

## THE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

### STAGE 1 : THE LONG AND SHORT LIST OF STRUCTURAL OPTIONS

#### (a) CONSULTANTS' LONG LIST

1. Formalising current arrangements
2. Area Cluster(s) Collaboration
3. School Federation(s)
4. Planning and Commissioning Body
5. Planning, Commissioning and Delivery Entity

#### (b) CONSULTANTS' SHORT LIST

<b>Table 1 : Characteristics of the Options – SHORT LIST</b>			
	<b>Option 3 – Provider Federation by Joint Committee</b>	<b>Option 4 – Planning and Commissioning Body (PCB)</b>	<b>Option 5 - Planning, Commissioning and Delivery Body (PC&amp;DB)</b>
<b>Legal Status</b>	All schools and colleges retain their legal identity; Joint Committee (JC) has no legal identity	All schools and colleges retain their legal identity. PCB has legal identity, probably as company limited by guarantee; company could be owned by institutions, directors or even WAG	FE College(s) dissolved to enable creation of PC&DB with assets and employees transferred to new body. Delivery body could be separate from the PCB. Other institutions retain their legal identity
<b>Funding</b>	16-19 years funding flows directly to the schools and colleges as is the case now , although JC could be delegated powers by governing bodies to negotiate funding allocations with funding bodies	Funding by contract from DCELLS to the PCB and from PCB by contract to institutions	Funding by contract from DCELLS to PC&DB and then to delivery arm and other institutions by contract
<b>Governance</b>	All institutions retain their governing bodies which may delegate, and rescind, powers to the Joint Committee	Governing Body or Board of Directors of PCB is determined by its constitution. All other institutions retain their governing bodies	Governing Body or Board of Directors of PCB or PC&DB determined by its constitution. WAG has powers to appoint up to two governors and approve constitutional change. Delivery arm could be separated with independent

**Table 1 : Characteristics of the Options – SHORT LIST**

	<b>Option 3 – Provider Federation by Joint Committee</b>	<b>Option 4 – Planning and Commissioning Body (PCB)</b>	<b>Option 5 - Planning, Commissioning and Delivery Body (PC&amp;DB)</b>
			governing body
<b>Planning</b>	Limited planning responsibilities because funding allocations routed directly to institutions, unless Joint Committee is able to represent all of the institutions in negotiation with funding bodies. JC able to coordinate 14-16 curriculum planning with post 16 curriculum planning	PCB plans sub-regional 16-19 years education and training, and, possibly, other provision. PCB able to coordinate 14-16 curriculum planning with post 16 curriculum planning	PCB or PC&DB plans sub-regional 16-19 years education and training, and, possibly, other provision. PCB or PC&DB less able to coordinate 14-16 curriculum planning with post 16 curriculum planning
<b>Commissioning</b>	Governing bodies of individual institutions can delegate powers and funds to Joint Committee to plan and commission education and training. Governing bodies can also empower the Joint Committee to negotiate funding allocations on behalf of each member institution	PCB commissions all 16-19 years education and training, and, possibly, other provision	PCB or PC&DB commissions all 16-19 years education and training, and, possibly, other provision
<b>Operational Costs</b>	Low set-up costs but the operational costs would be determined by the amount of power the individual governing bodies are prepared to delegate and the extent to which the JC is able and empowered to take a strategic overview and undertake post 16 education and training planning for the sub-region	High set up costs and operational costs due to resource requirements of planning, commissioning and contract management roles	Similar costs to Option 4 but internal staff resource available and less contract management costs if main provider
<b>Curriculum</b>	Delivery of LSM challenging for institutions in current structure; high transport costs expected	PCB has capacity to ensure delivery of LSM but possibly at the cost of increased travel for some learners and rationalisation	PCB or PC&DB has capacity to ensure delivery of LSM but possibly at the cost of increased travel for some learners and rationalisation
<b>Welsh Language</b>	JC could promote Welsh medium education but economics of the 6th form provision provides little capacity for this without rationalisation or designation of selected schools as Welsh medium schools	PCB could deliver increased access to Welsh medium education as a key priority	PCB or PC&DB could deliver increased access to Welsh medium education as a key priority
<b>Summary</b>	Simple low cost model	High set up and operational	Lower set up costs than

**Table 1 : Characteristics of the Options – SHORT LIST**

	<b>Option 3 – Provider Federation by Joint Committee</b>	<b>Option 4 – Planning and Commissioning Body (PCB)</b>	<b>Option 5 - Planning, Commissioning and Delivery Body (PC&amp;DB)</b>
	unless planning and commissioning powers are delegated to the Joint Committee. Voluntary nature of the option is a major weakness	costs but PCB could have strong representative directors with capacity to undertake comprehensive planning and commissioning	option 4 and able to undertake comprehensive planning and commissioning but potential conflict of interest with related delivery arm

Following further discussions, the Learning Partnership decided to explore further and test a hybrid option, drawing on this short list, and based on joint-collaborative working within a formal strategic framework.

## STAGE 2 : ASSESSMENT OF OPERATIONAL OPTIONS FOR JOINT COLLABORATIVE WORKING

**Table 1: Summary assessment of scoping options**

<b>Reference to:</b>	<b>Option 1.1</b>	<b>Option 1.2</b>	<b>Option 1.3</b>
<b>Description of option:</b>	<b>Do nothing</b>	<b>Minimum – “informal collaboration”</b>	<b>Maximum – “formal collaboration”</b>
<b>Investment objectives</b>			
Reducing competition and duplication to identify efficiencies and to deliver enhanced outcomes for young people	X	?	✓
To maintain high levels of attainment for learners at post-16	X	?	✓
To widen choice for learners at post-16 and respond to local labour market needs	X	?	✓
To widen participation of learners at post-16	X	?	✓
Enhance Welsh language and bilingual provision	X	?	✓
<b>Critical success factors</b>			
Business need	X	?	✓
Strategic fit	X	?	✓
Benefits optimisation	X	?	✓
Potential achievability	✓	✓	✓

Potential affordability	?	?	?
<b>Summary</b>	Discounted	Discounted	Preferred

**Table 2: Summary assessment of service solutions options**

<b>Reference to:</b>	<b>Option 2.1</b>	<b>Option 2.2</b>	<b>Option 2.3</b>
<b>Description of option:</b>	Small Area Cluster collaboration	Small Area Cluster collaboration with overview arrangement	Whole Area Cluster collaboration with overview arrangement
<b>Investment objectives</b>			
Reducing competition and duplication to identify efficiencies and to deliver enhanced outcomes for young people	✓	✓	✓
To maintain high levels of attainment for learners at post-16	✓	✓	✓
To widen choice for learners at post-16 and respond to local labour market needs	✓	✓	✓
To widen participation of learners at post-16	?	✓	✓
Enhance Welsh language and bilingual provision	✓	✓	✓
<b>Critical success factors</b>			
Business need	?	✓	✓
Strategic fit	?	?	✓
Benefits optimisation	?	✓	✓
Potential achievability	?	?	?
Potential affordability	?	?	?
<b>Summary</b>	<b>Possible</b>	<b>Possible</b>	<b>Preferred</b>