

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet Report

30th October 2008

Report of: Strategic Director, Children Young People and Skills

Title: Primary Review

Ward: Citywide

Officer Presenting Report: Kate Campion Programme Director

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 923 7950

RECOMMENDATION

1. To note the feedback from Full Council on 14 October 2008 (**Appendix 2**);
2. That the principles underlying the primary school review be further endorsed;
3. To approve the recommendations made in the Primary Review to close Stockwood Green Primary School; St. George C.E. V.C. Primary School; and St. Pius X Catholic Primary School as part of Phase 2 of the Primary Review, following extension and refurbishment work at St Michael on the Mount, Burnbush Primary School, Waycroft Primary School and The School of Christ the King. (**See Appendix 1**) subject to this feedback.

Introduction

The Primary School Review has been a major piece of work for Bristol City Council. There has been extensive consultation and a great deal of expert and specialist input into the Review and into the final set of recommendations.

£43m of investment commences with the approval of this report. This is a considerable investment in buildings, but also a re-invigoration of school leadership and management with new patterns of provision and settings.

The recommendations approved by Cabinet on 25th September 2008 were welcomed by a majority of schools, governors, staff, parents etc.

The appendices to this report sets out some of the information but the full extent of this work and the full extent of the consultation and consideration of all the facts can only be fully appreciated by reading all the background papers and previously published reports.

This executive summary seeks to set out the underlying rationale behind the Review and to explain why the specific recommendations have been made.

This executive summary recognises that such a review is complex and contentious but emphasises that it is undertaken to improve primary education across Bristol now and into the future - and thereby the education of primary school children across Bristol.

Structure of the Report

There is always a risk in presenting a complex piece of work of becoming lost in the detail. This executive summary seeks to present this work within a simplified narrative thus

- 1) What is a Primary School Review?
- 2) Why was one undertaken in Bristol?

- 3) How was it undertaken?
- 4) How was the consultation undertaken?
- 5) How were the results of the consultation taken into account?
- 6) How do the different recommendations fit together?
- 7) Why are officers are recommending closure of three schools?
- 8) What would happen if the cabinet did not follow officer recommendations?

1) What is a Primary School Review?

A Primary School Review is a review of the building estate, leadership & management of schools, governance arrangements and school improvement; what we have, where buildings are, how much they cost to run, how much it costs per pupil per year, how well they are doing and whether or not changes should be made to improve the service they provide. The context of this review is primary phase schools across the whole city.

The objective of the review is to improve the education provided to children and in reaching conclusions it is proper to take into account cost and quality of learning.

The principles of the review were agreed by Cabinet on 25th October 2007

There are FIVE key drivers:

1. That school improvement underpins the whole process.
2. The removal of small units of provision which fail to provide value for money – Schools where a cohort is less than one class of children (below 30) is a very expensive provision and fails to provide the range of opportunity we would expect a primary phase of education to offer children.

3. The opportunity to create larger units of provision to provide an opportunity for high quality, skilled, well qualified head teachers to progress in their careers within the city.
4. To challenge the conventional view of a primary school to enable creative solutions to difficult site issues.
5. To link our policy for change to wider, citywide growth and regeneration including an increase and change in the distribution of future housing and population to ensure the service meets demand in the short, mid and long term.

2) Why was a Primary Review undertaken in Bristol?

There are currently 110 primary schools in Bristol and in there are 31,058 children in our primary schools(2007-08). The schools vary in size and vary in their success.

In 2008, SAT results were 74% L4 in English (National 81%) and 72% L4 in mathematics (National 78%). This places us 128th in the league table of councils in England.

Some schools are oversubscribed, with too few places, eg Bannerman Road, Whitehall, Sefton Park and some are under subscribed with over 25% surplus places, eg Sea Mills, Stockwood Green and St Pius.

Schools are financed by government grant, through Bristol City Council and the costs can be broken down to individual children. Thus, it costs £3,115 on average for a primary school child to be educated for one year. In some schools it is much lower, eg Waycroft, an outstanding school as described by OfSTED where it cost £2,649 in 2007/08, in other primary schools it is much higher, eg St George, where it cost £4,017 in 2007/08.

Many of the schools are in a poor condition and not suitable for learning in the twenty first century.

A secondary school review was undertaken between 2001 and 2004. This was not only because it was necessary but also followed conversations with DfES regarding the opportunity to become a BSF

pathfinder. It was absolutely clear that radical changes were necessary. By 2011 these changes will have been delivered and Bristol is already showing significant improvement at the end of Key Stage 4.

Outcomes at Key Stage 2 over the last three years have made it absolutely clear that a primary school review was necessary and once more there is extra funding available if we can demonstrate an holistic approach to planning. A catalyst for this funding is our need to deal with surplus places and standards then we will be eligible for an extra £12million

Further details of this can be found in the Strategy for Change, Cabinet, 29th May 2008.

3 How was it undertaken?

The review began in May 2007 and was followed by a report to Cabinet in October 2007 which confirmed the principles of the review.

The LA met with Head Teachers in May 2007, established a working group of Heads and officers in June and July 2007, and consulted with schools and governors on the principles in September and October 2007.

Following the Cabinet approval, officers took six months to gather and interpret the data before providing schools and governors with LA recommendations on May 22nd 2008 for consultation.

4) How consultation was undertaken?

Consultation was at the heart of the review. We consulted with schools and with governing bodies. The consultation started on 22nd May 2008 and lasted until 18th July 2008. There has been vociferous criticism of some elements of the consultation and it is accepted that initial recordings of views were not accurate. However, that did not affect the quality of the contributions to the debate.

We received 596 responses and 10 e-petitions, some are still running. The details of the consultation can be found summarized in the Cabinet report of 25th September 2008. The recommendations

also went to the Scrutiny Commission on 1st September 2008 for consideration.

Cabinet, on 25th September 2008, approved and decided to refer the issue of the closure of three schools to full council on 14th October 2008, to enable a further open debate, where considerable discussion ensued.

5) How were the results of the consultation taken into account?

The consultation resulted in 22 proposals being confirmed as unchanged. Seven proposals were modified, two new proposals were added to the list identified for Phases 1 and 2 and seven initial proposals were withdrawn.

The detailed responses to the council debate are set out in **Appendix 2**.

6) How do the recommendations fit together?

The Primary School Review recommendations are aimed at improving education across the city now and into the future. It would be a grievous mistake to isolate the issue of the future of the three schools from that wider purpose.

The Primary School Review is not about closing St George, Stockwood Green and St Pius. It is about improving primary education across the city.

Regardless of which ranking of schools we use, Key Stage 2 outcomes in 2008, surplus places, condition of buildings, we have achieved recommendations that meet 86% of the criteria that were agreed. This is significant.

Of the schools below the 65% floor target in 2008 in both English and mathematics, (19 schools) 3 have already been subject to structural change, 10 more are part of the Phase 1 and 2 of the review, 4 further schools have been named for consideration in Phase 3 or before, leaving only 2, not impacted on through the review (Ashton Vale, St Matthias).

Of the schools with 25% or more surplus places(20 schools), 15 are tackled within the review, a further 3 have been allocated Children's Centres to take out capacity and encourage uptake, leaving only 2, not impacted on through the review (Littlemead [recently amalgamated] and Holymead Junior).

Of the schools with the poorest outcome from their asset management survey (worst 25), 14 are part of Phase 1 and Phase 2 recommendations, a further 6 are part of Phase 3 proposals, leaving only 5 not included in the review (Perry Court Infants, St Bernadette Primary, Shirehampton Primary, Southville Primary and Greenfield Primary).

7) Why are officers are recommending to close three schools?

The full argument is set out within the report to Council and the Cabinet Report of 25th September, but put in simple terms

1) Two schools(St Pius and Stockwood Green) are under subscribed. If they are not closed then effectively, other schools will continue to subsidise the education of children at these schools.

2) All 3 schools are expensive to run because there are such a small number of pupils, for the number of staff required to offer a broad and balanced curriculum, the resources needed to support the curriculum and the energy required to run the buildings.

3) If we do not close these schools, then money that could have been re distributed to primary schools across the city, by a formula, will not be used to provide more equality of provision.

It is accepted, that some parents, some children and some teachers oppose the changes. This was clear from the initial consultation, from meetings and from correspondence. Cabinet has a difficult decision to make in proceeding to close any school, balancing local, deeply felt views supportive of a particular school with what is in the best interests of primary school education across the city. Cabinet is recommended to take a strategic view.

8) What will happen if the Cabinet did not follow officer recommendations?

- As the closure of the three schools allows us to develop four other schools (St Michael on the Mount, School of Christ the King, Waycroft and Burnbush), no redevelopment of these schools, or expansion will take place.
- It is not yet known if we have been successful in our bid for the extra £12m from the DCSF. The outcome of the Cabinet decision may impact on this.
- If we do not get the extra funding, the following schemes are at risk, the development of new schools at Cabot (£3.2m), Millpond (£1.5m), and Whitehall (£1.5m), the expansion plans for Air Balloon (£2m), Sea Mills (£1m), Parson Street (£1.5m) and St Nicholas of Tolentine (£1m);
- The rest of the primary estate will not benefit from increased funding. £800,000 will not go to the schools the pupils will move to (take up of surplus places) and all schools will not have an increase in their funding per pupil (£15 per pupil) eg. 420 place primary school will not receive an extra £6,300.

Associated Reports

Cabinet Report 25th October 2007

Cabinet Report 29th May 2008

Scrutiny Report 1st September 2008

Cabinet Report 25th September 2008

Council Report 14th October 2008

Appendix 1

Proposed Recommendations

	Proposal for Consultation	Summary at Response	Final Recommendation
N3	Expand St. Michael on the Mount CE Primary in Phase 2 to be 1.5FE	Positive response, but would like 2FE. Potentially a phase 1 scheme and consideration to 2FE being scoped. Cof E support for scheme	a) Expand St. Michael on the Mount CE Primary in Phase 2 to be 1.5FE/2FE depending on outcome of feasibility
N3	Close St George CE Primary in Phase 2 after the expansion work at St. Michael on the Mount.	Significant response. Proposal to expand to 1FE as ideal for expansion and retain St Michael as 1FE. Expand Hotwells on current site to 1.5FE and then federate all three. Church has funded a feasibility.	b) Close St George CE Primary in Phase 2 after the expansion work at St. Michael on the Mount.
S3	Federate Burnbush Primary School with Waycroft Primary School and close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 creating 2FE at Waycroft until refurbishment and 1FE at Burnbush through expansion, with one leadership team and governance led by Waycroft.	Stockwood Green, large number of responses and a petition to leave the school and the provision in the area as it is. Waycroft are concerned about apparent surplus places. Two solutions a) close both small schools and remodel Waycroft as 3FE b) A new school to replace all three. Burnbush – prepared to collaborate, not federate (note that Waycroft and Burnbush serve communities with very different characteristics and that Burnbush will be a category 1 school).	a) Close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 b) Create 1FE at Burnbush through small expansion c) Refurbishment of Waycroft
S4	A part of the expansion plan for the School of Christ the King (ESP S2) St Pius RC Primary close in Phase 2.	Response from Governors and a petition not close St Pius, however, some responses supporting closure Federation between the two school proposed by St Pius	a) Expand School of Christ the King in Phase 2 to 1.5FE. in Phase 2
S2	Expand School of Christ the King in Phase 2 to 1.5FE.	This can only happen if St Pius closes. Consideration will be given to 2FE during next stage of consultation. Response from Head, welcome opportunity to expand and become at least 1FE, but do not want St Pius to close	b) St Pius RC Primary close in Phase 2.

Council recommendations to Cabinet

1. Consider the lack of provision of reception places in the Stockwood Green area.

There is no evidence of insufficient reception places in Stockwood.

The table below shows how the children on roll in the Reception classes in the three schools in the Stockwood Green area this September could be accommodated in the two schools that it is proposed to retain and improve. It can be seen that all schools would have some surplus places, despite the changes.

September 08 Census Data

	Admission Number	Number on Roll	Surplus Places	Surplus Place %ge
Stockwood Green School	17	7	10	59%
Burnbush School	25	15	10	40%
Waycroft	60	55	5	8%
Totals	102	77	25	25%

Without Stockwood Green School

	Admission Number	Number on Roll	Surplus Places	Surplus Place %ge
Stockwood Green School			0	
Burnbush School	30	22	8	27%
Waycroft	60	55	5	8%
Totals	90	77	13	14%

2. Council asked Cabinet to consider in relation to St George:

- **The failure to identify a site for rebuilding Hotwells Primary School and the likelihood that any new site will be south of the river;**
- **An environmental audit of the sites of St Michael on the Mount Primary School and St George Primary School;**
- **An assessment of how far children will have to travel to their nearest school and the difficulty of that journey;**
- **Changes in school age population in the central area.**

The recommendation to close St George is unrelated to plans for future expansion of Hotwells Primary School. Any expansion of Hotwells Primary School will be to cater for families in the Hotwells, Clifton Wood and Cumberland basin areas of the city. Such plans are deferred until Phase 3 review.

A thorough environmental audit will be necessary as part of the planning process for the exciting proposals for the development of St Michael's primary school. This will include a detailed School Travel Plan. Carrying this out prior to the development of the scheme would simply lead to a delay. Moreover, the true impact of the development will not be known until the final scheme is agreed. This development has the support of Governors at St. Michael on the Mount school, the Diocese and school.

No child in this area will live more than two miles from their nearest school. For many it will be much less. Currently some children attending St Georges School come (as a result of parental preference) from homes much further afield.

Distances between the St George's School site and other local schools by road are:

To St Michael on the Mount School – 0.8 miles

To Hotwells School – 1.0 miles

To Christ Church School – 1.1 miles

To Ashton Gate School – 1.8 miles

All journeys on foot are on street lit footpaths. Where major roads need to be crossed safe crossing points are provided. St Michaels is on a hill – but hills have been a feature of Bristol life since the city’s foundation and cannot be considered a significant barrier to movement.

The changes in the local population of school age children, will be catered for by the increase, to 2FE of St Michael on the Mount Primary School.

Currently, St George Primary School serves a very small local community. It ordinarily admits 15 pupils per year and half come from outside the immediate city centre area. This is illustrated by the following table based on the home post codes of children in this year’s Reception class:

Area	Post Code	Area	No. of Pupils
E	BS5	St Georges / Easton	1
E	BS16	Fishponds	1
E	BS2	Kingsdown / St Pauls	4
E	BS7	Bishopston	0
E	BS15	Kingswood	1
E Total			7
N	BS6	Cotham	0
N	BS1	Centre	3
N	BS8	Clifton	4
N	BS9	Henleaze	0
N	BS10	Henbury	0
N	BS11	Kingsweston / Avonmouth	1
N	BS12	Not used	0
N Total			8
S	BS13	Withywood	0
S	BS14	Whitchurch	0
S	BS3	Bedminster	0

S	BS4	Knowle	1
S Total			1
Grand Total			16

Recent residential development in the adjoining areas has had no discernible affect on the St George's Reception roll. Even if local numbers do begin to rise the proposed associated expansion of St Michael on the Mount would more than compensate for the reduced capacity.

It is true that residential development is continuing on adjacent harbour side sites. However, the new homes are high density flats and as such experience indicates will be predominantly occupied by households without young children.

3. Council asked Cabinet, in relation to St Pius, to consider:

- **The move of the school out of special measures, for which the Council congratulate the school**
- **The growing popularity of the school with local parents - with results and attendance on a steep upward trajectory, the school may well, in just a few years time, be outperforming other schools in the area.**
- **The capacity for expansion of the School of Christ the King.**

Improvement at St Pius is not yet sustained improvement.

The school continues to operate with significant surplus places (and has 12 surplus places in the year's Reception class alone). There is no evidence of increased popularity (as evidenced by the small number of children for whom the school was listed as their first preference). We hope that all schools, accelerated by the outcomes of the Primary Review, will improve significantly in the next few years.

September 09 Roll – 18 (against an Admission Number of 30)

St Pius – 1st Preferences for September 08 entry – 11

The School of Christ the King can expand to 1.5FE or possibly 2FE if demand in Knowle increases.

The School of Christ the King site is undoubtedly small (0.66 hectares). DCSF guidance for a confined site indicates a minimum recommended site area of 0.41 hectares for a school of 1.5FE (315 places). Expansion of that school must be considered feasible, although it may require some replacement of existing buildings to maintain acceptable external areas.

Schools impacted on in Phases 1 and 2 that are below KS2 Floor Targets in 2008 (65% in English and mathematics)

Amalgamation of Connaught and Ilminster Ave	Rebuild and Fresh Start
Millpond	Rebuild and Fresh Start
Cabot	Rebuild and Fresh Start
Bannerman Road	Refurbished, better accommodation to tackle learning environments
Weston Park	Amalgamation with Bluebell nursery – Improved continuity and progression
May Park	Possible new build – Fresh Start
Bishopsworth	Amalgamation with Highridge Infant to secure quality leadership
Upper Horfield	Addition of Children’s Centre
Whitehall	Rebuild and Fresh Start

Schools not impacted on in Phases 1&2, but which have been improved in recent years through LA intervention

Lockleaze	Recently amalgamated
Badock’s Wood	Recently amalgamated
Barton Hill	Recently amalgamated and newly built
Ashton Vale	Possible new build (Fresh Start) after 2013 with urban extension
Perry Court Junior	Discussion regarding wider federation
Hareclive	Discussion with Hartcliffe EY Centre re. federation

Other schools below floor target – currently in Phase 3 or not included in review:

Easton*

Gay Elms

St. Matthias & Dr.Bells* * both schools in areas of greatest need
for places.

Greenfield both schools in areas of deprivation

Therefore, of the 19 primary schools below the current 65% floor target:

9 are being addressed through Phases 1 & 2 of the review

6 are being addressed by other activity in partnership with the LA

2 are in areas of greatest need

2 are not impacted upon

Schools in the worst category for condition and suitability (taken from the Asset Management Plan) categorised by primary review phase.

Within Phases 1 & 2

St. George	Recommended for closure
Victoria Park I&J	Amalgamation and refurbishment
St. Barnabas	Expansion and rebuild
Stockwood Green	Recommended for closure
May Park	Rebuild or refurbishment
Whitehall	Rebuild
Wansdyke	Refurbishment
Waycroft	Refurbishment
Sefton Park Infant	Expansion and refurbishment
Highridge Infant	Amalgamation and refurbishment
Teyfant	Rebuild

Phase 3:

Hotwells	Badocks Wood
Easton	Hillcrest
Gay Elms	Summerhill Junior
Colston's	Broomhill Infant
Shirehampton	

Outside the remit of the review:

Perry Court Infant - Was offered inclusion in review but declined refurbishment through amalgamation

St. Bernadette

Southville

St. Peter & St. Paul

Of the 27 schools in the worst quartile for condition and suitability of buildings:

12 are being addressed in Phases 1 & 2

8 will be addressed in Phase 3 – as proposals stand

2 declined to take forward a recommendation

5 are not impacted on

Schools with > 25% Surplus Places

DCSF No.	School		Net Capacity	Roll	Surplus Places	SP %age	Where review addresses
2072	Sea Mills Infants' School	N1	150	51	99	66%	Yes
2071	Sea Mills Junior School	N1	260	100	160	62%	Yes
2337	Bank Leaze Primary School	N1	315	148	167	53%	Yes
2016	Oldbury Court Primary	EC2	362	189	173	48%	Yes
3413	St. Pius Xth Primary School	S4	210	116	94	45%	Yes
2015	Hillfields Primary School	EC2	369	209	160	43%	Yes
2086	Upper Horfield Primary	N2	204	116	88	43%	Yes
2320	South Street Primary School	S1	210	124	86	41%	Yes
2014	Henbury Court Primary School	N2	363	225	138	38%	Yes
2315	Weston Park Primary	N1	350	227	123	35%	Yes
2010	Fonthill Primary School	N2	333	218	115	35%	Yes
2124	Burnbush Primary School	S3	189	128	61	32%	Yes
2070	St. Annes Park Primary	S3	203	140	63	31%	
2084	Two Mile Hill Infants School	EC2	225	156	69	31%	Yes
3432	Little Mead Primary School	N2	315	226	89	28%	
2026	Ilminster Avenue Primary	S2	351	253	98	28%	Yes
2097	Holymead Junior School	S3	440	320	120	27%	
3002	Bishopsworth CE VC Junior	S1	206	151	55	27%	Yes
2142	Stockwood Green Primary School	S3	119	89	30	25%	Yes
2111	Highridge Infant School	S1	150	113	37	25%	Yes



COUNCIL MEETING

DATE: 14 October 2008

Report of: Strategic Director, Children Young People and Skills

Title: Primary Review

Ward:Citywide

Officer presenting report: Kate Campion, Programme Director,
Transforming Learning

Contact telephone number: 0117 923 7950

RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

- a)** notes the key principles within established policy (Cabinet decision of 25 October 2008, CAB 19.10/07 refers) for the Primary Review – to reduce surplus places, support improvement in standards, provide extra places where needed and to improve overall value for money;
- b)** notes the submission of the Primary Strategy for Change approved by Cabinet on 29 May 2008 (CAB 4.5/08 refers) embodying the principles of the Primary Review;
- c)** notes the approval by Cabinet on 25 September 2008 (CAB 21.9/08 refers) of revised proposals in line with decisions CAB 19 . 10/07 and CAB 4.5/08;
- d)** notes that these Cabinet decisions around the Primary Review have proceeded without recourse to ‘call in’ by any member of Council;
- e)** notes the cross party support given by the Children’s

- Services Scrutiny Commission on 1 September 2008 to the principles informing the Primary Review and the emerging final proposals;
- f) advises Cabinet to proceed with closure proposals involving St. George CofE VC Primary School, Stockwood Green Primary School and St. Pius X Catholic Primary School in a way consistent with the Primary Review and paragraphs a) to e) above which have received the support of Cabinet and Scrutiny.

Summary:

On 25 September 2008 Cabinet (CAB 21.9/08) considered the recommendations of the Primary Review, and opportunity to make a difference to primary education in Bristol.

Thirty-one recommendations within the Primary Review Phase 1 and 2 have been approved by Cabinet to go forward for consultation and delivery. **(See Appendix B).**

A decision on the Phase 3 recommendations has been deferred until 2011, when a further review will determine what changes have to be factored in, due to population and housing growth.

Cabinet requested that the three recommendations listed in **Appendix A** be submitted to Council for discussion before they go back to Cabinet on 30 October for a final decision. Each of these three recommendations are linked proposals and each decision will impact on the potential delivery of the whole proposal.

The significant issues in the report are:

- A framework for the Primary Review was approved by Cabinet in October 2007 (CAB 19.10/07) (Paragraph 1.1, refers). This followed consultation with schools and identified the following key issues; reduction in surplus places, support for improving standards, the need for extra places and overall value for money.

- The Primary Strategy for Change, the precursor for releasing funding from the DCSF, was approved by Cabinet in May 2008 (CAB 4.5/08) (Paragraph 1.3, refers). The Strategy for Change reflects the framework above as the justification for an extra £12m of capital grant. If the framework identified in the Primary review is not reflected in practice, the money will not be available and other recommendations in Phases 1 & 2, approved by Cabinet for development will be postponed, including the development of new schools at Cabot (£3.2m), Millpond (£1.5m), and Whitehall (£1.5m), the expansion plans for Air Balloon (£2m), Sea Mills (£1m), Parson Street (£1.5m) and St Nicholas of Tolentine (£1m);
- The Primary Review will be implemented in three phases (Paragraph 2.1, refers);
- In Phase 2 it is recommended that three very small schools close and that they are replaced by the expansion of other schools. If the closures do not take place the Council will be unable to expand and improve Burnbush (which would become 1 full form of entry per year [1FE], with adjoining Children's Centre); improve Waycroft (an outstanding school); expand The School of Christ the King (a rapidly improving school in Knowle West) or St Michael on the Mount (which would be re-modelled with the support of the Church of England Diocese at 2FE).
See Appendix G.

Policy

Council Corporate Plan 2008 – 2011

Our City: Ambitious Together-

- **Sharing in our City's prosperity** – The primary review will contribute to the prioritisation of actions that tackle the root causes of disadvantage by ensuring there are places where the need is greatest;
- **Our city: together** – The primary review will contribute to the building of strong and positive relationships, bringing together

people from different backgrounds and circumstances in schools and within local neighbourhoods;

- **Our green city** – The primary review contributes to the quality of life for residents by undertaking the development and refurbishment of schools in a sustainable way, and tackling climate change by reducing CO2 emissions from the schools.

Our City: Making a Difference –

- **For efficient, responsive services** – the primary review aims to deliver quality learning environments, accessible to local people and providing value for money educational provision, where all schools are given more equality of provision;
- **For children and young people** – the primary review will ensure that, with our partners we will deliver the best possible outcomes for Bristol’s children, young people and families, including:
 - Raising attainment at all key stages;
 - Improving attendance and reducing exclusions;
 - Re-building and refurbishing schools;
 - Providing new and linked Children’s Centre’s.

Our City: Safer and Healthier –

- **Healthy lifestyles: healthy communities** – the primary review will contribute to improving the health and wellbeing of the city’s population through investment in school kitchens, play and sports facilities, as part of the wider capital investment programme in schools.

Our City: Better Neighbourhoods

The primary review will contribute to ensuring that Bristol residents experience significant change in the physical quality of their neighbourhoods by making a substantial capital

investment in primary schools, including external landscaping and ensuring the extended function of these schools meets community needs.

Consultation

Internal:

- Children's Services Scrutiny Commission
1 September 2008 (CS 36.9/08);
- Cabinet
25 September 2008 (CAB 21.9/08)
- BCC departmental teams

External:

- Citywide consultation from 22 May 2008 to 18 July 2008 - including: schools; parents; neighbouring authorities; the Bristol Diocese; Clifton Diocese; Academies; partnership organisations; and the community.

Context

1. Introduction

FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

1.1. On 25 October 2007 Cabinet (CAB 19.10/07 refers), approved a framework for the future of primary school provision within the city.

1.2. The framework had been developed following a process of engagement with primary school head teachers and other partners that began in May 2007.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING

1.3. On 29 May 2008 Cabinet (CAB 4.5/08) approved the submission of the Primary Strategy for Change (PSC) to the DCSF. This document is a prerequisite to the release of £12m additional funding available between 2009/11 from the 'Primary Capital Programme'. The PSC is subject to approval by the DCSF. The DCSF instructed the City Council to address the following key priorities within the PSC:

- Increasing levels of attainment;
- Reducing surplus places;
- Support areas of high need.

1.4. These priorities were reflected in the Primary Review Recommendations.

2. Background Information

2.1. The review of primary provision was identified as a necessary strategic programme because overall standards in primary schools in Bristol are too low. Contributory factors include the suitability and condition of buildings, the high percentage of surplus places in parts of the city, the need for places in other parts of the city to ensure children of primary age can attend a local school, and, the distribution of funding that is not equitable across the city. Consultation centred on a range of proposals within an implementation model in three phases:

- Phase 1 2008 - 2010;
- Phase 2 2010 - 2013;
- Phase 3 post 2013.

2.2. Consultation in relation to specific schemes in Phase 1 and Phase 2 are currently being implemented following Cabinet approval on 25 September 2008. The Phase 1 & 2 recommendations propose the rebuilding of six schools (Cabot, Whitehall, Teyfant, Millpond, St Barnabas and Connaught/

Ilminster Ave), the expansion of five (Westbury on Trym, Sefton Park, Air Balloon, St Barnabas and Bannerman Rd), and the refurbishment of 19 others. **(See Appendix B).**

2.3. Recommendations to close three schools (Stockwood Green Primary School; St. George C.E. V.C. Primary School; and St. Pius X Catholic Primary School) have been deferred for consideration by Full Council. They are all linked to expansion/refurbishment projects for other schools).

2.4 If these schools are not closed, then the associated school(s) in each proposal will not be developed. The Council will be forced to devise alternative closure proposals in order to ensure that Bristol City Council can access the additional funding, and meet our strategic intentions for primary provision that helps all children in Bristol schools achieve their potential.

3. Proposal

It is proposed that:

- **Stockwood Green Primary School** is closed in Phase 2 (2010-13) of the Primary Review after the expansion of Burnbush Primary School (at 1 FE) and at the same time as refurbishment of Waycroft Primary school.

The South 3 Area has a surplus capacity of 434 places (13%). Over the next ten years it is envisaged that the roll will change by only +4%. There is a requirement to reduce the capacity in this area.

The Primary Review proposes that Burnbush Primary School is expanded to 1 FE (30 children per year group, currently 25).

Stockwood Green Primary has a capacity of 119 places (17 places in each year group – less than one full form of entry) with only 89 pupils on roll (January 2008). The school has 30 surplus places (25% of the schools capacity). It costs £3,979 per child per year, in part because of the high number of surplus places and because of the high cost of maintaining the

building and the expense of teaching resources for such a small cohort of pupils. The proposal would remove 12 surplus places per year group. Neither Burnbush nor Waycroft can be expanded or refurbished if Stockwood Green does not close.

The school ranks 5th worst in terms of the condition of the building in meeting the DSCF's BB99 Suitability, Condition and Sufficiency requirements.

The Local Planning Framework indicates there are potentially 8,000 new homes to be built in Bath and North East Somerset, and 1,500 in Bristol, in the Stockwood area (a decision about location has not been confirmed). As an approximation, for every 1,000 new homes there will be a class of 30 children per year group. Waycroft and Burnbush schools have enough space to expand if needed to support housing development in the Stockwood area.

- **St George's C.E. V.C. Primary School** is closed in Phase 2 following the expansion of St Michael on the Mount C.E Primary School at 2 FE in Phase 2.

The North 3 Area has a surplus capacity of 2%. Over the next ten years it is envisaged that the roll will have a change of +6%.

Pupil numbers at St George C.E. V.C Primary School are broadly static. There is no evidence that the increase in homes in the area has generated occupancy by families with children of school age. A significant proportion of children attending St George's come from outside the local area. There is scope and opportunity to expand the St Michael on the Mount C.E Primary School. This is supported by the Bristol Diocese. (**See Appendix G**). St Michael on the Mount cannot be expanded and remodelled if St George's does not close.

St George's has a capacity of 94 places (15 places in each year group – less than one full form of entry). It costs £4,017 per child per year, in part because of the high cost of maintaining the building and the expense of teaching resources for such a small cohort of pupils.

The school ranks 1st worst in terms of the condition of the building in meeting the DSCF's BB99 Suitability, Condition and Sufficiency requirements. The school operates from two very restricted sites and (judged against DCSF premises standards) no satisfactory expansion or refurbishment scheme has been identified.

- **St Pius X Catholic Primary School** is closed in Phase 2 and that the School of Christ the King is expanded to 1.5 FE in Phase 2.

The South 2 Area has a surplus capacity of 14%. Over the next ten years it is envisaged that the roll will have a change of +11%. There is a current requirement to decrease the capacity in this area. The developing plans for Knowle West may lead to the need for further provision which could be accommodated by the School of Christ the King. The School of Christ the King cannot be expanded if St Pius does not close.

The South 4 Area has a surplus capacity of 18%. Over the next ten years it is envisaged that the roll will have a change of +8%. There is a requirement to decrease the capacity of this Extended School Partnership area. The Bristol Development Framework and the Regional Spatial Strategy may lead to a major residential expansion in this locality in the period up until 2026. New provision may be required in a timely fashion to meet the needs of these new communities; this is likely to be in the Hengrove Park area.

St Pius X has a capacity of 210 places with only 116 pupils currently on roll (Jan 2008). The school has 94 surplus places (45% of the schools capacity). It costs £3,928 per child per year, in part because of the high cost of maintaining the building and the expense of teaching resources for such a small cohort of pupils in any one year group.

The school ranks 3rd worst in terms of the condition of the building in meeting the DSCF's BB99 Suitability, Condition and Sufficiency requirements.

4. Other Options Considered

A. Do nothing to address Surplus Capacity

There is a risk that the Secretary of State would view the local authority's failure to take action to reduce surplus capacity as evidence that the authority is failing to discharge its duties or is acting unreasonably in the performance of its duties - namely, in failing to target funds more effectively.

- The DCSF guidance "Value for Money Delivery Agreement" 2007, deals with issues such as better use of resources, reducing surplus places, and confirms the Government's view that there are significant resources tied up in surplus places that could be re-deployed to provide a richer educational experience for all young people in a more efficient system. **(See Appendix D)**;
- Responsibility for the management of school places rests with the local authority. The DCSF encourages local authorities to deal with surplus places by providing the following support;
- Ensuring that where there are significant issues with levels of surplus capacity the local authorities strategic plan for the Primary Capital Programme has measures to address the surplus;
- Challenging local authorities on the management of their estate;
- Increasing the challenge to local authorities on surplus places through the work of the Schools' Commissioner;
- Providing a range of guidance to promote action by local authorities.

B. Do nothing to reduce the number of very small schools.

While surplus capacity is a key issue, the principles of the Primary Review also outlined the desire to remove admission arrangements where schools were left to struggle with organising classes of less than 30 pupils. Wherever this occurs, a school is forced down an organisational route that limits choice and forces mixed age teaching. Mixed age teaching can be very rewarding, but it is more complex and challenging than

other organisational arrangements. This relates to arguments regarding value for money. **(see Appendix D).**

C. Retain one or more of the schools

This would not address the surplus capacity issues in those areas that the schools are retained (See Other Options Considered 'A'). It would also fail to redistribute revenue funding across the primary estate. It would also restrict our school enhancement aspects of the programme by failing to expand and/or refurbish St Michael on the Mount, Burnbush, Waycroft and The School of Christ the King.

D. Close other schools

This option considers achievement, asset management issues and a reduction in surplus capacity in the City. The criteria for selecting a school for closure are:

- **Close schools that fail to achieve the National Floor Target.** Individual school performance against National Floor Targets- This performance indicator (65% in 2008) identifies schools that are failing to meet basic educational targets. The use of this performance indicator is indiscriminate and does not indicate progress being made. The closure of schools based purely on performances against Floor Targets would result in no availability of primary provision in key areas of demographic need (especially in areas of deprivation) In 2008, there were 19 schools that were below the 65% floor target in both mathematics and English. (This floor target will be lowered in 2009 to 55%). This is how our current plans propose to address this.

Current recommendations for Phases 1 and 2 will:

Amalgamation of Connaught and Ilminster Ave	Rebuild and Fresh Start
Millpond	Rebuild and Fresh Start
Cabot	Rebuild and Fresh Start

Bannerman Road	Refurbished, better accommodation to tackle learning environments
Weston Park	Amalgamation with Bluebell nursery – Improved continuity and progression
May Park	Possible new build – Fresh Start
Bishopsworth	Amalgamation with Highridge Infant to secure quality leadership
Upper Horfield	Addition of Children’s Centre
Whitehall	Rebuild and Fresh Start

Schools not impacted on in Phases 1&2, but which have been improved in recent years through LA intervention

Lockleaze	Amalgamated
Badock's Wood	Amalgamated
Barton Hill	Recently amalgamated and newly built
Ashton Vale	Possible new build (Fresh Start) after 2013 with urban extension
Perry Court Junior	Discussion regarding wider federation
Hareclive	Discussion with Hartcliffe EY Centre re. federation

Other schools below floor target – currently in Phase 3 or not included in review:

Easton*

Gay Elms

St. Matthias & Dr.Bells*

Greenfield

* both schools in areas of greatest need for places.
both schools in areas of deprivation

Therefore, of the 19 primary schools below the current 65% floor target:

9 are being addressed through Phases 1 & 2 of the review
 6 are being addressed by other activity in partnership with the LA
 2 are in areas of greatest need
 2 are not impacted upon

Which other schools should close to help the LA meet their targets if the 3 recommendations are not taken forward?

- **Close schools with poor facilities in terms of suitability, sufficiency and condition.** Below is information on those schools in the highest quartile of need, in terms of asset management (suitability and condition). Closure of these schools would be indiscriminate in the redevelopment of primary school provision. The closure of schools based purely on asset management performance would result in none availability of primary provision in key areas of demographic need (especially in areas of deprivation) - Schools in the worst category for condition and suitability (taken from the Asset Management Plan).

Within Phases 1 & 2:

St. George	Recommended for closure
Victoria Park I&J	Amalgamation and refurbishment
St. Barnabas	Expansion and rebuild
Stockwood Green	Recommended for closure
May Park	Rebuild or refurbishment
Whitehall	Rebuild
Wansdyke	Refurbishment
Waycroft	Refurbishment
Sefton Park Infant	Expansion and refurbishment
Highridge Infant	Amalgamation and refurbishment
Teyfant	Rebuild
Filton Avenue Infant	Possible refurbishment

Phase 3:

Hotwells	Badocks Wood
Easton	Hillcrest
Gay Elms	Summerhill Junior

Colston's
Shirehampton

Broomhill Infant

Outside the remit of the review:

Perry Court Infant Was offered inclusion in review but
declined refurbishment through
amalgamation

St. Bernadette
Southville
St. Peter & St. Paul
Greenfield

Of the 27 schools in the worst quartile for condition and suitability of buildings:

- 12 are being addressed in Phases 1 & 2
- 8 will be addressed in Phase 3 – as proposals stand
- 1 declined to take forward a recommendation which would
 have provided a solution
- 5 are not impacted on

Which other schools should close to help the LA meet their targets if the 3 recommendations are not taken forward?

Risk Assessment

A Risk Assessment has been completed and is included as
Appendix E.

Equalities Impact Assessment

The Equalities Impact Assessments for the three schools are detailed in **Appendix F.**

Legal and Resource Implications

Legal: Section 13 Education Act 1996 places the Local Authority under a duty to secure that efficient primary and secondary education is available to meet the needs of the population in its area. The recommendations set out in this report are lawful.

School organisation proposals must follow the statutory framework set out in the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and accompanying Regulations and statutory guidance. This would include the proposals for school closures as recommended in the report. Any such proposals will require ongoing close liaison with Legal Services to ensure that the requirements are met.

Genny Seneque, Senior Solicitor (Education)

Financial:

Revenue: School funding comes from central government through the Dedicated Schools Grant which is based on the number of pupils on roll at the January pupil count. The proposal to close these 3 schools will not affect the total funding available to Bristol schools.

The DSG is a ring-fenced grant with tight controls on expenditure. If the Local Authority wished to earmark the savings from closure to use other than to give to schools, it could only do so with the prior agreement of the Schools Forum.

Based on the 2008/09 allocations, £1.24m was allocated to these schools through the school funding formula. Of this, £814,000 is pupil-led and will transfer to the school at which the pupil enrolls following closure.

Other factors in the formula cover premises costs and top-up funding to reflect the additional needs of small schools. Approximately £400,000 will be released if these proposals are agreed. This equates to a £15 increase in 'per pupil' funding for every pupil in the primary sector in Bristol.

Capital: The Primary Capital Programme funding has been allocated to the local authority on a formulaic approach.

Financial advice given by *Geraldine Mead*(Strategy Leader, Finance -Children and Young People's Services)

Land: In the case of VC and VA schools the land may not be in the ownership of the City Council.

In the case of the remaining community primary school provision, the land is within the City Council's ownership.

Personnel: A decision to close a school places all of the staff employed at a school at risk of redundancy. As a consequence, there is a legal requirement to consult with both the employees affected and their representatives.

However, the need for compulsory redundancies should be mitigated by the fact that the wider primary review proposals will lead to the expansion of neighbouring schools. This will provide staff with opportunities for suitable alternative employment.

The Council would pro actively work with governing bodies to ensure this takes place in as many cases as possible. Any employee who did not secure alternative employment would be entitled to a severance payment in accordance with Council policy.

Advice from Mark Williams, HR Manager - CYPS

Appendices:

- Appendix A - Recommendations for closure
- Appendix B - Primary Review recommendations approved by Cabinet on 25 September 2008
- Appendix C - Surplus Places
- Appendix D - Schools with very low admission numbers, or challenging admission numbers
- Appendix E - Risk Assessment
- Appendix F - Equalities Impact Assessments
- Appendix G - Data from Cabinet Report

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Background papers:

- Primary Review Draft recommendations May 2008
- Towards a Primary Strategy for Bristol, October 2007
- Regional Spatial Strategy
- Deprivation in Bristol 2007

Appendix A

Proposal for Consultation		Summary at Response	Final Recommendation
N3	Expand St. Michael on the Mount CE Primary in Phase 2 to be 1.5FE	Positive response, but would like 2FE. Potentially a phase 1 scheme and consideration to 2FE being scoped. Cof E support for scheme	a) Expand St. Michael on the Mount CE Primary in Phase 2 to be 1.5FE/2FE depending on outcome of feasibility
N3	Close St George CE Primary in Phase 2 after the expansion work at St. Michael on the Mount.	Significant response. Proposal to expand to 1FE as ideal for expansion and retain St Michael as 1FE. Expand Hotwells on current site to 1.5FE and then federate all three. Church has funded feasibility.	b) Close St George CE Primary in Phase 2 after the expansion work at St. Michael on the Mount. CofE support for scheme.
S3	Federate Burnbush Primary School with Waycroft Primary School and close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 creating 2FE at Waycroft until refurbishment and 1FE at Burnbush through expansion, with one leadership team and governance led by Waycroft.	Stockwood Green, large number of responses and a petition to leave the school and the provision in the area as it is. Waycroft are concerned about apparent surplus places. Two solutions a) close both small schools and remodel Waycroft as 3FE b) A new school to replace all three. Burnbush – prepared to collaborate, not federate (note that Waycroft and Burnbush serve communities with very different characteristics and that Burnbush will be a category 1 school).	a) Close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 b) Create 1FE at Burnbush through small expansion c) Refurbishment of Waycroft
S4	A part of the expansion plan for the School of Christ the King (ESP S2) St Pius RC Primary close in Phase 2.	Response from Governors and a petition not close St Pius, however, some responses supporting closure Federation between the two school proposed by St Pius	a) Expand School of Christ the King in Phase 2 to 1.5FE. in Phase 2
S2	Expand School of Christ the King in Phase 2 to 1.5FE.	This can only happen if St Pius closes. Consideration will be given to 2FE during next stage of consultation. Response from Head, welcome opportunity to expand and become at least 1FE, but do not want St Pius to close	b) St Pius RC Primary close in Phase 2.

Three proposals are referred to Council for member observation prior to a Cabinet decision

Appendix B

Recommendations agreed by Cabinet

1.1. 22 recommendations for Phases 1 and 2 are confirmed without change

Bank Leaze	Oldbury Court	Fonthill
Sea Mills	Whitehall	Glenfrome & Elmfield co-location
Weston Park	Parson St	Hillfields
Henbury Court	South St (Compass Point)	Millpond
Horfield	Victoria Park	St Nicholas of Tolentine
Upper Horfield	Bishopsworth & Highridge	Wansdyke
Westbury on Trym	Teyfant	
Cabot	Badock's Wood	

1.2. Seven recommendations from Phases 1 and 2 are confirmed with the following modifications to the recommendations

ESP	Initial Recommendation	Summary of consultation response	Modified Recommendation
EC1	Amalgamate Sefton Park Infant and Junior schools at 3FE in Phase 1 through expansion on the current site.	Responses are numerous, remain Federated. Do not want expansion either, though earlier agreed by Cabinet. Sensitivity to site requirements and impact on learning must be considered	As federated schools, expand Sefton Park Infants & Juniors to 3FE on their current site in Phase 1
EC2	Air Balloon Infant School and Air Balloon Junior School are amalgamated in Phase 2 at 2.5FE.	Earlier amalgamation, Phase 1 at 3FE preferably by September 2009	Air Balloon Infant School and Air Balloon Junior School are amalgamated in Phase 1 at 3 FE, though building adaptations are made in Phase 2
N2	Filton Avenue Infant School and Filton Avenue Junior School are amalgamated in Phase 2 at 2.5FE to become a birth – 11 learning campus.	Significant number of responses and petition. Do not want amalgamation and proposal, from Chair of infant school to federate	Filton Avenue Infant School and Filton Avenue Junior School federate in Phase 2 at 2.5FE to become a birth – 11 learning campus with an option to expand to 3FE after 2013 depending on population growth
EC1	Build a new school for St Barnabas at 2FE in Phase 2 on the old Fairfield Secondary School site.	Governor response regarding alternate site also being considered. Diocese would prefer a rebuild on site and to use Fairfield for decant.	Build a new school for St Barnabas at 2FE in Phase 2 – feasibility will consider the current site and old Fairfield site
EC2	Two Mile Hill Infant School and Two Mile Hill Junior School are amalgamated in Phase 2 at 2.5FE or possibly 3FE dependant on population change by 20/10/11.	Response from Chair of Juniors – good educational sense. Full forms of entry preferred. Response from Head of Infants – as above	Two Mile Hill Infant School and Two Mile Hill Junior School are amalgamated in Phase 2 at 2FE
EC3	May Park Primary School is rebuilt in Phase 2 at 2FE.	Response from Head and Chair regarding remodelling/rebuild. This would need to be looked at in terms of vfm	May Park Primary School is rebuilt or refurbished, dependant on feasibility in Phase 2 at 2FE.
S2	Amalgamate Connaught Primary School and Ilminster Avenue Primary School in a newly built	No change requested from Connaught No change requested from Ilminster Ave	Build one new school in Knowle West in Phase 2, at 2FE. Refer project to the Knowle West regeneration group to confirm preferred location and impact on

	school in Phase 2 at 2FE.	If the School of Christ the King is expanded, this provides further places in Knowle and Filwood	wider regeneration scheme. Locations to consider: a) Connaught site b) Melvin Square Zone
--	---------------------------	--	--

1.3. Two new recommendations are confirmed for Phases 1 and 2

EC3	Bannerman Road	Needs expansion to 2FE	Expand provision at Bannerman Road to 2FE in Phase 1
N 3	St Bonaventure's	Refurbishment in Phases 1/2 with some matched funding from Diocese	Make a contribution to the matched funding to provide a further phase of redevelopment of this school in Phase 2

31 recommendations in total

1.4 Original Phase 3 recommendations relate to the schools listed below

Ashley Down	Henleaze	St Werberghs
Chester Park	Holymead	Hannah Moore
Summerhill	St Anne's	Christ Church
Elmlea	Lock Leaze	Ashton Vale
Holy Cross	Gay Elms	Hotwells
Ashton Gate	St Mary Redcliffe	Bishop Road
Colston's	Hillcrest	Four Acres
St Bernadette	Bridge Farm	

1.5. Two recommendations are deferred to Phase 3 from Phase 2

EC1	Easton CE VA Primary is expanded through a two phase programme (2+3) at 1.5FE by 2013/2014.	Response from Governors wanting to retain small class sizes of 25 and asking for this to be recognised in the plans, all in phase 2
S3	Amalgamate Broomhill Infant School and Broomhill Junior School in Phase 2 at 2FE if needed but may reduce to 1.5FE.	Response from both Chairs opposed to amalgamation after scrutiny because of layout, impact on leadership

1.6. Seven recommendations are not taken forward from this strategic review, though the benefit of federation should be noted.

N1	a) Close Avon Primary School in Phase 2.
N1	b) Refurbish Avonmouth CE Primary School in Phase 2 at 1FE.
N1	Federate Our Lady of the Rosary Catholic Primary School with St Bernard's Catholic Primary School, creating one leadership team and one governing body in Phase 2, under the leadership of Our Lady of the Rosary.
EC1	Federate Elmfield School for the deaf with Glenfrome and Fairfield Community Schools.
S2	Federate Greenfield Primary School with Bridge Farm Primary School with one leadership team led by Bridge Farm in Phase 2 at 1.5FE
S2	Amalgamate Perry Court Infant School and Perry Court Junior School in Phase 2 at 2FE
S4	Hareclive Primary School federate with the Bridge Learning Campus in Phase 2 at 2FE with the Bridge Learning Campus taking the leadership and governance.

Appendix C

Surplus Places

There are 20 schools, based on the PLASC, return January 08, where surplus places are above 25%.

All but 3 of these were identified for Phase 1&2 resolution.

Weston Park and Bluebell Nursery amalgamation and reduced capacity	1.5FE	(350)	315
Sea Mills I&J – amalgamation and reduced capacity	1FE	(410)	210
Bankleaze – refurbishment to take out capacity	1FE	(315)	210
Oldbury Court – refurbishment to take out capacity	1FE	(362)	210
Hillfields – refurbishment to take out capacity	1FE	(369)	210
Fonthill – refurbishment to take out capacity	1FE	(333)	210
Two Mile Hill I&J – amalgamation and reduced capacity	2FE	(525)	420
Ilminster Ave & Connaught – amalgamation and reduced capacity	2FE	(351 + 367)	420
Highridge and Bishopsworth – amalgamation and reduced capacity t	1.5FE	(150 + 206)	315

Total Reduction

From: 3,738

To: 2,520

Proposed for Closure

Stockwood Green	Close	(119)	-
St. Pius	Close	(210)	-
St George	Close	(94)	

Total Reduction:

From: 423

To: 0

Plans to develop Children’s Centres are likely to increase numbers in the following schools:

Upper Horfield	addition of CC should increase numbers	Used to take out capacity From: 966 To: 840
South Street (Compass Point)	addition of CC should increase numbers	
Henbury Court	addition of CC should increase numbers	
Burnbush	addition of CC should increase numbers	

Those schools not included in Phases 1 &2:

St. Annes Park – Children’s Centre in place

Little Mead – Amalgamated in 2007

Holymead J – No plans in Phases 1&2

Appendix D

Addressing the issue of very small schools and schools with challenging admission numbers*

*(Based on intakes of 30 children per class, which is how funding is allocated)

Within Phases 1&2 the following schools have challenging admission numbers that we are addressing:

St. Barnabas	25 per year	Move to 2FE (60)
Oldbury Court	45 per year	Move to 1FE (30)
Two Mile Hill	75 per year	Move to 2FE (60)
Bannerman Road	45 per year	Move to 2FE (60)
Sea Mills Infant & Juniors	45 per year	Move to 1FE (30)
Henbury Court	45 per year	Move to 1FE (30)
St. George CE	15 per year	Move to close
Horfield CEVC	54 per year	Move to 2FE (60)
Westbury on Trym	45 per year	Move to 2FE (60)
Connaught Iminster	45 per year	Move to 2FE (60)
School of Christ the King	25 per year	Move to 1.5FE (45)
Victoria Park I&J	74 per year	Move to 2.5FE (75)
Burnbush	25 per year	Move to 1.5FE (30)
Stockwood Green	17 per year	Close – less than 1 form of entry

The following schools are not included in Phases 1&2 proposals,

St. Werburghs	25 per year	Less than one form of entry	Phase 3 expansion
Chester Park I&J	75 per year	2.5FE	
Barton Hill	45 per year	1.5FE	
Easton Primary	50 per year	Proposed to be 2.5FE in Phase 3	Phase 3 expansion
Hannah Moore	25 per year	Less than one form of entry	Possible Phase 3 expansion
St Bernard's Catholic	20 per year	Less than one form of entry	Federation?
Weston Park Primary	45 per year	1.5FE	
Badock's Wood	45 per year	1.5FE	
Filton Ave. I&J	75 per year	2.5FE	
Little Mead	45 per year	1.5FE	
Christchurch	38 per year	Less than 1.5FE	Phase 3 exp.
St. Johns	45 per year	1.5FE	
Stoke Bishop	45 per year	1.5FE	
Ashton Vale	25 per year	Less than 1FE	Phase 3 exp.
Headley Park	45 per year	1.5FE	
Greenfield	45 per year	1.5FE	
Fair Furlong	45 per year	1.5FE	
Four Acres	45 per year	1.5FE	

Risk Assessment

PRIMARY REVIEW – SCHOOL CLOSURES

No.	RISK Threat to achievement of key objectives of the report	RISK CONTROL MEASURES			ASSESSMENT OF RESIDUAL RISK	
		Impact	Probability	Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation)	Impact	Probability
	APPROVING CLOSURES					
1	Closure puts economic pressures on families who have to pay for public transport to take their children further from home to attend primary school.	High	High	Ensure that there is appropriate primary provision with capacity within the community.	High	Medium
2	Young people are put at a disadvantage as they are required to attend primary school outside of their local community.	High	High	Ensure that there is appropriate primary provision with capacity within the community.	High	Medium
3	Public/Community response to the Primary Review is negative and results in negative media coverage for the City Council.	High	High	Ensure that there is a sound business case for the Primary Review and full member support across all parties.	High	Medium
4	Demographics within the city change	High	High	Ensure that forecasts and models are checked regularly.	High	Medium

	dramatically (i.e. Birth/mortality rates; immigration or changes in employment market etc.). This could result in the wrong distribution of primary school provision within the city.			Ensure that where growth is predicted in the Bristol Development Framework the Primary Review reflects this in terms of capacity planning.		
No.	RISK	Impact	Probability	Mitigation	Impact	Probability
5	Some school governing bodies do not support amalgamations/closure. This will result in negative media coverage and little or no support for the change process.	High	High	Ensure appropriate business case is presented for the recommendations in the Primary Review.	High	Medium
NOT APPROVING CLOSURES						
6	The DCSF may intervene because it sees the authority's failed in its duty to take action to reduce surplus is evidence that the authority is failing to discharge its duties or is acting unreasonably in the performance of its duties – namely to target funds more effectively.	High	Medium	The city council will have to identify alternative proposals to reduce capacity in the Extended Partnership Areas.	High	Low
7	The DCSF could reduce or remove future Grant Allocations that fund the Primary Capital Programme. This could affect the viability of the Primary Review in terms of funding.	High	Medium	Although the DCSF have confirmed the Schools Capital Grant allocations for 2008/9 to 2010/11 if the funding is removed the Capital Programme will have to be re-programmed to take account of the reduced funding.	High	Low
8	The Strategy for Change fails to address DCSF concerns over surplus capacity in primary school settings.	High	Medium	The Strategy for Change (SFC) identifies the framework under which the review will be implemented. This included the reduction in capacity through amalgamations and closures. The SFC will have to be revised to reflect the revised proposals for reducing capacity.	High	Low

Appendix F

Equalities Impact Assessment: St George

Name of policy or function to be assessed: Closure of St Georges CE VC Primary School as part of the Primary Review	Name of manager responsible for assessment: <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets & Schools Organisation</i>
Is this a new or existing policy/function? New	<i>Date of assessment: September 2008</i>
Step 1. Describe the aims; objectives and purpose of the policy or function (include how it fits in to wider aims or strategic objectives).	<i>As part of the City Wide review of Primary School capacity to close St Georges CE VC Primary School in order to remove surplus places where identified.</i>
Are there any associated objectives of the policy or function (i.e. setting a standard of good practice, improving consumer confidence in the service)?	<i>The expansion of School of St Michael-on-the-Mount CE VC is linked to the closure of St Georges. Implementing the national 'Change for children' Programme Raising educational attainment Improving education of vulnerable children Providing new and better schools Reducing spare capacity within schools where appropriate Support community cohesion</i>
Who is intended to benefit from the policy/function and in what way?	<i>Children of ages 5 to 11 by the provision of 'state of the art' facilities. Use of these facilities, with a focus on learning, will be extended to pupil's families and local people.</i>
What are the intended outcomes of this policy/function?	<i>To remove surplus places in the area but to ensure that sufficient alternative school places are available to meet demand in the area.</i>
Step 2 What baseline quantitative data do you have about the policy/function relating to equalities groups (e.g. monitoring data on proportions of service users compared to proportions in the population)?	<i>The number of children of each ethnic group, is available and has been used to inform the plans</i>
What qualitative data do you have on different groups (e.g. results of previous consumer satisfaction surveys, feedback exercises, or evidence from other authorities undertaking similar work)?	

<p>Step 3</p> <p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on different racial groups?</p> <p>If Yes</p> <p>What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>The policy is aimed at providing the places needed to ensure no family travels further than two mile for primary education, unless by choice.</i></p> <p><i>i) The number of places available will be adequate to meet the forecast demand.</i></p> <p><i>ii) The places will be allocated in accordance with the existing criteria for identifying Children in Need which are based on the needs of the child, irrespective of ethnicity.</i></p> <p><i>No – The changes are necessary to comply with policy on admissions</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on boys/girls or men/women?</p> <p>If Yes</p> <p>What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No – All primary settings are co-educational.</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>

<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Disabled than on non-disabled children or adults? What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No. <i>In the refurbishment of schools (School of St Michael-on-the-Mount CE VC), more DDA compliance will be created.</i></p> <p><i>Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs naming a particular school are admitted and children in public care are the highest priority for admission.</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Lesbians, Gay Men and Bi-sexual than on heterosexual young people or adults? What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No. <i>See step 3</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/ function could have a differential impact on younger or older people? Yes What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No. <i>The primary schools will provide the appropriate school age range</i> <i>See step 3</i></p>

<p>Step 4 Should the policy proceed to a Partial Impact Assessment (see Appendix 3) and if so why have you decided this?</p> <p>Date by which the Partial Impact Assessment will take place:</p> <p>Should the policy function move to a Full Impact Assessment (see Appendix 4) and if so why have you decided this?</p> <p>Date by which the Full Impact Assessment will take place:</p>	<p>No.</p> <p><i>There will remain adequate numbers of places to the appropriate school education age range where required, if the proposal is agreed.</i></p> <p>No.</p> <p><i>See above.</i></p>
---	--

Equalities Impact Assessment: St Pius

Name of policy or function to be assessed: Closure of St Pius School as part of the Primary Review	Name of manager responsible for assessment: <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets & Schools Organisation</i>
Is this a new or existing policy/function? New	<i>Date of assessment: September 2008</i>
Step 1. Describe the aims; objectives and purpose of the policy or function (include how it fits in to wider aims or strategic objectives).	<i>As part of the City Wide review of Primary School capacity to close St Pius RCP School in order to remove surplus places where identified.</i>
Are there any associated objectives of the policy or function (i.e. setting a standard of good practice, improving consumer confidence in the service)?	<i>The expansion of School of Christ the King RCP is linked to the closure of St Pius. Implementing the national 'Change for children' Programme Raising educational attainment Improving education of vulnerable children Providing new and better schools Reducing spare capacity within schools where appropriate Support community cohesion</i>
Who is intended to benefit from the policy/function and in what way?	<i>Children of ages 5 to 11 by the provision of 'state of the art' facilities. Use of these facilities, with a focus on learning, will be extended to pupil's families and local people.</i>
What are the intended outcomes of this policy/function?	<i>To remove surplus places in the area but to ensure that sufficient alternative school places are available to meet demand in the area.</i>

<p>Step 2 What baseline quantitative data do you have about the policy/function relating to equalities groups (e.g. monitoring data on proportions of service users compared to proportions in the population)?</p>	<p><i>The number of children of each ethnic group, is available and has been used to inform the plans</i></p>
<p>What qualitative data do you have on different groups (e.g. results of previous consumer satisfaction surveys, feedback exercises, or evidence from other authorities undertaking similar work)?</p>	
<p>Step 3 Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on different racial groups? If Yes What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality if opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No, the areas of greatest need are in East and Central areas of Bristol where a significant number of newly arrived minority ethnic families live. The policy is aimed at providing the places needed to ensure no family travels further than two mile for primary education, unless by choice.</i></p> <p><i>i) The number of places available will be adequate to meet the forecast demand.</i></p> <p><i>ii) The places will be allocated in accordance with the existing criteria for identifying Children in Need which are based on the needs of the child, irrespective of ethnicity.</i></p> <p><i>No – The changes are necessary to comply with policy on admissions</i></p> <p><i>N/A</i></p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on boys/girls or men/women? If Yes What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality if opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No – All primary settings are co-educational.</i></p> <p><i>N/A</i></p> <p><i>N/A</i></p>

<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Disabled than on non-disabled children or adults? What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No. <i>In the refurbishment of schools (School of Christ the King), more DDA compliance will be created.</i></p> <p><i>Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs naming a particular school are admitted and children in public care are the highest priority for admission. This will be unchanged if the proposal is implemented.</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Lesbians, Gay Men and Bi-sexual than on heterosexual young people or adults? What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.) Are there concerns that the policy/ function could have a differential impact on younger or older people? Yes What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No. <i>See step 3</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>No. The primary schools will provide the appropriate school age range</i> <i>See step 3</i></p>

<p>Step 4 Should the policy proceed to a Partial Impact Assessment (see Appendix 3) and if so why have you decided this?</p> <p>Date by which the Partial Impact Assessment will take place:</p> <p>Should the policy function move to a Full Impact Assessment (see Appendix 4) and if so why have you decided this?</p> <p>Date by which the Full Impact Assessment will take place:</p>	<p>No.</p> <p><i>There will remain adequate numbers of places to the appropriate school education age range where required, if the proposal is agreed.</i></p> <p>No.</p> <p><i>See above.</i></p>
---	--

Equalities Impact Assessment : Stockwood Green

Name of policy or function to be assessed: Closure of Stockwood Green Primary School as part of the Primary Review	Name of manager responsible for assessment: <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets & Schools Organisation</i>
Is this a new or existing policy/function? New	<i>Date of assessment: September 2008</i>
Step 1. Describe the aims; objectives and purpose of the policy or function (include how it fits in to wider aims or strategic objectives).	<i>As part of the City Wide review of Primary School capacity to close Stockwood Green Primary School in order to remove surplus places where identified.</i>
Are there any associated objectives of the policy or function (i.e. setting a standard of good practice, improving consumer confidence in the service)?	<i>The refurbishment of the nearby Waycroft School and the expansion of Burnbush School are linked to the closure of Stockwood Green. Implementing the national 'Change for children' Programme Raising educational attainment Improving education of vulnerable children Providing new and better schools Reducing spare capacity within schools where appropriate Support community cohesion</i>
Who is intended to benefit from the policy/function and in what way?	<i>Children of ages 5 to 11 by the provision of 'state of the art' facilities. Use of these facilities, with a focus on learning, will be extended to pupil's families and local people.</i>
What are the intended outcomes of this policy/function?	<i>To remove surplus places in the area but to ensure that sufficient alternative school places are available to meet demand in the area.</i>

<p>Step 2 What baseline quantitative data do you have about the policy/function relating to equalities groups (e.g. monitoring data on proportions of service users compared to proportions in the population)?</p>	<p><i>The number of children of each ethnic group, is available and has been used to inform the plans</i></p>
<p>What qualitative data do you have on different groups (e.g. results of previous consumer satisfaction surveys, feedback exercises, or evidence from other authorities undertaking similar work)?</p>	
<p>Step 3 Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on different racial groups? If Yes What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>The policy is aimed at providing the places needed to ensure no family travels further than two mile for primary education, unless by choice.</i></p> <p><i>i) The number of places available will be adequate to meet the forecast demand.</i></p> <p><i>ii) The places will be allocated in accordance with the existing criteria for identifying Children in Need which are based on the needs of the child, irrespective of ethnicity.</i></p> <p><i>No – The changes are necessary to comply with policy on admissions</i></p> <p><i>N/A</i></p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on boys/girls or men/women? If Yes What evidence do you have for this? Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p><i>No – All primary settings are co-educational.</i></p> <p><i>N/A</i></p> <p><i>N/A</i></p>

<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Disabled than on non-disabled children or adults? What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No. <i>In the refurbishment of schools (the nearby Waycroft School and Burnbush Schools), more DDA compliance will be created.</i></p> <p><i>Children with a Statement of Special Educational Needs naming a particular school are admitted and children in public care are the highest priority for admission.</i></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Are there concerns that the policy/function could have a differential impact on Lesbians, Gay Men and Bi-sexual than on heterosexual young people or adults? What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p> <p>Are there concerns that the policy/ function could have a differential impact on younger or older people? Yes</p> <p>What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Do the differences amount to an adverse impact or unlawful discrimination? No</p> <p>If there are concerns that it is indirectly discriminatory could it still be justifiable e.g. on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? (It is advisable to get legal advice on this.)</p>	<p>No. <i>See step 3</i></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><i>No. The primary schools will provide the appropriate school age range</i> <i>See step 3</i></p>

<p>Step 4 Should the policy proceed to a Partial Impact Assessment (see Appendix 3) and if so why have you decided this?</p> <p>Date by which the Partial Impact Assessment will take place:</p> <p>Should the policy function move to a Full Impact Assessment (see Appendix 4) and if so why have you decided this?</p> <p>Date by which the Full Impact Assessment will take place:</p>	<p>No.</p> <p><i>There will remain adequate numbers of places to the appropriate school education age range where required, if the proposal is agreed.</i></p> <p>No.</p> <p><i>See above.</i></p>
--	--

Appendix G

Schools with > 25% Surplus Places

DCSF No.	School		Net Capacity	Roll	Surplus Places	SP %age	Where review addresses
2072	Sea Mills Infants' School	N1	150	51	99	66%	x
2071	Sea Mills Junior School	N1	260	100	160	62%	x
2337	Bank Leaze Primary School	N1	315	148	167	53%	x
2016	Oldbury Court Primary	EC2	362	189	173	48%	x
3413	St. Pius Xth Primary School	S4	210	116	94	45%	x
2015	Hillfields Primary School	EC2	369	209	160	43%	x
2086	Upper Horfield Primary	N2	204	116	88	43%	x
2320	South Street Primary School	S1	210	124	86	41%	x
2014	Henbury Court Primary School	N2	363	225	138	38%	x
2315	Weston Park Primary	N1	350	227	123	35%	x
2010	Fonthill Primary School	N2	333	218	115	35%	x
2124	Burnbush Primary School	S3	189	128	61	32%	x
2070	St. Annes Park Primary	S3	203	140	63	31%	
2084	Two Mile Hill Infants School	EC2	225	156	69	31%	x
3432	Little Mead Primary School	N2	315	226	89	28%	
2026	Ilminster Avenue Primary	S2	351	253	98	28%	x
2097	Holymead Junior School	S3	440	320	120	27%	
3002	Bishopsworth CE VC Junior	S1	206	151	55	27%	x
2142	Stockwood Green Primary School	S3	119	89	30	25%	x
2111	Highridge Infant School	S1	150	113	37	25%	x

SUITABILITY AND SUFFICIENCY DATA
CLASSROOMS - BASIC DATA ADJUSTED TO GIVE
WEIGHTED SEVERITY SCORE PER PLACE + WEIGHTED
CONDITION SCORE

The rank score is based on a formula of the combined condition and severity data.

School	DfES No	No. FE	Net Capacity	Total severity score	Condition Score	Rank
St George CE Primary	3013	0.5	94	7.82	400	1
Hotwells Primary	2044	1	210	5.81	720	2
Victoria Park Junior	2088	2	239	5.62	560	3
St Barnabas CE Primary	3010	1	175	5.51	180	4
Stockwood Green Primary	2142	0.5	119	5.29	180	5
Easton Primary	3301	1.5	350	5.28	400	6
Filton Avenue Infant School	2034	2.5	219	5.21	180	7
Gay Elms Primary	2325	1	210	4.99	400	8
Perry Court Infants	2304	2	150	4.90	100	9
May Park Primary School	2327	2	415	4.78	180	10
St Bernadette RC	3415	1	210	4.76	180	11
Whitehall Primary	2328	2	390	4.68	420	12
Shirehampton Primary	2027	2	420	4.64	320	13
Wansdyke Primary	2130	1	210	4.52	120	14
Waycroft P	2017	2	420	4.50	260	15
Sefton Park Infant	2073	2	201	4.46	320	16
Broomhill Infant School	2115	2	158	4.33	340	17
Colston's Primary	2022	2	407	4.29	840	18
Southville Primary	2079	1	210	4.11	320	19
Highridge Infant School	2111	2	150	4.05	240	20
Teyfant Community Primary	2323	2	446	4.04	320	21
Badocks Wood Primary	2338	1.5	315	4.01	400	22
Greenfield Primary School	3431	1.5	315	3.97	260	23
Victoria Park Infant	2090	2.5	224	3.96	280	24
Hillcrest Primary	2023	2	420	3.89	360	25