**EXAMPLE DUE DILIGENCE GRID**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| XXX MAT | XXXX MAT | XXXXX MAT |
| **Positives:**Primary Schools OnlyKnown schoolLocal areaInterested schools will have a say in shaping MATRetain autonomyTry to maintain one head/one schoolAppoint own staffChurch School status respectedSchools have a say on ‘non-negotiables’experienceSimilar schools with Good/Outstanding OfstedsShould lead to closer working relationships with the XXXX  | **Positives:**Promoting a collaborative approach with equal status for all schoolsHub model of working Church schools already within the TrustRetain own Head and local governing bodyBuild on established cluster linksGeographical localityCommon Secondary School 3-19 learning pathwayAttractive to new families/parents-may help secure the future of the schoolSimilar schools with Good/Outstanding Ofsteds3% top-slice as things standFlat structure promotedLight touch approach Teaching School StatusClear focus on CPDPositive impression of key leadersIn a position to shape the structure/systemsFeedback The Trust approach is ‘hands-off’ at the momentBuying in experienced people Positive feedback about CEO | **Positives:**Clear structure Experienced and establishedStrong service team and modelGood track record of moving RI schools to GoodOther schools locally have joinedVery clear systems across the schools-enabling greater benchmarking and cross-school analysis/support (reports to governors/policies)Tight focus on school improvement with rigorous monitoring (this presents challenges too). Performance issues will be picked upValues based ethosFeedback from other Heads has been positive & Feedback from admin teams has been positive and the word ‘supportive used regularlyOpportunities to work across LAsAnecdotal feedback positive e.g. the MAT treats them as ‘their’ schools and has a supportive and move forward together outlookOne school feels they have lost some autonomy but in the right areasThe Trust have bought in a national educational provider to do school reviews when they are expecting OfstedTheir size appears to enable them to bring in high quality peopleResponsive-when schools are in need, additional support is givenOne school felt like the Trust serves them wellSchools feel like the monitoring is done ‘with’ schools rather than ‘to’ One school said that their safeguarding has improved as a result of Safeguarding supportCEO/COO very experienced Coordinated approach to subject leader networks. Wide range of CPD opportunities (deputies to head programme)Staff in one school say that they have not seen much difference apart from rigour in monitoringFeedback is that the key staff are genuine and fair Central analysis of data |
| XXX MAT  | XXXX TRUST  | XXXXX MAT |
| **Concerns:**Trustees appear to be already identified from Leadership roles already appear identifiedSustainability-not sure how many schools will go in | **Concerns:**Lack of clarity about what we are signing up for Lack of high quality cross-school work in pastVolume of work involved in establishing a new MATWould probably be a more complex transition than with XXX MAT which already has systems/processes established Admissions may be complex and leave us in a similar positionIt is not clear how many other primaries are joining so how sustainable will a hub model beDifficult to know how easily we would fit in with the other schools - not schools we have worked with closely in the pastSome unknowns-how will it change if xxxx school joins? Probably a longer journey, potentially some sticking points, will it take more leadership and governor time? | **Concerns:**Geographically it is more diverse in terms of geography and catchment and not necessarily with schools we have worked closely with in the pastIt might be that the agenda for development/ improvement is set for us-we may lose some autonomyStaff morale?-three weekly visits seems intenseFeedback is it can feel a bit 'big brother-ish' in that it is all set out and robustly followed up that you are 'on it' as a schoolYou do have to change your logo on paperwork/ uniform5% top-sliceNo choice over certain things-e.g. Assessment system (quote for us was £XXX annual cost)Questions around where the meetings are held.  |

**Concerns for all options:** New office systems including Finance New accounting year The complexities of the conversion Increased pension contributions due to Pension fund shortfall Losing our autonomy