

Appendix C

Central Bedfordshire Learning Transformation Programme - Detailed Options Appraisal (For Dunstable and Houghton Regis)

1	DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL SUMMARY FOR ‘OPTION 1’	2
1.1	HIGH LEVEL OVERVIEW OF OPTION 1	2
1.2	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK (PER THEME) FROM THE DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL PROCESS FOR OPTION 1	3
1.3	CORPORATE CAPACITY TO DELIVER OPTION 1	10
2	DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL SUMMARY FOR ‘OPTION 4’	15
2.1	HIGH LEVEL OVERVIEW OF OPTION 4	15
2.2	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK (PER THEME) FROM THE DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL PROCESS FOR OPTION 4	16
2.3	CORPORATE CAPACITY TO DELIVER OPTION 4	23
3	DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL SUMMARY FOR ‘OPTION 3’	27
3.1	HIGH LEVEL OVERVIEW OF OPTION 3	27
3.2	SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK (PER THEME) FROM THE DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL PROCESS FOR OPTION 3	28
3.3	CORPORATE CAPACITY TO DELIVER OPTION 3	30
4	HIGH LEVEL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS	31
4.1	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS FOR OPTION 1	31
4.2	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS FOR OPTIONS 4	33
4.3	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS FOR OPTIONS 3 (OVER AND ABOVE OPTION 4)	35
4.4	GENERAL EQUALITY ISSUES TO CONSIDER FOR ALL OPTIONS	36

1 Detailed Options Appraisal Summary for 'Option 1'

1.1 High Level Overview of Option 1

This option offers a continuation of the current pattern of provision but with schools supported to formally engage in hard federations, Academy chains and/or trusts to secure transitions and improve outcomes. These partnerships are to be developed across phases or as all through schools. To support the Council's statutory responsibilities for the delivery of its School Improvement Plan this may still include the closure of schools on the grounds of small school size, minimising transitions, reducing surpluses and improved governance focussing on schools that are below a new floor standard or are otherwise causing concern based on local intelligence or Ofsted.

Implementation Considerations:

- Manage surpluses by reducing Published Admission Numbers (PANs) and mothballing accommodation on school sites until it is required with later growth in the area.
- Needs to promote the federation of rural schools geographically to tackle the considerably high cost per pupil of small schools.
- No immediate capital investment required.
- When standards improve and/if current pupil loss (lower through to upper) is reversed, rebalancing provision would require an extra 2 Forms of Entry (FE*) at Upper = £4.7M (CBC/basic need).
- Infill development requires expansion of existing Middle/Upper Schools - £13M (S106).
- Major growth would require new Lower, Middle and Upper Schools - £52M (S106).

*Note: * FE relates to the forms of entry to a school i.e. the number of classes in each year group based on a standard number of 30 pupils per class.*

Opportunities:

- Partnerships built around a common ethos and vision.
- Robust data management.
- Common curriculum (horizontally and vertically).
- Workforce development, enhanced recruitment and retention.
- Shared teaching resource and best practice.
- Could provide a common governance structure and shared resources i.e. resourced partnership development officer

- Could be developed around 5-13 and 13-19 models of provision, aligned with the development of the UTC

1.2 Summary of feedback (per theme) from the Detailed Options Appraisal Process for Option 1

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 1
1. Effect on Standards and School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets LA Educational Vision (in part). • Common curriculum (horizontally and vertically). • This option also meets White Paper objectives around schools autonomy, and is line with the direction of where education is going with the Coalition Government. • This option is the one most likely to lead to school improvement in the area, with potential to improve continuity and progression, due to minimal structure change and need to develop strong and effective relationships and federations. • However, there are no guarantees this option will lead to raising standards (historical data), as there is insufficient evidence that school structures influence school improvement but rather having good strategic leadership is the key ingredient for success (which this option aims to deliver on). • The success of this option also relies on the schools being willing and able to develop relationships / linkages to federate. However, schools can choose who they federate with (which partners), which is not strategic from a CBC perspective. • Provides an opportunity to link outstanding schools with schools in need of support, thereby helping improve diversity in the area. • Enables partnerships to be built around a common ethos and vision, providing an opportunity to have informal common governance around: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – SEN – PRU – Back office functions – Child protection and other common policy frameworks – Staffing and expertise – Curriculum development and coordination – Peer support and challenge • Could ensure robust data management.

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workforce development, enhanced recruitment and retention in innovative models. • Shared teaching resource and best practice. • Reduced risk of turbulence and disruption – especially for children and families in D&HR area, where this option offers minimum disruption where instability is more likely to feature prominently in their lives. • Maximises existing expertise regarding Governance, with fewer Governors required overall. • It also enables more efficient planning of places and gradual management of population growth to meet the needs of parents/children (i.e. shaped by parents). • Builds on work already underway by some schools in the area, which have already started discussions about creating formal links/relationships to help and support each other. Provides framework to broker discussions between the other schools in the area. • As this option is a continuation of the existing structure, the proposal should have no negative impact on extended services (which will no longer be a requirement for LAs as a result of the Education Bill). In fact, there may be opportunities to use any surplus accommodation by schools and extended services rather than mothball them until increased demand for places is realised via growth. • Early Years - improved liaison on transitions between Early Years and Lower Schools/Nursery Schools resulting from the possibility to develop Federations. • This option provides framework for services to be delivered locally. • Three tier perceived as not successful – from outside the LA (e.g. Ofsted). • Without very clear communication messages about the changes/benefits linked to this option, there is a possibility that Members/Parents may have a perception of “no change”. • Any further movement of schools to academies in the area will result in the LA having reduced funds (for every school that converts) to support the schools causing concerns. This reduction in DSG funding would only be accelerated by this option, as it provides a framework to support schools switching to academies.
2. Types of Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option is the only one that emphasises partnerships, trusts and / or academies as a necessary part of improving standards. • Under this option, CBC would remain the freeholder of the majority of schools ensuring consistency in the condition of school buildings.

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 1
3. School Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structures alone do not ensure effective partnerships. • This option has synergy with the financial imperative facing schools. • This option provides a mechanism for smaller schools to develop partnerships across phases or as all through schools, in order to make them more financially viable. • In cases where existing accommodation is currently used in schools with surplus places, these could either be mothballed or used for other school-related activities. • Whilst this option does not formally involve the closure of any schools, it does not exclude the possibility especially where partnerships are developed across phases or as all through schools – where it may include the closure of schools on the grounds of small school size, minimising transitions, reducing surpluses and improving governance and facilitating partnerships. • Ensures school size for existing upper schools remains unchanged, which is a benefit as school leaders within the review area have expressed concerns that large upper schools (up to approx. 2500 in option 3) are not workable with the leadership structures currently in place. • Addresses the need for a minimum number of pupils in order to employ sufficient staff for specialist teachers at KS3 and “primary” teachers at KS2, by ensuring schools are of a sufficient size. • Retains access to extensive educational and sporting facilities at an earlier age than would be the case under option 4.
4. Need for Places	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables more efficient planning of places (including surpluses) and gradual management of population growth, by reducing Published Admission Numbers and mothballing accommodation on school sites until it is required with later growth in the area. • Also enables early planning based upon retention of the current system to manage growth via the Masterplanning process (i.e. offers more certainty for strategic planning).
5. Impact on the Community and Travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option is the least disruptive to known travel patterns to and from schools in the area, as well as any existing community relationships. • Staff travel between school sites will depend on how any new partnerships are setup, but has the potential to result in some additional staff travel between federated/linked schools (in order to manage the school timetable).
6. Specific Age	<p>This option has no significant impact on specific age provision.</p>

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 1
Provision Issues	
7. Funding and Land	<p><u>Capital Costs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No immediate capital investment required. • However, when standards improve and/if current pupil loss (lower through to upper) is reversed, rebalancing provision would require an extra 2 FE at Upper = £4.7M (CBC/basic need). <p><u>Important Note</u> - There will be additional capital costs associated with growth, but these will apply to all of the options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infill development requires expansion of existing Middle/Upper schools - £13M (S106). • Major growth would require new Lower, Middle and Upper Schools - £52M (S106). <p><u>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding:</u></p> <p>As this option involves schools being formally engaged in federations, the Children’s Services Finance Team and the relevant schools would need to discuss and understand whether the linked schools should be treated as one governing body, as this would result in a single budget share. Any revenue savings to DSG funding resulting from this option would remain in the schools budget for redistribution to other schools.</p> <p>The specific revenue issues related to this option would include (but not limited to) the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated resource to oversee and help broker and develop the required partnerships between schools – potential to seek support of the Schools Forum to request funding for a ‘Partnership Development Officer’ post. • Federated schools may cut ‘per pupil’ costs, leading to more efficient use of resource. • Joint funding of staff for working partnerships including specialist teaching and services and “back office” functions thereby improving recruitment and retention and capacity to deliver

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not cut operating costs in smaller schools. • May result in continuation of additional cost of assessment moderation, data collection and analysis for Yrs 4 and Yr 8 which are non-statutory. • Associated costs of mothballing surplus accommodation. • Associated redundancy costs – which could involve DSG funds being top-sliced. • Possible additional costs associated with inter-school transport due to new federations. • Possible safeguarding costs. • Possible teacher support costs as backfill for any school teachers needing to spend time developing the necessary Partnerships.
8. Special Education Needs (SEN) Provision	<p>A separate review is already underway for Special School provision that includes schools within the Dunstable and Houghton Regis area, so is excluded from this document for the purpose of the review.</p> <p>However, it is important to highlight that this option will not have an adverse effect on current SEN provision in the area. In fact, it could provide an opportunity to develop more robust SEN provision in mainstream schools via formal partnerships.</p>
9. Other Issues	N/A
10. Property, School and Site Specific (Local Factors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involves minimal physical changes to sites. • Negligible impact on travelling to schools and subsequent movement of staff during the school day. • The impact of this option on the environment will depend on the current state of the buildings; however it should provide opportunities for federated/linked schools to make improvements in their energy management (e.g. joint procurement, sharing best practice etc....). • Where a hard federation is implemented a school is likely to want to re-structure. This may involve a streamlining of the leadership team and/or support staff, which may result in fewer posts available. In these cases, appropriate HR processes will need to be followed (e.g. consultation, recruitment, re-skilling, redeployment, redundancies, etc....) • There is a risk that this option will result in a faster reduction of DSG funding being directed to the LA, due to the potential of accelerated number of schools opting out of LA control to become academies. This is due to the fact that DSG funding is linked to the pupils, so every time a school opts out of LA

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 1
	<p>control to become an academy, the overall proportion of funding will reduce each time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any changes to school organisation resulting from this option will need to take into consideration CBC transport policy as set out in the Sustainable Models of Travel to Schools and Colleges Strategy (SMoTS) section of the Local Transport Plan 2011-2026. All transport implications should be fully investigated and considered as part of the process (e.g. need to consider cycle parking provision, dropping off areas for bus users and separate pedestrian, cycle and vehicular entrances to the schools). • If any proposals involve changing the school sites, the value of land and property will need to be assessed based on published Market Rates and Values. <p>There are a number of HR considerations related with proposals that could arise from this option, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In most cases where a school becomes part of a Trust or an Academy the TUPE regulations would apply. HR involvement (in summary) would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Attendance at staff and union consultation meetings Support to governors, headteachers and LA in respect of the process – Preparation of due diligence information – Administration processes • HR Services are purchased by schools on annual basis and will be charged per employee from 1 April 2011 with additional charges for consultancy work. A reduced number of schools buying back the service will impact negatively on income but this would be countered in part by increased staffing in other schools should there be a need to recruit additional staff as a result of increased pupil numbers. There would be an increase in demand for consultancy services charged at £85 per hour. • The Local Authority (LA) has a role as the employer in respect of the TUPE process where a community school is becoming an Academy/ Trust. There would be no charge for consultancy in respect of 'employer' related work. • Where a member of staff is deployed into a post attracting a lower salary or in the case of Teachers, a lower Teaching and Learning Responsibility safeguarding/ salary protection is payable. • Staff with over two years continuous service with an organisation covered by the Redundancy Payments Modification Order would be entitled to receive a statutory redundancy payment. Schools are

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 1
	<p>able to determine whether they release pension for teaching staff over 55, schools are required to release pension for NJC staff aged over 55. These costs are normally capitalised so would have an impact on the in year budget and not ongoing (nb there is an ongoing administration cost from teachers pensions to be considered). Where the school is closing finance advice would be required in respect of whether costs could be charged to the budget of the closing school or would need to be met by the LA in this instance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very difficult at this stage to estimate the redundancy and pension costs associated with the proposal. As this would depend on the age profile and length of service of staff within the school. For example, the capitalised pension cost for a female member of teaching staff aged 56 with 21 years service earning £30,726 would be £32,787. The statutory redundancy payment assuming that service is continuous would be in the region of £16,000.

1.3 Corporate Capacity to Deliver Option 1

This exercise relates to the ability of Services to provide support throughout the implementation phase for each of the proposals i.e. how well resourced are these teams to provide change management, communications, consultation, educational planning (workforce and curriculum development), HR and ICT development.

In summary, implementation of this option represents the least amount of additional corporate resource requirements above the current Business As Usual service delivery capacity. However, this option does not represent a nil growth in corporate demand for services supporting these associated changes. Where targeted support is required (e.g. brokering school partnerships), additional resources would be requested from the Schools Forum.

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
Finance	What impact would the proposal have on the Finance Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal (e.g. financial modelling etc...)?	4	No immediate capital investment required. However, when standards improve and/if current pupil loss (lower through to upper) is reversed, rebalancing provision would require an extra 2 FE at Upper = £4.7M (CBC/basic need). This option offers the least amount of change (out of the options) in terms of additional finance team support needed to implement.
HR	What impact would the proposal have on the HR Team in terms of resources, in order to support the HR-related tasks involved in implementing this proposal?	3	The HR function does not currently have the resources to advise and support schools where significant school organisation changes are being proposed. Consideration would need to be given to the employment of additional temporary HR professionals, which could potentially be funded via DSG funds.
ICT	What impact would the proposal	3	The ICT Team could provide support for any

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
	have on the ICT Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?		required changes to infrastructure that arise from this option but this would need to be bought through a buy-back service and planned in with other ICT work.
Property & Assets	What impact would the proposal have on the Property & Assets Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	4	This option offers the least amount of change (out of the options) in terms of additional 'Property & Assets' support needed to implement. Resources would need to be planned according to the works that were required out of any chosen option.
Planning & Building Control	What impact would the proposal have on the Planning & Building Control Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	4	This option offers the least amount of change (out of the options) in terms of additional 'Planning & Building Control' support needed to implement.
School Improvement Team	What impact would the proposal have on the School Improvement Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal	2	The School Improvement Team currently has capacity to broker and support partnerships for those schools causing concern (only). However, there is no capacity within the current team to support the wider requirement (with this option) to broker and develop any new partnerships between schools in the area. To mitigate this, a request could be submitted to the School Forum requesting funding for a dedicated resource i.e. Partnership Development Officer type role.
Transport Strategy	What impact would the proposal have on the Sustainable Communities Transport Strategy	3	This option offers the least amount of change (out of the options) in terms of additional Sustainable Transport Team support needed to implement. In

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
	Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?		fact, the federation of some schools has the potential to reduce the number of Travel Strategy Plans needed in future if and when schools decide to develop these jointly.
Home to School Transport Team	What impact would the proposal have on the Children's Services Home to School Transport Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	4	Any impact would need to be considered on an individual basis.
Integrated Transport Unit (ITU)	What impact would the proposal have on the Sustainable Communities ITU in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	4	Any impact would need to be considered on an individual basis.
Legal	What impact would the proposal have on the Legal Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	4	This option requires little or no additional legal support over and above the existing role of the Legal Team in respect to formalising Trusts and Academies. However, the speed and volume by which schools develop formal partnerships (that may require legal support) could be accelerated, with the potential to add more pressure on the Legal Team resources.
Communications and Consultation	What impact would the proposal have on the Communications Team in terms of resources, in order to	Overall score of 4	See below for individual questions and associated scores/ responses.

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
	<p>support the required communication and consultation activities involved in implementing this proposal?</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the option relevant to one/many/all schools in the area? 		All
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the scale of potential the disruption? (1-5, 5 high) 		1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How complex is the option to communicate/ consult on? (1-5, 5 high) 		1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the option require statutory consultation? If schools are being closed/ merged statutory consultation is required. 		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the consultation process defined in terms of process/ timescale/ stakeholders? 		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so have time and people requirements been assessed? 		N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there capacity within the communications team to continue to deliver within current project work? 		Yes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What impact would this have on delivery of other work/projects? (1-5, 5 high) 		1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What (if any) financial resource is available to fund any related communication/ consultation 		None budgeted in project to support comms/ consultation

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
	activities?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What funding will be required to support the communication/consultation? 		None

2 Detailed Options Appraisal Summary for 'Option 4'

2.1 High Level Overview of Option 4

This option represents a two tier 5-11 Primary and 11-19 model, closing all Middle schools, converting Upper schools to Secondary but limiting each new Secondary in size to the pupil capacity of the former Upper school.

Implementation Considerations:

- Manage surpluses in lower schools by reducing Published Admission Numbers.
- Convert lowers to primaries at new PAN and mothball any remaining surplus accommodation on school sites until it is required with later growth in the area.
- Requires immediate investment of £16.3M (CBC) to convert lowers into primaries at reduced PANs.
- In addition to primary cost above, additional investment required to provide/convert a new secondary on either Kings Houghton or Mill Vale sites = £14.5M (CBC)
- When standards improve and/if current pupil loss (lower through to upper) is reversed, rebalancing provision would require investment of £7M (CBC/basic need) at secondary.
- Infill development would require expansion of primary/secondary schools - £20M (s106)
- Major growth would require new primary and secondary schools - £50M (S106)
- Would leave ability to dispose of surplus middle sites but with constraints outlined below. (excluding Kings Houghton or Mill Vale, whichever used to convert to secondary)

Timescales and Cashflow:

- Expenditure profile (combined primary and secondary costs)

2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Est. £100k rev	£4.5M	£22.3M	£3.4M	£0.5M

- Sept 2013 Lowers retain yr5, middles operate with yrs 6,7 &8, uppers as existing
- Sept 2014 Lowers retain yr6, middles close yrs7,8 &9 transfer to secondaries

- Capital receipts not realised before Sept 2014

2.2 Summary of feedback (per theme) from the Detailed Options Appraisal Process for Option 4

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 4
1. Effect on Standards and School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fits with the current national curriculum. • Needs less Headteachers, Senior Leaders and Governors for 2 tier model. • Fewer points of transfer. • Recruitment and retention could be easier in a traditional model; however the transition and closure of some schools (especially at Middle Schools) will not be good for the morale of current teaching staff. • If there were to be significant building on some Lower School Sites, where there was no Early Years provision it could offer the opportunity to add in this part of the 0-19 equation. • There is insufficient evidence that school structures (e.g. two tier vs. three tier) influence school improvement, which places the capital investment required for this option as high risk. Therefore, the current leadership (which does not lend itself to raising standards) will also need to improve; otherwise a restructure alone will not guarantee better outcomes. • Whilst this option fits with the national curriculum, the current DfE consultation underway might result in a move away from Key Stages and bring a focus to curriculum by year groups. If this is implemented, there is less need to move away from a three tier model, as the current three tier structure would be able to ensure continuity of education by year groups rather than the current mix of schools covering the key stages. • Builds on current underperforming structure at KS3 and above. • Leadership capacity needs to be able to realign to two tier structure. • Risk of substantial drop of standards across all phases during implementation. • For children and family networks in these areas, it could provide disruption where instability is more likely to feature prominently in their lives – change being an initial threat. Time-limited regarding coping with initial change/adjustments for vulnerable children/families. • This proposal does not directly impact on existing Early Years provision. However improved liaison is essential on transitions between Early Years and Lower Schools/Nursery Schools, and this may be

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 4
	more difficult when assimilating two new years of pupils is being undertaken.
2. Types of Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would not add to the diversity of school provision that is operating in Partnerships, Trusts and/or Federations. • Redevelopment of Lower to Primary schools could have potential impact on any Early Years settings or Children’s Centres based on the existing school sites.
3. School Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option will involve changes to all Lower schools, along with the introduction of an additional school at Secondary level (which would be expected to be an Academy). • Restricts access to extensive educational and sporting facilities at an earlier age than would be the case under option 1.
4. Need for Places	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It better supports parental preferences near LA boundaries. • Would leave ability to dispose of surplus middle sites but with constraints outlined below (excluding Kings Houghton or Mill Vale, whichever used to convert to secondary). • The proposals provide an opportunity to ensure a better match between the need for places and the supply, thereby reducing surplus places to a manageable level. • All displaced pupils resulting from this option would be provided for in an alternative 2 tier structures. • As far as Early Years Provision and Children’s Centres are concerned the presence on a site can sometimes mean an under occupied school, and therefore closure on this basis would be a cause for considerable concern.
5. Impact on the Community and Travel	<p><u>Community:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option is more likely to secure greater community involvement as there will be a greater pool of community capacity to draw on for each school (e.g. to support fundraising for school, interaction with wider communities). It therefore provides the potential to establish/coordinate a true ‘hub’ approach supporting wider family/community networks. Conversely, it reduces the diversity of community hubs currently provided by the Middle Schools, which would close under this option. • Limits existing choice and/or parental preferences to existing upper schools, but increases the diversity of provision with an additional fourth Secondary School. • As potentially more parents would be accessing the current Lower School sites, it would mean that

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 4
	<p>more of them would possibly access Children Centre Services for longer, and this would be a benefit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential environmental impact of this option depends on the amount and quality of information and support given to parents about allowing their children to walk, cycle or use a bus (public or dedicated school transport) for the journey to school. If this is done carefully there is a possibility for reducing carbon emissions. However, if this is done as a cursory effort/or of poor quality support and information only, there is a very strong likelihood that the number of journeys to schools made by private cars will increase significantly and increase carbon emissions. <p><u>Travel:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under this option, children will stay on for an additional 2 years in their Lower/Primary schools, before transfer to their new Secondary School. • This option will mean parents/pupils/staff having to significantly change travel patterns and habits, which on the plus side could (if given the right information and support) provide a great opportunity to develop sustainable travel options to pupils new school sites. • However, this option is most likely to result in increased demand on the transport network, potentially leading to increased congestion owing to pupils/parents travelling from further afield: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This may lead to increased CO2 emissions and poorer air quality in localised areas. In addition there may be additional pressures on the highway maintenance programme. – Increased competition for staff car parking spaces, parking on site in areas not dedicated for parking (this may have implications for emergency service access also), increased on-road parking in the areas adjacent to schools and subsequently complaints from local residents. – Significant increase to the number of car journeys made for the school run, with ‘knock-on’ consequences such as increased congestion, poorer health, poorer air quality and an increased need for road maintenance. • The possible additional transport costs incurred by non teaching staff could outweigh their level of pay and hours of work, which may reduce the financial benefits of employment.
6. Specific Age Provision Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matches with the majority of school systems nationally. • Fits with the current national curriculum.

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 4												
7. Funding and Land	<p><u>Capital Costs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High (£31M) initial capital cost required to be funded by LA – no national programmes available to support costs (e.g. BSF/PCP). • Capital receipts not realised before Sept 2014. • Included in the figure above is a requirement for an immediate investment of £16.3M (CBC) to convert lowers into primaries at reduced PANs. • In addition to primary cost, additional investment required to provide/convert a new secondary on either Kings Houghton or Mill Vale sites = £14.5M (CBC) • When standards improve and/if current pupil loss (lower through to upper) is reversed, rebalancing provision would require investment of £7M (CBC/basic need) at secondary. <p>• Implementation Timescales and Cashflow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Expenditure profile (combined primary and secondary costs) <table border="0" data-bbox="734 906 1653 976"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">2011/12</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2012/13</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2013/14</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2014/15</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2015/16</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Est. £100k rev</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">£4.5M</td> <td style="text-align: center;">£22.3M</td> <td style="text-align: center;">£3.4M</td> <td style="text-align: center;">£0.5M</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sept 2013 Lowers retain yr5, middles operate with yrs 6, 7 & 8, uppers as existing – Sept 2014 Lowers retain yr6, middles close yrs7, 8 & 9 transfer to secondaries – Capital receipts not realised before Sept 2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any surplus sites would be able to be identified for potential disposal to offset some of the capital costs, although the value of those sites will be dependent on wider planning considerations in terms of possible alternative use and on approval from the Secretary of State to dispose of the sites. • Our desktop study has indicated that converting lowers to primaries at new PANs is problematic with playing field provision and site areas a problem at a number of school sites. • Converting uppers to secondary at existing capacity and creating new secondary, if Kings Houghton site 		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Est. £100k rev		£4.5M	£22.3M	£3.4M	£0.5M
	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16								
Est. £100k rev		£4.5M	£22.3M	£3.4M	£0.5M								

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 4
	<p>is chosen, with give rise to serious concerns over the future viability of All Saints. Recommended option would therefore be to re-use Mill Vale site as 7 FE secondary , but need to provide all weather pitch as playing field is undersized. Alternative would be to limit Mill Vale to 5FE and retain Streetfield as 2 FE (360 pupil) addition to Manshead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where sites would be surplus it should be noted that disposal is subject to a number of constraints and in the first instance requires Secretary of State's approval under Schedule 35A (Academies), which could require the transfer of the former school site to the promoter of a Free School and S77 (disposal of Playing Fields). All of the potential surplus sites will present challenges to their redevelopment and disposal e.g. Listed buildings, conservation area status, open space requirements. <p><u>Important Note</u> - There will be additional capital costs associated with growth, but these will apply to all of the options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infill development would require expansion of primary/secondary schools - £20M (s106) Major growth would require new primary and secondary schools - £50M (S106) <p>In addition, Members will need to be committed (in principle) to any required capital expenditure before they agree to enter into formal consultation on any related options.</p> <p><u>Revenue Costs:</u></p> <p>The revenue costs associated with this option would include (but not be limited to) the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicated LA team (resources) required to manage the Capital Programme and oversee the Change Management process needed to successfully migrate the current three tier model to a two tier on time and within budget without disruption to staff and pupils. Associated redundancy costs – which could involve DSG funds being top-sliced. Additional costs associated with school transport. <p><u>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Funding:</u></p>

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any revenue savings to Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) as a result of any school closures would remain in the schools budget for redistribution to other schools.
8. Special Education Needs (SEN) Provision	A separate review is already underway for Special School provision that includes schools within the Dunstable and Houghton Regis area, so is excluded from this document for the purpose of the review.
9. Other Issues	N/A
10. Property, School and Site Specific (Local Factors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient site capacity at some Lower Schools, specifically playing field provision for expansion to Primary schools. This option would result in greater turbulence to staff and will require more significant HR support (e.g. consultation, recruitment, re-skilling, redeployment, redundancies, etc....). Significant “transitional” arrangements required, in terms of phased implementation of Primary and Secondary provision, pupil journeys, and new Leadership/Management structures. Site area assessments for each of the new primary and secondary schools would also be required to ensure that pupils could be properly accommodated and that standards could be met. Additional capacity would be required at the new primary and secondary schools for which capital funding would need to be found. Further property feasibility studies would be required on the proposed primary and secondary schools (approx. £100K revenue in 2011/12). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of these feasibilities for schools intended to be expanded is to determine the sufficiency of the overall school site and playing fields and to scope any requirements related to planning consent. For schools proposed to close under this option, the feasibilities study will determine the opportunity for alternative use and private redevelopment of each site and therefore the potential value of disposal. However, there are a number of disposal issues related to the following sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Kings Houghton Community School Site may be required to relocate Hawthorn Park

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 4
	<p>as a primary from its current restricted site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) The Brewers Hill School site could be disposed but playing fields linked to Creasey Park so building footprint is only available. c) The Ashton School site could be disposed but is owned by the Diocese and the building is listed. d) The Streetfield School site shared with Manshead Upper School may be required to contribute to the new capacity of the Secondary School. e) The Priory School site could be disposed but is in a conservation area. f) The Mill Vale School site would be required for expansion as a Secondary School. g) The Caddington Village Schools site would be a Primary school in this option.

2.3 Corporate Capacity to Deliver Option 4

This exercise relates to the ability of Services to provide support throughout the implementation phase for each of the proposals i.e. how well resourced are these teams to provide change management, communications, consultation, educational planning (workforce and curriculum development), HR and ICT development.

In summary, implementation of this option represents considerable additional corporate resource requirements above Business As Usual service delivery capacity. If this option were to be the preferred option of the Local Authority (to be subject to full Public Consultation), further detailed evaluation would need to be undertaken to determine final revenue costs.

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
Finance	What impact would the proposal have on the Finance Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal (e.g. financial modelling etc...)?	2	This option would require significant support from the Finance Team (e.g. financial remodelling of budgets, support to HR, and reviewing of existing school funding formulae).
HR	What impact would the proposal have on the HR Team in terms of resources, in order to support the HR-related tasks involved in implementing this proposal?	1	Significant HR issues including redundancies, TUPE and training. The HR function does not currently have the resources to advise and support schools in respect of this process. Consideration would need to be given to the employment of additional temporary HR professionals.
ICT	What impact would the proposal have on the ICT Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this	3	The ICT Team could provide support for any required changes to infrastructure that arise from this option but this would need to be bought through a buy-back service and planned in with

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
	proposal?		other ICT work.
Property & Assets	What impact would the proposal have on the Property & Assets Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	2	This option represents the greatest demand out of all of the options, in terms of additional 'Property & Assets' support needed to implement. Feasibility studies that would be required are currently unbudgeted and a designated project team would need to be established to deliver the scale of capital investment within the implementation timeframe, and to ensure the timely disposal of any surplus sites.
Planning & Building Control	What impact would the proposal have on the Planning & Building Control Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	2	Building Control is resourced sufficiently to cater for phased implementation. However, if Academies or Free Schools instigate their own building programmes there will be a need to assess resources to establish the ability to deliver the Building Control Service.
School Improvement Team	What impact would the proposal have on the School Improvement Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal	1	<p>The School Improvement Team currently has capacity to broker and support partnerships for those schools causing concern (only).</p> <p>There is no capacity within the current team to support this option and implement a two tier system in the area. Additional funding would be required (e.g. from the School Forum) to provide a dedicated Change Management resource/team needed to ensure a successful transition.</p>
Transport Strategy	What impact would the proposal have on the Sustainable	2	This option would require additional support from the Sustainable Transport Team to evaluate the

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
	Communities Transport Strategy Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?		new schools transport plans, recognising a reduction in the overall number of schools but also a change to the age of transfer.
Home to School Transport Team	What impact would the proposal have on the Children's Services Home to School Transport Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	3	Any impact would need to be considered on an individual basis.
Integrated Transport Unit (ITU)	What impact would the proposal have on the Sustainable Communities ITU in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	3	Any impact would need to be considered on an individual basis.
Legal	What impact would the proposal have on the Legal Team in terms of resources, in order to support the planning and implementation of this proposal?	3	As reflected in the commentary relating to HR, Property & Assets, and Communications & Consultation, this option would require additional Legal support above that currently provided within the existing team.
Communications and Consultation	What impact would the proposal have on the Communications Team in terms of resources, in order to support the required communication and consultation activities involved in implementing this proposal?	Overall score of 1 (i.e. this option will involve the most amount of change and support from the Communications	See below for individual questions/responses related to this overriding question.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the option relevant to 		All

Sub Themes	Detailed Appraisal Criteria / Questions	Score (0-5) 5 - can be delivered within existing resource 0 - needs significant external resources	Service Area Response
	one/many/all schools in the area?	Team)	
	• What is the scale of potential the disruption? (1-5, 5 high)		5
	• How complex is the option to communicate/ consult on? (1-5, 5 high)		5
	• Does the option require statutory consultation? If schools are being closed/ merged statutory consultation is required.		Yes
	• Is the consultation process defined in terms of process/ timescale/ stakeholders?		Yes
	• If so have time and people requirements been assessed?		Yes. Timescale known. The Consultation Manager and project team will support.
	• Is there capacity within the communications team to continue to deliver within current project work?		Will mean other projects will not be supported.
	• What impact would this have on delivery of other work/projects? (1-5, 5 high)		5
	• What (if any) financial resource is available to fund any related communication/ consultation activities?		None budgeted in project to support comms/ consultation
	• What funding will be required to support the communication/ consultation?		Some to fund printing, exhibitions and meetings.

3 Detailed Options Appraisal Summary for 'Option 3'

3.1 High Level Overview of Option 3

This option represents a two tier model of 5-11 Primary and 11-19 Secondary schools, closing all middle schools. Each new secondary school would operate across 3 sites i.e. existing upper and two former middle school sites.

Implementation Considerations:

- Manage surpluses in lower schools by reducing Published Admission Numbers.
- Convert lowers to primaries at new PAN and mothball any remaining surplus accommodation on school sites until it is required with later growth in the area.
- This option would require an immediate investment of £16.3M (CBC) to convert lowers into primaries at reduced PANs.
- Infill development would require expansion of Primary schools - £6M (S106).
- Major growth would require new Primary and Secondary schools - £50M (S106).

Timescales and Cashflow:

- Expenditure profile (primary conversion costs):

2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Est. £80k rev	£3.1M	£12.5M	£0.6M

- Sept 2013 Lowers retain yr 5, middles operate with yrs 6, 7 &8, uppers as existing.
- Sept 2014 Lowers retain yr6, middles close yrs7, 8 & 9 transfer to secondaries.
- There will be no surplus sites available for potential disposal / capital receipt.

3.2 Summary of feedback (per theme) from the Detailed Options Appraisal Process for Option 3

Given this option is so similar to option 4, it seems more appropriate to highlight any key strengths and weaknesses that are different to option 4.

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 3 (over and above those captured for Option 4)
1. Effect on Standards and School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large schools potentially attract high calibre staff linked to funding. • More innovative curriculum solutions can be delivered across each secondary's 3 sites. • Risk of substantial drop of standards across all phases during implementation. • Transport and timetable logistics problematic at secondary schools. • Inefficient use of capacity - required to enable timetable and curriculum flexibility across 3 sites.
2. Types of Schools	As per option 4.
3. School Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the changes to all Lower Schools, this option would create three new Secondary Schools based upon current Upper School leadership and each operating across three sites. • Increases current pupil capacity of each Upper School. • Retains access to extensive educational and sporting facilities (on former middle school sites) than would be the case under option 4.
4. Need for Places	As per option 4.
5. Impact on the Community and Travel	<p><u>Community:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As with option 4, this option is more likely to secure greater community involvement as there will be a greater pool of community capacity per school to draw on (e.g. to support fundraising for school, interaction with wider communities). It therefore provides the potential to establish/coordinate a true 'hub' approach supporting wider family/community networks. However, it also retains the diversity of community hubs currently provided by the Middle Schools, which would involve keeping these existing

Decision Makers Theme	Summary of Key Comments – for Option 3 (over and above those captured for Option 4)
	<p>sites under this option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extends choice and/or parental preferences to enlarged existing upper schools, but does not increase the diversity of provision in the area. <p><u>Travel:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per option 4, but also the eventual transfer to their former Middle School site or Upper School site will be reliant upon the curriculum model adopted by the new Secondary School.
6. Specific Age Provision Issues	As per option 4.
7. Funding and Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infill development would require expansion of Primary schools - £6M (S106), compared with £20M (S106) associated with the expansion of primary and secondary for option 4. • This option does not provide any sites for potential disposal / capital receipts.
8. Special Education Needs (SEN) Provision	A separate review is already underway for Special School provision that includes schools within the Dunstable and Houghton Regis area, so is excluded from this document for the purpose of the review.
9. Other Issues	N/A
10. Property, School and Site Specific (Local Factors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides management challenges of staff resources (e.g. transport, timetable management across multiple sites). • Increased potential safeguarding issues with pupils transferring between sites during the school day.

3.3 Corporate Capacity to Deliver Option 3

The requirement for corporate capacity to deliver this option was very similar to option 4, with the exception of:

- Property & Assets – will have less new capacity required at Secondary level and fewer feasibility studies to carry out in relation to potential sites for disposal.
- Planning & Building Control – less involvement required in terms of feasibilities of potential sites for disposal.

As with option 4, the implementation of this option represents considerable additional corporate resource requirements above current Business As Usual service delivery capacity. If this option were to be the preferred option of the LA (to be subject to full Public Consultation), further detailed evaluation would need to be undertaken to determine final revenue costs.

4 High Level Equality Impact Assessment of Options

4.1 Equality Implications for Option 1

Pros:

- This option meets White Paper objectives around schools autonomy, and is in line with evolving education policy of the Coalition Government.
- For children and family networks in these areas, this option offers a reduced risk of turbulence and disruption where instability is more likely to feature prominently in their lives.
- This option is most likely to lead to school improvement in the area – due to minimal structure change and need to develop strong and effective relationships and federations.
- Provides an opportunity to link outstanding schools with schools in need of support, thereby helping improve diversity in the area.
- Enables partnerships to be built around a common ethos and vision., providing an opportunity to have informal common governance around:
 - SEN
 - PRU
 - Back office functions
 - Child protection and other common policy frameworks
 - Staffing and expertise
 - Curriculum development and coordination
 - Peer support and challenge
- Enables the potential for common curriculum development (horizontally and vertically)
- It also enables more efficient planning of places and gradual management of population growth to meet the needs of parents/children (i.e. shaped by parents).
- Builds on work already underway by some schools in the area, which have already started discussions about creating formal links/relationships to help and support each other. Provides framework to broker discussions between the other schools in the area.
- As this option is a continuation of the existing structure, the proposal should have no negative impact on extended services (which will no longer be a requirement for LAs as a result of the Education Bill). In fact, there may be opportunities to use any

surplus accommodation by schools and extended services rather than mothball them until increased demand for places is realised via growth.

- Early Years - improved liaison on transitions between Early Years and Lower Schools/Nursery Schools resulting from the possibility to develop federations.
- This option provides a framework for services to be delivered locally.
- Ensures school size for existing upper schools remains unchanged, which is a benefit as school leaders within the review area have expressed concerns that large upper schools (up to approx. 2500) are not workable with the leadership structures currently in place.
- Addresses the need for a minimum number of pupils in order to employ sufficient staff for specialist teachers at KS3 and “primary” teachers at KS2, by ensuring schools are of a sufficient size

Cons:

- May not raise standards (Historical data), as there is insufficient evidence that school structures influence school improvement (e.g. two tier Vs three tier) but rather having good strategic leadership is the key ingredient for success.
- Success of this option relies on the schools being willing and able to develop relationships / linkages to federate.
- Status quo means limited school facilitated resource enhancing community support networks towards facilitating education/learning attendance.
- Involvement in parent/teacher organisations remains minimum until wider federation approaches influence school’s approaches to involving a broader catchment of families – will it do this?
- Whilst this option does not formally involve the closure of any schools, it does not exclude the possibility especially where partnerships are developed across phases or as all through schools – where it may include the closure of schools on the grounds of small school size, minimising transitions, reducing surpluses and improving governance and facilitating partnerships.

Other Issues to Consider:

- Option will not impact on the provision of Early Years and Children’s Centres on existing sites.
- In cases where existing accommodation is currently used in schools with surplus places, these could either be mothballed or used for other school-related activities.
- This option is the one that is closest to retaining existing known travel patterns to and from schools in the area, as well as any existing community relationships. Staff travel between school sites will depend on how any new partnerships are setup, but has the potential to result in some additional staff travel between federated/linked schools (in order to build and maintain partnerships).

- Where a hard federation is implemented a school is likely to want to re-structure. This may involve a streamlining of the leadership team and/or support staff, which may result in fewer posts available. In these cases, appropriate HR processes will need to be followed (e.g. consultation, recruitment, re-skilling, redeployment, redundancies, etc....)

4.2 Equality Implications for Options 4

Pros:

- Fits with the current national curriculum.
- Staff recruitment and retention could be easier in a traditional model
- Fewer points of transfer for pupils
- If there were to be significant building on some Lower School Sites, where there was no Early Years provision it could provide an opportunity to add in this part of the 0-19 continuum.
- Linking (Social Capital / Community Cohesion) – greater scale/role for school facilitated resource input enhancing community support networks towards facilitating education/learning attendance. Potential to establish/coordinate a true ‘hub’ approach supporting wider family/community networks.
- Community Strength – more likely to secure involvement in parent/teacher organisations - greater pool of community capacity to draw on to support fundraising for school and interaction with wider communities. Need to prevent exclusion of those less likely to take-up this activity.
- As potentially more parents would be accessing the current Lower School sites, it would mean that more of them would possibly access Children Centre Services for longer, and this would be a benefit.

Cons:

- Whilst this option fits with the current national curriculum, there is a DfE consultation underway that might move away from Key Stages and focus on curriculum by year groups. If this is implemented, there is less need to move away from a three tier model, as the current three tier structure would be able to ensure continuity of education by year groups rather than the current mix of schools covering the key stages.
- Need less Headteachers, Senior Leaders and Governors for 2 tier .
- Not good for morale of current teaching staff especially at Middle Schools.
- Leadership capacity needs to be able to realign to two tier structure.
- Risk of substantial drop of standards across all phases during implementation

- For children and family networks in these areas, this option could provide disruption where instability is more likely to feature prominently in their lives – change being an initial threat. Time-limited regarding coping with initial change/adjustments for vulnerable children/families.
- This proposal does not directly impact on existing Early Years provision. However improved liaison is essential on transitions between Early Years and Lower Schools/Nursery Schools, and this may be more difficult when assimilating two new years of pupils is being undertaken.
- As far as Early Years Provision and Children’s Centres are concerned the presence on a site can sometimes mean an under occupied school, and therefore closure on this basis would be a cause for considerable concern.
- Employment - for non teaching staff the possible additional transport costs could outweighing level of pay and hours of work, may remove the financial benefits of employment.

Other Issues to Consider:

- Options should not impact on the provision of Early Years and Children’s Centres on existing sites, however if current lower schools were to expand it could put the site as a whole under pressure, which could in turn put pressure on the presence of these provisions. It would be important to take this into account when undertaking site assessments. On the other hand if there were to be significant building on some Lower School Sites, where there was no Early Years provision it could offer the opportunity to add in this part of the 0-19 equation
- Relationships building is important if the combined catchment areas demonstrate aspects of exclusion/prejudice as identified above
- Maintaining/re-establishing/strengthening connections & networks potential to ensure services and their ability to respond to needs over a wider area. Thought to be given to facilitating off school/outreach utilising wider facilities/venue networks.
- Significant HR issues including redundancies, TUPE and training.
- The management of a re-deployment register - It would be important to ensure as far as possible that schools and academies in the area are ‘signed up’ to the redeployment process. Local Management of Schools prevents the LA from requiring schools to take on redeployed staff from other schools. As a result, the current redeployment policy offers one off sums of money as an incentive to other schools accepting re-deployees. This policy may need to be reviewed in light of current budget constraints.

Equality Implications for Options 3 (over and above option 4)

Given option 3 is so similar to option 4, this section of the report will highlight any key equality implications that are different to option 4.

Pros:

- Large schools potentially attract high calibre staff linked to funding.
- More innovative curriculum solutions can be delivered across each new secondary's 3 sites
- In addition to the changes to all Lower Schools, this option would create three new Secondary Schools based upon current Upper Schools but each operating across three sites. Therefore, this option increases current capacity of each Upper School.
- As with option 4, this option is more likely to secure greater community involvement as there will be a greater pool of community capacity to draw on (e.g. to support fundraising for school, interaction with wider communities). It therefore provides the potential to establish/coordinate a true 'hub' approach supporting wider family/community networks. However, it retains the diversity of community hubs currently provided by the Middle Schools, which would involve keeping these existing sites under this option.
- Extends choice and/or parental preferences to enlarged existing upper schools.
- Retains access to extensive educational and sporting facilities (on former middle school sites) than would be the case under option 4.

Cons:

- Risk of substantial drop of standards across all phases during implementation
- This option does not increase the diversity of provision in the area.
- Provides management challenges of staff resources (e.g. transport, timetable management across multiple sites).
- Inefficient use of capacity - required to enable timetable and curriculum flexibility across 3 sites.
- Increased potential safeguarding issues with pupils transferring between sites during the school day.

Other Issues to Consider:

- The travel implications are similar to option 4, but also the eventual transfer to their former Middle School site or Upper School site will be reliant upon the curriculum model adopted by the new Secondary School.

4.3 General Equality Issues to consider for All options

- This review area has the highest level of schools in Ofsted category or LA schools causing concern and is most vulnerable to the negative impact of change.
- Access to support and learning facilities is key for addressing whole family approach in supporting the Every Child Matters principles – These facilities do not need to be located on the school site, but if they were and joined together in common leadership and management, this could result in improved outcomes for children and families within the area.
- School partnerships created around priority neighbourhoods have a higher potential for supporting and managing vulnerable children and families than could be the case with individual schools.
- Communities in these areas have a strong sense of identity often built through shared social experience such as ‘post code blight’ and ‘reputation’ prejudice. Academies and/or Partnerships must facilitate open catchment and equality of opportunity.
- Denominationally-sensitive opportunities for prayer/worship will need future proofing to be considered with regard to expected housing growth (e.g. rooms available to facilitate broader requirements).