

Assessment of Sub-regional Models for MOG

3 Models

1. Local Authorities undertake strategic commissioning collectively with **shared services** to manage Further Education and all 16-18 provision on behalf of the sub-regional grouping
2. Local Authorities undertake strategic commissioning and **collectively agree** for a **lead Local Authority** to manage FE provision on behalf of the sub-regional grouping
3. Local Authorities come together to share plans but **each local authority procures provision** from **providers within their own boundaries**

Variations on 3 Models

Models	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>Model 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A sub regional grouping responsible for all 16-19 funding possibly as a stand alone agency or as a combined service of LA's 	<p>Transfer easy to manage: LSC staff just TUPE into sub-regional group (poss through lead LA) Economies of scale Keeps planning and funding of all 16-19 together Strong alignment with developing city region Stronger representation to region</p>	<p>Loose linkage (and possibly conflict) with CYPP plans and 14-19 teams Diploma consortia are organised on a borough basis Governance issues around sensitive issues such as funding FE and sixth forms Possible disconnection with DCS statutory responsibilities</p>
<p>Model 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sub regional grouping for FE with lead banker (14-19 teams coming together to do this) o Local Authorities fund School 6th Forms and 6th Form Colleges o WBL is likely to be sub-regional 	<p>Economies of scale Alignment with city region Single conversation for FE colleges (a consistent approach) Quality and data issues can be managed through sub regional basis Stronger representation to region</p>	<p>One LA takes on responsibility of funding FE (currently £70m) and could be seen as not only disinterested Splits planning and funding FE from sixth forms. potential problems for diploma planning Possible governance and scrutiny issues .Possible disconnection with DCS statutory responsibilities</p>
<p>Model 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sub regional grouping is responsible for skills strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Skill priorities for individual borough 14-19 commissioning plans o Quality o Employer engagement o Labour market trends analysis o Data <p>Local Authority responsible for funding FE and 6th Forms in their own area within priorities set by Employment and Skills Board</p>	<p>Close link to DCS for discharging their statutory responsibilities Governance and scrutiny is strong in this model Some economies of scale Some alignment with city region Model is dynamic in that it seeks to develop sub –regional working but also maintain local planning Supports local consortia for diplomas and builds on current LA collaborative working Enables decisions to be close to CYP plans and local commissioning priorities Keeps planning and funding of all 16-19 together</p>	<p>Needs to develop trust between borough and sub regional working Danger of replicating resources across each borough rather than centralising them...this is an issue for quality monitoring Capacity over 6 LA's to monitor quality Need for data sharing protocols Possible inconsistent approach to FE across Greater Merseyside Not clear on how hard decisions about resource reduction are managed in this model Who would be voice on behalf of sub region</p>

Draft Principles to underpin Governance/Management/Decision Making Arrangements

1. Linked to statutory responsibilities

- Provision of 16-19 learning (including 25 for Learning Difficulties (LLDD) and also Young Offenders up to age of 18)
- Securing entitlement for diplomas
- Securing entitlement for apprenticeships
- Agreeing effective local collaborative arrangements at sub-regional level
 - i. Sharing commissioning plans
 - ii. Analysing cross boundary traffic/travel to learn
 - iii. Aggregating demand for provision
 - iv. Deciding who leads on planning, commissioning, procurement and funding for each college and provider
- Ensuring range and appropriateness of provision to support the raising of the participation age to 18

2 Securing effective support for commissioning

- access to needs analysis
- access to supply and demand analysis
- access to performance analysis
- coherence with CYP commissioning

3 Supporting employment and skills agenda

- ensuring provision drives forward economic growth

4 Efficiency of planning and funding arrangements

- ensuring decisions, accountability and funding rules are transparent and equitable
- ensuring good value for money is secured in the allocation and use of public funds
- enabling hard decisions about resource reduction or institutional changes to be made effectively

5 Overall effectiveness of provision and capacity to improve

- ensuring there is a clear focus on quality
- ensuring intervention is proportionate to under-performance