Spencer Alliance for Leadership and Teaching: Quality Assurance Policy 2024- 2026

Date of Adoption: 03.09.2024
Date of Review: 03.09.2026
Policy Owner: Tammy Elward, Director of SALT

The Spencer Alliance of Leadership and Teaching wish to ensure that every person, from course participants to leaders and assessors, engaged with our programme and course delivery, experience high quality training and support underpinned by evidence and striving to make impact to the outcomes of pupils. This includes all arms of work:

Spencer Teaching School Hub, including all CPD courses
Spencer Teaching School Hub AB Services
George Spencer Academy SCITT
Spencer Apprenticeships
The Derby Research School at Wyndham Primary Academy
Maths Hub East Midlands West
Spencer Academies Trust End Point Assessment Organisation

The following document relates to the work of the Spencer Alliance for Leadership and Teaching – there are additional processes which may be in place for specific piece of work, for example the East Midlands West Maths Hub has a reporting structure as a part of the quality assurance mechanisms with the NCETM. This will be covered under their specific policies and documentation. All arms of work will be covered under these core principles.

1) Golden Thread: Monitoring and Risk Assessing

At the heart of our approach is our risk assessment and reviewing of the landscape in order to be proactive and respond. Regular leadership meetings, connectivity across the system and our governance protocols around active challenge for risk at each Strategic Board are critical for being agile and responsive to emerging changes and challenges. This is part of our DNA stemming from years of experience as a training provider where we have learnt to be continuously vigilant.

2) Central Team

i) Our central team is well resourced and equipped. A robust selection process ensures we appoint the right individuals and we induct staff according to our Trust policy. The wider team stems across our portfolio of work, including the Research School, SCITT and Maths Hub, and this allows for sharing of best practice, peer learning and continuous improvement through collaboration. CPD from all national partners is disseminated across our team.

ii) We also utilise the apprenticeship levy when needed to draw in new staff and allow for progression and growth for more senior members of staff. This allows us to create a pipeline of staff development and talent manage so that any loss of staff can be efficiently addressed within the team.

iii) We draw upon wider support structures from across our MAT including finance, HR, health and safety, safeguarding, graphic design, website and estates. This allows us to draw on expertise from our larger organisation.

We have arranged our next steps of quality assurance as it relates to our role as a delivery partner in the resourcing and delivery of the training.

3) Recruitment of Facilitators

i) **Clarity of Recruitment Criteria and Robust Process:** We make the facilitator eligibility criteria clear when recruiting (interviewing where necessary) and onboarding. In this instance, we use the EDT requirements to align with the contract expectations. In addition to this, we requested references from the organisation to ensure that the applicant has credibility in their context and leadership support for their application.

ii) **Safeguarding**: As a part of our process, we require a statement from the employing schools that the applicant has been DBS checked, has completed all necessary EDI and Safeguarding training which is currently up to date

iii) **Contracting**: Following the successful appointment of a facilitator, we issue an SLA to the school once terms are agreed. In the SLA, there are clear expectations for what the school, the Hub and the facilitator agrees to, including confidentiality, effective communication and commitment to shared professional values and behaviours. There are also clearly articulated consequences for a break in contract.

4) Onboarding of the Facilitation Team

i) As a part of the **onboarding process**, we set common expectations for ways of working with robust systems and structures, clear communication processes, a single point of contact within the admin team and clarity of accountability.

ii) The '**Train the Trainer'** process is planned in partnership with EDT so that facilitators feel comfortable and confident with the facilitation style and programme content. This assures for consistency.

5) Resourcing and Contingency Planning

i) Delivery Venues

a. For internal venues, we have a robust booking process, communication structure with site and catering teams and set protocols for the management of events. This includes an annual review of resources in venues to ensure they are continuously of a standard we would expect.

b. For external venues, commissioned beyond our trust, we have an SLA in place for the use of spaces, expectations for catering etc and clear communication lines in case of any issues.

ii) **Catering**: We have internal and external catering structures, with contingency plans in place. We work with our trust catering manager to review catering facilities and provision on a termly basis. We have arrangements with two external organisations for any unforeseen events as a contingency.

6) Programme Design, Planning and Delivery

i) When we are delivering events of our own design, we have a course design process around scoping objectives, desired content and design, and evidence base check in alignment with the CPD standard.

ii) When we are working with a lead provider and delivering external content, we are committed to showing fidelity to the programme and ensure we have clear understanding of where local variation or cohort specific tweaks can be made within contract terms.

iii) All delivery materials are peer-reviewed across the leadership team before they are deployed.

iv) Taking account of new evidence and research: Where we commission work ourselves, we review materials and content ongoingly and in turn will complete a programme re-fresh annually to ensure current evidence and research is reflected in our work.

7) Monitoring of Delivery

We monitor delivery through session drop ins, peer-review structures and participant feedback after each session. All data gleaned from these exercises are channelled back into our continuous improvement cycles, feeding back to facilitators and reviewing activity. Where needed, a member of the leadership team may work more closely with a programme or delivery team to ensure our high expectations for delivery are maintained.

8) Continuous Improvement

i) **Self-assessment**: We use a range of self-assessment tools on a termly basis – for example, we use the DfE TSH Self-Assessment grid to self-evaluate on a termly basis and action plan accordingly.

ii) **Seeking and acting on feedback from personnel, participants and partners:** we take ongoing feedback seriously to ensure we maintain our high expectations for delivery.

iii) **Taking account of new evidence and research:** Where we commission work ourselves, we review materials, content and CPD design structure ongoingly and in turn will complete a programme re-fresh annually to ensure current evidence and research is reflected in our work.

iv) **Working with EDT and/or DfE, NCETM, EEF, Ofsted or other partners to improve quality:** we ensure that we work against the KPIs and quality standards of the different partners we work with and are held account by. Their feedback and review outcomes are steering back into our cycles for continuous improvement.

9) Financial Management

i. We have regular meetings with our designated lead within the finance team. We also account to the Director of Finance termly and account to the Board of Trustees annually for finances.

ii. Where finance reporting is required, e.g. financial returns, Annex Gs etc, our designated finance lead oversees that so that any requirements within grant and funding arrangements are met.

iii. We work with the trust procurement lead to ensure that we have value for money whilst also maintaining quality of our investments.

10) Compliance

i) **Complaints and Appeals Procedures:** We follow our trust policy for complaints process, with specific addendums where needed e.g. Appealing an NPQ Final Assessment Outcome.

ii) **Prevent and Dealing with Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism:** Where needed, we share clearly with all participants any policies relating to academic misconduct and plagiarism. This is updated every 3 years, or when needed if there are any changes.

11) Governance

Our governance structures are robust across all arms of work – for example with the TSH, we ensure that deep dives of detail can be discussed at steering group level, which reports up to the Strategic Board which holds us to account to the KPIs. We also report into the governing body at Chetwynd Primary Academy (lead school), the executive leadership team of the trust and Quality and Standard Committee of the Board of Trustees.

12) Transparency of Performance Metrics

Our performance metrics against our KPIs will be published on our website and updated regularly in order to ensure transparency.

13) External Review and Challenge

We will seek external review and challenge to allow us to consistently grow and develop.

i. External partners, e.g. DfE TSH Self-assessment Toolkit, NCETM self-assessment framework for the Maths Hub, the SCITT SEF against the Ofsted framework

ii. Peer review, e.g. the TSH network as organised by the DfE, AB peer review with an experienced and trusted partner in another region

14) Golden Thread: Sustaining Relationships with Schools

In order to maintain standards for delivery and maintain good completion rates, we have found that our relationships with schools, both in terms of clear communications around expectations within particular programmes and our availability to chat with them as they need. For example, our experience with the NPQs have been that when a participant is not successful, it can be that the school hasn't fully understood their role in supporting them back at base. By setting our expectations clear from the outset, feeding back to schools where we have concerns and making ourselves available to check in, sense check something and ask for further support. This proactive approach to relationship management means we have less to chase after something has gone wrong.

15) Systems for Annual Review and Refresh

Within the quieter term of Summer 1 where schools are focused on exams, we build in the opportunity to review and refresh all our systems, processes and resourcing. We reflect on feedback and performance metrics to help refine our thinking and plan ahead. This also gives us time to put in place any new systems, e.g. new finance management system, refresh tables and conferencing resources in a venue, before the new academic year.