HEART
HEALTH & EDUCATION ADVICE & RESOURCE TEAM

Helpdesk Report: Alternative Education Provision for Pakistan

Date: 31st July 2013

Query: Research on charter Schools in the US, academy schools in the UK, 'adopted' schools in Pakistan, and private management of public school.

Content

1. Charter schools, US
2. Academy schools, UK
3. Adopted schools, Pakistan
4. Private management of public schools
5. Additional information

---

1. Charter schools, US

This section is presented in the following sub-sections:
  a) Case studies
  b) Teachers
  c) Accountability
  d) Relationship with central government
  e) Organisations

a) Case studies

Is it wrong for us to want good things? The origins of Gompers Charter Middle School
Mehan, H.B. & Chang, G.C. 2010
http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10833-010-9139-5.pdf

This paper documents the initial process by which Gompers, a San Diego middle school, located in a low-income and predominantly Hispanic neighbourhood and repeatedly failing to meet No Child Left Behind (NCLB) provisions, restructured into an academically rigorous, detracked charter school. The discussion of the political experience and working relationships between the charter organisers, the school district, and its superintendent illustrate the often contentious process of community mobilisation and deliberation. The involvement of faculty from the University of California San Diego and community groups as contributing partners enhances our understanding of the creation of educational reforms or the transformation of passion into practice.

After months spent reviewing the various options provided by NCLB act, the Gompers' work group concluded that the school should be reconstituted as an independent charter school. Zealous parents, supported by dedicated teachers, secured signatures endorsing the charter petition from more than 70% of the parents whose students lived in Gompers' catchment area and 58% of the school's teachers. On March 1, 2005, the San Diego Unified School District's

Board of Education voted unanimously to grant the group its charter petition to form the Gompers Charter Middle School in partnership with UCSD and the GCMS community.

The Gompers Charter Middle School (GCMS) academic plan crafted after months of weekly work group meetings called for making the school safe and inviting and instilling a common set of beliefs and values among youngsters and adults about appropriate behaviour and learning, implementing a rigorous curriculum reinforced by academic and social supports, and engaging families and the community in the daily life of the school. It takes time to instil these conditions which are critical for increasing the possibility of equitable access to college and career for low-income students of colour. Constraints internal to the school made it difficult for GCMS to put these critical conditions in place for more than 800 students in the 6 months between the approval of the charter to the opening of the school. Challenges included hiring an entire teaching and support staff, refurbishing facilities, designing a college-going culture, coaching teachers in the adoption of the school's academic plan, and making learning rigorous and exciting for students.

Circumstances external to the school also constrained the conversion. The school board supporting the superintendent was replaced by a board hostile to him and his commitment to charter schools. This newly elected school board changed the rules governing the charter petition process. Charter school advocates had to scurry to obtain teachers' approval even after they had secured parents' approval. The San Diego Education Association challenged agreements between the district and the union that allowed district teachers to be on loan to charters, thereby causing anxiety and uncertainty among affected teachers. The California Charter Schools Association, San Diego City Schools staff led by a representative of the School Choice Office, and local philanthropic organisations, notably the Girard Foundation, helped charter advocates navigate around these obstacles. University of California, San Diego's (UCSD's) partnership with GCMS, while helpful, produced its own troubles. On the one hand, faculty associated with CREATE were able to assist GCMS traverse the uncertainties of the political process and promise considerable resources for the school. On the other hand, the uneven record of UCSD in communities of colour and the less-than-enthusiastic commitment of the central administration toward community engagement required CREATE to proceed cautiously and negotiate trust repeatedly.

Best practices for non-profit charter schools accountability: a case study of American youth works
Flores, C.P. 2010. Texas State University-San Marcos
http://academia.edu/1195219/Best_Practices_for_Nonprofit_Charter_Schools_Accountability_A_Case_Study_of_American_YouthWorks

The purpose of this applied research project was to develop a best practice model for non-profit charter school accountability and to compare how closely American YouthWorks compares. American YouthWorks is an award-winning non-profit charter school in Austin, Texas. Four key components were identified for the model: Mission-Based Accountability; Ethical Culture; Financial Practices; and Performance Measures.

Going Exponential: Growing the Charter School Sector's Best
Hassel, E.A., Hassel, B.C. & Ableidinger, J. 2011. Progressive Policy Institute.
http://www.progressivefix.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/2.2011_Hassel_Going-Exponential_WEB1.pdf

Though controversy rages about the overall contribution of charter schools to U.S. education reform, few doubt that a subset of charter schools has achieved extraordinary results with disadvantaged students. Relative to the enormous need for quality education, the number of children served by the best charter schools is far too low. Numerous growth barriers confront

even the best charter institutions. The charter sector's best must aim for high exponential growth similar to that of the best growth organisations in the for-profit and non-profit sectors. Millions more children would be reached with excellence every year if the charter sector's best pursued sustained, rapid growth. To develop fresh insights to spur growth of the charter sector's best, the authors researched the distinguishing characteristics of organisations in other sectors that have grown at sustained, high-exponential rates. This paper summarises the lessons that emerged from that research and the authors' initial recommendations for the charter sector.

Innovations in Education: Successful Charter Schools
U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement. 2004.
http://www2.ed.gov/admins/comm/choice/charter/index.html

Elements of effective charter schools and stories of eight successful charter schools are presented in this report.

Innovations In Education: Supporting Charter School Excellence Through Quality Authorizing
U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement. 2007.
http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/choice/charter/authorizing/index.html

Intended primarily for policymakers and charter school authorisers and potential authorisers, this guide describes various ways that authorisers and policymakers can achieve quality authorising. It provides detailed information designed to help policymakers at the state and national levels and to help current and potential authorisers replicate these successful models and practices.

In order to provide specific illustrations of abstract concepts involved in successful charter authorising, this guide highlights the practices of eight charter authorisers that have fostered the development of high-quality charter schools. By profiling the work of these authorisers, this guide intends to enhance the knowledge base, capacities, and practices of all types of authorisers, aiming to strengthen the quality and success of charter schools nationwide. The field of charter authorising is relatively new, though, and there is a great deal of necessary experimentation—and resulting variation—among the offices profiled here.

b) Teachers

Working conditions in charter schools. What's the appeal for teachers?
Malloy, C.L. & Wohlstetter, P. 2003. University of Southern California.
https://www.usc.edu/dept/education/cegov/focus/charter-schools/publications/journals/Working%20Conditions%20in%20Charter%20Schools%20-%20What's%20the%20Appeal%20fo.pdf

This article synthesises past research findings on the work of charter school teachers and juxtaposes this research with case studies of forty charter school teachers in six urban charter elementary schools. Charter schools, with increased autonomy over personnel and budget, are given the freedom to make many decisions related to hiring, salary, and working conditions. In general, charter school teachers work longer hours and receive less job security than colleagues in traditional public schools. In some states, charter school teachers earn significantly less than other public school colleagues. The evidence also suggests, however, that teachers generally enjoy their professional lives in charter schools—their colleagues and the school's education program. The authors argue that in order to continue to attract and retain teachers, charter schools may need to extend their use of autonomy to improve the working conditions of teachers and ultimately, to extend the life of the school.

Teacher Working Conditions in Charter Schools and Traditional Public Schools: A Comparative Study
Ni, Y. 2012. Teachers College, Columbia University.
http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentID=16301

This article compares teacher working conditions in charter and traditional public schools and among various types of charter schools. In doing so, it seeks to understand whether the different working conditions are influenced by the intrinsic institutional features of charter schools such as autonomy and competition, or by the extraneous factors such as measureable school and teacher characteristics.

The results show that charter and traditional public school teachers perceive their working conditions to be similar in many regards, including principal leadership, sense of community and collegiality, classroom autonomy, opportunities for professional development, and adequacy of instructional supplies. However, charter school teachers perceive that they have significantly more influence over school policies, but a heavier workload than traditional school teachers. Among charter schools, district-granted charter schools show consistently more supportive working environments than charters granted by other organisations. This implies that state policy can have some indirect influence over charter school working conditions by providing substantial administrative support and oversight to charter schools authorised by independent organisations other than the established structure of school districts.

Teacher Turnover in Charter Schools
Stuit, D. & Smith, T.M. 2010. National Center on School Choice.
http://www.vanderbilt.edu/schoolchoice/documents/briefs/brief_stuit_smith_ncspe.pdf

Key findings:
- The rate that teachers leave the profession and move between schools is significantly higher in charter schools than in traditional public schools.
- Charter schools that are started from the ground up experience significantly more attrition and mobility than those converted from traditional public schools.
- Differences in teacher characteristics explain a large portion of the turnover gap among charter and traditional public school teachers.
- Dissatisfaction with working conditions is an important reason why charter school teachers are significantly more likely to switch schools or leave the profession.
- Involuntary attrition is significantly higher in charter schools.

Evaluation of New Texas Charter Schools
Maloney, C., Sheehan, D. & Rainey, K. 2011. Texas Center for Educational Research.
http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED538563.pdf

Since 1994, the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) has provided funding to new charter schools through Charter School Program (CSP) grants designed to provide support for the planning and implementation of effective new charter programs. CSP funding is available for a period of 3 years, of which no more than 18 months may be used for charter school planning and program design and up to 2 years may be used to implement the educational program. Grants are awarded to state education agencies, which then provide funding to approved charter schools through a system of subgrants. As a condition of CSP funding, state education agencies are required to evaluate new charter schools using objective criteria and quantitative and qualitative data.

One of the evaluations findings was that teachers chose to work in new charter schools because they were attracted to charters' missions and educational goals, felt schools had high academic standards, and wanted to work with like-minded educators.

c) Accountability

Understanding the Basic Bargain: A Study of Charter School Accountability in Massachusetts and Texas
Herdman, P.A. 2002. New American Schools, Education Performance Network
http://1.usa.gov/15QttOb

This paper examines the balance between autonomy and accountability in education from the perspective of Massachusetts and Texas charter schools and their state authorisers. By analysing national survey data, interviews with key policymakers, and case studies of six low, medium, and high performing schools, the paper examines the organisational needs of charter schools and how government oversight policies address or mitigate those needs. The paper draws lessons from the charter school governance model and applies them to the efforts of districts moving toward more decentralised governance systems such as charter districts. It builds on Hassel's 1999 work, "The Charter School Challenge," which highlights three strategies in which charter schools might achieve systemic reform (the laboratory, competition, and replacement theses). This paper notes a fourth thesis, the governance thesis, which hypothesises that the primary benefit of charter schools is in changing the basic district structure so that schools have the opportunity to control their fiscal and human resources while the central government holds them accountable for performance.

Improving Charter School Accountability: The Challenge of Closing Failing Schools
Osborne, D. 2012. The Progressive Policy Institute.
http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED533181.pdf

In this report the author discusses why it is important that authorisers close failing charters, reviews the facts about charter and authoriser performance, examines why some authorisers fail to close underperforming charters, and proposes solutions to these problems. To answer such questions, the author has reviewed the literature and interviewed fifteen current or former charter authorisers and another ten experts on charter schools. In addition, thanks to the generosity of the National Association of Charter School Authorisers (NACSA), the author has reviewed the data accumulated by its annual surveys of authorisers.

Recommendations include:
- Invest in better measurement. States should measure student growth, and they should measure more than test scores.
- Require that charters be performance contracts, and enforce them.
- Require that all charters be for five years, with a minimum of one review in between.
- Require that authorisers adopt clear policies spelling out the conditions that will lead to a charter's revocation or renewal.
- Require authorisers to vote on closure if a charter's performance falls below a minimum level.
- Create at least one politically independent, single-purpose organisation dedicated to authorising charters throughout the state.
- Encourage authorisers to replace failing charters with new charters run by organisations that have proven track records.
- Take away the right to appeal an authoriser's decision to the courts.
- Make authorisers accountable for the performance of their schools.

Evaluation of the Public Charter Schools Program
http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/pcsp-final/finalreport.pdf

Charter school authorisers were analysed as part of this evaluation.

Authorising bodies are a critical component of the charter school movement and include a variety of entities. In 2001-02, local school districts authorised 45 percent of charter schools, while state departments of education authorised 41 percent, and institutions of higher education authorised 12 percent. (In addition, other entities, such as independent charter boards, authorised 2 percent of charter schools.) It is interesting to note that although they authorise 45 percent of all charter schools, local education agencies represent 91 percent of the population of authorisers. State education agencies on the other hand, authorise 41 percent of all charters but represent just 3 percent of all authorisers.

There is a general expectation in the charter school sector that authorisers have a responsibility to regularly oversee charter school operations and progress toward meeting the goals in the charter. The reality is that only 36 percent of authorisers had a charter school office or staff in 2001-02 suggesting limited capacity to address charter school oversight. However, this finding varies by type of authoriser. For example, 85 percent of states that are authorisers have an office or staff dedicated to charter school work. Because states are more likely to authorise a large number of schools, they may require an infrastructure to provide adequate oversight.

Some authorisers, particularly local school districts, report that they provide a number of services to charter schools, the most common being administrative oversight, assistance in meeting state or federal regulations and special education services. Increasingly, authorisers report that schools must pay for these services.

In theory, charter schools enjoy flexibility or school-level control over key decisions not available to the typical school in exchange for accountability for specified outcomes. In reality, the autonomy of charter schools is limited by state policies, as well as by relationships with authorisers, education management organisations (EMOs) and community-based organisations (CBOs). Only 37 percent of states with charter schools granted them automatic waivers from state policies and regulations in 2001-02, but 54 percent waived regulations on selected policies or allowed charter schools to request waivers on a case-by-case basis. Nine percent did not permit any waivers to charter schools.

Furthermore, charter schools frequently share their school-level authority with one or more other entities. Schools were most likely to report sharing control with their authorisers. Some school directors reported sharing authority with EMOs or CBOs.

The charter school accountability process involves three phases: the application process, the monitoring process and the implementation of sanctions (if needed).

During the application process, authorising bodies screen applications, denying charters because of problems relating to, for example, proposed instructional strategies, governance procedures, accountability provisions, and business plans.

The monitoring process occurs after authorisers have awarded charters to planning groups. Authorisers and states reserve legal authority to monitor charter schools, but other entities are also involved, resulting in a complex system of accountability. Charter schools reported being monitored by their authorisers, governing boards, states and, in some cases, EMOs or CBOs. They reported that they are most accountable to their own governing boards.

Authorisers have developed monitoring procedures and determined criteria for applying interventions or sanctions with little specific guidance from state charter school legislation.

Authorisers reported monitoring nearly all of their schools on: compliance with federal or state regulations; student achievement results; enrolment numbers; financial record keeping and viability; and special education services.

Finally, authorising bodies have the authority to implement formal or informal sanctions against a school that fails to meet the terms of its charter. Results from the survey of authorisers show that few authorisers had implemented formal sanctions: only four percent of authorisers had not renewed a school's charter and six percent had revoked a charter as of 2001-02. (The authors were unable to compare these rates with the proportion of traditional public schools that have been sanctioned through closure or reconstitution.) Informal and less severe sanctions, such as written notification of concerns, were more common. Formal and informal sanctions were usually associated with problems relating to compliance with state and federal regulations and school finances.

Authorisers report facing a wide range of challenges in sponsoring and providing support to charter schools, including inadequate financial or human resources. More important, more than half of authorisers report difficulty closing a school that is having problems—a key responsibility of authorisers in this educational reform.

In the early years of the charter school movement's development, charter schools—at least theoretically—were more accountable for outcomes than other schools, by virtue of the terms of a charter contract. More recently, however, states have implemented reporting systems to track school inputs in addition to outcomes for all public schools. Little difference now exists between state reporting requirements for charter schools and those for traditional public schools.

d) Relationship with central government

Charter Schools Programe State Educational Agenices (SEA) Grant
Webpage accessed: 26/7/13
http://www2.ed.gov/programs/charter/index.html

The purpose of the Charter Schools Program (CSP) is to increase the national understanding of the charter school model by: (1) expanding the number of high-quality charter schools available to students across the Nation by providing financial assistance for the planning, program design, and initial implementation of charter schools; and (2) evaluating the effects of charter schools, including their effects on students, student academic achievement, staff and parents.

The Secretary awards grants to State Educational Agencies (SEAs) on a competitive basis to enable them to conduct charter school programs in their States. SEA's use their CSP funds to award subgrants to non-SEA eligible applicants in their State. These subgrants are used for two primary purposes: (1) initial planning, program design, and implementation of new charter schools; and (2) dissemination of information, including best practices, by charter schools open at least three consecutive years with demonstrated success in several areas, as specified by statute.

Implementation of the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program: Final Report
Temkin, K. et al. 2008. U.S. Department of Education.
http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/charter-school-facilities/final-report.pdf

The Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program was established in 2001 to address a critical problem faced by many charter schools - lack of suitable facilities and difficulty obtaining financing to secure suitable facilities. The program makes competitive grants to eligible public entities that provide credit enhancements to absorb some of the risk in making facilities loans to charter schools. This study examines, broadly, how the program was implemented by the nine organisations that received grants in financial year 2002 – financial year 2004, and specifically, whether the program is providing: (1) improved access of charter schools to capital markets, (2) better financing rates and terms than the schools otherwise could obtain, and (3) assistance to charter schools that are serving students with the greatest need for school choice. The study draws on information from grantee applications and annual performance reports; several secondary data sources; and discussions with samples of grantees, lenders, and schools assisted by grantees.

Results indicated that credit enhancements provided by the program facilitated a total of $168 million in loans to 84 schools that served over 23,000 students. Students in these schools were more likely to be low-income and minority than students enrolled in all charter schools and in all U.S. public schools. Many of the assisted schools could not have received facility loans at any price without the program because lenders believed that these schools reflected a prohibitively high level of risk. With the credit enhancements provided by grantees, assisted charter schools received loans with rates and terms that were better than otherwise would have been available to them.

Federal Investment in Charter Schools: A Proposal for Reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Lazarin, M. 2011. Center for American Progress
http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED535992.pdf

The charter school landscape is dramatically different today compared to when the federal government first forayed into the field in 1994. That year it established the Charter School Program as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA. The Charter School Program, which is designed to support the start-up of new public charter schools, was established at a time when only seven states had charter school laws on the books and 60 charter schools were in operation.

Today, there are more than 5,000 charter schools in 40 states and the District of Columbia, and the long waiting lists indicate that there is a demand for many more charters. Meanwhile, concerns over quality, accountability, and access continue to be hot-button issues for the charter sector. The long overdue ESEA reauthorisation presents an opportunity to take stock of the small but growing and changing role of charter schools in American education. The Obama administration has recently offered states flexibility around the current law while Congress continues to debate revising ESEA. The new flexibility does not address charter schools. So ESEA remains the main vehicle for addressing charter schools in the country.

This paper outlines some of the key issues facing the charter sector at this important juncture. Congress and other policymakers should bear these issues in mind as they determine how best to support the next generation of effective charter schools.

Recommendations for Congress:

- Ensure charter schools are held to the same accountability standards as traditional public schools and support the creation and expansion of high-quality charters that serve the needs of all students.
- Ensure equitable funding for charter schools.
- Strengthen charter authorising practices.
- Encourage states to lift caps on the development of high-quality charter schools
- Prioritise states that implement smart effective quality control policies for federal competitive dollars.
- Reward states and districts that engage high-quality charters in turning around their chronically underperforming schools.

e) Organisations

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools
Webpage accessed: 26/7/13
http://www.publiccharters.org/

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools is the leading national non-profit organisation committed to advancing the charter school movement. Our mission is to lead public education to unprecedented levels of academic achievement for all students by fostering a strong charter sector. The Alliance provides assistance to state charter school associations and resource centres, develops and advocates for improved public policies, and serves as the united voice for this large and diverse movement.

National Association of Charter School Authorizers
Webpage accessed: 26/7/13
http://www.qualitycharters.org/

The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools is the leading organisation committed to advancing quality, growth and sustainability for the charter school movement. Their integrated approach to advocacy and national reach allows them to make significant impacts at both the federal and state levels.

Key activities:
- They speak and advocate for hundreds of thousands of students hoping for the chance to attend a charter school.
- They provide assistance to state charter school associations and resource centres, advocate for improved public policies, and serve as the united voice for a large and diverse movement.
- They focus on key policy priorities like replicating and expanding high-quality charter schools, lifting arbitrary "caps" on charter growth, and closing the funding gap between charters and other public schools.

Charter Schools USA
Webpage accessed: 26/7/13
http://www.charterschoolsusa.com/

Charter Schools USA was founded in 1997. The organisation has emerged as one of the nation's fastest growing and most successful education companies, with more than 4,000 employees educating more than 40,000 students. Charter Schools USA schools produce some of the strongest academic gains in reading, writing and math in the nation based on state and federal standards. On recent year end state exams, CSUSA as a district scored an A. Charter Schools USA started the nation's first charter school in the workplace, the first

municipal charter school, and the largest municipal charter middle-high school. Charter Schools USA currently operates 48 charter schools on 45 campuses in five states.

2. Academy schools, UK

This section is presented in the following sub-sections:
- a) Background
- b) Staffing
- c) Accountability
- d) Organisations

a) Background

UK Department for Education Academies website
Accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/typesofschools/academies

This area of the Government website contains information for schools interested in becoming an academy and information for existing academies, local authorities and sponsors.

Academies are publicly-funded independent schools that provide a first-class education.

Academies benefit from greater freedoms to innovate and raise standards. These include:
- Freedom from local authority control;
- The ability to set their own pay and conditions for staff;
- Freedoms around the delivery of the curriculum; and
- The ability to change the lengths of terms and school days.

Some academies, generally those set up to replace underperforming schools, will have a sponsor. Sponsors come from a wide range of backgrounds including successful schools, businesses, universities, charities and faith bodies. Sponsors are held accountable for the improving the performance of their schools. They do this by challenging traditional thinking on how schools are run and what they should be like for students. They seek to make a complete break with cultures of low aspiration and achievement. The sponsor's vision and leadership are vital to each project.

Academies receive the same level of per-pupil funding as they would receive from the local authority as a maintained school, plus additions to cover the services that are no longer provided for them by the local authority. However, academies have greater freedom over how they use their budgets to best benefit their students. Academies receive their funding directly from the Education Funding Agency (EFA) rather than from local authorities.

The principles of governance are the same in academies as in maintained schools, but the governing body has greater autonomy. Academies are required to have at least two parent governors.

By Schools for Schools: The Origins, History and Influence of the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust, 1987-2007
SSAT, 2007.
http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED525596.pdf

This paper presents the history of the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust (SSAT). The origins of the specialist schools programme lie in a meeting to address high levels of youth unemployment held at the House of Lords in January 1986, the result was the establishment

of 100 technology schools to meet the skills needs of new business. In the early 1990s the organisation employed nine full time members of staff and supported 15 schools. It now employs over 350 people and supports a network of schools over 4700 strong. England now has a specialist system of secondary education. Charting this journey reveals six factors that appear to have most to do with this success. The first is timing. The second factor is the design of the specialist schools programme itself. The third factor is the power of the schools' network. The fourth factor is the involvement of external sponsors in the programme. The fifth factor is the ability of the organisation itself to change and adapt and, in recent years under the leadership of Elizabeth Reid, to build capacity. The sixth crucial factor is the vision, lobbying skills and determination of its chairman, Sir Cyril Taylor, described as a "man with a mission", Sir Cyril has advised 11 successive secretaries of state and chaired the organisation throughout its 20-year history.

b) Staffing

Guidance on transfer of school staff to academies
Webpage accesses: 28/7/13
http://www.lge.gov.uk/lge/core/page.do?pageId=7152910

The Academies Act 2010 gives all maintained schools the opportunity to become academies. These are publically-funded schools that are independent of local authority control. Like all schools they will be able to buy in private services, such as HR services, including buying back services from the local authority should they so wish. In terms of the workforce the main implication is that the school will be able to set its own pay and conditions for staff.

However, when a maintained school becomes an academy, the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) will apply, meaning that employees working in the maintained school will transfer to the academy, and the academy will become their employer. This brings with it the requirement to consult with employee representatives on the proposed change of employer and the implications of the transfer.

Transferred employees will also have protected employment rights under TUPE. Therefore, in the immediate future when schools convert to academy status, teachers and support staff will retain their current contractual rights. This means that the statutory School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD) will be incorporated into their contracts, as will the Conditions of service for school teachers in England and Wales ('Burgundy Book') and any local agreements between the local authority and the recognised teacher unions. Similarly, whatever arrangements currently apply to school support staff - whether this is based on the national agreement negotiated within the National Joint Council for local government services in respect of staff in community schools, or other local arrangements which apply to staff in foundation schools and voluntary aided schools - will transfer. For newly-appointed staff, however, the academy will be able to determine new pay and conditions arrangements.

An employee who transfers to an academy under TUPE will have continuity of service preserved for redundancy entitlements. An employee who voluntarily goes to work for an academy (not under TUPE) will have that period of employment counted as continuous service within local government under the Redundancy Payments (Continuity of Employment in Local Government, etc.) (Modification) Order 1999 (RMO).

Existing academies established under section 482 of the Education Act (EA 1996) are covered by the RMO (under paragraph 8, section 3 of Schedule 1). New academies are also covered because sub-section 17(4) of the Academies Act 2010 says that "EA 1996 and sections 1 to 13, 15 and 16 of this Act are to be read as if those sections were contained in EA 1996".

Employees who TUPE from maintained schools to academies
The Learning Trust Legal Team, No date
http://trustnet.learningtrust.co.uk/humanresources/Documents/Legal%20risks%20and%20iss
ues%20-
%20Employees%20who%20TUPE%20from%20maintained%20schools%20to%20academie
s.pdf

This document is a very basic outline of some of the legal risks and issues that schools
wishing to convert to academies will have to consider. The areas of law involved are highly
complex and this is by no means a definitive guide to all issues that may arise. Any school
considering converting to an academy should consider obtaining independent legal advice.

This document answers the following FAQs:
- Do existing staff of maintained schools TUPE to new academies?
- What exactly will the academy inherit in relation to the transferring staff?
- Will academies be bound by subsequent pay increases reached under collective
  agreements such as the Teachers' Pay and Conditions and the Green Book?
- Will new starters at the Academy have to be employed on the same terms and
  conditions as the transferring staff?
- Can terms and conditions inherited from the maintained school be changed after the
  TUPE?
- Are academies at risk of equal pay claims, based on comparisons with groups of staff
  who remain employed by the LA?
- Pensions issues
- What are the school's consultation obligations?
- Insurance

c) Accountability

Academy inspection factsheet
Webpage accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/typesofschools/academies/open/b00219097/
academyfactsheets/academyinspectionfactsheet

Academies continue to be subject to Ofsted inspections and are also accountable through the
achievement and attainment of pupils in the same way as all other state-funded schools.

Key statutory requirements:
All academies are required to be inspected in accordance with the Education Act 2005 under
"The Framework for School Inspection from September 2012".
To ensure a consistent approach to inspection of all "academy family" schools, i.e., new
sponsored academies, Free Schools, Studio Schools and University Technical Colleges
(UTCs) opening since September 2011, are inspected under section 5 of the Education Act
2005 in their second year of operation. Other academies will be inspected broadly in line with
their existing inspection history and expected timescales. Ofsted uses risk assessment to
select for inspection those schools where it has concerns about performance and no longer
routinely inspects outstanding primary and secondary schools.

Summary of requirements under the funding agreement:
For academies a "Special Measures Termination Event " occurs when Her Majesty's Chief
Inspector (HMCI) gives a notice to the Academy Trust in accordance with section 13(3) of the
Education Act 2005 (the "Special Measures Notice") stating that in his opinion special
measures are required to be taken in relation to the academy. This means that the Secretary
of State, having followed appropriate procedures, could decide to terminate the funding
agreement of an academy in special measures. This would not necessarily mean that the

school would close. Alternative governance arrangements could be put in place to ensure improvements, and this is the most likely outcome.

Accountability in Academies
Marriott, D. 2011. David Marriott LTD.
http://www.thegovernor.org.uk/freedownloads/acadamies/Accountability%20in%20Academies.pdf

The author's reflections on Academy governors' accountabilities:

According to the National Governors' Association (NGA) "Academies are exempt charities and companies limited by guarantee which require different financial accounting and accountability mechanisms. Converting schools need to be clear about the regulatory requirements for Academies and ensure that they have appropriate mechanisms in place to meet them.

The principles of governance are the same at an academy as at a maintained school. However the difference is that all academies are charitable companies and as such have a trust body. The trust body is the over-arching accountable body and may have the ability to appoint the majority of the governing body. The respective responsibilities of the trust body and the governing body will be set out in the Articles of Association. The model Department for Education Articles of Association assumes that in single converter schools the members of the governing body will also be the directors of the company and the charity trustees.

The Companies Act does not require private companies (which is how Academies are classified in Company law) to have a Company Secretary. There are specific returns relating to companies which have to be submitted annually to Companies House and the Directors will need to ensure that there are systems in place for the submission of these returns. Directors can be held personally liable if these returns are not submitted."

So, the key message is that "the principles of governance are the same at an academy as at a maintained school", which implies that the accountability for maintained schools described above applies equally to Academies. In addition, Academy governors and Trusts have to abide by certain other legal and reporting requirements.

The academy sponsor role
Webpage accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/typesofschools/academies/sponsors/a00209715/academysponsorrole

Sponsors make a huge contribution to academies, bringing drive, expertise and capacity as well as experience from a wide variety of backgrounds and sectors. A good sponsor can play a pivotal role in turning round and improving the life chances of pupils in some of the most disadvantaged and under-performing schools in the country.

Sponsors come from a wide range of backgrounds. Some are existing academies, primary schools, grammar schools or further education institutions with excellent track records in improving performance.

Some are organisations such as dioceses, universities, businesses, charities, independent schools, educational foundations or faith communities and some are individual philanthropists with strong interests in improving education. All bring a record of success either in education or other enterprises and a diverse range of experience and expertise. What unites them is a passion for educational excellence and opportunity and capacity to bring it about.

Sponsors are held accountable for the improving the performance of their schools. They do this by challenging traditional thinking on how schools are run and what they should be like for students. They seek to make a complete break with cultures of low aspiration and achievement. The sponsor's vision and leadership are vital to each project.

Sponsoring a school involves taking responsibility for its performance and finance. As such, there is a process to go through to ensure all staffing, legal, land and financial issues are properly and transparently agreed before the new academy opens. The prospective will be supported throughout this process. As well as support and advice, financial assistance may be available for new sponsors, which have been approved by the Office of the Schools Commissioner, who demonstrate a need for help to build capacity to sponsor underperforming schools. For more information about becoming a sponsor email the Office of the School Commissioner.

The first stage is to complete an Academy Action Plan. This is the document setting out the challenges at the school, and an action plan as to how the sponsor will tackle those challenges to dramatically improve performance at the school. Once this has been signed off by the Minister, the next stage can begin. This is when the legal issues are agreed between the sponsor and local authority, including the staffing structure, land transfers and financial agreements. Administrative work is also completed during this stage, including registering the new academy with examination boards, carrying out any Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks and establishing new contracts for services such as HR.

Once this work is complete, a funding agreement is signed to formally transfer leadership of the school from the local authority to the sponsor. On signing the funding agreement, the sponsor will become responsible for the new academy and can start putting their vision into action.

Financial Management in the Department for Children, Schools and Families
National Audit Office, 2009.
http://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/0809267.pdf

Academies are directly accountable to the Department for Education, but there is currently no reporting of their financial performance to Parliament. The Academies sector is growing at a significant rate, with the number of Academies planned to increase from 132 as at January 2009 to a final number of around 400. Local authorities do not have responsibility for Academies and if they encounter financial difficulties, the risk falls directly on the Department. As part of the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Bill, the Department plans to move the funding of Academies to a new agency, the Young Person's Learning Agency. The Department's new agency should prepare an annual report for Parliament on the performance of the Academies sector, including an audited consolidated account for Academies.

The Role of School Governing Bodies
Education Committee – Second Report
http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmeduc/365/36508.htm

Emma Knights of the National Governors Association observed that: the whole issue of more autonomy, as you have in the academy sector, by definition means more risk and it therefore means you absolutely need better governors.

The evidence received by the committee showed a lack of clarity about—and varying degrees of support for—the different models of governance that exist within academies. Dr

Bridget Sinclair of National Co-ordinators of Governor Services (NCOGS) commented that "there is a concern about the more complex models of governance that we are seeing, and a study should be made of the vulnerabilities of those models"

It is up to academies to decide how governance will work, subject to approval by the Secretary of State. In academies, the principal sponsor, or Trust members (who are the owners of the company) appoint the majority of governors. Many witnesses expressed concern at the threat to genuine accountability this may pose. NCOGS commented that "there are concerns that some of the governance structures within non LA maintained schools may remove the decision making powers away from local governors, thereby impacting their ability to effectively govern the school and provide the independence to hold senior leaders to account". The Association of Teachers and Lecturers also warned "it is vital that the voice, knowledge and expertise of local governors is not lost".

The Academies programme: Progress, problems and possibilities
Curtis, A. et al. 2008. Institute of Education.
http://thegovernor.org.uk/freedownloads/acadamies/Sutton%20Trust%20on%20Academies.pdf

A distinguishing aspect of Academy schools can be seen as their independence from the local authority. This autonomy was seen as central to facilitating innovation in Academies. Yet this has led to some criticism that Academies are largely unaccountable, and damaging to neighbouring schools. Academies' autonomy has been, to some extent, curtailed by recent reforms. However, whilst this reduction in the autonomy of Academies has been welcomed by some, it has been criticised by others as diluting the original concept.

The freedom available to Academy principals has led to instances of visionary leadership in terms of innovation and pedagogy. However, there is a potential danger that the most talented head teachers will be drawn away from other state schools into Academies. The National Audit Office found that Academy principals are paid on average between £18,000 and £32,000 more than those in the maintained sector.

Although there have been sponsors in other types of schools, for example Specialist Schools, the power of an Academy sponsor is considerable. This includes the right to appoint the majority of the governing body and having ownership of the estate.

A comment from one forum contributor on the Local Schools Network forum raises an important point:"It seems very odd that the ultimate power in academies lies not with the Governing Body, representing parents, staff, community etc, but with its Trust Board…..the Trust Board (normally just 3 or 4 people) is accountable to nobody and has no accountability"

The author concludes:
On the face of it, governors' accountability in Academies is poorly defined and understood, lacks formal, strong mechanisms to ensure compliance and is in danger of being weakened still further as Academy chains grow larger and more powerful.

Academy governing bodies - A strategic approach to monitoring and evaluation
Kanpta, D. No Date. SSAT
http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED525542.pdf

Academies are state-funded independent schools and they have greater flexibility than maintained schools. However their key consideration in deciding how to operate, and on what to focus besides their legal requirements, is achieving and maintaining school improvement.

'The Academy Principals' Handbook'
(http://www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk/academies/publications/?version=1) includes a section on governance and makes the following point:
'The broad aims and objectives of governance in Academies are no different from that of maintained schools and much of the existing guidance for maintained school governors will be helpful to Academy governors. However, it must be emphasised that in some respects, largely legal and structural, Academies are in a different position, and guidance that is aimed at maintained schools must be used with this in mind'.

The Articles of Association for each academy provide explicit information about how the governing body should be constituted and how decisions should be made. The Ofsted document 'Academies. Supplementary guidance for section 5 inspection of academies' http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Forms-and-guidance/Browse-allby/Education-and-skills/Schools/Supplementary-guidance-and-resources notes:
'The role and influence of the governing body, and particularly the academy sponsor, make governance different in an academy. Time should be set aside to interview the sponsor and/or their representatives'.

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector has made it clear that:
'On section 5 inspections of academies, inspectors are required to make a specific judgement on 'The extent to which governors and other supervisory boards discharge their responsibilities'. Inspectors initially use the issues from the school self evaluation form and records of the governing body's work to investigate how effectively governors hold the school to account and ensure compliance with legal requirements'.

The governing body should be central to deciding the academy's values and vision. It makes decisions that impact on children, staff, parents and carers and the wider community. It should bring a strategic approach to planning, monitoring and evaluating performance to ensure that the values are embedded and the vision achieved.

Governors themselves are evaluated by Ofsted. One strand evaluated: is how rigorously governors and supervisory boards challenge and support leaders and managers, holding them to account for tackling weaknesses and further improving outcomes for all pupils.

d) Organisations

Specialist schools and academies trust (SSAT)
Website accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.ssatuk.co.uk/ssat/programmes-support/academies/

SSAT promote and provide a range of networking opportunities for all types of academy stakeholders including headteachers of sponsored and converter academies, sponsors, governors and business managers.

They state that: The government's intervention strategy of choice, in its efforts to address under performance in schools, is, of course, to create academies. Initially limited to secondary schools in disadvantaged urban communities, the programme has expanded hugely over the years and now includes secondary, primary, all-through and special schools.

Independent academies association (IAA)
Webpage accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.iaa.uk.net/

The Independent Academies Association (IAA) is the national representative membership organisation for leaders of academies and other state-funded independent schools. They are

a non-partisan organisation committed to supporting members in the advancement of the education and life chances of all students in their care. An acknowledged and respected national body, they are 'the voice of academies', run by and on behalf of their growing membership. They play a leading role in the development of the wider academy movement, providing help, support and advice to existing, new and converting academies. They are the only independent organisation dedicated to supporting academies and have a track record of over 20 years experience in providing leadership to state-funded independent schools. They are regularly consulted by government and opposition on matters relating to educational policy. Their Board of Directors is elected from highly experienced Academy Principals, Executive Principals and Chairs of Governors. They hold meetings three times a year with the Minister who holds the Academies portfolio, and interim meetings with senior civil servants, in order to represent members' views to government.

In this key lobbying role, they work to secure amendments to Education Bills and other relevant legislation and respond to government consultations on a range of issues, stating the case for academies. Membership of the IAA offers exceptional networking opportunities and provides a support mechanism for member academies, enabling problems and challenges to be discussed and best practice solutions to be identified.

Anti Academies Alliance
Website accessed: 28/7/13
http://antiacademies.org.uk/

The Anti Academies Alliance is a campaign composed of unions, parents, pupils, teachers, councillors and MPs.

They state:
Academies are schools that are run by a private sponsor. They are outside of the local family of schools, not accountable to the local community, allowed to set their own curriculum and terms and conditions for staff. We oppose the government's Academies programme and believe we need 'a good school for every child'.

Freedom and autonomy for Schools – National Association
Website accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.fasna.org.uk/home

FASNA is a national forum for self-governing primary, secondary and special schools and academies. It is the only national association that expressly represents the interests and views of all self-governing schools (foundation, foundation with trust, voluntary-aided and academies). FASNA has an Executive Board with elections structured to ensure equal representation of primary and secondary representatives, including heads and governors as well as clerks to governing bodies.

FASNA represents the interests of self-governing schools to Government Ministers, as well as to the Department for Education, the National Employers' Organisation for School Teachers (NEOST), unions and other groups in the educational field including the Education Funding Agency (EFA), and the School Funding Implementation Group (SFIG). FASNA also makes contact with all the political parties to ensure that FASNA's views are understood as party policy is developed.

FASNA promotes autonomy for schools to enable them to raise standards for students. The philosophy believes that autonomous schools are the best vehicle to support creative leadership and school strategies that respond to the needs of the local community. It believes that this is the best way to raise standards.

Alongside increased autonomy FASNA also supports schools in working cooperatively with a variety of agencies and different groups.

3. Adopted schools, Pakistan

This section is presented in the following sub-sections:
   a) Case study
   b) Organisations
   c) Research

a) Case study

Case Study: SMB Fatima Jinnah Government Girls School in Karachi
Text adapted from a telephone conversation with Sana Kimazi from the Zindagi Trust

The Zindagi Trust have not adopted a school in the same way as the model in Sindh. Their model is to try and reform government schools by using as many of the existing resources as possible. They work with the system which is more challenging but there is a greater chance of replication. They obtained a transfer of management certificate for a pilot school, SMB Fatima Jinnah Government Girls School in Karachi. It has 2400 female students. They are currently managing one school but the idea is to replicate the model across the province. They are currently in the process of taking on another school.

With transfer of management Zindagi have been able to provide training and support to teachers, and improve buildings and facilities.

One of the freedoms the school enjoys is permission to teach whatever books they want. This is controversial in Pakistan because of the political or religious nature of some texts. Certain exams are the same so texts for them have remained the same. But in other areas and years they have introduced new books and developed some of their own materials. Chess is taught in the school and has been accepted although there are questions that it is an un-Islamic activity. A sexual and reproductive health course has been introduced despite controversy. It was discussed with parents and teachers so that questions and issues could be discussed and everyone was on board.

They have undertaken building maintenance such as replacing desks and refurbishing bathrooms. Most government schools have more space than private school. They are increasing utilisation of outdoor space for sports activities. Within schools there were rooms that were filled with junk which have been cleared and converted. They created an art room, a library, a computer lab and an audio visual room for educational films.

Adopted schools in Sindh have been welcomed by the government as they are aware that there is a problem with current schooling. Similarly, when Zindagi approached the government with their idea to take a school and turn it around with their own resources the government agreed. Although there is transfer of management they still need government approval in some areas. They lobby the government constantly and report success to promote replication of the model. There has been little resistance from the government who do not feel the need to regulate the Zindagi school or other 'adpoted schools' as they accept that schools were previously inadequate and are improving under different management. Many programmes the government are on board with and approval is not needed. The government are proud of the Zindagi school and they bring visitors there.

Accountability of teachers is not well defined. There has been some tension as most teachers are still employed and paid by the government and this is a significant obstacle for Zindagi to

be taken seriously. Some teachers have issues with accepting authority from another organisation. Government school teachers jobs are like the job of a government official and some have been working for many years without analysis of their performance. They feel threatened by having their attendance and performance monitored by outsiders. Sometimes a government official has to be brought in to instruct resistant teachers. Younger teachers tend to be more motivated.

The school environment has been improved for teachers to increase motivation. They have provided: drinking water facilities, a staff room and kitchenette, and day care for teachers with young children. They have also experimented with changing school hours with longer hours during the week to allow Saturdays off but preferences for working hours differ among teachers. It is uncertain that these changes have made a difference. Giving teachers ownership has seemed a successful approach. Teachers have been given a project management roles within new facilities or subject coordinator roles. They have been offered some involvement in management. They have a teacher appreciation day every term with a dinner and this recognition is appreciated.

The school has seen improvement in grades. There have been students winning prizes in competitions which were traditionally won by children from elite private schools.

Another Zindagi project streamlined a number of separate schools that were located on the same site so that resources could be shared more efficiently.

b) Organisations

CARE Adopted Government Schools
Website accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.carepakistan.org/adopted.html

In 1998, CARE pioneered a public-private partnership with the City District Government of Lahore whereby CARE would adopt 10 non-functional government schools. The public education system suffers from low student performance, student and teacher absenteeism, lack of a broad and need-based government policy and woeful infrastructure. Government schools most commonly constitute the lowest rung of the ladder in the field of education. The non-functional schools that CARE adopts are the worst of the worst. They have poor facilities, low teacher and student attendance and occasionally no boundary wall or toilet.

CARE's adoption includes the operational control of schools with a CARE Internal Coordinator working side-by-side with the Government Principal. For urgent infrastructure needs, such as building a boundary wall for a Girls Primary School, CARE will incur the capital expenditure itself. CARE provides new teachers for the adopted school who work side-by-side with government teachers. As CARE starts its involvement with a government school, increased oversight and accountability influences the government apparatus at the school and increases the standard of government teachers. As a result of its collaborative approach, CARE provides government teachers access to the same teacher training programs as teachers employed by CARE. We have a professional management structure.

CARE provides management oversight through its network of Internal Coordinators, Cluster Managers and Area Managers. There is one Internal Coordinator stationed at each school, providing day-to-day management of teacher standards, attendance, timetables, lesson planning, hygiene and other issues. Cluster Managers oversee 5-6 schools each and work in close collaboration with the government. They oversee academics, manage performance and visit the same school every 2nd or 3rd day. Cluster Managers report up to Area Managers, who have executive leadership responsibility over the management and academic performance of their schools. CARE manages its adopted schools through this network of experienced, talented and professional employees.

Over the years, CARE has enhanced its burgeoning reputation as a credible and capable government partner. Their performance has allowed them to strike deals with local governments across Pakistan. In 2013, they plan to extend their reach across Pakistan by adopting 3 more government schools in Karachi and taking on schools in Jacobabad, Khairpur and Hyderabad in Sindh. They are expanding their presence in South Punjab, in Muzaffargarh, Dera Ghazi Khan and Rajanpur. Going along with their tradition of taking on the toughest challenges, they are actively looking for opportunities to enter Balochistan.

Change in Education
Website accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.change.org.pk/

Change in Education has structured a comprehensive "Adopt a School Program", where it aims to adopt, rehabilitate, enrich, refurbish ad reform government and community school across rural and peri-urban areas in various districts of Pakistan. We aim for quality education delivery in these areas through a school reform program that is consistent with existing school, social, cultural, religious and national norms with improved school facilities, teaching & learning standards and resources. Our aim is to work in partnership and in support of District/Provincial/Federal Government schools, Donor Community, PPAF, National Education Stakeholders, Non Governmental, Community, Rural Support Groups and Organizations to help foster sustainable change in education development, excellence, delivery, access and quality.

Seed Pakistan, Mashkoor Hussain comments
- School education in Pakistan is a provincial government subject. Adopt-a-school is an approved policy of the Educational Department of the Government of Sindh. An independent organisation is established by the name of Sindh Educational Foundation (www.sef.org.pk) which is authorised to complete this process for adopting of government run schools by private individuals and NGOs. In this policy, there is no significant authority given to the adopter. The adopter is responsible for preparing a quarterly development plan which is approved by Sindh Education Foundation.
- It is reported that there are 49,000 government run schools in the province of Sindh and only 500 schools have so far been adopted. The resistance and process delays are obvious. It is the school management which means the headmaster/headmistress and mid-level administration that cause the majority of delays in agreeing towards adoption, getting the documentation and approving the paperwork. In principal, they are resistant to change because their under-performance will be exposed.
- School adopters have the right to provide additional private teachers to the schools to meet the gap in quality and quantity of teaching staff. Adopters have no right to demand the government teacher to perform according to their standard. However, we can provide additional incentives and motivation to the government teachers to perform at par.
- Teachers are intact as per the policy of the Adopt-a-school programme. According to the policy, if the adopter complains three times about the same teacher, then disciplinary action can be taken.
- There is a performance committee for the Adopt-a-school program at the Sindh Education Foundation which monitors and assesses the performance of these schools.
- There is no relationship between an adopted school and the central government as education in Pakistan is not a Federal program, rather a Provincial program.

- Adopted schools enjoy the freedom to: develop and implement school development plan and monitor progress on targets; participate in trainings and; facilitate quality initiatives in school.
- As a responsible citizen of the society, many individuals and NGOs want to adopt a school to promote and improve education and literacy around the country. This is a personal commitment and dedication towards uplifting and building society.
- Professor Anita Ghulam Ali is the MD at Sindh Education Foundation and you can reach her directly at aasp@sef.org.pk for further insights into Adopt-a-School programme.

Ghazali Education Trust
Website accessed: 31/7/13
http://get.org.pk/what_we_do/school-sponsorship-program.html

Ghazali Education Trust (GET) is providing quality education in rural areas of Pakistan. Where the majority of people are poor and needy they do not have the capacity to pay fee for their children. In last few years the prices of all commodities have increased and the consumption level of ordinary people decreased, people are hardly maintaining their livelihood. In this situation it is difficult to increase fees in schools. While on the other hand, we are compelled to raise the teacher's salary as well. Income from schools is very low that's why GET contributes funds to run these schools. So, there is a great need to bridge these gaps in order to achieve 100 % literacy and 0% drop outs. It's not the responsibility of Government alone to do so. It's the joint responsibility of Government and the citizens to improve the situation. The situation demands for a huge public private partnership. Philanthropists, NGOs, Universities and Corporate should adopt the schools to bridge the gaps that are mentioned and convert them to model school to achieve the mission "100 % literacy and 0% drop outs.

Objectives:
1) Bridging the gap between rural and urban Pakistan for positive social relations.
2) Focusing on efforts in improving the academic quality by getting rid of financial constraints.
3) Mobilizing individuals, communities, and private sector involved in school sponsorship.
4) Fulfilling the running cost of a school.
5) Encouraging maximum enrolment, regular attendance and reduction of the dropout rates.
6) Making targeted investments in schools to increase the effectiveness of their existing programs and resources.
7) Increasing involvement of parents and communities through extensive community mobilisation.
8) Regulating school monitoring and feedback.
9) Increasing/improving co-curricular activities in the school.
10) Provide training of teachers to improve quality of teaching
11) School adoption session will be from July 1st to June 30th.

Procedure:
1. Any Ghazali Education Trust School can be adopted by anyone who agrees with the vision, mission, and objectives of the Trust.
2. It is highly recommended to give priority for adoption to the school listed by department Pakistan Rural Education Programme (PREP).
3. The school will be allocated on first come first serve basis.
4. One donor can adopt one school or more than schools.
5. Minimum adoption period is one year (July 1st to June 30), but a period of three years for school adoption is highly desired.

6. Donor will pay the adoption cost till 30th August for July 1st to June 30.
7. On adoption, a letter of thanks, donation receipt, school adoption certificate, and school profile will be sent to the donor.
8. The school adoption is a cost to fulfill the running cost of a school, and does not involve construction.
9. The school can be named to anyone proposed by the donor.
   For example:
   - Ghazali education Trust School
   - Village Name
   - Donor Name Campus like Khalil Ahmad Campus
10. GET has responsibility to manage and administer the academics, finances, human resource, training etc of the school.
11. The donor will be updated about the progress of the school on yearly basis. However one would select any mode to monitor or evaluate the whole process.
12. GET always welcomes the one who adopts a school or its representative to visit, discuss, and share the school's issues, but the donor will not be involved in any administrative roles.
13. A request for school re-adoption will be sent to the donor at least till May 31.
14. GET will wait for two months after adoption expiration to hear from the donor. If the school is not readopted, it will be opened to everyone for adoption.
15. In case of re-adoption, it is preferred to renew the same school adopted by the donor.
16. If a school is already adopted, it is suggested to give another school from the same district.
17. The donor will be notified about any issue and problem that the school is facing.
18. In case of school closing, the donor will be properly informed, explaining the reasons of school closing; and he/she will be given another school as an alternative.
19. Following are the proposed break up of sponsorship amount

Millennium Roots Schools. Adopt a School Program
Website accessed: 28/7/13
http://www.millenniumschools.edu.pk/adoptschool.php

Roots Millennium School has structured a comprehensive "Adopt a School Program", where it aims to adopt, rehabilitate, enrich, refurbish ad reform government and community school across rural and peri-urban areas in various districts of Pakistan. They aim for quality education delivery in these areas through a school reform program that is consistent with existing school, social, cultural, religious and national norms with improved school facilities, teaching & learning standards and resources. Their aim is to work in partnership and in support of Change in Education/District/Provincial/ Federal Government schools, Donor Community, PPAF, National Education Stakeholders, Non Governmental, Community, Rural Support Groups and Organisations to help foster sustainable change in education development, excellence, delivery, access and quality.

Zindagi Trust's Adopt-a-School Initiative
Ganesh, U. 2011. Searchlight South Asia newsletter
http://urbanpoverty.intellecap.com/?p=67

Commentary from this article includes:

Zindagi Trust adopted SMB in 2007. It was considered one of the better public schools in Karachi. When Zindagi Trust took over running the school, there were eight separate schools operating from the same campus in two shifts. Each of the eight schools had a different principal, and teachers came and went at will, as there was no accountability. The campus was home to stray dogs, its grounds were leased out for weddings and functions and

neighboring residents treated the campus as a garbage dumping ground. Conditions within the school were no better – there was no drinking water, corridors were dark and damp, classrooms were wasted and used for storing broken furniture and had live and exposed electric wires. A hole in the ground served as the toilet.

Civil and infrastructure improvements were the first tasks the trust embarked on. Classrooms and corridors were tiled, computers and filing cabinets installed, corridors were well lit, water filters and sewage lines installed and round-the-clock security guards were engaged to provide a safe and clean environment. A well-equipped library, an art room and a conference room for teacher meetings and training came next. Weddings were banned, and stray dogs were removed from the premises. The eight schools were merged into one entity. Teachers, who claimed they remained absent or came in late due to concerns regarding their own children, were given a solution. The Trust built a daycare center on-campus for the children of teachers, and strictly monitored late arrivals and absenteeism. Zindagi Trust and its technical partner, the Book Group, a not-for-profit education research outfit, together raised around PKR 40 million (~US$465,000) to bring about these improvements at SMB. They also roped in Barclays Pakistan to sponsor a teacher-training programme.

In addition to improving school infrastructure and facilities to students, Zindagi Trust, along with the Book Group, replaced outdated textbooks with innovative textbooks that aimed to develop thinking skills in children. While English was taught using modern techniques, the focus was on developing analytical skills using the local language, which was found to be more efficient. Under new management and a motivated staff, SMB is now considered on par with Pakistan's private schools. Parents are opting out of private schools where they paid fees to the completely free education at SMB.

c) Research

Whose Public Action? Analysing Inter-sectoral Collaboration for Service Delivery Identification of Programmes for Study in Pakistan: Initial Notes and Methodology
Bano, M. 2007. International Development Department.
http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/government-society/idd/research/non-state-providers/pakistan-programmes.pdf

In the Adopt a School Programme model, a New School Programme (NSP) takes over the management of the government schools. The number of such cases is still limited. One reason for this is that most NGOs are donor dependent and cannot take on the responsibility of running state schools unless they get a donor-funded project to support this. In this regard, a significant push is coming from USAID, which so far is the only big donor that is supporting NGOs to take over schools under the Adopt a School Programme.

USAID has engaged the Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy, a national level NGO, to administer a programme of three-way partnership to adopt government schools. In this programme, a business concern is asked to provide financial support to take over the government school, and make investment in developing its infrastructure. USAID in turn finances PCP administrative costs and those of the NGO which is selected to mobilize the community to contribute to the running of the school. Thus, the partnership is between the corporate sector, a local NGO, and the government school. However, this is not necessarily a naturally developed alliance but is especially brought together by PCP, with support from funds from USAID. In this approach the state doesn't give up the management of the school or staff; the private sector puts in resources, and the community contributes.

The National Education Foundation and its provincial counterparts are also approaching prominent corporate entities to take part in this programme. However, the number of such initiatives is relatively limited and none of the bigger NGOs interviewed, expect a few

exceptions discussed below, appeared enthused about the idea. Some big NGOs are also concerned that under this programme the better run state schools rather than the poorly performing ones are being taken out of the state system as the private sector is not interested in taking over the worst cases. This allegedly is further weakening the state schooling system.

For the Adopt a School model, other terms are also being used. For example, many call it School Improvement Programme or School Upgradation Programme. The main defining feature of this programme is that the NSP is given the right to support the school either through improving the infrastructure facilities or getting involved in school management. How exactly the private sector engages in management, however, varies. The rise of this model/programme is embedded in debates over improving quality of schooling in state schools.

Adopt a School involves a more diverse range of nonstate providers. There have been examples of individual philanthropists taking over a school; philanthropic organizations like CARE taking over hundreds of schools; there are corporate philanthropists involved in sponsoring schools; and finally there are Rural Support Programmes taking over hundred of schools. Education Foundations, especially Sindh Education Foundation, have played a key role in introducing this model. Anita Ghulam Ali the head of Sindh Education Foundation (SEF) is regarded as the initiator of this programme in her tenure as Minister of Education for Sindh. Very few NGOs, i.e. those reliant on donor aid, are actively involved in this programme. Apart from ITA (Baela Jammel's NGO) it is difficult to identify any big education NGO which is involved in this programme.

Whose Public Action? Analysing Inter-sectoral Collaboration for Service Delivery Pakistan: From case studies back to programme level
Bano, M. 2008. International Development Department
http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/government-society/idd/research/non-state-providers/pakistan-stage5-report.pdf

This document looks at adopted schools in the context of inter-sectoral collaboration for delivering education services.

4. Private management of public schools

Public–Private Partnerships: Implications for Primary Schooling in Pakistan
Farah, I. & Rizvi, S. 2007. Social Policy & Administration, Volume 41, Issue 4, pages 339–354
http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2007.00557.x/abstract;jsessionid=4B4A234A20E4B37686FAEB784B12228B.d03t03?deniedAccessCustomisedMessage=&userIsAuthenticated=false

Since the early 1990s, the government of Pakistan has promoted a policy of public–private partnerships to increase access and improve the quality of education in Pakistan. This article describes the evolution of the policy and discusses a variety of partnership arrangements aimed to establish and govern primary schools. It suggests that, while partnerships have positive outcomes and may be a viable option for resourceful communities, they are located in a hierarchical structure and lack equal distribution of power and trust between partners. Partnerships are often temporary and established for the purpose of a transition to privatisation. These problems make them an unlikely strategy for a sustained increase in the chances of access to good-quality schooling for the poor and disadvantaged.

Center for Education Innovations
Webpage accessed: 31/7/13
http://www.educationinnovations.org/program/public-private-partnerships-education

The Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy (PCP) in 2012 launched the Public Private Partnerships for Education (3Ps) program to promote school improvement in rural schools of Sindh Province. Under the 3Ps model, an individual, citizen group, or corporate philanthropist voluntarily commits to sponsoring interventions in an adopted public school in underserved areas. PCP acts as technical advisor, providing facilitation of this matching process free of charge.

Once the donor outlines a budget it is able to allocate for the improvement of its selected school(s), PCP convenes meetings with relevant stakeholders in the target area, including the school, district education governing bodies, School Management Communities (SMCs, which in Pakistan serves to link a school's management with the community it serves), and other community-based organizations (CBOs), to promote engagement and ownership. The PCP then conducts an assessment of the school(s) to develop a final School Improvement Plan.

Improvement plans could include interventions such as:
- Infrastructure improvement (including construction, water/sanitation, electrical wiring, etc.);
- Provision of teaching and learning materials and furniture;
- Facilitation of administrator or teacher trainings;
- Formation or training for improved functionality of SMCs.

After the donor's final review and approval of the plan, a tripartite partnership agreement between the sponsor, district government and PCP is signed. Throughout the implementation of the School Improvement Plan, the SMCs of each school monitor the interventions to ensure cohesion with school and community needs.

In order to engage potential corporate donors, PCP develops comprehensive informational material about the project and its goals, as well as short education profiles for each of Sindh's 23 Districts, which provide information on current facts, gaps, and missing facilities in order to assist a potential corporate donor's decision making. A District Education Improvement Manual has also been developed that provides a roadmap of how public school adoption will be carried out and the roles and responsibilities of District Officials, CBOs, PCP, and SMCs. Finally, PCP conducts regular meetings and workshops with all relevant stakeholders to ensure continuation of accountable improvement processes.

State Takeover, School Restructuring, Private Management, and Student Achievement in Philadelphia
Gill, B. et al. 2007. RAND Coorporation.
http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2007/RAND_MG533.pdf

In 2002, the state of Pennsylvania, frustrated by years of low achievement and a decade of budget crises in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP), took charge of the city's 200,000-pupil system. The state replaced Philadelphia's nine-member school board with an appointed School Reform Commission (SRC) composed of three members appointed by the governor and two appointed by the city's mayor. The SRC then hired a new CEO who immediately instituted sweeping changes, including the implementation of district-wide common curricula and a system of frequent benchmark assessments to be used for diagnostic purposes. More controversially, the SRC adopted a "diverse provider" model as it turned over management of 45 of the district's lowest-performing elementary and middle schools to seven for-profit and

non-profit organisations, including two local universities; the private managers were given additional per-pupil funding to support their work. For the last four years, Philadelphia has been the site of the nation's largest experiment in the private management of public schools. Philadelphia's experience may have implications for schools and districts across the country: State takeover and private management are two of the interventions that can be applied to chronically low-achieving schools and districts under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

In addition to privately managed schools, the diverse provider model in Philadelphia also included two groups of low-achieving schools that were given special support and/or funding while remaining under district management. At the same time the SRC brought in the private managers, it "restructured" an additional 21 low-performing schools, providing intensive staff support and extra per-student funding, and provided 16 other schools that were perceived as improving (and became known as the "sweet 16") with increased funding but no additional intervention.

Philadelphia's diverse provider model borrows from theoretical models by which districts promote internal competition through school choice and the establishment of clearly distinguished alternatives, but the district's implementation diverged from the theory in important ways. The Philadelphia model was characterized by little competition among providers and by the absence of parental choice among the educational models offered. In addition, continued district involvement in provider schools and mandated districtwide initiatives constrained provider autonomy. As a result, the providers' education improvement strategies looked more similar than might have been predicted. Consequently, Philadelphia's experience should not be viewed as a definitive test of private management under competitive conditions.

Risky Business. Private Management of Public Schools (Book overview)
Richards, C.E., Shore, R. & Sawicky, M. 1996. Economic Policy Institute.
http://www.epi.org/publication/books_riskybizintro/

The key findings that emerge from this study are the following:
- Actual experience in contracting out the management of public schools to business firms is rare. Business firms seeking such business are start-ups that have yet to demonstrate expertise. There remains no empirical evidence that such arrangements can improve public education, while failed experiences to date have cost communities money, time, effort, and morale. For reformers in search of *proven* innovations or demonstrated cost savings, contracting is the wrong option. It can be approached only as an experiment.
- Genuine competition is yet to be seen in the market for education management services. For contracting to provide the economic benefits commonly ascribed to it, governments must have a variety of choices and organize the contracting process to exploit competitive forces. Local governments have not been sensitive to the prerequisites for competition in education contracting, thus raising basic questions about their capacity to master the education market.
- A basic requirement for any educational reform, including contracting out, is establishment of an information system that will gather and report baseline data on student achievement and make possible rigorous evaluation of educational practices. To date, the limited efforts at contracting out have not placed a priority on information gathering or evaluation.
- There is no evidence that education contractors possess proprietary approaches to instruction that are superior to proven methods already in the public domain. The absence of such a rationale for private contracting diminishes the plausibility of the claim that business firms can simultaneously manage schools successfully, reduce public costs, and turn a profit.

- An important source of appeal for contractors has been offers to advance funds to their potential customers for such things as upgrades in physical plant and computer facilities. The lure of investments, however, reflects the frailties of local government finance more than any inherent advantage in contracting. Contractors are not the bankers of choice for local governments.
- One of the best-known exponents of contracting out management is Education Alternatives Inc. (EAI). However, EAI has failed to establish a reputation for corporate responsibility, to take effective control of the schools under its purview, to produce improvements in educational outcomes (despite the advantage of additional resources), or to demonstrate that it can make money managing public schools. To date the bulk of the company's cash flow has been derived from stock offerings and financial speculation.
- Using competition to advance education reform remains an interesting idea that deserves fair and rigorous trials. Recommendations on ways to approach contracting is offered without forgetting that other pathways to reform are available as well. In any case, we do not take vouchers, contracting, or other market devices to be suitable substitutes for public policies that push schools to meet higher standards of accomplishment. Leadership and support from state and national government will be crucial to the success of education reform.

The chapters in this book adopt different approaches to the evaluation of business management of public schools. Chapter 1 is a comprehensive survey of the practice of contracting out in public education, and provides a broad historical background for the U.S. education system as a whole. Chapter 2 conducts a close financial analysis of the current industry leader in the field of educational contracting, Education Alternatives Inc., and an in-depth budgetary analysis of EAIs arrangement with the city of Baltimore, Md. Chapter 3 draws from Shore and Richards to consider how economic theory and practical experience inform the concept of contracting out the management of public schools. The final chapter focuses on the policy implications of the author's findings.

Private Management of Public Schools. Early Experiences in Four School Districts
US General Accounting Office, 1996.
http://www.gao.gov/assets/160/155446.pdf

The four school districts, visited for this study, gave their private management companies varying authority and responsibilities which are outlined. The report outlines the experiences in implementing different private management and the benefits from private management efforts.

5. Additional information

Author
This query response was prepared by **Laura Bolton l.bolton@ids.ac.uk**

Contributors
Bill Watkin, SSAT
Sana Kazmi, Zindagi Trust

About Helpdesk reports: The HEART Helpdesk is funded by the DFID Human Development Group. Helpdesk reports are based on 2 days of desk-based research per query and are designed to provide a brief overview of the key issues, and a summary of some of the best literature available. Experts may be contacted during the course of the research, and those able to provide input within the short time-frame are acknowledged.

For any further request or enquiry, contact info@heart-resources.org

HEART Helpdesk reports are published online at www.heart-resources.org