

## E21C TRUST SELF EVALUATION FORM 2016/17

This document is taken from a document published by the RSC in 2016. Minor amendments to wording have been made from the original document.

### Indicators of the high performing MAT

| <b>Location of the MAT</b>   |                                |                   |               |                    | <b>Why this is a valid area to probe?</b>  |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|--|
| 1. The member academies are located within a tight geographical radius where distance to travel between any of the academies is no more than one hour. | ALL                            | 80%               | 60%           | Less than Half     | Efficiency and inter school working beyond set piece training  |
| 2. Are there any academies that are outliers to the central hub of the MAT who may not receive the same level of support as other schools?             | None                           | 1-2               | 3-4           | 50%                | Mission and culture creep will lead to disengagement and the school potentially feeling isolated from the MAT.   |
| <b>Composition of the MAT</b>  |                                |                   |               |                    |  |
| 3. How long has the MAT been in existence in its current structural format?  | More than 5 years              | More than 3 years | 12-18 months  | Less than 6 months | Length of operation will determine the maturity and sustainability of the MAT and potential to grow and perform. |
| 4. The MAT has a good balance of converter and sponsored academies.  | 30% Sponsored to 70% Converter | 50/50             | 75% Sponsored | 90% Sponsored      | If sponsored academies make up too high a percentage then the Mat may perform less well and face more challenge. |

|  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. The MAT is responsible for students from the 3-19 age range.  | MAT has good balance of primary and secondary (60 – 40%)                    | Imbalance exists where 20% is Primary or Secondary            | All Secondary or All Primary  |   | If all Primary and no Secondary then the MAT appears to perform less well (scale, resource, quality of leaders).  |
| 6. Did the MAT change its leadership structure when the number of academies exceeded 5 or 6?                                       | Yes at Board and Educational leadership                                     | Board Yes but Educational Leadership No                       | Board No but Educational Leadership Yes                             | Nothing changed                             | Test how the Board avoided just getting bigger as it did not want to ask directors or local reps to stand down. CEO likely to be under too much pressure without capacity.  |
| <b>Vision and Culture of the MAT</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7. Is there a defined purpose that drives the intent of the MAT? What is it? Is there evidence that it results in better outcomes? | Yes and the results show that it works                                      | Yes there is but limited evidence that it has impact          | Purpose statement exists but general and hard to relate to outcomes | No evidence of a purpose in core statements | A MAT might claim to be the “champion of vulnerable children” but results for Pupil Premium are weak for example.   |
| 8. Does the MAT make explicit the non-negotiables that the academies are expected to follow?                                       | Yes and the impact is evident in the classroom and financial and HR systems | Yes but the evidence is only seen in financial and HR systems | Yes but only in terms of brand identity                             | None made explicit                          | Non-negotiables will not make the big difference but as a central employer with responsibility for 1000s of children is the best practice being adopted as a non-negotiable or can the academies do what they like? |

|  |   |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p>9. Academies in the MAT have varying degrees of autonomy depending upon their current performance</p>                         | <p>Yes – Autonomy is earned but there are still non-negotiables applied to the best schools</p>                                       | <p>Yes – Autonomy is granted in every respect</p>   | <p>All Academies have to do the same irrespective of how well they perform</p> | <p>All Academies are free to make every decision themselves</p>                                  | <p>There is a close link between getting the balance of autonomy and direction and the performance of the MAT.</p>                          |
| <p>10. Is there a MAT brand that is recognised in the communities served by the academies?</p>                                   | <p>Yes – MAT is proud to celebrate its identity and it is visible and understood but the academies retain their identity as well.</p> | <p>Yes but there is less emphasis on the academies maintaining their own identity e.g. the sponsor name is in each academy name</p> | <p>Brand is limited to website, signage, letter headings etc.</p>              | <p>There is no brand identity and the local community would not know what or who the MAT is.</p> | <p>Logo, uniform, signage, press and PR, a “MAT WAY” of doing things?</p>   |
| <p>11. The MAT collects data for every 7, 11, 16 and 19 year old (as appropriate) in the organisation as well as by academy.</p> | <p>Yes at every data drop.</p>  | <p>Yes but only as part of post result analysis.</p>  | <p>Yes but only in attainment measures and not progress.</p>                   | <p>No</p>  | <p>A good test to see that MATs have the mindset of focusing on every child at the key assessment points and not just at academy level.</p> |
| <p><b>The expertise and performance of the MAT board</b></p>   |   |   |  |  |   |
| <p>12. The MAT board is made up of nine members or less.</p>   | <p>9 or less</p>  | <p>10 – 15</p>  | <p>15 – 20</p>   | <p>20+</p>   | <p>Smaller board appear to be more effective and 9 or less seems to be the ideal number.</p>  |

|   |   |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>13. The MAT structure makes provision for local governing bodies and for escalation to main board.</p>   | <p>Yes and there is a formalised route for local issues to be brought to board's attention</p>  | <p>Yes but the scrutiny remains at the local level and is not passed to board</p>   | <p>Yes but it is a forum rather than a tool of governance</p>                     | <p>No local representation</p>   | <p>Ensures that local representation is in place with local scrutiny of performance.</p>   |
| <p>14. The board has a mix of private and public sector expertise.</p>  | <p>The MAT board is made up of a balanced number of those from commercial / professional backgrounds and those from the education sector.</p> | <p>The board directors have more commercial / other professional experience than educational but sector experience is present</p> | <p>The MAT board is made up of a majority of education professionals</p>          | <p>The members are all from a commercial / professional background</p>         | <p>The strongest MAT seems to have strength in the balance between private and public professional sector.</p>   |
| <p>15. The board has members who can contribute strategic business development, financial, HR, site, management, ICT, legal and educational strategic support, guidance and challenge to the CEO.</p> | <p>Yes and can offer all of the skillsets mentioned (except legal and ICT)</p>  | <p>Yes but only financial, HR and legal</p>   | <p>Yes but the experience is limited to local small scale business operations</p> | <p>Very few of the skills needed are present and is a priority for the MAT</p> | <p>The MAT board has strategic responsibility for large numbers of children, staff and public sector income and needs to be equipped to manage it and plan strategically for its implementation.</p> |

|  |   |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <b>The outcomes for all children across the MAT at 11 and 16</b>                           |   |   |   |  |  |
| 16. At KS2 children perform significantly well in national tests                           | 20% above floor   | 10% above floor   | At floor or just above                                    | Below floor as a MAT   |  |
| 17. At KS2 children make significantly better progress from KS1                            | 90% in Reading, Writing and Maths (2 or more count)                   | 85% in Reading, Writing and Maths (2 or more count)                     | 80%   | Below 80% in any of the three measures   |  |
| 18. The performance of disadvantaged children – KS2 level 4+ in Reading, Writing and Maths | Disadvantaged children perform at the same level as every other child | Disadvantaged children perform significantly above D-A national average | Disadvantaged children perform at national average levels | 11 year olds are significantly below national average for disadvantaged children |  |
| 19. At KS4, children perform significantly well in GCSE exams                              | At MAT level 55% or more attain 5 ACEM                                | 50% to 54%  | 45% to 50%  | MAT 16 year olds perform below 45%   |  |
| 20. At KS4, children make significantly strong progress in English and Maths               | At MAT level, progress in English and Maths exceeds 70%               | Progress in English OR Maths exceeds 70%                                | Progress in English and Maths is between 65% and 70%      | Progress in English and Maths is below 65%                                       |  |
| 21. At KS4 disadvantaged students perform well at 5 ACEM                                   | MAT disadvantaged 16 year olds exceed 45% 5 ACEM                      | MAT disadvantaged 16 year olds attain 40-44% 5 ACEM                     | MAT disadvantaged 16 year olds attain 35% to 40%          | MAT disadvantaged 16 year olds perform below 35% at 5 ACEM                       |  |

|   |   |   |  |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 22. What percentage of the academies that the MAT has sponsored <b>for three</b> years are outstanding?                         | 25%   | 15-24%  | 10-14%   | Less than 10%   |  |
| 23. What percentage of the academies that the MAT has sponsored <b>for three</b> years are good?                                | 100%  | 80-90%  | 70-80%   | Less than 70%   |  |
| <b>How effective is the MAT in supporting its academies to improve?</b>   |   |   |  |   |  |
| 24. There is a strategic improvement plan written by the CEO for the MAT that addresses the priority of the whole group.        | Yes and it addresses the actions of the MAT and how the academies will support it | Yes, MAT plan is clear about MAT activity but loose references to what the academies will do                          | Yes but high level statement of intent with little or no implementation planning | No MAT plan   |  |
| 25. Each academy in the MAT responds to the strategic priorities of the MAT and shows their contribution towards delivery of it | Academies are clear about how they contribute to the MAT strategic plan           | Academies make reference only to the role of the MAT in supporting them and not how the academy delivers the MAT plan | Academy plan makes administrative references to the MAT                          | Academy plans make little or no reference to the MAT plan |  |

|  |  |   |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>26. The MAT has a published calendar of data collection so that it can monitor systematically the performance of the schools</p>                  | <p>Data drops are clear at key points in the year and a range of data for all students at every age range is collected</p> | <p>Data drops are clear at key points but only for KS2 and GCSE students</p>              | <p>Data is collected less frequently and is only used to inform planning when results are published</p>               | <p>Data remains focused on individual academies and no attempt is made to measure performance of all MAT children</p> |  |
| <p>27. The MAT employs centrally the whole workforce</p>   | <p>Every person working in the MAT has them as their single employer</p>   | <p>If there is a local MAT under an umbrella trust then this MAT employs all staff</p>    |   |   |  |
| <p>28. The MAT has taken decisions to move underperforming leaders, teachers and support staff out of the organisation within the last two years</p> | <p>Evidence that underperforming senior leaders have been moved on and that capability is used quickly when necessary</p>  | <p>Evidence that action has been taken after repeated attempts at support have failed</p> | <p>MAT has been over generous in its view that staff can improve when results suggest poor performance over time.</p> |   |  |
| <p>29. The MAT has a mobility clause in its staff contracts</p>  | <p>Yes for all staff and may examples of this impact</p>   | <p>Yes but only for senior leaders to add capacity and succession plan</p>                | <p>Yes but used to fill vacancies only and not for school improvement</p>   | <p>Yes but rarely used</p>  | <p>This makes it much easier for key staff to have a strong influence across the MAT</p> |

|  |  |  |   |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>30. The MAT provides a range of central services to its academies for this they pay a contribution from their GAG</p>                     | <p>Yes, full and comprehensive menu</p>  | <p>Yes but focused around a few key areas – HR, Payroll etc.</p>                                   | <p>Yes but central team work in academies are not accountable to the central leadership team</p>                  | <p>No central services</p>   |   |
| <p>31. The MAT requires a central charge from its academies equal to 4-6% of GAG</p>   | <p>4-6% and service is high quality VFM – see Ofsted and audit reports</p>                                 | <p>3-5% service is good but not comprehensive but could be</p>                                     | <p>0-2% possible nervousness about the charge or there is no central capacity</p>                                 | <p>No central charge as everything is done at school level</p>   | <p>This has to be measured against the volume of service being provided</p> |
| <p>32. The MAT can show clearly how it delivers strong budget management and forward financial planning</p>                                  | <p>Minutes of Finance and Audit sub groups, and annual audit and EFA rag demonstrate high quality work</p> | <p>Budget Management and Financial planning is Good but board need more information and detail</p> | <p>The detail provided in this area is too complex leaving the MAT board unable to fulfil its monitoring role</p> | <p>Performance in this area is weak and EFA aware</p>  |   |
| <p>33. The MAT central services are delivered by well qualified financial, HR, IT, Health and Safety, Legal and Project Management staff</p> | <p>Full range of staff with commercial expertise in all areas listed and more</p>                          | <p>Staff expertise in Finance and HR areas in particular but gaps for other skill sets</p>         | <p>Staff expertise is limited to financial expertise</p>  | <p>MAT has not recruited sufficient expertise at MAT level and allows the academies to operate independently on day to day basis</p> |   |

| 34. The members of the MAT central team (above) have had commercial / professional experience in a previous role         | ALL   | MOST   | FEW   | NONE  |  |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| 35. The MAT strategically moves strong staff between the schools   | Frequently and with successful outcomes for children  | Frequently but it is limited to one sector of the workforce Senior Leaders for example | Occasionally and usually driven by CPD for the staff moving                                 | Rarely and never for school improvement reasons               |  |
| 36. The MAT leads cross academy CPD and Leadership Development   | All CPD and Leadership Development is organised centrally   | Some CPD and Leadership is central but is blended with academy programmes              | CPD and cross MAT activity focused around large conferences and presentation style delivery | Very little is offered strategically by the MAT for its staff |  |
| 37. The MAT provides educational support from a central team who offer leadership and classroom support to the academies | There is a central team of leaders and subject experts in English, Maths and Science providing school to school support | Central team is made up of CEO and Executive Leaders only                              | Central team input is made up of a small team of consultants brought in by the MAT          | Very little central educational support on offer to schools   |  |

|   |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>38. The MAT has good examples of key staff being promoted within the organisation to senior leadership posts</p>                             | <p>Clear and successful succession plan at Exec, Senior and Middle Leadership levels beyond filling vacancies</p> | <p>Internal MAT candidates are successful when they apply for advertised posts</p>                                   | <p>Some evidence of leaders moving between the academies but usually where academies have that close relationship and drive this</p> | <p>No evidence of current senior leaders being appointed from another academy in the MAT</p> |  |
| <p><b>Sustainability</b></p>  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <p>39. Is there a succession plan for the CEO, Chair of the Board, Executive Principals and Academy Principals?</p>                             | <p>Yes and all current post holders have come through this route</p>  | <p>There is a succession plan but it only addresses Exec Leadership and not Chair of Board or sponsor succession</p> | <p>Succession Planning is evident but MAT view is that it is not needed yet</p>  | <p>No evidence that succession has been considered</p>                                       |  |
| <p>40. Is there a business plan that specifies the rate of expansion that the MAT is aiming to see?</p>   | <p>Yes and it is planned in timescales with appropriate business cases to support it</p>                          | <p>MAT is keen to consolidate and not seeking to expand at this point</p>  | <p>MAT wants to be able to respond to projects as and when they arise</p>  | <p>No expansion or business case plan</p>  |  |
| <p>41. If the MAT were to admit three new academies in the next 12-18 months would there need to be structural changes to the organisation?</p> | <p>Yes and this forms part of the business case</p>   | <p>Not under consideration but the answer would be yes if it were to change</p>                                      | <p>No, MAT believes current model could sustain new academies</p>  |  |  |

|   |  |   |  |                              |  |
|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| <p>42. The MAT is able to evidence the savings that it makes through collective procurement</p>                               | <p>Yes and there is a costed plan to show impact which is the responsibility of a key officer in the MAT</p> | <p>Yes but response is anecdotal as no one is accountable for the saving plan</p> | <p>Yes but the examples are modest because of the scale of the MAT or the lack of priority</p> | <p>The MAT does not know</p> |  |
| <p>43. The MAT has a commercial arm that generates revenue income as a result of support for other schools not in the MAT</p> | <p>Yes and the MAT generates a significant income to support its academies (100k plus)</p>                   | <p>Yes, MAT generates an income that is in excess of the cost of the delivery</p> | <p>Yes but the income only covers the cost of the activity so cost neutral</p>                 | <p>No</p>                    |  |