9.3 Appendix C – Scoring Outcomes

Category	Criteria	Weight	In House	Outsource	LATC	Schools Led Company (social enterprise)	Joint Venture	Joint Venture with Schools	Category Weighting
Strategic Direction	Supports sector led improvement	4	1	3	3	5	4	5	30%
	Helps maintain a coherant local education offer	4	2	4	4	5	5	5	
	Promotes intelligent information sharing to improve standards and inform service direction	4	3	3	3	5	4	5	
	Ability to be flexible and agile in a changing education landscape	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	
	Focus on Barnet	3	5	2	5	5	3	4	
	Helps to maintain a strategic partnership between the council and all schools	4	3	2	3	4	4	5	
	Weighted Subtotal		59	70	83	107	93	108	
	Category Score		**51%**	**61%**	**72%**	**93%**	**81%**	**94%**	
Initiation / design	Time and Cost of Implementation	3	5	3	4	3	3	2	10%
	Inclusive of Expertise across school system and local authority	4	3	1	3	5	5	5	
	Simplicity of Governance Structure	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	
	Ability to engage and build trust with key stakeholders	3	4	2	4	5	4	5	
	Weighted Subtotal		48	31	48	56	53	50	
	Category Score		**74%**	**48%**	**74%**	**86%**	**82%**	**77%**	
Cost Saving	Ability to attract external investment (£ and expertise)	4	1	5	2	2	4	4	40%
	Ability to guarantee budget targets	5	1	5	2	3	5	4	
	Ability to sustain a coherent service offer over the long term	5	1	4	3	3	4	4	
	Ability to access further funding streams	2	0	2	2	5	3	3	
	Weighted Subtotal		14	69	37	48	67	62	
	Category Score		**18%**	**86%**	**46%**	**60%**	**84%**	**78%**	
Performance	Preserves and/or improves service delivery performance levels	5	2	4	2	3	4	4	20%
	Supports delivery of better education outcomes across Barnet	5	2	3	2	4	4	4	
	Ability to meet demand from all schools	3	2	4	3	5	5	5	
	Capability and capacity to develop or adapt services flexibly to meet changing needs	4	1	5	2	4	5	5	
	Freedom to innovate	3	1	5	3	5	5	5	
	Delivery and Performance risks are shared	4	0	4	0	4	4	5	
	Weighted Subtotal		33	98	46	97	106	110	
	Category Score		**28%**	**82%**	**38%**	**81%**	**88%**	**92%**	
	Grand Total (weighted by category)		**35%**	**74%**	**55%**	**77%**	**84%**	**85%**	

Commentary on evaluation of models

Model	Strategic Direction (30%)	Initiation/design (10%)	Cost saving (40%)	Performance (20%)
In house **Total score – 35%**	Scores well on "focus on Barnet", as this model would continue to have a dedicated focus on Barnet schools. Scores less well on other criteria due to the limited opportunity to develop stronger partnerships with schools and the lack of formal involvement of schools in the governance model. In addition, scores for this model reflect the impact of anticipated budget reductions on its capacity to respond quickly and effectively to changing needs.	This model constitutes limited change, and there would therefore be little or no set-up cost. It maintains the current position regarding inclusion of expertise from schools and engagement with key stakeholders. The governance structure score reflects the current internal decision making processes.	The impact of budget reductions will severely hamper this model's ability to sustain a coherent service over time, as there would be limited flexibility within the budget and service capacity to access commercial expertise, develop and grow services and generate additional income. It would have severely limited ability to access further investment or funding streams and has no means of guaranteeing budget targets. Anticipated service reductions could deliver savings, but this would impact on performance and the relationship with schools.	The impact of budget reductions will severely restrict capacity for change or innovation, meaning that service performance will diminish over time. This will in turn have an impact on education outcomes, as the service will be less able to facilitate sector-led improvement. With no capacity to innovate, it is highly unlikely that this model would be able to meet the demand from all schools, stimulate improvement or mitigate risks associated with under-performance.
Outsource **Total score – 74%**	Scores reflect concerns about the ability to actively engage schools with this model. Income generation would enable the maintenance of a coherent education offer and the governance arrangements within a commercial organisation would enable flexibility and agility in responding to changing needs. The commercial focus of this model could reduce the focus on Barnet.	There would be moderate implementation time and cost due to the need for a procurement exercise. The commercial focus of this model is likely to present challenges, with schools more likely to be simply a customer of the service, rather than a peer or partner to it. This may inhibit inclusivity and relationship building with key stakeholders. Once a contract is in place, governance structures are relatively straightforward.	This model is well placed to attract external investment from commercial sources. It is also able to contractually guarantee budget targets. The commercial imperative to recover any initial investment will ensure that there is a focus on maintaining the coherence and viability of services in the long term. However, the commercial nature of this model means that it is not well placed to access other funding streams, eg grants.	The commercial drive and knowledge associated with this model will bring the flexibility, capacity and freedom to innovate that is needed to respond to changing needs quickly and effectively. However, the lack of formal involvement of schools may impact on this model's ability to support the delivery of better education outcomes.

Model	Strategic Direction (30%)	Initiation/design (10%)	Cost saving (40%)	Performance (20%)
Local Authority Trading Company **Total score – 55%**	Potential restrictions on trading outside the borough would mean that the primary focus is on Barnet schools. Scores less well on some of the other criteria due to the limited opportunity to develop stronger relationships with schools and lack of formal involvement of schools in the governance model. Streamlining of internal governance arrangements would improve flexibility, but this could be constrained by lack of commercial expertise and investment.	This model would be relatively straightforward to establish and would not involve a complex procurement exercise. As a separate entity, it would be able to determine its own internal management processes, thereby simplifying internal governance arrangements.	The lack of commercial expertise associated with this model would make it difficult to attract external investment from commercial sources. There would be limited opportunity for this model to guarantee budget targets. The lack of formal involvement of schools in the governance arrangements would also mean that it is not well placed to access other funding streams. The inability to access additional investment or funding would impact on the model's ability to sustain a coherent service offer over the long term.	This model would have some freedom to innovate and to develop services in response to changing needs. However, the lack of commercial knowledge and investment would hamper the ability to respond quickly and effectively, which would impact on service performance over time, which would ultimately affect overall education outcomes in due course. As a local authority owned entity, delivery and performance risks would continue to rest wholly with the Council.
Schools-led company/social enterprise **Total score – 77%**	This model scores well across all criteria, because of the school leadership role. This would ensure that this model is well placed to identify emerging needs quickly and respond to them effectively. It would also facilitate information sharing and sector-led improvement. However, this would be contingent upon some up-front investment from schools and the Council.	Establishing a school company will add time and cost. This model would be very well placed to include expertise across the system and engage with key stakeholders. Once established, governance structures are relatively straightforward.	The lack of commercial expertise associated with this model would make it difficult to attract external investment from commercial sources. However, its social objectives and the involvement of schools in its governance structure would make it easier to access grant funding from other sources. School involvement would also make it more likely to sustain a coherent service in the long term, as it would be in schools' interests to do this.	The school leadership role puts this model in a good position to identify emerging needs quickly and to develop ways of meeting them effectively. However, the lack of commercial knowledge and investment could reduce this model's overall effectiveness in this respect. The extent of this impact would depend to a large extent on the level of initial investment that schools are willing to make in establishing the model.

Model	Strategic Direction (30%)	Initiation/design (10%)	Cost saving (40%)	Performance (20%)
Joint Venture – LBB and third party **Total score – 84%**	Scores reasonably well against most criteria, as the commissioning role of schools would help to ensure that services are responsive to changing needs. Commercial expertise and investment from a third party provider would help to translate school demands into new services more quickly. However, the more commercial focus of a third party provider could reduce the focus on Barnet schools.	There would be moderate implementation time and cost due to the need for a complex procurement exercise. The involvement of schools in a commissioning role would enable the inclusion of expertise from across the system and the engagement of key stakeholders. Once a contract is in place, governance structures are relatively straightforward.	This model would draw in the commercial expertise and status that would enable access to external investment. This would also enable it to contractually guarantee budget targets. Having schools in a formal commissioning role, together with its commercial focus, would make it more likely to sustain a coherent service in the long term. With some school involvement, it may also be able to access grant funding.	This model scores well against all criteria in this category due to the combined benefits of having school involvement through a commissioning role and the commercial expertise and investment that would come from a third party provider. Delivery and performance risks would be shared between the Council and the third party provider.
Joint Venture – LBB, schools and third party **Total score – 85%**	Scores well against all criteria due to the combined benefits of direct formal school involvement in the governance model and the commercial expertise and investment that would come from a third party provider. This would bring the flexibility and agility that is needed to respond effectively to the changing needs of schools. Direct involvement of schools would help to ensure that the main focus remains Barnet schools.	There would be higher implementation time and cost due to the need for a complex procurement exercise and the need to establish a school company. This model would be very well placed to include expertise from across the system and to engage all key stakeholders. The involvement of three parties could make on-going governance arrangements more complex.	This model would draw in the commercial expertise and status that would enable access to external investment. However, having three parties involved in the governance arrangements may make contractual guarantees on budget targets more problematic. The direct involvement of schools in ownership of this model, together with its commercial focus, would make it more likely to sustain a coherent service in the long term. This direct involvement of schools would also increase the possibility of accessing grant funding.	This model scores very well against all criteria in this category due to the combined benefits of having school involvement through an ownership role and the commercial expertise and investment that would come from a third party provider. Delivery and performance risks are shared between all three parties.