.

Students in most language lessons are still not developing the necessary confidence and oral skills that they need for successful outcomes and most are not sufficiently challenged to attain the higher levels of which they are capable, although students in Years 7 and 8 make better progress than those in older Years. An acting head of department has been in post since November 2009. She has effectively steered forth significant improvements within the department such as schemes of work, marking schemes and better implementation of the behaviour policy. The deputy headteacher with senior leadership and responsibility for this area has provided good support and challenge for staff.

However, the department lacks significant capacity in good languages teaching and assessment expertise. Students' progress as tracked against FFTD targets is satisfactory in French and inadequate in Spanish and German. The number of hours available to teachers to teach the QCA units is insufficient to ensure that students can make the progress they should, to be successful. Therefore, the current GCSE-based curriculum will not enable all students to pass. The school urgently needs to review the appropriateness of the curriculum in line with students' abilities and needs and to seek alternative, more flexible and achievable accreditation. Teachers do not use learning strategies that foster the active use of language skills, nor do many lessons generally develop greater student confidence, enjoyment and progress in learning. The use of the school's valuable resource, its teaching assistants, is not helping students develop oral and listening skills, and currently, there is no scheme of work or accountability for this area of work. The Language College is still an important contributor to the local authority's plan for extending modern foreign languages in primary schools and this aspect of the provision is developing well.

Progress on the area for improvement:

- involve managers, staff and students in clearly focused actions that address areas of identified weakness – good.

External support

The local authority has provided good strategic and operational support since the last visit and has taken steps to facilitate the setting up of the Trust Status for the school to enable it to have greater support. The statement of action in relation to its impact is now much more demonstrable and is being monitored very effectively by the schools' executive headteacher and the local authority adviser.

Priorities for further improvement

- To improve learning and progress across all subjects through ensuring
 - that teachers and support staff consistently plan learning activities to suit their students' capabilities and prior attainment across all subjects.

- To improve assessment and academic guidance through
 - providing an effective range of activities that assess students' understanding throughout the lesson and inform the next stages of learning
 - ensuring that all students know what they need to do to improve in their written work and can improve their literacy skills
 - ensuring that students catch up on work missed or redraft work as necessary to minimise gaps in skills and knowledge
 - ensuring that all students know precisely what they need to do to improve on their targets

- Strengthen middle leadership, management and staffing capacity, through the local authority and the Trust Status, in those areas that have been identified as weak: modern foreign languages, information and communication technology, and mathematics.



Elliott School

Trust School Status

Consultation

Dear Parent, Carer or Colleague

You will probably know that a lot has been happening in recent months at Elliott School and more developments are planned over the next few years - all designed to improve the quality of education provided by the school and to raise the standards reached by its students. This consultation document is about an important change on which we need to seek your views.

As you will be aware, since the Ofsted inspection last March, Wandsworth Council has worked with the school to bring about a number of significant changes. Margaret Peacock, the head of Chestnut Grove School has become the Acting Headteacher of Elliott School and will continue in that position until April 2010. The existing board of governors has been replaced by a smaller group called the Interim Executive Board. The school has been placed in the Government's National Challenge Programme, a major initiative to secure higher standards in secondary schools, especially those where the standards are lower than they should be.

Already the positive effect of these changes is being felt in the school. GCSE and A level results have risen well. A new headteacher for Elliott, Mark Phillips, will start in April and in the early Autumn, detailed planning will begin on the multi-million pound investment in the school buildings as part of the council's Building Schools for the Future project that will transform the school.

The Interim Executive Board now believe that the best way forward for the school, in terms of its overall governance, is that it should become part of a National Challenge Trust. This involves the setting up of a special Trust or charity to oversee the long-term direction of the school. This proposal has the full support of Wandsworth Council and was included in their strategy for improvement of the school published last May.

The Trust will be made up of three highly experienced educational partners, namely:

- **Chestnut Grove School, who will be the lead partner;**
- **Ernest Bevin College; and**
- **Roehampton University.**



The Trust will have final responsibility for the school and will appoint a majority of the governors to a new governing body which will oversee the day-to-day working of the school under the leadership of the new headteacher. Elliott is already a Foundation School, where the governing body was responsible for all aspects of the school's operation, including the employment of staff and management of the buildings and site. By becoming a Trust school, Elliott will still be responsible for all these matters and it will continue to be a foundation school, but the foundation will be supported by the Trust.

The Interim Executive Board believes that working with Chestnut Grove School, Ernest Bevin College and Roehampton University will open up many exciting possibilities and opportunities for the students and staff of Elliott School. All the partners are excited by the prospect of working together and developing projects to support the school.

You can read more about the potential advantages for Elliott of working with Chestnut Grove School, Ernest Bevin College and Roehampton University in following pages.

What will be the implications for Elliott School?

Elliott School will remain committed to providing the highest quality of teaching and learning, enabling all students to reach their full potential within a safe and secure environment. With continued specialist status - currently as a Language College - and a long and proven history in the creative and performing arts, the school will also seek to maintain its unique sense of identity and purpose within the Putney community.

Many things will therefore stay the same. There will be new opportunities, however, for the school to benefit from the Trust partners' educational experience, expertise and resources, for example, in relation to improving the quality of teaching and leadership.

In the longer term, the Trustees, through their representatives on the Governing Body, will be involved in the detailed visioning for the school for the next 25 years as we embark on the multi-million pound Building Schools for the Future project in 2011.

We therefore believe that we are at a pivotal point and that the Trust can help to take the school to new heights. Under the leadership of a new headteacher and with the continuing support of Margaret Peacock through the Trust, Elliott has the potential to:

- **transform our students' learning experience**
- **drive up attainment levels to be among the best in the borough and in London**
- **engage the local community giving them a real stake in our vision**
- **inspire our students in a creative, artistic and energetic environment.**

What happens next?

The Interim Executive Board want to hear your views and opinions before they make any decisions. There will be an informal period of consultation beginning on the 3rd February 2010 which will run for six weeks, concluding on 17th March 2010. There will be a public consultation event on Wednesday 24th February at Elliott School from 7.30 to 9pm which we hope you will be able to attend to find out more about the proposal and ask any questions that you may have. A meeting for Elliott staff will be held on Monday 22nd February and all staff will be invited to attend this. Separate meetings will be arranged for staff and parents of the two Trust partner schools as necessary.

As well as the meetings with parents, carers and staff, and discussions with community groups, you will be able to comment in writing by completing the form at the end of this document, by writing to us at the freepost address below, or by emailing elliottconsultation@wandsworth.gov.uk before 17th March 2010.

Freepost LON-10632
Elliott Consultation
Lorraine O'Reilly, Chair of Elliott School Interim Executive Board
Children's Services Department
Wandsworth Council
Town Hall
Wandsworth High Street
London SW18 2PU

At the end of the six-week period, the Interim Executive Board will review all the comments and will decide whether to proceed to issue a formal public legal notice of the proposed change. A summary of the responses will be made available to all consultees.

If the Interim Executive Board decides to proceed and issue a formal notice, there will be another opportunity to comment on the proposals before the Interim Executive Board makes any further decision. If there are objections at this stage, Wandsworth Council can refer the proposal to the Schools Adjudicator to decide.

We very much look forward to hearing from you. If you require further information about the consultation, please contact John Johnson, Assistant Director of Children's Services at Wandsworth Council, on (020) 8871 7891 or email jjohnson@wandsworth.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely
Lorraine O'Reilly

Potential benefits of working with Chestnut Grove School as a Trust partner

Chestnut Grove is a Foundation School located in Balham, with specialisms in the visual and creative arts. Chestnut Grove would be the lead partner in the Trust. The reasons for proposing Chestnut Grove as a Trust partner are as follows.

- The relationship with Elliott is very strong following the appointment of Chestnut Grove's headteacher, Margaret Peacock, as Interim Head at Elliott since last June. Since her appointment, Mrs Peacock has made huge progress in improving pupil and parental confidence, and staff morale. She has stabilized staffing and has begun to empower all staff to be more accountable for the school's progress.
- Chestnut Grove itself was judged outstanding by Ofsted in March 2008 and it is now a National Support School, with Mrs Peacock designated a National Leader in Education. Chestnut Grove is also a nationally recognised training school and would be able to continue to offer support to Elliott in this capacity.
- Chestnut Grove has an excellent track record of school improvement, with the progress that its pupils make from entry in Year 7 to GCSE ('value-added') now ranked 9th in the country out of over 3,150 secondary schools nationally.
- Chestnut Grove will be able to enhance strategic leadership in Elliott by using the National Challenge Trust funding to expand the Senior Leadership Team in Chestnut Grove in order to release some of the school's experienced senior and middle leaders and Advanced Skills Teachers to provide support in Elliott.
- Mrs Peacock's influential position as Chair of the Wandsworth Secondary Heads is useful in mobilising support from other schools. The current valuable support for Elliott from Graveney School as a High Performing Specialist School, for example, will continue, as will Elliott's involvement in the local 14-19 Partnership.
- Chestnut Grove's knowledge of and involvement in the council's BSF programme will enable it to play a key role in supporting Elliott, which is one of the first schools to be redeveloped after the two sample schools. Chestnut Grove's staff have specific expertise in the borough-wide ICT platform that is being developed.
- The governors at Chestnut Grove recognize the significant opportunities for staff development and career progression for all three schools which a Trust could provide.
- The transition to a new Trust should be relatively smooth given Mrs Peacock's current responsibilities at both schools.



Potential benefits of working with Ernest Bevin College as a Trust partner

Ernest Bevin College is a community school located in Tooting. It is a specialist college in PE and sport, with a second specialism in mathematics and computing. It is also a nationally recognised 'Leading Edge' school. The reasons for including it as a Trust partner are as follows:

- The college has a very strong track record of raising standards, being the fifth most improved school nationally since 2006 (out of more than 3150 secondary schools) and would bring this expertise to bear in Elliott.
- The college was the lead partner supporting another Wandsworth secondary school when it went into special measures several years ago and it was instrumental in helping that school to improve.
- The college has demonstrated innovative approaches to improvement. For example, in 2006 it appointed two co-principals, with this model of leadership subsequently judged outstanding during an Ofsted inspection visit in 2009.
- One of the co-principals of the college was seconded to Chestnut Grove School three years ago. The partnership was very successful and established a strong working relationship.
- The college has a stable staff and strong succession planning, meaning that there is substantial capacity amongst its senior and middle leaders to provide outreach support for Elliott, for example in teaching and learning.
- One co-principal is a member of the council's BSF Project Board and the other co-principal is a member of the BSF Implementation Group. Both therefore have significant knowledge of the BSF programme and will be able to support Elliott in the extensive BSF preparatory work that will be needed later this year.
- The Chairman of Governors at Ernest Bevin has been a member of the Elliott Interim Executive Board since its establishment, having been asked to join the Board for his expertise as an existing Chair and in relation to finance and school improvement.



Potential benefits of working with Roehampton University as a Trust partner

Roehampton University is a locally based teaching and research university, with a strong tradition of work in schools' education, including teacher training. It has worked with schools in other boroughs to bring about significant improvement in the standard of education provided. The benefits to Elliott of working with the university would be:

- Opportunities to raise the aspirations and expectations of Elliott students - in relation to higher education and careers
- Opportunities to support Elliott students in their learning - through access to university facilities and resources
- Opportunities for university students to undertake teaching practice in Elliott School - with potential benefits to the school in terms of subsequent recruitment
- Opportunities for teachers' professional development - benefiting from the university's research programmes, its curricular specialisms and its resources
- Opportunities to benefit from the university's experience of working with schools in challenging circumstances in other boroughs.



QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What are Trust Schools?

Trust schools are a new kind of school - part of the local authority system but supported by a Charitable Trust which will appoint a majority of the Governors.

What will be the benefits of becoming a Trust school?

Trusts are a way for schools to harness the energy and experience of external partners to support the school's leadership and direction. The support of Chestnut Grove School, Ernest Bevin College and Roehampton University will help to raise standards at Elliott School by drawing on the expertise of external partners. The specific benefits of working with each of the partners are summarised on the accompanying pages.

In addition, Elliott will receive substantial additional funding, as a Trust school, of £750,000 over the next two years from the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) under the National Challenge programme. This funding has already been approved by the DCSF in a bid made in early January 2010, conditional on the Trust School proposals being agreed.

As Trustees, Chestnut Grove School, Ernest Bevin College and Roehampton University will be entering into a long term, sustainable and stable relationship with Elliott. This will enable the school to plan developments over the long-term and ensure continuity of direction throughout a period of substantial change under Building Schools for the Future.

The Interim Executive Board believe that, within this partnership, the school can provide better opportunities and develop ways of working which would improve the lives of its pupils, their families, the staff of the school and the wider community. All these stakeholders will be able to work with each other in a much more effective way, accessing pooled expertise, to continue the drive to make Elliott School an excellent learning community for all.

What will this mean for students?

The school will continue to teach its present curriculum but will benefit from the partners' experience and ideas as they work together to raise attainment and to develop both the new 14-19 curriculum and extra-curricular opportunities, working with the other schools in the Trust and within Wandsworth, over the longer term.

What will this mean for Governors, parents and carers and the local community?

The new Governing Body, following the ending of Interim Executive Board, will oversee the school's strategic direction and will remain responsible for its performance. The school's budget will continue to be delegated by the council to the Governing Body.

The Trustees will appoint a majority of governors to the new Governing Body. This will enable the Trustees to bring their educational and managerial expertise to assist the Governing Body to fulfill its key role in school leadership, governance and improvement. There will still be elected staff governors, elected parents and community governors.

All Trust schools must establish a Parents' Council to offer advice and feedback to the Governing Body. This allows more parents to be actively involved with the School. The Governors will consult with the Parents' Council and the Elliott Supporters about key decisions. The Interim Head has already set up a Parents' Council at Elliott.

The school will strive to become a focal point for the local area by making its resources available to nearby primary schools, local business and the wider community. Extended services, such as family learning, will be developed within and beyond the school day.

What will Trust Status mean for staff?

Staff will still be employed by the Governing Body and the school will continue to be a foundation school. Teachers will still be employed under School Teachers' Pay and Conditions. Support staff's terms and conditions will continue to be set by the school, in line with equal pay and single status legislation and policy. There will therefore be no change in terms and conditions of employment for either teachers or support staff.

What will happen about admissions and the pupils already on roll?

The Governing Body will be responsible for agreeing the admissions arrangements for Elliott School, after consultation with the local authority and other schools. The school will continue to be bound by the School Admissions Code. This means that the school will continue to have fair admissions and that it will continue to admit up to 10% of its pupils (equivalent to 21 pupils in each year group) by their aptitude for Modern Foreign Languages. The Interim Executive Board expects to keep similar arrangements and oversubscription criteria to those which operate now.

All pupils currently on the roll of Elliott School will remain on the roll of the Trust school.

What is the timetable if this proposal goes ahead?

3rd February 2010	Start of consultation process
22nd February 2010	Information meeting for Elliott School's staff
24th February 2010	Information meeting for parents and the local community
17th March 2010	Consultation ends
Mid March 2010	Interim Executive Board decides whether to proceed with the National Challenge Trust proposal taking account of the consultation comments.

If it does go ahead then the timetable is likely to be:

Late March 2010	Statutory Notices published
29th April 2010	End of Statutory Notice Representation Period
Early May 2010	Decision made by Interim Executive Board (or Wandsworth Council can refer the proposal to the Schools Adjudicator to decide)
June - Sept 2010	National Challenge Trust Created New Governing Body Appointed Interim Executive Board dissolved and full responsibility handed over to Governing Body and National Challenge Trust
1st Sept 2010	Trust fully operational



Roehampton
University
London



If you have difficulty understanding this in English, please contact:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 English

إذا واجهت صعوبة في فهمه باللغة الإنجليزية، فيرجى الاتصال بـ:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 Arabic

যদি আপনার এটি ইংরেজিতে বুঝতে অসুবিধা হয় তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে এখানে যোগাযোগ করুন:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service (020) 8871 5751 Bengali

如果你看不懂英文版，請聯繫：
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 Chinese

Si vous avez des difficultés à comprendre ce texte en anglais, veuillez contacter:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service (020) 8871 5751 French

અગર તે અંગ્રેજીમાં સમજવી મુશ્કેલ લાગે, તો મહેલબાની કરીને
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 પર સંપર્ક કરો. Gujarati

W razie problemów ze zrozumieniem tekstu w języku angielskim prosimy o kontakt z:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 Polish

Se tem dificuldades em compreender isto em Inglês, por favor, contacte:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 Portuguese

Hadday kugu adag tahay inaad ku fahamto Ingriis fadlan la xiriir:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 Somali

Si tiene dificultad para entenderlo en inglés favor contactar a:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 Spanish

இதை ஆங்கிலத்தில் புரிந்துகொள்வதில் சிரமம் இருந்தால் நீங்கள் தொடர்புகொள்ள வேண்டியது:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 Tamil

اگر آپ کو انگریزی میں سے سمجھنے میں دشواری کا سامنا ہو تو برائے کرم رابطہ کریں:
Wandsworth Interpreting Service: (020) 8871 5751 Urdu

COMMENTS SHEET

Please send your comments on the proposal that Elliott School changes status to become a National Challenge Trust School working in partnership with Chestnut Grove School, Ernest Bevin College and Roehampton University on this form, by letter or by email.

Do you agree with the proposal that Elliott should become a National Challenge Trust School? (Please indicate)

Yes

No

Comments



If you want to, please put your name and contact details in the box below.

Please return this form by 10th March 2010 to:

Freepost LON-10632
Elliott Consultation
Lorraine O'Reilly, Chair of Elliott School INTERIM EXECUTIVE BOARD
c/o Children's Services Department
Wandsworth Council
The Town Hall
Wandsworth High Street
London
SW18 2PU

or email comments to elliottconsultation@wandsworth.gov.uk

(d) Consultation Undertaken

(i) The following people and organisations were consulted during the informal consultation stage which ran from 3 February to 17 March 2010

The Interim Executive Board, in partnership with the proposed Trustees of the Elliott School Trust, consulted with:

- the parents of all registered pupils at Elliott School, Chestnut Grove School and Ernest Bevin College;
- the staff represented at all three schools and their trades unions or professional associations;
- all Wandsworth primary and secondary schools and post-16 colleges;
- the neighbouring local authorities of Lambeth, Southwark, Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham, Richmond, Kingston, Sutton, Merton and Croydon;
- the three Members of Parliament covering the Wandsworth area and all members of Wandsworth Council;
- the Learning and Skills Council, City Challenge, the Office for the Schools Commissioner, Ofsted and the DCSF.

A copy of the published consultation document is attached as Appendix 1. This was made available in hard copy to all individuals and organisations listed above and was also made available via a dedicated website. To encourage the maximum response, a Freepost address was available for replies.

(ii) Minutes of all the consultation meetings are attached as Appendices 2-6.

(iii) The views of the persons consulted

The consultation responses were summarised in a report to the Elliott Interim Executive Board on 22nd March 2010. It was reported that the informal consultation ran for 6 weeks from 3 February to 17th March 2010, two weeks longer than the recommended minimum. During this time, five consultation meetings were held as follows:

11 February 2010	Teachers' Professional Associations
22 February 2010	Elliott teaching and non-teaching staff
24 February 2010	Elliott and other parents, and the wider community
15 March 2010	Chestnut Grove parents
18 March 2010	2nd meeting with Teacher Professional Associations

In addition, the Chair of the IEB met separately with a representative of the GMB union on 1 March. Comments were accepted until 19 March to allow time for a second meeting with the Elliott professional associations (Appendix 6) and for parents to respond who attended the meeting at Chestnut Grove School on 15 March (Appendix 5).

A total of 34 written responses were received by post, e-mail or the web.

Summary of written responses

Of the 34 responses, 27 were in favour of Elliott proceeding to National Challenge Trust Status and 3 were opposed. Four respondents did not indicate either that they were in favour or opposed.

Of the 27 in favour, 19 included additional written comments. Seven respondents commented positively on the potential benefits of Elliott working with the Trust partners, with particular mention of Roehampton University by three people. Three respondents mentioned the positive impact of the Interim Headteacher. Five people commented mainly on Elliott's recent or previous problems, such as staffing, the buildings and lack of stability, rather than on the Trust proposals per se. Three respondents said that they would have liked more information, including the risks, and wanted a meeting for Chestnut Grove parents. This was subsequently arranged on 15th March 2010. At the end of this meeting, parents said that they were reassured and supportive of the proposal.

Of the three respondents who were opposed to the establishment of the Trust school, one was a parent from Chestnut Grove who was worried about the impact on that school, for example, in terms of possible loss of Chestnut Grove staff to Elliott. A second person felt the proposal would harm Elliott's ethos. The third did not give the reason for their objection.

Of the remaining four respondents who did not give a definitive 'yes' or 'no' to the proposals, one was broadly supportive but questioned whether the Trust would have the necessary impact. One was a Chestnut Grove parent who felt that they did not have sufficient information and requested a meeting at that school, which was subsequently arranged. The final two responses were a letter sent on behalf of the staff association at Elliott (App 6, Annex 1) and an e-mail from the Chair of the Elliott Supporters, raising similar points. The points raised are addressed below. As a result of the staff association's comments, a further meeting was held with them on 18 March. The response to each point is set out in the minutes (Appendix 6).

Summary of consultation meetings

The overall tone of the meetings was supportive of the proposals. A number of questions recurred across the meetings, which can be summarised as follows.

- (a) Would it be possible for Elliott School also to be a partner in the Trust with the other three trustees?
- (b) What would be the rationale for, and benefits of, working with Roehampton University?
- (c) How would the Trust and the governing body interrelate? Where would the locus of power lie?
- (d) How will the constitution of the Governing Body will be decided?
- (e) What will be the nature of support provided by the partner schools and for how long?
- (f) How will the Trust funding work and is there a danger that it will be diverted to the partner schools?

- (g) What are the advantages of a Trust over other solutions such as academy or federation?
- (h) Will staff's employment status and their terms and conditions of employment be maintained when the Trust is established?
- (i) What are the Trust's legal responsibilities to parents and how it will engage them?

The minutes of the meetings record the detailed responses that were made to each point. The following paragraphs summarise these responses.

(a) Would it be possible for Elliott School also to be a partner in the Trust with the other three trustees?

This issue was raised by staff, the professional associations and parents and is re-iterated in the written comments made by the staff association and the Chair of the Elliott Supporters. Advice was sought from the DCSF and the OSC and the text of their reply is given below:

“National Challenge Trusts are targeted at those schools which require significant improvement to leadership and governance. In many cases this will involve a new or significantly strengthened leadership team and in all cases the establishment of a new governing body. Establishing a NCT can transform a school's performance and provide a platform for on-going improvement by harnessing the expertise and energy of experienced education partners.

It is our expectation that membership of the Trust does not include the National Challenge school's governing body. It is important for the Trust to be able to act independently of the governing body, to enable them to have frank and open discussions regarding the success of the governing body and to take appropriate action if necessary. However, we recognise that it is important that this policy is applied in a flexible way to take account of local circumstances. We have agreed in one case, for example, that a school's new governing body may act as an associate member of the Trust providing that the representative is neither the head teacher nor any other member of staff.”

A shared trust is therefore not an option in the school's circumstances. However, the IEB understands the Elliott point that the school has much to offer and wants to have a voice on the Trust. The IEB has asked the Trust, when established, to consider how it can address this issue

(b) What would be the rationale for, and benefits of, working with Roehampton University?

These are set out in the consultation document. At the meetings, the IEB representatives explained these in more detail, including the benefits to pupils, teachers and the wider community. There were no objections to Roehampton being a partner and a number of positive endorsements.

(c) How would the Trust and the governing body interrelate? Where would the locus of power lie?

The IEB representatives explained that the new Governing Body will remain the legal body statutorily responsible for the school – its staffing, curriculum, premises and so forth. The Trust will exercise its role primarily through appointing a majority of the Governors – in the proposed model, this will be 10 of the total of 18 governors – whom it may dismiss if necessary. It is envisaged that the Trust Board will comprise the three Trustees' representatives. It is likely to be a small group, perhaps between three and six people. It is anticipated that the Interim Head will be appointed as the Chief Executive of the Trust, taking the role of executive officer working with Elliott and the partners.

(d) How will the constitution of the Governing Body will be decided?

The composition of the Governing Body will be determined in accordance with numerical rules set by the DCSF, available in their guidance on trusts. These rules cannot be varied and ensure appropriate representation. One-third of the Governing Body must be parents of pupils registered at the school (or other schools if insufficient parents are willing to stand). These parents may either be elected or appointed by the Trustees. The rules also determine how many staff governors there should be and specify other categories eg LA and community. The Chair of Governors is elected by the Governing Body, a legal requirement. The suggested make-up of the Governing Body, as set out in the draft Instrument of Governance and supported by the proposed Trustees, is set out in Appendix K(i) and K(ii). The final model proposed by the IEB and Trustees has to be confirmed by the DCSF. It was agreed at the various meetings that this final model will be made available if the IEB decides to proceed to the next stage in the Trust proposal and, indeed, will be published as part of the 'complete proposal' which has to accompany the Statutory Notice.

(e) What will be the nature of support provided by the partner schools and for how long?

At the various meetings, the Interim Headteacher outlined the benefits of the local Trust. The local solution will bring greater commitment from the partners and consistency, and it will be for the long term. It will also be better than short-term external support. The Interim Head explained, by way of example, how a new inexperienced Head of Mathematics in Elliott, for example, could be supported by the experienced Head of Mathematics from Chestnut Grove. Another example cited was ICT, where support going into preparing for BSF will be essential. The Interim Head reassured parents that this would not mean taking good teachers away from their own schools to the detriment of those schools – rather it would be achieved by building capacity across the schools. It will also give excellent staff development opportunities for the staff in all three schools and may help with staff retention. The IEB Chair explained at several of the meetings that there will be opportunity to review the working of the Trust in due course. The Trustees may decide not to continue, but equally they may feel that the Trust's eventual success could be used to support a wider range of schools and will wish to extend its role.

(f) How will the Trust funding work and is there a danger that it will be diverted to the partner schools?

This questions was raised at several of the meetings. It was explained that a financial plan has to be approved by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), alongside the five year improvement plan. This ensures transparency of use of the funding. It was also explained that each of the schools retains a separate governing body and its own budget. In some cases, the funding may be used for backfill or release of staff in the partner schools, which is completely appropriate to recompense them. The funding cannot be used simply to offset Elliott's deficit budget. It was agreed at the various meetings that the Five Year Improvement Plan will be made available once it has been approved by the DCSF.

(g) What are the advantages of a Trust over other solutions such as academy or federation?

It was agreed at both the meetings with the professional associations and at the meeting with parents that the Trust model has a number of advantages over the alternatives. It ensures that each school retains a separate governing body. It brings the expertise of local education partners to support Elliott. It keeps Elliott firmly within other local collaborative arrangements, such as the Wandsworth 14-19 Partnership and the Improving Behaviour and Attendance Partnership.

(h) Will staff's employment status and their terms and conditions of employment be maintained when the Trust is established?

It was confirmed that there will be no changes to terms and conditions of staff as a result of the school becoming a Trust School. This is indicated in the consultation document.

(i) What are the Trust's legal responsibilities to parents and how it will engage them?

The Chair of the IEB explained that it is a legal requirement that a Parents' Council is established. This has already been done and the group is now having a direct influence on the management in the school. In addition, there is already a parents' forum - the "Elliott Supporters" - which is not a statutory requirement but nevertheless has an important role to play in being consulted about and commenting on issues related to the school.

In response to other points raised in the meetings or via written comments, the Chair of the IEB confirmed that the Trust's vision statement, once drafted, will be made available to all consultees. The Chair confirmed there will be no change to the school's admissions policy. The school's grounds and assets will transfer to the Trust but there is no intention to sell off any land as part of this proposal. Indeed, the full site will be needed for BSF.

[Post meeting note: the draft vision statement is attached as Appendix 8]

(iv) The Interim Executive Board's response to the consultation feedback

The IEB met on 22nd March 2010 to discuss the feedback. The Board's primary responsibility at this meeting was to consider the questions raised in response to the proposal and to determine whether to proceed to the next stage (the issuing of statutory notices), or whether any substantial changes requiring a further informal consultation were necessary, or not to proceed. The following is the text of the IEB's response which was circulated to all those who received the original consultation proposals.

"The overall response to the proposal was positive, both in the written responses and through the six meetings held with staff, parents and professional associations. Some specific questions were raised which the Board carefully considered in turn.

Initial feedback concerned the potential changes to the ethos of the school. The Board unequivocally agreed that the purpose of the Trust is to safeguard the positive identity of the school whilst sharpening the focus on standards and provision, and referred to the draft Vision statement which advocates developing the full potential of each pupil. This vision statement will be made widely available as part of the next stage of the process.

The second main area of enquiry focussed on allowing Elliott School to be a partner in the Trust so as to ensure representation and communication with the school. Advice had been sought from the DCSF on this point prior to the meeting. The Board considered this issue at length and agreed to ask the proposed Trustees (Chestnut Grove School, Ernest Bevin College and Roehampton University) to consider the proposal to have an associate Trust member representing Elliott who, as per the DCSF guidance, is not a staff member or the Headteacher. It was noted that the DCSF would still have to approve this.

In response to the other questions raised in the consultation, the Board reiterated that the Governing Body, and not the Trust, would remain legally responsible for the school and that the composition of the Governors is pre-determined by rules set by the DCSF. The Board agreed that the Governing Body constitution and 5 year improvement plan would be made available following final approval by the DCSF.

Financial and staffing questions were considered and the Board noted that the use of the £750,000 National Challenge Trust funding will be used transparently to benefit Elliott and will be set out in the an addendum to the five year improvement plan, which the DCSF has to approve. The funding cannot be used to offset the school's deficit. The employment status of staff will not change as a direct result of the school becoming a National Challenge Trust.

The Board felt that other questions raised were adequately covered in either the consultation document or the associated consultation meetings such that no further response to these questions was required. The IEB will ensure that the Trustees agree with the decisions that have been made prior to progressing the proposal and a full summary of the discussion will be available once the minutes of the meeting are released.

The Board agreed that at this stage there were no major changes to be made requiring further informal consultation and that the proposal should progress to the next stage.

- (v) **The Interim Executive Board thus confirms that it has followed due process and has taken into account the views of the consultees. All applicable statutory requirements in relation to the proposal to consult have therefore been complied with.**

(e) Alteration description

A statement of which one of, or combinations of, the alterations prescribed in regulation 3 of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 comprise the proposals.

Elliott is currently a foundation school without a foundation. Under the proposal it will remain a foundation school but it will acquire a foundation, the Elliott Trust.

The proposed alteration therefore comprises:

- (i) the acquisition of a Trust, to be known as the Elliott Trust, as permitted by the Education and Inspections Act 2006;
- (ii) a change in the instrument of governance which results in the majority of governors being foundation governors appointed by the Trust in accordance with the Education and Inspections Act 2006, the associated School Governance Regulations and the National Challenge Trust requirements at the date of incorporation of the Trust.

2. Where the prescribed alteration is a change of category, the proposals must contain the following information—

- (a) the rationale for the proposals;

As a result of the Ofsted Section 5 inspection of Elliott School of 18-19 March 2009, Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Schools judged that Elliott School required Special Measures because it was:

‘failing to give its students a satisfactory standard of education and the persons responsible for leading, managing or governing the school are not demonstrating the capacity to secure the necessary improvement.’

Elliott School GCSE Results

Performance results:	2007 GCSE (inc. Eng & maths)	2008 GCSE (inc. Eng & maths)	2008 CVA (KS2-4)	2009 GCSE (inc. Eng & maths)	National Challenge risk rating
	43%	34%	965	43%	High

Although GCSE results rose in 2009, its Contextual Value Added (a measure of the progress pupils make) remains well below 1000. While the results are currently above the Government’s floor target, there is a serious risk that while the

school remains in special measures, the trajectory will see results fall back towards or below 30% 5+A*-C grades without radical action. In addition, the school remains a designated 'behaviour challenge' school as pupils' behaviour was judged only satisfactory at the first HMI monitoring visit (September 2009).

As a result of the special measures judgement and failure to address adequately the issues in the Notice to Improve, the Council decided that more radical solutions were required. Accordingly it:

- replaced the governing body with an Interim Executive Board and has secured very strong membership of the Board to support the leadership of the school;
- appointed the headteacher of Chestnut Grove School as interim headteacher from the 1 June 2009 to April 2010 to stabilise the school and secure rapid progress;
- supported a high profile advertising campaign by the Interim Headteacher to recruit substantive post holders to vacant posts, with two new Deputy Heads appointed from September 2009;
- through the IEB, successfully recruited a substantive head who took up post in April 2010;
- worked with the Senior Adviser for London Challenge to establish Elliott as an 'intensive' Keys to Success' school, with support provided via Education London in key subjects and year groups.

As a result of these actions and, in particular, the work of the interim headteacher and the IEB in strengthening the school's leadership and management, the first two HMI monitoring visits in September 2009 and February 2010 judged the school's progress and capacity to improve as satisfactory. The most recent Ofsted monitoring letter (February 2010) is attached as Appendix 7.

Rationale for Trust status

The principal reason for seeking trust status is therefore to use the capacity and expertise that strong educational partners (an outstanding school which is also a National Support School, a second school with a strong track record of improvement and outreach support for schools in difficulty, and a higher education provider) will bring to tackle the four key issues identified in the 2009 Ofsted inspection report:

- to ensure that teaching meets the full range of individual needs in all lessons, so that all students are engaged, motivated and enabled to make good progress;
- to devise, and implement consistently, attendance and behaviour management policies in order to improve attitudes to learning;
- to ensure that students' progress is effectively monitored using accurate information, so that all students make at least the progress expected;
- to involve managers, staff and students in clearly focused actions that address areas of identified weakness.

The IEB has considered the available options for the school and believes that National Challenge Trust status is the best way forward for three reasons:

- (i) the school failed to demonstrate that it has the necessary capacity to improve, as it had been previously given a Notice to Improve in late November 2007 but was judged by Ofsted in the 2009 inspection to have made inadequate progress on each of the four key issues;
- (ii) alternative solutions and actions that had been tried previously, including intensive LA support and a soft federation with another local school, had not secured the necessary improvement
- (iii) The school is in the first wave of the Council's Building Schools for the Future programme after the two sample schools, because it has major weaknesses, despite being a listed building. The BSF work will require significant leadership capacity. Alternative options for the school, such as an academy, would create uncertainties which could jeopardise the school's place in the programme, and indeed the whole Council programme, as well as distracting from the core work of improving teaching and learning and raising standards. A smooth transition to Trust status would bring external expertise and capacity whilst maintaining recent progress.

The National Challenge Trust proposal will enable Elliott to build capacity by strengthening further the school's leadership at both senior and middle leader level, via collaborative work with Chestnut Grove School and Ernest Bevin College, potentially including joint appointments, secondments and internships, as well as advice and support. Governance too will be further strengthened, through the Trust arrangements and the anticipated appointment of Chestnut Grove's headteacher as Chief Executive of the Trust. Together with opportunities for Chestnut Grove and Ernest Bevin to support classroom teaching at Elliott, this model will provide an effective collaborative framework for sustained long-term support, challenge and improvement.

In addition to the support provided by Chestnut Grove and Ernest Bevin through the proposed Trust, the Governors of Graveney School have indicated that they wish to continue to support Elliott in Graveney's capacity as a High Performing Specialist School with specialism in Raising Attainment and Pupil Progress.

Wandsworth Council's school improvement strategy will thus continue to be rooted in building schools' own capacity by establishing effective partnership arrangements with other education providers. This is shown for example, in the partnership work that took place between Battersea Park School, formerly in special measures, and Ernest Bevin College, together with the Council and London Challenge.

Further, Wandsworth Council policy is firmly committed to providing parents with diversity and choice with regards to the range of types of school within the borough. By including a Trust school within its portfolio, which already includes an academy and a recently approved new denominational school, it will be further extending those choices and opportunities, in line with the objectives set out in its Building schools for the Future Strategy for Change.

The new Elliott Trust School will remain committed to providing the highest quality of teaching and learning, enabling all students to reach their full potential within a safe and secure environment. With continued specialist status and a long and

proven history in the creative and performing arts, the school will seek to maintain its unique sense of identity and purpose within the Putney community. There will be new opportunities, however, for the school to benefit from the Trust partners' educational experience, expertise and resources, for example, in relation to improving the quality of teaching and leadership.

The proposed Trust partners are listed in Section 3 (c) below and the detailed rationale for this choice of partners is set out in section 3(j) on subsequent pages.

- (b) a statement that the school will—
- (i) have a foundation established otherwise than under the School Standards and Framework Act (SSFA) 1998; or
 - (ii) belong to a group of schools for which a foundation body acts; or
 - (iii) be a foundation school not falling within either of sub-paragraphs (i) or (ii);

- (i) The establishment of Elliott as a trust school involves the acquisition of a foundation, the Elliott Trust, established otherwise than under the SSFA 1998.
- (ii) At the time of establishment, the foundation will act solely for Elliott School.

3. Where the prescribed alteration is the acquisition of a foundation established otherwise than under SSFA 1998, the proposals must contain the following information—

- (a) the name or proposed name of the foundation;

The name of the foundation will be the Elliott Trust.

- (b) the rationale for acquiring the foundation and the ethos that it will bring to the school;

Trusts are a way for schools to harness the energy and experience of external partners to support the school's leadership and direction. The support of the three proposed Trustees will help to raise standards at Elliott School by drawing on the expertise of external partners. The specific benefits of working with each of the partners are summarised in section 3(j) below.

In addition, the school will receive substantial additional funding, as a Trust school, of £750,000 from Department for Education under the National Challenge programme. This funding has already been approved by the DCSF in a bid made in early January 2010, conditional on the Trust School proposals being agreed.

The Trustees will be entering into a long term, sustainable and stable relationship with Elliott. This will enable the school to plan developments over the long-term and ensure continuity of direction throughout a period of substantial change under Building Schools for the Future.

The Elliott Interim Executive Board believes that, within this Trust partnership, the school can provide better opportunities and develop ways of working which would improve the lives of its pupils, their families, the staff of the school and the wider community. All these stakeholders will be able to work with each other in a much

more effective way, accessing pooled expertise, to continue the drive to make Elliott School an excellent learning community for all.

What will this mean for students?

The school will continue to teach its present curriculum but will benefit from the partners' experience and ideas as they work together to raise attainment and to develop both the new 14-19 curriculum and extra-curricular opportunities, working with the other schools in the Trust and within Wandsworth, over the longer term.

What will this mean for governors, parents and carers and the local community?

The new Governing Body, following the ending of Interim Executive Board, will oversee the school's strategic direction and will remain responsible for its performance. The school's budget will continue to be delegated by the Council to the Governing Body.

The Trustees will appoint a majority of governors to the new Governing Body. This will enable the Trustees to bring their educational and managerial expertise to assist the Governing Body to fulfill its key role in school leadership, governance and improvement. There will still be elected staff governors, elected parents and community governors.

All Trust schools must establish a Parents' Council to offer advice and feedback to the Governing Body. This allows more parents to be actively involved with the School. The Governors will consult with the Parents' Council and the Elliott Supporters about key decisions. The Interim Head has already set up a Parents' Council at Elliott.

The school will strive to become a focal point for the local area by making its resources available to nearby primary schools, local business and the wider community. Extended services, such as family learning, will be developed within and beyond the school day.

What will Trust Status mean for staff?

Staff will still be employed by the Governing Body and the school will continue to be a foundation school. Teachers will still be employed under School Teachers' Pay and Conditions. Support staff's terms and conditions will continue to be set by the school, in line with equal pay and single status legislation and policy. There will therefore be no change in terms and conditions of employment for either teachers or support staff.

What will happen about admissions and the pupils already on roll?

The Governing Body will be responsible for agreeing the admissions arrangements for Elliott School, after consultation with the Council and other schools. The school will continue to be bound by the School Admissions Code. This means that the school will continue to have fair admissions and that it will continue to admit up to 10% of its pupils by their aptitude for Modern Languages for as long as this specialism continues. The Interim Executive Board expects the Trust to keep similar arrangements and oversubscription criteria to those which operate now. All current pupils will transfer to the Trust school.

- (c) the details of membership of the foundation, including the names of the members;

The membership of the Trust will be:

- the Governing Body of Chestnut Grove School, Wandsworth, who will be the lead Trust partner;
- the Governing Body of Ernest Bevin College, Wandsworth
- Roehampton University.

- (d) where the majority of governors are to be foundation governors, a statement that a parent council will be established in accordance with section 23A of EA 2002(1);

In accordance with section 23A of the Education Act (EA) 2002, a Parents' Council has been established with effect from September 2009. The Terms of Reference of the Parents' Council are as follows:

Purpose

- The Parents' Council will provide the opportunity for the senior management team at Elliott to talk directly to Parents/Guardians in the community about issues relating to the school.
- The Parents' Council will enable Parents to receive information relating to progress and changes that affect their children.
- The Parents' Council will enable parents to receive information relating to the future development of the school including BSF and Trust Status.
- The Parents' Council is not a task-based group. There are no expectations for Parents to be more active other than participation in the meetings.
- The Parents' Council is not a vehicle for fundraising or events management which remains the role of the Elliott Supporters Group.

Objectives

- To attend Meetings on a half termly basis and engage in open dialogue with the Elliott senior management team.
- To provide the school with a parents perspective.
- To enable the Parents' Councils members to have a deeper understanding of the operation of the school and thereby influence its development.
- To share with other members of the community, information received through the Council and to encourage other parents/guardians to join the Elliott Supporters Group.
- To receive information and give feedback where necessary.

Membership

- Parents/Guardians of children in each year group
- One parent to represent all children in any year group
- The Interim Headteacher (the substantive Headteacher once appointed)
- The Chair of the IEB (Chair of Governors once appointed)
- The parent representative of the IEB (Parent Governor once appointed)
- The Chair of the Elliott Supporters Group

(1) Section 23A was inserted by section 34 of the EIA 2006.

- (e) the entitlement to appoint charity trustees and the number of trustees to be appointed;

Each member shall be entitled (but not obliged) to appoint the number of Trustees set out below and at any time may remove its nominated Trustee(s) from office:

Member	Number of Trustees
Chestnut Grove School	2
Ernest Bevin College	1
Roehampton University	1

- (f) the proposed constitution of the school's governing body;

The name of the governing body will be "The Shadow Governing Body of Elliott School." The shadow governing body shall consist of a total of 18 members, comprising ten governors appointed by the Trustees and eight other governors.

The ten Trust-appointed governors will be made up as follows:

- 6 governors nominated by the Trustees of whom:
 - at least 2 will be nominated by Chestnut Grove School;
 - at least 1 will be nominated by Ernest Bevin College
 - at least 1 will be nominated by Roehampton University;
- 4 parent governors, nominated by the Trustees.

The eight other governors shall comprise:

- 2 parent governors elected by the parent body;
- 2 community governors appointed by the Governing Body;
- 1 Local Authority governor;
- 2 elected staff governors;
- the headteacher of Elliott School.

The Elliott School Trustees may remove any of the ten governors appointed by the Trust at any time during their period of office.

The term of office of the members of the Shadow Governing Body will be until such time as the Interim Executive Board is dissolved and replaced by the new Governing Body, which must be within three months of the date of implementation of the Elliott School Trust.

- (g) details of the foundation's charitable objects;

The objects of the Charity are to advance education for the public benefit, in particular but without limitation:

- 1.1 the education of the pupils at the Elliott school it being acknowledged that in carrying out this Object the Charity must, so far as is consistent with this purpose, have regard to its obligation to promote community cohesion under the Education Acts;

1.2 the education of the pupils or students of any age at any school, college or institution (whether or not it is a Qualifying School) with which the Charity works in partnership or collaboration whether formally or not.

- (h) whether the foundation already acts as a foundation for any foundation or voluntary schools;

The foundation does not yet exist and therefore does not act as a foundation for any other foundation or voluntary school.

- (i) except where the alteration consists of a voluntary aided or voluntary controlled school changing category to a foundation school and it is intended that the foundation should appoint a minority of foundation governors, a statement that the requirements set out in the Foundation Regulations will be met;

The proposed Trustees confirm that the requirements set out in the School Organisation (Requirements as to Foundations) (England) Regulations (2007/1287) will be met.

- (j) a statement and supporting evidence as to how the foundation will contribute to the advancement of education at the school and in particular how it will help to raise standards;

The potential Trustees and the School have drawn up a draft Five Year Improvement Plan which has been submitted to the DfE for approval and will be made available to all interested parties once it has been agreed.

To bring about the required improvements and raise standards, the Trust will:

- ensure a robust strategic direction for the school, providing a high quality critical dimension which will support the governors and the Headteacher in making rapid and secure improvements;
- enable the school to come out of Special Measures in as short a time as possible and, within the time-scale of the Trust, to be judged at least 'Good' by Ofsted;
- establish a culture of high expectations, leading to excellent standards of achievement for all students;
- bring about a step-change in teaching and learning, providing high quality learning opportunities which enable all students to reach their full potential within a safe, secure and stimulating environment;
- ensure students leave with the best life chances and the skills and knowledge necessary for future study or employment;
- maintain and strengthen the school's unique sense of identity and purpose within the Putney community and become the school of choice for students and their parents;
- create effective partnerships with the community and others;
- in liaison with the school's SIP, develop as a specialist school, using the school's strengths to become a centre of excellence.

Key drivers to achieve these aims are to:

- attract, develop and retain the staff necessary to take the school forwards by ensuring that all teachers are highly qualified in their prime teaching area and have access to excellent continuous professional training;
- adopt an appropriate structure to build strength in leadership and management and in priority teaching areas, ensuring the staffing is in place to deliver results;
- develop and maintain a culture in which staff are encouraged to grow as professionals and put in place incentives to achieve this;
- develop creative relationships between the Trust partners and beyond to deliver excellence in teaching, leadership and management;
- ensure that the school is financially sustainable and has sufficient resources to deliver the school plan.

Focus Area 1: Raising Achievement/Provision

- 1.1. Development of Key Stage 3 provision
- 1.2. Development of Key Stage 4 provision
- 1.3. 16-19 developments
- 1.4. Improving Maths, MFL and ICT
- 1.5. Improving teaching & learning across all key stages
- 1.6. Improving assessment
- 1.7. Raising attainment of underperforming students.
- 1.8. Improving the use of ICT as a teaching & learning tool across the curriculum

Focus Area 2: Improving Ethos, Support and Guidance

- 2.1. Improving behaviour and motivation
- 2.2. Improving care, guidance and support
- 2.3. Ensuring the effectiveness of students' safety
- 2.4. Improving student voice and leadership
- 2.5. Improving students' attendance & punctuality

Focus Area 3: Developing dynamic and effective strategic leadership and management

- 3.1. Ensuring SLT communicates ambition & drives improvement
- 3.2. Ensuring effective Middle Leadership
- 3.3. Ensuring high quality teaching staff in all subjects
- 3.4. Developing the school as a Specialist School
- 3.5. Ensuring effective financial management planning
- 3.6. Ensuring effective leadership and management of BSF

Focus Area 4: Improving Image and Developing Effective Partnerships

- 4.1. Improving community cohesion including relationships and communication with parents
- 4.2. Ensuring the Trust partnership works effectively
- 4.3. Ensuring governance is strong and effective in raising achievement

Targets for Student Achievement at Key Stages 3, 4 and 5

Examination/level	2007-8 (baseline)	2008-9 (baseline)	2009-10 targets	20010-11 targets	2011-12 targets	2012-13 targets
Key Stage 3						
2 levels progress						
English	15%	17%	85%	90%	90%	
Maths	52%	36%	85%	90%	90%	
English + Maths	n/a	17%	66%	67%	87%	
GCSE 5+ A*-C	44%	60%	70%	67%	67%	65%
GCSE 5+ A*-C with English and Maths	34%	43%	65%	55%	58%	58%
GCSE 5+ A*-G	84%	96%	96%	96%	97%	97%
APS	259	311	320	325	330	335
A level APS Points per entry	176	215	215	220	220	225

Notes: Key Stage 3 are based on 90% of students making 2 levels progress in 3 years; GCSE targets are based on 80% of students making 3 levels progress from KS2 – 4. Both are above the national average.

Rationale for the choice of Chestnut Grove School as the lead Trust partner

Chestnut Grove is a Foundation School located in Balham, with specialisms in the visual and creative arts. Chestnut Grove would be the lead partner in the Trust. The reasons for proposing Chestnut Grove as a Trust partner are as follows.

- The relationship with Elliott is very strong following the appointment of Chestnut Grove's headteacher, Margaret Peacock, as Interim Head at Elliott from June 2009 to April 2010. During her appointment, Mrs Peacock has made huge progress in improving pupil and parental confidence, and staff morale. She has stabilized staffing and has begun to empower all staff to be more accountable for the school's progress.
- Chestnut Grove itself was judged outstanding by Ofsted in March 2008 and it is now a National Support School, with Mrs Peacock designated a National Leader in Education. Chestnut Grove is also a nationally recognised training school and would be able to continue offer support to Elliott in this capacity.
- Chestnut Grove has an excellent track record of school improvement, with the progress that its pupils make from entry in Year 7 to GCSE ('value-added') now ranked 9th in the country out of over 3,150 secondary schools nationally.
- Chestnut Grove will be able to enhance strategic leadership in Elliott by using the National Challenge Trust funding to expand the Senior Leadership Team in Chestnut Grove in order to release some of the school's experienced senior and middle leaders and Advanced Skills Teachers to provide support in Elliott
- Mrs Peacock's influential position as Chair of the Wandsworth Secondary Heads is useful in mobilising support from other schools. The current valuable support for Elliott from Graveney School as a High Performing Specialist School, for example, will continue, as will Elliott's involvement in the local 14-19 Partnership.
- Chestnut Grove's knowledge of and involvement in the Council's BSF programme will enable it to play a key role in supporting Elliott, which is one of the first schools to be redeveloped after the two sample schools. Chestnut Grove's staff's have specific expertise in the borough-wide ICT platform that is being developed.
- The governors recognize the significant opportunities for staff development and career progression for both schools which a Trust could provide.
- The transition to a new Trust should be relatively smooth given Mrs Peacock's knowledge of, and interim responsibility for, both schools.

Rationale for the choice of Ernest Bevin College as a Trust partner

Ernest Bevin College is a community school located in Tooting. It is a specialist college in PE and sport, with a second specialism in mathematics and computing. It is also a nationally recognised 'Leading Edge' school. The reasons for including it as a Trust partner are as follows:

- The college has a very strong track record of raising standards, being the fifth most improved school nationally since 2006 (out of more than 3150 secondary schools) and would bring this expertise to bear in Elliott.
- The college was the lead partner supporting another Wandsworth secondary school when it went into special measures several years ago and it was instrumental in helping that school to improve.
- The college has demonstrated innovative approaches to improvement. For example, in 2006 it appointed two co-principals, with this model of leadership subsequently judged outstanding during an Ofsted inspection visit in 2009.
- One of the co-principals of the college was seconded to Chestnut Grove School three years ago. The partnership was very successful and established a strong working relationship.
- The college has a stable staff and strong succession planning, meaning that there is substantial capacity amongst its senior and middle leaders to provide outreach support for Elliott, for example in teaching and learning.
- One co-principal is a members of the Council's BSF Project Board and the other co-principal is a member of the BSF Implementation Group. Both therefore have significant knowledge of the BSF programme and will be able to support Elliott in the extensive BSF preparatory work that is now needed.
- The Chairman of Governors at Ernest Bevin has been a member of the Elliott Interim Executive Board since its establishment, having been asked to join the Board for his expertise as an existing Chair and in relation to finance and school improvement.

Rationale for the choice of Roehampton University as a Trust partner

Roehampton University is a locally based teaching and research university, with a strong tradition of work in schools' education, including teacher training. It has worked with schools in other boroughs to bring about significant improvement in the standard of education provided. The benefits to Elliott of working with the university would be:

- opportunities to raise the aspirations and expectations of Elliott students - in relation to higher education and careers;
- opportunities to support Elliott students in their learning - through access to university facilities and resources;
- opportunities for university students to undertake teaching practice in Elliott School – with potential benefits to the school in terms of subsequent recruitment;
- opportunities for teachers' professional development – benefiting from the university's research programmes, its curricular specialisms and its resources;
- opportunities to benefit from the university's experience of working with schools in challenging circumstances in other boroughs.

Proposed Trust Management Arrangements

The proposed Trust structure will involve the three partners in a sustainable partnership that will allow options for further development once the immediate challenges of Elliott are resolved. Trustees will be represented in the ratio of 2 to 1 to 1 from Chestnut Grove, Ernest Bevin and Roehampton University respectively. The Trust does not wish to appoint an Executive Headteacher across the three schools, but rather the headteacher of Elliott will remain independent and will be accountable through the new Governing Body to the Trust. The Trust will appoint a Chief Executive, who is likely to be the head teacher of Chestnut Grove School, who will work closely with the headteacher of Elliott School. The role of the Chief Executive will be to:

- (i) steer the overall strategic direction of the Trust in both the medium and long term;
- (ii) advise the Trust on its strategic priorities and performance management arrangements;
- (iii) ensure that these priorities and performance arrangements are reflected in the policies of the governing body and, along with the Elliott headteacher, ensure that they are implemented;
- (iv) secure the effectiveness of work with, and support from, partners including Chestnut Grove, other Trust members and others, in building capacity to bring about the desired improvement;
- (v) ensure that the Trust's resources are used effectively;
- (vi) advise the governing body and the headteacher, with the School Improvement Partner, on performance management and key objectives.

- (k) a statement of how the foundation will contribute to the promotion of community cohesion and the impact the foundation will have on the diversity of school provision in the area.

As a non-denominational Trust school, the pupil roll at Elliott will continue to be fully representative of the cultural and ethnic diversity of this part of South London. This will continue to be a rich resource to help students understand what they have in common and celebrate what is different.

The Trust school will actively promote inclusion by building strong links based on personal contact with parents and carers, for example through the Parents' Council, and will thus raise staff awareness of the cultural background of the student population.

Personalised learning programmes supported by rigorous monitoring procedures will allow the Trust school to identify cohorts or groups which are likely to underachieve and put in place the required intervention to ensure pupils from all backgrounds achieve the highest possible standards.

All curriculum areas will have a global dimension which will apply inclusive principles to curriculum content and language and encourage learning through activities such as Black History Month and Fairtrade Fortnight.

The school's current specialism of Modern Foreign Languages promotes a strong international dimension to its work, including its outreach role with primary schools. Links with Chestnut Grove School, whose primary specialism is in the Creative and Expressive Arts, together with Modern Languages, will enable the two schools to build further on the many existing links that they already have with schools overseas – for example, in India, NW China and Southern Europe.

The Trust's objectives include preserving and developing Elliott's long and proven ethos in the creative and performing arts. Links with Roehampton University through the Trust will support the school in accessing the rich cultural and artistic opportunities that exist locally in this part of SW London. The university will also facilitate links with local businesses and commerce.

The school will be a resource to other schools and the wider community through collaborative programmes and its extended services and activities. The school will work with other schools in the Wandsworth 14-19 partnership to enable its students to access other specialisms in the strong 14 to 19 offer that is currently being further.

- (l) a statement of the impact of the Trust on the diversity of school provision in the area.

There are currently five Foundation schools, three Voluntary Aided schools, one Community school, one Academy and several independent schools in Wandsworth. The establishment of Elliott as a Trust School will therefore further diversify the range of provision and increase parental choice by creating the borough's first Trust School.

Appendix 2

ELLIOTT TRUST CONSULTATION - JOINT TEACHERS' PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS MEETING

11 FEBRUARY 2010

Present:

John Johnson (JJ) for the IEB, Margaret Peacock (MP) Acting Head, Bruce Howard (NUT, Elliott School representative) (BH), Andy England (NASUWT, Elliott school representative), Simon Watten (DHT, Elliott School), Frank Marshall (ATL) (FM), Spencer Barnshaw (NUT, area representative) (SB), (NUT, Ernest Bevin representative)

Points noted and questions raised by the association representatives:

- (i) Frank Marshall asked why Roehampton University had been chosen as a Trust partner? Why are they needed in the Trust?

JJ and MP explained the benefits of working with Roehampton University, as outlined in the consultation booklet, and that most Trusts include a higher education provider – this seems to be a DCSF expectation.

- (ii) Spencer Barnshaw stated that, 'The devil is in the detail' and that consultees need to be clear what is included in 'the basics' of the proposals.

JJ confirmed that there will be contractual continuity for staff and that there will be no variations from the Burgundy Book.

- (iii) Andy England asked whether a member of staff could be forced to go to work in one of the other schools in the Trust?

MP replied, 'No but there may be developmental opportunities offered to staff – this is one of the key benefits of the Trust'. She then explained how this might work.

- (iv) Frank Marshall asked how the £750,000 grant will be used?

Answer: JJ explained the next steps necessary with regard to drawing up the 5 Year Improvement Plan for DCSF approval, which will include a budget plan. The funding must be used to support Elliott's improvement, it cannot write off the current deficit.

- (v) Spencer Barnshaw stated that the NUT believes that schools should be accountable to our local authority. A key aspect of the proposal will be the inter-relationship of the three governing bodies. Spencer asked that the Trustees consider whether an Elliott representative can be one of the Trust partners.

JJ undertook to refer this back to the IEB and potential Trust partners and also to seek advice from the DCSF and/or Office for the Schools Commissioner.

- (vi) Spencer Barnshaw then said that two particular issues were exercising him:
- the possibility of restructuring – with the Trust deciding
 - the budget deficit, falling rolls and the potential for redundancies.

MP explained that the budget deficit would have to be managed, whether or not the Trust went ahead. There would therefore have to be a reduction in staff numbers.

- (vii) Frank Marshall said that staff have two concerns:
- the IEB have added to the budget deficit in the last year
 - the flawed structure proposed by the previous head was accepted by the LA.

JJ replied that the IEB, with MP, had secured some of the necessary savings this year rather than adding to the deficit, although some additional support had been provided. MP added that the current structure needs to change. Spencer Barnshaw agreed. However, there will be continuity of thinking and planning because she will remain involved in the school through the Trust once the new head takes up his post.

- (viii) Andy England asked whether voluntary redundancy would be available?

MP did not commit to this. She said, though, that the school will have to reduce the number of non-teaching staff as well as teaching staff.

Frank Marshall argued that a three year plan is needed.

- (ix) Spencer Barnshaw asked what the thinking was among Councillors about the long term future of the school?

JJ confirmed that Elected Members were fully committed to the local Trust model. They had considered alternatives and papers had gone to Committee that looked at other Trust partners. Their strongly held view was for a local Trust.

- (x) Spencer Barnshaw concluded by saying that it will be essential to involve the support staff unions as well as the professional associations in the consultation.

JJ confirmed that this was in hand.

Appendix 3

Notes of Informal Trust Consultation meeting with Elliott staff on 22nd February 2010

Introductions

Miss O'Reilly, Chair of IEB, introduced herself.

The Proposal

Miss O'Reilly explained that the IEB are working towards the development of Elliott School as a Trust School.

Initial proposals were received from United Westminster Schools. The IEB are delighted that a local solution is being consulted upon. The first stage of the consultation is informal. Once comments and questions have been received a statutory notice will be sought. This is the formal stage.

Miss O'Reilly explained that the terms and conditions of staff will not alter as staff will still be employed by the governing body. The IEB are very pleased with the appointment from April 2010 of Mr Mark Phillips as the substantive Headteacher.

Questions

Who makes up the Board of Trustees?

The IEB will be here until the school is set up as a Trust. There must be a minimum of 3 Trustees who choose some of the governing body.

Mr Barnshaw

In a meeting with Ms Peacock last week some fundamental questions were raised. It is going to be hard for staff to make their views known until we know how the governing body will be made up.

We cannot see how anybody could be against getting £750k when we are £750k in debt. Do you have any thoughts on how the money will be used?

Miss O'Reilly

The governing body is important. Guidance is given on the DCFS website showing proportions for the constitution of the governing body.

Ms Peacock

There haven't been any in depth discussions as yet. The first Trust meeting will take place this Thursday. The Chair of Governors at Chestnut Grove has done a lot of work on this. She has a model in her head and will bring it to the meeting on Thursday. The Trust will then appoint a certain number of governors.

Miss O'Reilly explained that the school needs long term support and engagement from other schools in the borough. The money cannot be used to offset the current deficit.

Mr Johnson explained that he had just come from a meeting with the Chairs of Governors from Chestnut Grove and Roehampton University. Thursday's meeting will determine more but initial thinking is that there will be a governing body of 15, in line with DCFS rules. 8 out

of the 15 governors will be appointed by the Trust.

Ms Peacock explained that last summer she wrote a 5 year development plan which identified how the money would be used. The use has to be specific to improvement i.e. the current problems in ICT and Maths means we need to be able to attract good ICT and Maths specialists. Some of the money could be used creatively to attract people.

Mr Johnson explained that the 5 year improvement plan has to be approved by the DCFS.

Ms Peacock explained that as soon as the improvement plan and funding is agreed, some money will be released.

Appendix 4

CONSULTATION MEETING WITH PARENTS AND THE COMMUNITY

24 FEBRUARY 2010

1. Present

Lorraine O'Reilly (Chair of the Elliott Interim Executive Board (IEB)), Margaret Peacock (Elliott Interim Headteacher and Headteacher of Chestnut Grove School), John Johnson (Assistant Director of Children's Services) & 12 parents/members of the local community

2. Welcome and Introduction

- The Chair of the IEB welcomed parents and representatives of the community and explained that it is the IEB that is proposing and consulting on establishing the Trust
- The Chair explained that the IEB had considered different Trust models and potential partners and that they were delighted that the preferred option is a local trust.
- The Chair then summarised the process of consulting, including this informal stage, how adjustments may be made to the proposals as a result of the consultation and then final publication of statutory notices, which is itself a further consultation.
- The Chair explained that the Trust will be a charity, which is proposed to have the three partners named in the consultation. She explained that the charitable purpose of the Trust is the educational benefit of the pupils; it cannot have aims or activities which are inconsistent with this.

3. Questions from the floor

(j) There will be a Trust and a separate governing body for Elliott? How will the numbers be determined?

- The Chair explained that there is statutory guidance setting out the proportions of governors in different categories.
- A parent responded that Elliott is not one of the Trust Partners. It needs to be represented as a Trustee too.
- The parent also asked how these comments will be taken on board.
- The Chair explained that this consultation is precisely to hear the points made. The Chair also explained the balance of the IEB reflects a good mix of experts.
- The Assistant Director explained the statutory process and how the comments will be minuted and publicised. In the final proposals, the IEB must show how it has taken account of any comments, and if any are not adopted, why not. If there are concerns that the IEB has not followed correct procedures, objections can be made and the final proposal referred to the Schools Adjudicator to decide.

(k) A parent asked how the Trust funding will work and what is the Trust going to do?

- The Chair explained that this is not a federation proposal. She explained that the three schools' budgets and their governing bodies remain separate.
- The Assistant Director explained that the budget plan has to be approved by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), alongside a five year improvement plan. This ensures transparency of use of the funding.
- The Assistant Director also explained that the main benefits of the proposal are the additional capacity that the Trust will bring - leadership, teaching and pupils.
- The Interim Headteacher then outlined the benefits of the local Trust rather than partners who are not local. The local solution will bring greater commitment from the partners and consistency, and it will be for the long term. It will also be better than short-term external support.

- (l) Another parent said that she did not understand the nature of support that might be provided and asked for clarification.
- The Interim Head explained, by way of example, how a new inexperienced Head of Mathematics in Elliott, for example, could be supported by her experienced Head of Mathematics from Chestnut Grove.
 - Another example cited was ICT, where support going into preparing for BSF will be essential.
 - The Interim Head also explained how she will work one or two days a week with the new Elliott Headteacher after Easter. There is a big co-ordinating job too, managing all the support.
- (m) Do you have a view how long this support will be necessary?
- The Chair of IEB explained that the school does not simply have to get out of special measures, but also has to become really strong – this may take two or three years.
- (n) There has been support from Graveney. Were they considered as a Trust partner?
- The Assistant Director explained that they were consulted and chose not to be Trustees but committed to continuing to provide support as required.
- (o) Was the new Head fully aware of the Trust proposal and is he comfortable with it?
- The Chair explained that all candidates were fully briefed and were particularly enthused by the local Trust rather than partners from further afield.
- (p) A local resident who is also a parent commented that the link with Roehampton is an excellent opportunity, for example for PGCE students. She also recognised that a number of trainee teachers may well be asked back to be employed full time. She also raised a third point about the benefits of teachers sharing expertise.
- The Chair responded saying that the staff had been consulted and they were in favour of the proposals. They saw the benefits of staff working across schools.
- (q) How is the constitution of the Governing Body decided?
- The Chair explained that there are fixed rules set out in the published guidance that determine the make up of the Governing body. For example, one-third must be parents, one or two must be community governors, one or two must be staff.
- (r) Another parent endorsed the comment about the benefits of the potential link with Roehampton University.
- (s) Another parent asked if these local links would raise the profile of the school in the local community?
- The Chair confirmed this will be one of the benefits and that Mrs Peacock and the IEB have worked hard to raise the profile of the school with pupils and parents.
- (t) How will the Trust and the governing body interrelate? Is there any risk ultimately of conflicts of interest? A further question was asked about Charity Law – which says that proposers must explain how the Trust will spend the money.

- The Assistant Director explained that the Trust exercises its power through the governing body. The rules in the guidance are that a majority of governors (e.g. 10 of 18) will be Trust appointed. It is the governing body who are still legally responsible for the land, buildings, staff and budget. The budget plan has to be approved by the Department for Children, Schools and Families.
 - The Interim Head explained what could happen in a “worst case” scenario.
 - The Chair re-emphasised the vision and benefits of the Trust.
- (u) How do you get the best people as Trustees?
- The Chair said this would be by careful choice. We do not pretend it will be easy.
- (v) A parent said that it will be really important to have good governors, as this was a weakness of the previous governing body. Another responded that there could be some loss of autonomy. A third said that this was ok if the right checks and balances are in place. A parent representative on the IEB said that one reason for choosing these Trust partners was because it would best retain Elliott’s special ethos.
- The Chair summarised, noting that this need to retain Elliott’s unique ethos whilst driving up standards is one of the key reasons for the local Trust.
- (w) A local resident who is also a member of staff at Chestnut Grove made two points:
- (i) She completely understood the point about local democracy. Of the various alternatives (academy, federation etc), this gives the most checks and balances. She feel very relieved that this absolutely keeps Elliott as a local school. The many layers are about accountability, not bureaucracy. It is a tiered approach.
 - (ii) Hard federation (the three schools sharing a single governing body) would see a greater loss of autonomy.
- (x) Can you explain the Trust’s legal responsibilities to parents and how it will engage parents in the school?
- The Chair of the IEB reminded the meeting that there is already a parents’ forum - the “Elliott Supporters”)
 - In addition, a Parents’ Council has been established which has direct influence on the management in the school. This is a legal requirement of Trust status.
- (y) A parent asked if there will be an opportunity to meet with the new headteacher?
- The Interim head and the IEB Chair confirmed that a date has been set for this.
- (z) The 750,000 grant is for two years, what happens after that?
- The Chair of the IEB confirmed that this is correct – the grant’s use will be linked to achievement targets.
- (aa) Can you spend the money over more that two years?
- The Chair explained that both the IEB and the Trust will need to plan carefully to sustain development over time. The Headteacher already has some ideas about how the funding will be used, for example, where it’s difficult to attract key staff.

Appendix 5

MEETING FOR PARENTS OF PUPILS AT CHESTNUT GROVE

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair of Governors welcomed 11 parents and three members of staff. Also present were the Head of Chestnut Grove and the Assistant Director of Children's Services.

The Chair then outlined the potential benefits of the Trust to Chestnut Grove, the risks and the risk mitigation strategies, as set out in the attached document (Appendix A).

The Head added a few points about her perception of Elliott's needs, particularly in relation to staff training.

2. Questions from Parents

- (i) A parent raised her concern about the need for continuity in the teaching of her children at Chestnut Grove, especially as they start GCSE

MP responded that teachers would generally not be moved between schools, except where there are particular opportunities e.g. if Elliott and Chestnut Grove each have a 0.5 vacancy in a subject, they might make a joint appointment.

- (ii) A parent asked if the key benefit is retention of staff

MP explained that this was correct. It should help retain middle managers especially by giving them a career development opportunity. Christian Kinglsey (Acting Head) exemplified this by reference to CG's work with a school in Torcross. JJ pointed out that this is also a tried and tested model in Wandsworth at Battersea Park School.

- (iii) A parent governor asked what were the benefits of working with Roehampton University?

JJ outlined four key benefits. MP added that there will also be benefits from Roehampton's business links, especially with the media-related industries.

- (iv) A parent asked how senior staff from Chestnut Grove will work in Elliott?

MP explained – short bouts of support e.g. CG AHT for half a day a week for a term.

- (v) A parent asked about the benefits for their children at Chestnut Grove

MP outlined several points – joint activities (e.g. G & T residential), benefits from Elliott's strong sixth form, shared work in key subjects such as art. Some of the funding will be used for joint student activities.

- (vi) Is there any benefit from the prestige in terms of better physical facilities under BSF?

The Chair said that the benefits through prestige will probably not greatly affect the BSF plan for the school. JJ added that rather the prestige would benefit Chestnut Grove's role in relation to other schools in the future as government thinking is currently for more "school-on-school" support, for example, by becoming an 'Accredited Schools' – a status to which the highest performing schools will aspire.

- (vii) A parent asked about the timescale for the start of the Trust

JJ outlined range from six weeks to three months, depending on response to the consultation and any delay due to the election.

3. Concluding remarks

The Chair thanked parents for attending and for their thoughtful questions. In response, two parents said that they had found the meeting very useful. Prior to the meeting they had some doubts about the Trust proposal and they were now reassured and could see that it would be beneficial to Chestnut Grove as well as to Elliott.

Appendix 6

Elliott Trust Consultation - Further Meeting with Professional Association Representatives - 18 March 2010

Present: Lorraine O'Reilly (Chair of IEB) (LOR), Peter Jones (NUT school representative), Andy England (NASUWT school representative), John Johnson (Assistant Director WBC)

Apologies: Frank Marshall (ATL), Bruce Howard (NUT) and Spencer Barnshaw (NUT)

1. Introductory Discussion

- LOR welcomed the association representatives and indicated that she was grateful for the opportunity for further dialogue. LOR confirmed that the informal consultation closed yesterday but she will be happy to take today's discussion into account at next week's IEB meeting.
- LOR then outlined the statutory process of consultation, including the issuing of the standing notice. LOR explained that the IEB has to submit a number of documents to the DCSF before they will agree to the Trust being established and agreeing that the Statutory Notice can be published. The process is that the proposals have to be scrutinised by officials at the DCSF and then are signed off by a Minister. The signing off will clearly be delayed for an unknown period due to the forthcoming election.
- LOR confirmed that objections can be made in the statutory notice period and the IEB must subsequently consider them. If anyone objects to the process flowed by the IEB, the LA has to consider whether they have carried out this process properly and can decide to refer the proposal to the Schools Adjudicator for decision.

2. Responses to the Staff Association Questions (See Annex A attached)

- (i) Why not a shared Trust?

LOR explained that because the school is in special measures, and is designated as a National Challenge School, it can only be a National Challenge Trust or one of the other less preferable alternatives (i.e. a hard federation or an academy). A shared trust is therefore not an option in the school's circumstances – this has been confirmed by the DCSF.

LOR noted, however, that the IEB fully understand the Elliott staff concern that they have much to offer and want to have a voice on the Trust. LOR confirmed that the IEB will seriously consider how it can address this issue when it meets next week. LOR also confirmed, in response to a question, that the governing body would not simply be a 'trumpet' for the Trust.

- (ii) LOR confirmed that there will be no changes to terms and conditions of staff as a result of the school becoming a Trust School. This is indicated in the consultation document.
- (iii) LOR confirmed that the grounds and assets of the school will transfer to the Trust. However, there is no intention to sell off any land as part of this proposal. Indeed, the full site will be needed for BSF.
- (iv) The Trust Board will comprise the three Trustees' representatives. It is likely to be a small group, perhaps between three and six people. Mrs Peacock will have a role in relation to the school. It is not appropriate to have parents or staff on it.

- (v) The Governing Body will have parents and staff on it, determined in numerical rules set by the DCSF. These rules cannot be varied and ensure appropriate representation. The Chair of Governors will be elected by the Governing Body – this is a legal requirement.
- (vi) There will be no change to the school's admissions policy. The aim is simply to recruit more pupils which means the school needs to get out of special measures. The primary pupil population in the area is growing and this will increase demand.
- (vii) LOR reaffirmed that the Governing Body will remain the legal body statutorily responsible for the school – its staffing, curriculum, premises etc.
- (viii) LOR explained that the National Challenge Trust funding (£750,000) comes to the school. It is the Governing Body that is legally responsible for the school's budget, though clearly the spending will have to be in line with the Trustee's views. The five year financial plan has to be approved by the DCSF.
- (ix) Peter Jones asked how the money might be used e.g. could it be used to pay an incentive to attract an ICT teacher. LOR replied that this could be a legitimate use of the money, as it is designed to address key weaknesses. The funding cannot be used simply to offset the school's deficit.
- (x) The three Trustees representatives will be volunteers and are not paid.
- (xi) Peter Jones asked whether, if Elliott staff are to be made redundant at any point in the future, the partner schools will consider them? LOR replied that Wandsworth Council's normal redeployment rules would apply i.e. other schools would be asked to consider and people who potentially could be made redundant and we would expect the Trust partner schools to consider them. But clearly this would only be within the normal rules (e.g. there would have to be vacancies).
- (xii) Peter Jones asked, if the Trust changed in the future, would there have to be a consultation? LOR replied, yes, this would be the case.
- (xiii) The representatives asked, 'If "we" decide that we don't want to continue with the Trust when Elliott has recovered, can we do this?'

JJ replied that the process would be that the Governing Body would consider any proposal and make a recommendation to the Trustees to consider. If necessary, the Governing Body would publish proposals and consult.
- (xiv) Will the school's curriculum be co-ordinated with other 14-19 partners? JJ replied this was a key aspect of the proposal, which aims to keep Elliott as a full and active member of the the local 14-19 Partnership. LOR reaffirmed that the IEB recognise fully that Elliott has strengths to offer the other schools, such as in art.
- (xv) LOR confirmed that the IEB fully agree that Roehampton University will want to offer professional development for the school's staff, as suggested. This is one of the key benefits and reasons for their wanting to be in the Trust.
- (xvi) Andy England acknowledged that the staffing is incredibly top heavy at Elliott. Peter Jones described some of the changes to the school over time in terms of staff, pupils, etc.

Annex A To: Wandsworth Local Authority and the IEB for Elliott school

From: Staff association, NUT, NASUWT, ATL, GMB, UNISON

Date: 3.3.10

Re: Trust proposals for Elliott School

It is difficult to comment at present on the trust proposals as there is little detail on this at present or indeed a clear development or improvement plan. Nevertheless, the staff of Elliott school, teachers and support staff, would prefer a trust that is based on equal partnership. We feel that a shared trust rather than a national challenge trust would mean that there is a shared vision for education in Wandsworth whereby effective relationships and trust are built upon between all partners and developments will be of mutual benefits to all stakeholders and the community.

We would also like the local authority and IEB to consider the following assurances:

- 1 There will be no change in the pay, terms and conditions of all staff. STPC conditions and Burgundy book would be part of the statute of the trust and will not be able to be changed.
- 2 The grounds and assets associated with Elliott School will not be sold off to offset deficits or for any other reason and that these would remain under the ownership of the local authority.
- 3 The trust board would be truly democratic with parents and staff represented.
- 4 There will be open dialogue, consultation and regular meetings with professional associations and parent bodies.
- 5 There would be no change in terms of the admissions policy.
- 6 Elliott school governing body would still have the ultimate say on the direction of the school, its vision, curriculum and learning.
- 7 The vast majority of the money allocated by the DCSF for setting up the trust is used at 'grassroots' level rather than at senior management or consultancy level.
- 8 That if there are any redundancies at Elliott school, staff will be provided the chance to take up a position in the partner schools should an opportunity arise.
- 9 If there are any changes in the structures, policies and procedures related to the trust then staff and parents will be consulted.
- 10 There will be a clause in the constitution that if there is felt to be a need not to be a trust any longer then it could dissolve.

We also feel that

- (a) The trust could be an opportunity to coordinate curriculum between the partner schools especially at 14-19.
- (b) The trust could be an opportunity for Roehampton University to offer staff a range of professional development opportunities including post graduate qualifications and sabbaticals.
- (c) The trust could be an opportunity for partners to offer support in specific areas they have a strength in. For instance, Elliott school may be able to provide hands on support to its partners in terms of Art or A level teaching or another school may be able to have a HoD or AST that could also directly lead a department at Elliott school that may need support.

We hope that you do consider the above points and truly believe that if this trust is to work and is to be sustainable then it must be democratic and based on a shared vision for the community through a shared trust. Once staff have had the opportunity to examine and discuss the detail of the trust proposals we will then be in a better position to state our opinions and whether we will support the trust or not.

Appendix 7

HMI Monitoring Report



Tribal Education
1-4 Portland
Square
Bristol
BS2 8RR

T 08456 40 40 40
enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
www.ofsted.gov.uk

25 February 2009

Ms Margaret Peacock
Headteacher
Elliott School
Pullman Gardens
London
SW15 3DG

Dear Ms Peacock

Special measures: monitoring inspection of Elliott School

Following my visit with Michael Milton and Robert Smith, additional inspectors, to your school on 9 and 10 February 2010, I write on behalf of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services and Skills to confirm the inspection findings.

The visit was the second monitoring inspection since the school became subject to special measures in March 2009. The monitoring inspection report is attached and the main judgements are set out below.

Progress since being subject to special measures is satisfactory. Newly qualified teachers may be appointed at this stage in the department of modern foreign languages and mathematics, with the relevant support in place.

This letter and monitoring inspection report will be posted on the Ofsted website. I am copying this letter and the monitoring inspection report to the Secretary of State, the chair of the interim executive board and the Director of Children's Services for Wandsworth.

Yours sincerely
Meena Wood
Her Majesty's Inspector



Appendix 8

Draft Vision Statement – The Elliott Trust

The Elliott Trust will harness the energies and experience of three successful educational partners to support the leadership, direction and governance of Elliott School in order to bring about effective transformation.

The three partners – Chestnut Grove School, Ernest Bevin College and Roehampton University – bring to the Trust a strong educational philosophy which will provide a framework for developments and improvements.

The Elliott Trust is committed to helping Elliott school raise the highest standards, levels of achievement and behaviour in all areas of academic and personal development. Students will be challenged to achieve through a culture of high expectation and the construction of frameworks that encourage positive attitude and high aspirations. The Elliott Trust will promote quality learning as an entitlement for all pupils. It will realise the potential of all students through the use of high quality models of teaching and learning designed to meet the needs of the individual.

The Elliott Trust will be inclusive and celebrate the richness of today's cultural diversity. It will support any individual in the Elliott School who experiences obstacles to the realisation of their potential, through strategies appropriate to their needs and through the specialisms of the schools and university. The Elliott Trust will seek to promote the individual in each student fostering their creative and expressive talents

The student voice will be synonymous with every aspect of the school giving them a sense of pride and a sense of real responsibility. The Trust will assist with providing a range of skills necessary for the workplace and foster a sense of local pride and an awareness of the world of work.

This can be summarised as a strong and fundamental belief in the ability of all students to achieve highly, regardless of background, race, or gender;

In order to achieve highly, students need:

- **High expectations.** It will be fundamental to Elliott's success that students are set aspirational targets and provided with the support they need to reach these targets;
- **A personalised curriculum.** The curriculum will be flexible and responsive to students' needs, abilities and aspirations;
- **Life-skills.** Students will be provided with wide-ranging opportunities to develop skills for later life in the 21st century, including new technologies, literacy, numeracy, creativity, independence and a love of learning;
- **Personal awareness and development.** It is important that all students are enabled to develop personally as well as academically, so that they develop an appreciation of their own worth and place in the world. In order to achieve this, Elliott will be a place where every individual is valued and individual talents, abilities and skills are nurtured and helped to grow. In return, we will expect all members of the community, staff and students, to treat each other with respect, humanity and care.

- **A sense of community.** Community in its widest sense will be fundamental to Elliott's success. Students will develop a sense of the school community, the local community, and the wider national and international community of which the school is part.
- **Celebration of diversity.** Stemming from the sense of community will also come a firm belief in the strength of diversity and the need to respect all cultures, world views and attitudes.

The Governors will be responsible for running Elliott School in the interests of not only the pupils, but also the local community. The Elliott Trust will help bring a purposeful design to the new building, with its state-of-the art facilities that will be adapt to current and future technologies.