

AGENDA ITEM NO 5

BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet Report

25th September 2008

Report of: Director of Children and Young People's Services

Title: Primary Review - Post Consultation Recommendations

Wards: Citywide

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

Contact telephone number: 0117 9037950

Recommendation

1. Note the feedback from strategic consultation
2. To confirm that outcomes of this review are dependent upon success in securing funding from the Primary Capital Strategy, subject to requirements to reduce surplus places to under 10% and improve outcomes for children at KS2, through improvement in learning, teaching and leadership.
3. To agree the following recommendations under Phases 1&2 as set out in **Appendix 1**, 1 to 6 and that formal consultation may proceed on specific proposals for change under 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3
4. To agree that all Phase 3 recommendations (**set out in Appendix 1.4**), including two recommendations moved to Phase 3, (**set out in Appendix 1.5**) are noted and deferred until 2011 when a further review of housing and population growth will take place, unless schools meet the criteria for amalgamation in the interim and wish to proceed.
5. To agree that the proposals in **Appendix 1.7** be referred to Council for members observations, prior to a Cabinet decision.

Summary

The significant issues in the report are:

- 1) This is an excellent opportunity for investment in Bristol Primary Schools.
- 2) This report concerns the steps being taken to improve the quality of provision in the primary sector as part of the overall strategy to raise standards by the end of KS2
- 3) To access extra funding, BCC must have a robust strategic plan for primary provision, which addresses excess places in parts of the city, the need for an increase in places in other areas, targets deprivation and makes an overall, significant contribution to removing the current barriers to learning eg. Transition, inadequate accommodation, anomalous admission numbers, inability to attract leaders of high quality.
- 4) Recommendations are based on principles agreed by Cabinet on 25th October 2007
- 5) Strategic consultation on draft recommendations spanned an eight week period leading to final recommendations for Cabinet. The Primary Review is the strategic vehicle to demonstrate to government that Bristol meets these conditions and secure funding. Statutory consultation on specific school projects will be undertaken as a separate exercise

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;
 - **Our city: together** – The primary review will contribute to the building of strong and positive relationships for people from different backgrounds and circumstances in schools and within 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, tackling climate change by reducing CO2 emissions from the schools and developing travel plans that promote Bristol as 'Cycle City'.
- **Our City: Making a Difference –**
 - **For efficient, responsive services** – the primary review aims to deliver quality, accessible and value for money educational 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 schools;**
 - **Providing new children’s centres.**

- **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 as part of the wider capital investment programme in schools and ensuring travel plans encourage walking and cycling.

- **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 that all plans relate to city wide strategic neighbourhood development.

Consultation

A wide range of strategic consultation took place over an eight week period, from 22nd May 2008 until 18th July 2008. However, responses have continued to be received and added to the data. This is reported on in detail in **Appendix 2, subject to receipt of further comments**

596 responses were received in total, of these:

23 recommendations received no objections
99 responses proposed alternative solutions
7 responses requested a recommendation be brought forward
473 responses objected to proposals

Responses to consultation were by letter, on line, petition and statement. Some petitions are still running.

Key issues raised in the consultation

- 1) Concern regarding the ability of ‘large schools’ to meet pupils’ needs
- 2) Concern regarding the closure of small schools
- 3) Concern regarding capacity to meet population growth in central and east Bristol
- 4) Concern regarding federations and the role of successful schools in them

- 5) Concern regarding the amalgamation of all infant and junior schools, especially where they are high performing, popular and/or already federated
- 6) Concern regarding the consultation process
- 7) Concern regarding funding for Phases 1 & 2
- 8) Concern regarding plans for new housing

A summary of response to these key concerns is set out in **Appendix 3**.

Context

Introduction

On the 25th October 2007 Cabinet (CAB 19.10/07, refers) approved a framework for the future of primary school provision within the city and instructed officers to bring forward proposals based on the approved principles.

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

Background Information

During the consultation process 596 responses have been received. An analysis of the responses is detailed in **Appendix 2**.

Schools from 1FE up to 3FE are part of the strategic plan, depending on community, appropriate site, pupil numbers (including predictions) and value for money. The average cost of educating a primary aged pupil in Bristol is £3,135. This is £93 per child more than the average in England.

Consultation in relation to specific schemes in Phases 1&2 have either already commenced or will commence dependent on the Cabinet decision on 25th September 2008

Phase 3 proposals cannot be agreed until 2011/12 because funding has yet to be confirmed and decisions will need to be taken in light of demographic changes and housing development. Close liaison with officers from the City Development team has taken place to ensure recommendations reflect planned housing development and regeneration plans.

Consultation was around strategic objectives and some alternative options have emerged. However, it must be noted, that to fund additional places in some areas of the city, a robust strategy for reducing places where there are excess must be adhered to.

Any school closure will lead to the capital and revenue funding saved being re distributed to other primary schools with the exception of the disposal of church land, which remains with the relevant Diocese.

Proposals

The proposals are set out in **Appendix 1**

Other Options Considered

Do Nothing

1. If the Council chooses not to undertake the recommendations of the review the DCSF may intervene concerning surplus place management. There are currently twenty-one primary schools with surplus places in excess of 25% and already the subject of DCSF concern.
2. Without a strategy for primary school provision capital investment will not be strategic to meet future capacity shortfalls, suitability and sufficiency requirements or condition priorities. This will impact on the Council's capital programme in terms of delivery and viability.

Risk Assessment

A Risk Assessment has been completed and is included as **Appendix 4**.

Some key areas of risk that have been highlighted include:

- **The DCSF do not approve the Primary Strategy for Change in terms of the allocations of Primary Capital Programme grant allocated to specific projects;**
- **The Primary Capital grant allocated to a specific project falls short of the required funding requirement following design of the scheme;**

Equalities Impact Assessment

The Equalities Impact Assessment is detailed in **Appendix 5**

Environmental Impact Assessment

The Environmental Impact Assessment is detailed in **Appendix 6**

The significant impacts of this proposal are

- Short-term increase in environmental impacts through the consumption of fossil fuels and raw materials in constructing and refurbishing schools. Longer term, there will be on-going consumption of energy for heat and power, production of waste and staff and pupil travel to school.
- Potential exists for both positive and negative net effects from each school project, for example on biodiversity or energy use.
- The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts....

- All new buildings and refurbishments will meet the BREEAM Very Good standard and will be reduce energy use by 60% compared to current levels.
- The transport impacts will be assessed for each school as part of a Home to School Transport Assessment.
- All planning applications will be accompanied by a statement of the environmental impacts of the proposals and the mitigation measures proposed.

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts....

The Government expect all local authorities to apply energy efficient and renewable energy measures, to meet the 60% reduction in carbon emissions, to all new school buildings.

New schools will include energy efficiency measures that reduce energy required for:

- Heating (and cooling);
- Lighting.

All new build will (and where possible refurbishments) will be to BREEAM standards.

By internal refurbishment, learning environments will be enhanced, building more sustainable schools and improving current settings in terms of sustainability.

Schools are required to develop Travel Plans and as 'Cycle City' opportunities for cycling to and from school, providing for the safe storage of cycles on site, will be a key aim.

The net effects of the proposals are....

- It is hoped that the long term effect of the strategy will be a net reduction in Carbon Dioxide emissions from schools and associated travel and the impacts of individual schemes will be monitored.
- New buildings on sites that have not previously been occupied by buildings will increase the overall carbon footprint of the site.
- By increasing the number of pupil places there will be an adverse impact on road traffic
- A reduction in the carbon footprint of existing schools that are refurbished or re-built.

Legal and Resource Implications

Legal

The new statutory framework introduced by the Education and Inspections Act 2006 requires consultation as part of school organisation proposals. The

recommendations in this report comply with those requirements in so far as consultation will take place. Legal advice should be obtained to ensure that the ambit of the consultation meets statutory criteria.

Nancy Rollason,
Principal Solicitor, Community Services

CAPITAL PROJECT PROCUREMENT ISSUES

In July 2006 as part of the Building Schools for the Future Project the council entered a Strategic Partnering Agreement with the Bristol Local Education Partnership (LEP). This agreement gives the Bristol LEP exclusivity on all Bristol City Council CYPS projects over £500K in value.

The LEP operates an agreed process to assess and bid for projects that meet the cost threshold, although BCC can decline to retain the LEP and procure works elsewhere. It is anticipated that the use of the standard process to procure the work, together with the standard form Design and Build contracts will represent significant cost savings on procurement process and the partnership working will assist in the achievement of the efficiencies required by the Primary Capital Programme by rationalisation of use of existing buildings, reappraisal of high maintenance buildings, and standardisation of design and construction across the Primary School estate.

Joanne Mansfield,
Principal Solicitor, Legal Services

Financial

Revenue

There are no direct revenue implications arising from this paper. Efficiency savings will arise through the Primary Review and will be directed to Bristol schools. However, the Department will need to secure funding for transitional support to the affected schools.

Geraldine Mead
Strategy Leader, Finance - Children and Young People's Services

Capital

The Primary Capital Programme funding has been allocated using a formulaic approach. **Appendix 7** indicates the provisional allocation for Phases 1&2

Land

In the case of VC and VA schools (which have to be considered within the Strategy for Change, and the Primary Capital Programme) 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

There are no direct HR implications arising from the adoption of the recommendation. However, as the strategy is implemented on a school by school basis, there will be significant staffing implications and these will need to be carefully managed. This will include meaningful consultation with staff and their trade union representatives on implementing any amalgamations, federations and closures.

Mark Williams,
HR Manager - Children and Young People's Services

Appendices:

- Appendix 1 – Proposals
- Appendix 2 – Consultation Response
- Appendix 3 – Addressing the areas of concern
- Appendix 4 - Risk Assessment;
- Appendix 5 – Equalities Impact Assessment;
- Appendix 6 - Environmental Impact Assessment.
- Appendix 7 – Capital Programme for Phases 1&2
- Appendix 8 – Surplus Places
- Appendix 9 - School data sheets
- Appendix 10 - Performance

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

Recommendations for 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	No change requested from Connaught No change requested from	Build one new school in Knowle West in Phase 2, at 2FE. Refer project to the Knowle

	School in a newly built school in Phase 2 at 2FE.	Ilminster Ave If the School of Christ the King is expanded, this provides further places in Knowle and Filwood	West regeneration group to confirm preferred location and impact on 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	Hoymeard	Hannah Moore
Summerhill	St Annes	Christ Church
Elmlea	Lockleaze	Ashton Vale
Holy Cross	Gay Elms	Hotwells
Ashton Gate	St Mary Redcliffe	Bishop Road
Colstons'	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.

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

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.

Appendix 2

Consultation Summary based on original recommendations

Initial Recommendations	Responses were received	Recommendations received no objections	Responses proposed alternative solutions	Responses requested a recommendation be brought forward	Responses objected to proposals	Comment	Petitions
Totals	596	23	99	7	473		8,504 (signatories)
Air Balloon Infant School and Air Balloon Junior School are amalgamated in Phase 2 at 2.5FE.	1	1					
Amalgamate Ashley Down Infant and Junior School in Phase 3.	20				20		
Ashton Gate Primary rebuilt in phase 3 at 2FE capacity and site to be reviewed if the redevelopment of the Ashton Gate stadium takes place.	4		4			& be brought forward	
Ashton Vale Primary likely to expand to 1FE in Phase 3 in sequence with urban expansion in Long Ashton area.	1	1				& be brought forward	
Amalgamate Avon Primary School in Phase 2 with Avonmouth CofE.	50				50		Petition to CYPs Scrutiny opposed to the proposals.01/09/08 – 667 signatories.
Refurbish Avonmouth CE Primary School in Phase 2 at 1 to 1.5FE.	4		4				Petition - 125 signatories for school to remain on its current site.
Badock's Wood Primary is refurbished in Phase 2 at 1.5 FE.	0						
Refurbish Bank Leaze Primary School in Phase 1 at 1FE	0						
Refurbish Bishop Road Primary School in Phase 3 at 3FE.	0						
Amalgamate Bishopsworth CE Junior School and Highridge Infant School in Phase 1 at 1.5FE.	1		1			Federate with Bedminster Down	

Initial Recommendations	Responses were received	Recommendations received no objections	Responses proposed alternative solutions	Responses requested a recommendation be brought forward	Responses objected to proposals	Comment	Petitions
Bridge Farm Primary School takes lead in federation with Greenfield (S1) in Phase 3 and has some refurbishment.	0						
Amalgamate Broomhill Infant School and Broomhill Junior School in Phase 2 at 2FE if needed but may reduce to 1.5FE.	2				2		
Federate Burnbush Primary School with Waycroft Primary School and close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 maintaining 2FE at Waycroft with refurbishment and 1FE at Burnbush through expansion, with one leadership team and governance led by Waycroft.	1				1		
Expand Cabot Primary School to 2FE in Phase 1 as new build to include Children's Centre accommodation, CYPS extended services and multi agency provision.	0						
Chester Park Infant School and Chester Park Junior School are amalgamated in Phase 3 at 2FE.	2				2		
Expand Christ Church CE in Phase 3 to 2FE following determination of capacity/site for expansion.	0					Should be brought forward	
Refurbish Colston's Primary in Phase 3 following discussion regarding planning requirements at 2FE.	1	1				Should be brought forward.	
Amalgamate Connaught Primary School and Ilminster Avenue Primary School in a newly built school in Phase 2 at 2FE.	4				4		

Initial Recommendations	Responses were received	Recommendations received no objections	Responses proposed alternative solutions	Responses requested a recommendation be brought forward	Responses objected to proposals	Comment	Petitions
Easton CE VA Primary is expanded through a two phase programme (2+3) at 2.5FE by 2013/2014.	1					Only want expansion for classes of 25	
Amalgamate Elmlea Infant School and Elmlea Junior School in Phase 3 at 3FE.	6				6		
Filton Avenue Infant School, Filton Avenue Junior School and the nursery and children's centre are amalgamated in Phase 2 at 2.5FE to become a birth – 11 learning campus.	15				15		201 signatures on a petition opposed to the proposals.
Fonthill Primary School is refurbished in Phase 2 at 1FE.							
Four Acres Primary is refurbished in Phase 3 at 1.5FE.	0						
Gay Elms Primary is refurbished in Phase 3 and may expand to 2FE if needed.	0						
Refurbish Glenfrome Primary School at 1FE and create accommodation for the co-location of Elmfield School for the Deaf primary phase, in Phase 2.4. Federate Elmfield School for the deaf with Glenfrome and Fairfield Community Schools in Phase 2.	5	1	1		3		
Federate Greenfield Primary School with Bridge Farm Primary School with one leadership team led by Bridge Farm in Phase 2 at 1.5FE.	1						Governing body exploring alternative partnering arrangements
Hannah Moore Primary School may expand between 1.5FE and 2FE in Phase 3 depending on housing increase.	1	1			1		
Hareclive Primary School federate with the Bridge Learning Campus in Phase 2 at 2FE with the Bridge Learning Campus taking the leadership and governance.	2				2		124 signatures to petition opposed to the proposals.

Initial Recommendations	Responses were received	Recommendations received no objections	Responses proposed alternative solutions	Responses requested a recommendation be brought forward	Responses objected to proposals	Comment	Petitions
Henbury Court is refurbished as part of plans to develop Children Centre in Phase 1, at 1.5FE.	0						
Amalgamate Henleaze Infant School and Henleaze Junior School in Phase 3 at 3FE.	99				99		
Amalgamate Bishopsworth CE Junior School and Highridge Infant School in Phase 1 at 1.5FE.	0						
Refurbish Hillcrest Primary School in Phase 3 at 2FE.	1			1			
Hillfields Primary School is refurbished to ensure best use is made of space for 1FE in Phase 2.	0						
Holy Cross R.C Primary School possible expansion to 1.5FE in Phase 3 if demand exceeds current provision.	1	1				Opposed to proposals for neighbouring RC schools.	
Amalgamate Holymead Infant School and Holymead Junior School in Phase 3 on one site at 3FE.	3				3		
Horfield CE Primary is expanded in Phase 1 to 2FE.	0						
Hotwells Primary School should expand to 2FE in Phase 3; there is a need to identify a new site.	55				55		185 signatories to a petition opposed to the proposals.
By Phase 3 (2013+) Lockleaze Primary may need to expand, dependent on population growth, to 2FE.	0						
May Park Primary School is rebuilt in Phase 2 at 2FE.	1	1					
Millpond Primary School undergoes major refurbishment in Phase 2 at 2FE.	0						

Initial Recommendations	Responses were received	Recommendations received no objections	Responses proposed alternative solutions	Responses requested a recommendation be brought forward	Responses objected to proposals	Comment	Petitions
Oldbury Court Primary School is refurbished to ensure best use is made of space for 1FE in Phase 1.	1				1	78 signatories to the petition	
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.	1				1		
Parson Street Primary School refurbishment in Phase 1 at 2FE.	1	1					
Amalgamate Perry Court Infant School and Perry Court Junior School in Phase 2 at 2FE.	0						
Expand School of Christ the King in Phase 2 to 1.5FE.	1		1			Supported expansion, but opposed linked closure.	
Amalgamate Sea Mills Infant School and Sea Mills Junior School on the Junior School site in Phase 1 at 1FE.	1	1					
Amalgamate Sefton Park Infant and Junior schools at 3FE in Phase 1 through expansion on the current site.	90				90	81 responses opposed to loss of the Scout hut (including 30 from Sefton park pupils).	E petition Sefton park School is unsuitable for expansion 141 responses by 03/09/08 – closing date 21/09/08. Keep Brunel playing field a playing field – 125 responses by 25/07/08.(closing date)
South Street Primary School refurbished and Children's Centre added to provision in Phase 1 at 1FE	0						

Initial Recommendations	Responses were received	Recommendations received no objections	Responses proposed alternative solutions	Responses requested a recommendation be brought forward	Responses objected to proposals	Comment	Petitions
Amalgamate St. Anne's Infant School, St. Anne's Junior School and St Anne's Park Primary School as a new school on one site in Phase 3 at 3FE.	3		2		1		
Build a new school for St Barnabas at 2FE in Phase 2 on the old Fairfield Secondary School site.	0					Diocese support, prefer new build on current site	
Federate St. Bernadette RC Primary under St Bernadette Secondary School in Phase 3 at 1FE all through provision.	2				2		
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.	2	2					
Close St George CE Primary in Phase 2 after the expansion work at St. Michael on the Mount.	22				22	Diocese identify school plans	E petition Stop the Council's plans to close St Georges primary Schools - 118 signatories by 30/08/08. Paper petition to CYPS Scrutiny 1584 signatories
St. Mary Redcliffe Primary School to be rebuilt in Phase 3 or earlier if available site identified at 2FE.	1	1				Diocese would like this brought forward	
Expand St. Michael on the Mount CE Primary in Phase 2 to be 1.5FE	7	1	3		3	Diocese support plans for 2FE	
St Nicholas of Tolentine VA Primary is refurbished in Phase 2 at 1FE	0						

Initial Recommendations	Responses were received	Recommendations received no objections	Responses proposed alternative solutions	Responses requested a recommendation be brought forward	Responses objected to proposals	Comment	Petitions
As part of the expansion plan for the School of Christ the King to 1.5FE (S2) St Pius RC Primary close in Phase 2.	28	8			20	Clifton Diocese support letter for St Pius	E petition against the closure of St Pius 51 signatories closed 31/08/09 Paper petition presented as response to consultation – 1,507 signatories.
St Werburgh's Primary School should become 1FE in Phase 3 if land is available for expansion.	0						
Federate Burnbush Primary School with Waycroft Primary School and close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 maintaining 2FE at Waycroft with refurbishment and 1FE at Burnbush through expansion, with one leadership team and governance led by Waycroft.	34				34		Paper petition – opposed to closure of Stockwood Green School presented to full Council 22/07/08 – 2,578 responses. E petition - save Stockwood Green School – 131 signatories by 03/09/08 (closing 30/09/08)
Summerhill Infant School and Summerhill Junior School are amalgamated in Phase 3 at 3FE.	39				19		Paper petition presented to full Council 22/07/08 – 844 signatories. E petition closing 01/07/09 – opposed to amalgamation – 5 signatories.
Teyfant Primary School federated in Phase 1 as part of the Bridge Learning Campus at 2FE.	1					BLC response positive	
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 2010/11.	2	2					
Upper Horfield Primary is being refurbished to include a Children's Centre and will also have enhanced play space.	0						

Initial Recommendations	Responses were received	Recommendations received no objections	Responses proposed alternative solutions	Responses requested a recommendation be brought forward	Responses objected to proposals	Comment	Petitions
Amalgamate Victoria Park Infant School and Victoria Park Junior School in Phase 1 at 2.5FE.	0						
Wansdyke Primary School refurbished in Phase 2 at 1FE.	1	1					
Federate Burnbush Primary School with Waycroft Primary School and close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 maintaining 2FE at Waycroft with refurbishment and 1FE at Burnbush through expansion, with one leadership team and governance led by Waycroft.	1		1				
Westbury on Trym Primary School is expanded in Phase 1 to 2FE.	0						
Amalgamate Weston Park Primary School and Bluebell Nursery School in Phase 1 at 1.5FE	0						
a) Whitehall Primary School and The Limes Nursery & Children's Centre Co-located on their current site in a new build school in Phase 1 at 3FE for the primary school.) Further consideration is given to the facility becoming part of an all through Academy with the City Academy.	0					Governing Bodies have agreed to move forward	
Fair Furlong	1		1				
Bannerman Road	1	1					
Southville	1		1				
St Bonaventure's	77		77				
Stoke Bishop	1		1			Expansion proposed	
Westbury Park	3		3				

Responses also received from

Organisation	Comments
Health Authority	Would like plans to reflect issues around travel to school – walking and cycling and also facilities for cycle stores
Unison	Some members opposed to amalgamations
Bristol Diocese	Comments on each scheme, broadly supportive
NUT	Against closure and amalgamation
NAHT	Any changes need to be well managed
S. Gloucester	Will take into account when planning themselves
BaNES	Ambitious and well presented proposals
Statements made to Council, Cabinet and Scrutiny	
Nusery HTs Group	Concerns about integration of the PR with Early Years plans.

Response to key concerns raised in the consultation

1. Concern regarding the ability of 'large schools' to meet pupils' needs

The largest school proposed in the Strategy for Change is no larger than other primary schools that already operate in the city and across the country, many of which are effective and popular. The current Primary Review proposals are in the main to create medium-sized primary schools (2 forms of entry), rather than large schools (3 forms of entry or more).

There is no evidence to suggest that small schools achieve better results either locally or nationally. All three small schools proposed for closure either achieve below the government's floor targets or below the expected attainment of similar schools nationally (otherwise referred to as FFTB expectations). Across Bristol there are some high performing small and large schools; and many under-performing small and large schools. The common factors across successful schools are not related to size, but to the effectiveness of leadership and management and the quality of teaching and learning.

Nationally and locally, Key Stage 2 results demonstrate that large schools, even in the most challenging circumstances, can be successful. An example of such a school in Bristol is Bishop Road

This is also demonstrated by OFSTED inspections. Bristol examples include: Waycroft, Bridge Farm and Westbury on Trym

There is national and local evidence that two small schools, amalgamating into one larger school, can improve significantly (as demonstrated by OFSTED inspection and Key Stage test results) as a larger unit of provision. Stark examples of such schools in Bristol include Barton Hill and Littlemead.

Some reference has been made to the research on 'small schools' by James Wetz, University of Bristol. It has been argued that his research on 'human scale' education argues against the effectiveness of large schools. The council very much supports the view that 'Human scale' education important to children, school staff and communities, but believes, as does researcher and former headteacher James Wetz, that these conditions can be effectively created within larger units of provision. James, for example, showcased Brislington Engineering College as a good example of this in a recent BBC documentary. Brislington is a large secondary school, but its internal structure is based on smaller 'schools within the school'. This model provides greater capacity to personalise the learning experience for all students; the bigger the school - the more staff and resources; the smaller the unit of learning within the school the more personalised the support to individuals.

All state schools are funded through a national pupil-led formula. Small units of provision struggle to provide the curriculum flexibility now required by government. This is more affordable where there are economies of scale. Small schools find it more difficult to afford the same level of support and development opportunities for staff that larger schools are able to provide. This affects recruitment and retention.

2. Concern regarding the closure of small schools

Concern regarding the closure of 'small' schools is linked to the above.

The proposals to close three small primary schools in the Primary Review are founded upon the specific circumstances of the three schools. The Strategy for Change explicitly recognises the role that small schools play in Bristol's primary provision. In this context a small school is deemed as a one form entry school.

There is no intention to close one form of entry schools on principle. Bristol's provision will continue to be of a mixed economy. It is Bristol's intention, however, not to create any more one form of entry schools in the future for the reasons set out above.

The key issue related to the three schools in question is 'value for money'. Each school is below the size of one form entry. The per pupil unit cost for each of the three schools is £4,017, £3,979 and £3,928 compared to the Bristol average of £3,135. Surplus places stand at 6%, 45% and 25%. First choice preferences by parents in 2007 were 11, 11, and 5. High pupil unit cost is compounded by other factors. These high costs impact on the budgets of Bristol's other primary schools. Other primary schools, therefore, subsidise these particularly small units of provision. BSF capital funding is only available where authorities can demonstrate that they are addressing the most stark value for money issues.

Furthermore, in some parts of the city there are insufficient school places, and in others there are surplus school places. Some recommendations to expand/amalgamate schools are to meet parental demand. To secure government funding to do this, the council has to reduce inefficiencies elsewhere in the system. Some proposals to expand can only be achieved in tandem with the closure of another school.

3. Concern regarding capacity to meet population growth in central and east Bristol

Modelling, approved by the DCSF to be sound, though like any modelling, not completely reliable, indicates sufficient places will be created by current recommendations up to 2013. Much of the Phase 1 & 2 plans are to expand where needed and only when new places are available, close down places where there is a surplus.

An immediate shortfall of reception places for 2009 will be addressed through temporary accommodation on sites identified for expansion where planning permission permits.

It is likely that in the review scheduled to precede Phase 3, further places will be needed in key areas of the city.

Due to varied admission numbers in some paired infant and junior schools, there are currently more infant places than junior. This situation is also being addressed in Phases 1&2.

4. Concern regarding federations and the role of successful schools in them

In principle, Federation is an improvement strategy that schools themselves take the decision to pursue, and a number of primary, secondary and special schools in Bristol have already moved towards federated arrangements under their own initiative. Their reasons are varied, but federation is generally pursued to strengthen schools' collective capacity to improve, raise pupils' attainment and secure community confidence.

Some schools, including high performing schools, are pursuing federation as a means to minimise the negative impact of transition. In other situations federation is seen as an alternative to closing a struggling or underperforming school where pupil places are still needed. Some schools have chosen to federate as a means to re-brand their offer to parents, and / or to improve economies of scale. The Primary Review suggests a variety of

federated arrangements for schools to consider, drawing on the creative solutions to complex issues that are being pursued by other Bristol schools.

Whilst Federation is an improvement strategy usually pursued by schools themselves, a 'Forced Federation' may also occur. Under the Education and Inspections Act 2006, local authorities have a strategic leadership role to promote high standards in education. To this end they have a range of intervention powers in schools requiring special measures, schools requiring significant improvement and schools in receipt of a local authority warning notice. These are the powers of closure, forced federation, IEB, additional governors, and de-delegation.

Government is currently concerned that local authorities are not sufficiently taking the opportunity to issue warning notices to address under-performance, thus enabling Forced Federation and other interventions. It therefore proposes to take a new legislative power in the forthcoming Education and Skills Bill to require authorities to consider formal warning notices in the following circumstances:

- "Low attaining schools ... stuck at unacceptable levels of performance ... where Key Stage 2 level 4 attainment rates in both English and Maths have been below the Government's 65% Floor Target for five or more years;
- Schools that are badly and sharply declining in performance, including schools achieving above government Floor Targets, but in danger of falling below;
- Schools with persistently low value added or contextual value added;
- Persistently 'coasting' schools with poor rates of pupil progress". (Ref: Delivering the Children's Plan: Proposals for Revisions to Legislation for Schools Causing Concern, 2008).

Given the overall context of extremely low performance in its primary schools, it is Government's expectation that Bristol will increasingly use the mechanisms of Formal Warnings to 'force' federations and other interventions. Indeed, the Chair of Bristol's 'Raising Attainment' Workstream Group states in his annual report 2008: "Those "hard to shift" primary schools which have not made progress must close or be incorporated in hard federations with effective schools."

In this context, the Primary Review provides the opportunity for schools that may be vulnerable to a Formal Warning to take the initiative in determining their own future.

5. Concern regarding the amalgamation of all infant and junior schools, especially where they are high performing, popular and/or already federated

The Primary Review principles agreed in 2007 state that amalgamations will be considered where: either the linked schools request it; where one or both schools fall into a category of concern; where there is financial sustainability for one or both of the linked schools; and where large scale capital investment is required which cannot be achieved without the resources available through reorganisation.

The proposal to complete the amalgamation of all infant and junior schools in the long-term is a strategic one. The aim being to secure a coherent primary system across the entire city, that consistently provides all pupils with a smooth transition between Key Stages 1 and 2 to minimise the barriers to learning; and consistently simplifies the links between home and school, especially where families have children in both Key Stage 1 and 2.

This proposal is informed by research to show that transition between schools is a major barrier to students' learning. DCSF guidance on transition includes:

“Transfers and transitions play a crucial role in school improvement. Evidence shows that children and families experience significant levels of stress and anxiety at times of transfer between one school and another. This, and a break in continuity in the curriculum and personal relationships, has a negative impact on pupils’ progress. All schools, therefore, have a duty to ensure that transfer and transition is effective for all children. Where children are performing below expected levels, it is even more vital for schools to secure effective transition and transfer. This means ensuring that transition and transfer is explicitly addressed in strategic, budgetary, curriculum, performance management and collaborative planning. Schools wishing to accelerate pupil progress may look to new models of governance to maximise their capacity to manage transition and transfer, and minimise a dip in pupil progress.”

“Local authorities are required to ensure that educational provision in their area provides high standards and value for money. To achieve this, they are required to review and reorganise school provision to remove any barriers to pupil progress. Where there is under-performance across an area there is even greater urgency for local authorities to reconfigure provision, particularly to minimise transition and transfer wherever it can be achieved.”

In this context, it is acknowledged that hard federation provides a completely valid alternative to amalgamation.

It is to be noted that succession planning is a key issue for small schools, even where they are successful. In Bristol we need to attract the best school leaders to meet the challenges we face. We have direct experience in Bristol of having hardly any, or no, applicants for a number of discreet infant and junior schools - even after two attempts to recruit through national advert. Feedback from people who seek information but fail to apply for headship indicates that the size and scope of the school was a major factor in their decision not to apply for a particular headship. The national leadership pay scales are such that the most ambitious leaders are attracted to bigger and more diverse units of provision, and this will increasingly become the case over time.

6. Concern regarding the consultation process

Consultation was carried out in 2007 to identify the principles that should underpin the Primary Review. The outcome of this first stage of consultation was reported to Scrutiny and the following principles were confirmed by Cabinet on 25th October 2007.(CAB:19.10/07)

- ❖ Creation of new models of governance and leadership
- ❖ Creating larger schools, with better integrated service delivery
- ❖ Increase capacity in east central Bristol
- ❖ New built forms
- ❖ Reduce capacity in peripheral areas
- ❖ Remedy school level deficiencies in accommodation

The decisions taken by Cabinet on 25th October 2007.(CAB:19.10/07) were that officers bring forward proposals in line with the above principles that:

- a) Create larger units of provision (on one or more sites) that may involve new partners and forms of organisation, replacing existing schools and where new provision is required
- b) Remove small units of provision (where schools admit less than 30 pupils per year), where this can be achieved without adverse impact
- c) Increase the number of available primary school places to meet the needs of a growing school population in east and central Bristol
- d) Reduce the number of primary school places in the outer suburban areas
- e) Require new built forms
- f) Address accommodation deficiencies

At the time of the 2007 consultation, a number of specific primary capital projects were already identified for feasibility. These projects are now in an advanced stage of planning (E.g.: Sea Mills, Cabot) and are grouped as 'Phase 1' in the Primary Review recommendations.

To secure Primary funding, Bristol was required to submit a city-wide 'Strategy for Change' to government by 16th June 2008. Given Bristol's context in relation to levels of educational attainment, Bristol received DCSF support in this process to meet the very tight deadlines imposed. The purpose of the submission was to provide DCSF with the evidence to show that Bristol's planning met the conditions set out above.

As the submission date for the 'Strategy for Change' fell shortly after a school holiday, the recommendations were shared with schools before the break. Feedback was invited up to 18th July 2008. All affected schools were individually informed of their inclusion in the review one day prior to a launch event on 22nd May 2008, to which all schools were invited. It was emphasised at this event and in all other communications, that the 'Strategy for Change' is a strategic document designed to secure additional capital funding; it does not constitute any formal decisions or statutory consultation on any specific proposals.

DCSF are expected to respond to Bristol's 'Strategy for Change' by October 2008. If Bristol has reassured DCSF that it has an overall strategy to meet the conditions, funding will be confirmed. Bristol will retain the flexibility to alter any initial proposals, provided that the alternative proposals also meet the aforesaid conditions. E.g.: surplus places are reduced to below 10%; parental demand for places is met; under-performance is addressed in specific schools; etc.

7. Concern regarding funding for Phases 1 & 2

Total Allocations to Primary Review

Programme	2007/8 [^]	2008/9 [^]	2009/10 [^]	2010/11 [^]	2011/12 ³	2012/13 ³	2013/14 ³
Modernisation	£500,000 ¹	£1,128,000 ¹	£872,000 ¹	£1,895,954	£2,650,000	£2,500,000	£500,000
New Places	£2,301,845	£4,868,323	£5,224,000*	£6,500,000*	£6,000,000*	£3,950,000*	£1,500,000
Primary Capital Programme	Nil	Nil	£3,250,000*	£6,304,046*	£5,550,000	£6,100,000	£5,000,000
Extended Schools ²	Nil	£70,000	Nil	nil	Nil	Nil	nil
DCSF Targeted Capital Fund*		£250,000	£1,350,700	£2,600,000			

Capital Receipts ^a			£4,350,000		£7,500,000		
Section 106 ^o	431,832		1,500,000				
TOTAL (£84,646,700)	£3,233,677	£6,316,323	16,546,700	£17,300,000	£21,700,000	£12,550,000	£7,000,000 (remainder funds to be allocated)

[^] The remainder funding is targeted to earlier primary capital projects, R&M works and secondary non PFI/BSF building works

¹ Remainder funding targeted to individual school R&M works identified in Asset Management Plan.

² Remainder funding allocated to small school projects such as CCTV.

³ These funding allocations are estimated and based on funding allocations in 2010/11

* Allocations have also been made to primary projects outside of the review and an element of contingency.

* The TCF was applied for under advice from the DCSF . We are awaiting confirmation if the application has been successful.

^a The allocation of receipts to the Primary Review is subject to market realisation of land values and business case.

^o The allocation of Section 106 funds is subject to Cabinet approval.

See also Appendix 8

8. Concern regarding population growth and plans for new housing

CYPS has worked closely with Planners when considering the strategic recommendations. Officers are informed, through membership of the Bristol Development Framework Board, of the thinking behind plans for extensive housing development between now and 2026. 'Shaping Bristol over the next 20 years, Bristol Development Strategy – Core Framework' has been well used in discussion and strategic planning.

The process is not one way, officers from CYPS have continued to develop dialogue regarding potential new sites and the use of surplus sites to deliver the 'Core Strategy'. We are fully aware that plans for expansion of housing are in the very early stages of development. We know where it is expected to focus and the overall quantities of housing anticipated in each area, but because none of this is yet definite, there is a need for a review in 2011/12 before Phase 3 proposals are brought forward.

What is certain, is that population growth is greater in some parts of the city and the rate of growth in these areas has increased in recent years, making planning quite difficult. There are also lifestyle changes to be factored in, such as more single occupancy dwellings, larger families living in smaller units of accommodation in some areas and a continuing decline in families with school age children in other areas.

The modelling we use will have to become more sophisticated. This is underway. We are confident that the Phase 1&2 recommendations will enhance the provision we need in the city.

Risk assessment for approving the Primary Review						
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
1	The DCSF may not approve the Strategy which would result in Capital funding not being released. This would affect the viability of the CYPs Capital Programme.	High	Medium	The DCSF will advise Local Authorities on what amendments are required to the Strategy for Change to release the capital funds. The programme will only be delayed for the period it takes to achieve approval.	High	Low
2	The delay in securing approval results in a delay in starting the Capital Programme. This could impact on statutory requirements, including those relating to admissions.	High	Medium	Look to re-phasing the programme to meet the slippage and communicate the delay to all stakeholders. Explore opportunities to overcome temporary delays within affected schools.	High	Low
3	The DCSF do not approve the Primary Strategy for Change in terms of the allocation of Primary Capital Programme grant allocated to specific projects.	High	Medium	Ensure that the supportive data within the strategy reflects the need for investment in terms of DCSF prerequisites.	High	Low
4	The DCSF place restrictive conditions on the use of funding in relation to the capital programme	High	Medium	Look to re-phasing programme and re-allocating funding.	High	Low

No.	RISK	Impact	Probability	Mitigation	Impact	Probability
5	The Primary Capital grant allocated to a specific project falls short of the required funding requirement following design of the scheme.	High	High	<p>Ensure that feasibilities are undertaken in an appropriate level of detail to enable realistic prices to be submitted within the capital programme.</p> <p>Look to re-phasing funding opportunities.</p> <p>Report to Cabinet where variance triggers the need within the Financial Regulations to enable a review of project viability.</p>	High	Low
6	The DCSF could reduce or remove future Grant Allocations that fund the Primary Capital Programme	High	Medium	The DCSF have confirmed the Schools Capital Grant allocations for 2008/9 to 2010/11. The Government have confirmed in public documents that the Primary Capital Programme, which starts in 2010/11, is additional to capital grants already given to local authorities.	High	Low
7	The Strategy for Change fails to address DCSF concerns over surplus capacity in primary school settings.	High	Medium	The Strategy for Change will identify the framework under which the review will be implemented. This includes the reduction in capacity through amalgamations. This will include consolidation of pupils on to one campus in many cases.	High	Low

Risk assessment for not approving the Primary Review						
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
1	There will be no approved strategic framework for capital investment in Primary Provision.	High	High	The investment strategy will be based on the broad objectives of the Children and Young people's Plan.	High	Medium
2	The DCSF will not approve capital expenditure from the Primary Capital Programme without a 'Primary Strategy for Change'.	High	High	The Primary Strategy for Change is part of the Primary Review process. Cabinet (CAB 19.10/07, refers) has previously agreed the key principles for the review.	High	Medium
3	The City Council will not be able to allocate Primary Capital Programme funding within the overall Capital Programme. This will result in a failure to deliver the Corporate priorities in terms of Learning and Achievement.	High	High	Revise the CYPS capital programme so that the delivery of corporate objectives is achievable within the funding available.	Medium	Low

EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Initial Impact Assessment of a policy or function

<p>Name of policy or function to be assessed: Primary Review – City Wide</p>	<p>Name of manager responsible for assessment: <i>Michael Branaghan Strategy Leader - Capital, Assets & Schools Organisation</i></p>
<p>Is this a new or existing policy/function? New</p>	<p><i>Date of assessment: August 2008</i></p>
<p>Step 1. Describe the aims; objectives and purpose of the policy or function (include how it fits in to wider aims or strategic objectives).</p>	<p><i>To undertake a City Wide review of Primary School capacity to increase places where needed and remove surplus places where identified.</i></p>
<p>Are there any associated objectives of the policy or function (i.e. setting a standard of good practice, improving consumer confidence in the service)?</p>	<p><i>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></p>
<p>Who is intended to benefit from the policy/function and in what way?</p>	<p><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></p>
<p>What are the intended outcomes of this policy/function?</p>	<p><i>To provide sufficient school places to meet demand in the area.</i></p>
<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>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</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>Yes, 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. Where appropriate new schools will be constructed.</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?</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><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>The plans include enhanced facilities for deaf children and in the refurbishment of 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. This will be unchanged if the proposal is implemented.</i> <i>Any new primary school would comply with DCSF code of practice on admissions, SEN and with current guidance on exclusions.</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</p> <p>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 be increased 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>
<p>Signed (completing officer):</p> <p>Job Title :</p>	

Environment Impact Checklist

Title of report: Strategy for Change: Primary Capital Programme			
Report author: Kate Campion, Piers Brunning, Mick Branaghan			
Anticipated date of key decision: 29 th May 2008			
<p>Summary of proposals: The development and approval of Primary Strategy for Change is a mandatory prerequisite for the release of capital funding from the DCSF to invest in primary school refurbishment, re-building or new provision. Cabinet is asked to approve the strategy.</p> <p>Additionally, Cabinet will be asked to approve the draft recommendations of the Primary Review so that they can be distributed for wider consultation. The Primary Review identifies the priorities for primary provision throughout the city.</p>			
Will the proposal impact on.....	Yes/ No	+ive or -ive	If yes.....
			Briefly describe impact
Emission of Climate Changing Gases?	Yes	+/-	<p>The Primary Strategy for Change, if approved by the DCSF, will release capital funding for refurbishment and building of new or extended primary school provision within the city. In the short-term, there is a potential for secondary emissions of climate changing gases arising through the use of energy and materials during the construction works. Additionally, new buildings on sites that have not previously been occupied by buildings will increase the overall carbon footprint of the site.</p> <p>The Government expect all local authorities to apply energy efficient and renewable energy measures, to meet the 60% reduction in carbon emissions, to all new school buildings. New schools will include energy efficiency measures that reduce energy required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heating (and cooling); • Lighting; <p>Low or Zero Carbon (LZC) energy generation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable and LZC sources for heating; • Renewable sources for hot water; • Renewable sources for electricity; <p>Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Older buildings with higher carbon footprints will be demolished or refurbished.</p>

Bristol's vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	No Yes	+	<p>New buildings: May be at risk of flooding. May increase the area of impermeable surfaces May not be robust enough to cope with extreme temperature variations, or violent storms Consume water</p>	<p>Planning applications for all new buildings will be required to prepare Environmental Impact Assessments and identify the appropriate mitigation in relation to the impacts identified. Examples may include:</p> <p>Rainwater harvesting Sustainable drainage techniques Passive building design</p>
Consumption of non-renewable resources?	Yes/ No	+/-	<p>In the short-term, there is a potential for the consumption of fossil fuels and other non-renewable materials products arising through the use of energy and materials during the construction works.</p> <p>In the long-term, there will be consumption of fossil fuels for heating and power, and also for travel to and from the sites</p>	<p>The Government have asked local authorities to consider the use of biomass heating.</p> <p>Older buildings with higher carbon footprints will be demolished or refurbished.</p> <p>Architects will be expected to consider opportunities for the use of renewable construction materials where feasible, and to consider how the quantities of materials required can be minimised.</p> <p>The location of the site will affect its users' choice of transport and will be considered with a view to reducing impact.</p> <p>School travel plans will be required for all new or refurbished schools</p>
Production, recycling or disposal of waste	Yes	+	<p>Waste will arise from construction and demolition works</p> <p>Waste will arise from the normal operation of the school</p>	<p>Construction contractors will be legally obliged to prepare site waste management plans, which detail how waste will be minimised, and recycling promoted.</p> <p>All schools will be required to provide recycling facilities – in</p>

				particular, paper, glass, cardboard and food.
The appearance of the city?	Yes	+	Refurbished or rebuilt schools will alter the appearance of the city	The suitability of the buildings' appearance will be considered as part of the planning applications
Pollution to land, water or air?	Yes	+	If brownfield sites are chosen, they may be contaminated There is a risk of hazardous materials (e.g. fuels or paints) being spilled during construction works.	The Pollution Control team will advise as part of the planning application The construction contractor will be subject to site inspection to ensure that hazardous materials are adequately controlled
Wildlife and habitats?	Yes	+	It is possible that sites for new schools will: Impact upon protected species or habitats Reduce green spaces/ corridors Remove trees	Improve access to wildlife Plant trees Create new habitats Seek guidance on protected species & habitats As part of external areas as defined in Building Bulletin 99. (explanation needed?)

Consulted with:

Internal: - Planning and Central Support Services – to identify growth points and community issues.

External - Not at this stage.

Summary of impacts and mitigation – to go into the Cabinet/Council Report

The significant impacts of this proposal are....

Short-term increase in environmental impacts through the consumption of fossil fuels and raw materials in constructing and refurbishing schools. Longer term, there will be on-going consumption of energy for heat and power, production of waste and staff and pupil travel to school.

Potential exists for both positive and negative net effects from each school project, for example on biodiversity or energy use.

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts....

All new buildings and refurbishments will meet the BREEAM Very Good standard and will be reduce energy use by 60% compared to current levels.

The transport impacts will be assessed for each school as part of a Home to School Transport Assessment.

All planning applications will be accompanied by a statement of the environmental impacts of the proposals and the mitigation measures proposed.

The net effects of the proposals are....

It is hoped that the long term effect of the strategy will be a net reduction in Carbon Dioxide emissions from schools and associated travel and the impacts of individual schemes will be monitored.

Checklist completed by:

Name:	Michael Branaghan, Strategy Leader, Capital Assets and School Organisation
Dept.:	Children and Young People's Services
Extension:	23384
Date:	12 May, 2008
Verified by Environment and Sustainability Unit	Alex Minshull

Appendix 7

CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS for PRIMARY REVIEW PHASE 1 AND 2

Total Allocations to Primary Review

Programme	Phase 1				Phase 2		
	2007/8 [^]	2008/9 [^]	2009/10 [^]	2010/11 [^]	2011/12 ³	2012/13 ³	2013/14 ³
Modernisation	£500,000 ¹	£1,128,000 ¹	£872,000 ¹	£1,895,954	£2,650,000	£2,500,000	£500,000
New Places	£2,301,845	£4,868,323	£5,224,000*	£6,500,000*	£6,000,000*	£3,950,000*	£1,500,000
Primary Capital Programme	Nil	Nil	£3,250,000*	£6,304,046*	£5,550,000	£6,100,000	£5,000,000
Extended Schools ²	Nil	£70,000	Nil	nil	Nil	Nil	nil
DCSF Targeted Capital Fund*		£250,000	£1,350,700	£2,600,000			
Capital Receipts ^a			£4,350,000		£7,500,000		
Section 106 ^o	431,832		1,500,000				
TOTAL (£84,646,700)	£3,233,677	£6,316,323	16,546,700	£17,300,000	£21,700,000	£12,550,000	£7,000,000 (remainder funds to be allocated)

[^] The remainder funding is targeted to earlier primary capital projects, R&M works and secondary non PFI/BSF building works

¹ Remainder funding targeted to individual school R&M works identified in Asset Management Plan.

² Remainder funding allocated to small school projects such as CCTV.

³ These funding allocations are estimated and based on funding allocations in 2010/11

* Allocations have also been made to primary projects outside of the review and an element of contingency.

* The TCF was applied for under advice from the DCSF. We are awaiting confirmation if the application has been successful.

^a The allocation of receipts to the Primary Review is subject to market realisation of land values and business case.

^o The allocation of Section 106 funds is subject to Cabinet approval.

Name of School	Estimated costs and funding streams to be used
PHASE ONE	
EAST CENTRAL 1	
Cabot Primary School (expand to 2 FE to include St Paul's Children Centre, CYPS Extended services and multi agency provision)	New Places 2008/9 £1,000,000 Capital Receipt 2009/10 £2,300,000 Capital Receipt 2009/10 £500,000 Section 106 2009/10 £1,500,000 New Places 2009/10 £1,000,000 New Places 2010/11 £1,000,000 Primary Capital Programme 2010/11 £3,200,000 TOTAL COST £10,500,000
Sefton Park Schools – expand to 3 FE	New Places 2006/7 £1,544,000 Prudential Borrowing (2006/7) £2,000,000 New Places 2007/8 £845,845 Section 106 (2007/8) £431,832 New Places 2008/9 £598,323 New Places 2009/10 £1,000,000 New Places 2010/11 £500,000 TOTAL COST £6,920,000
EAST CENTRAL 2	
Oldbury Court Primary School – refurbishment to 1 FE	Awaiting feasibility
Air Balloon Hill Infant and Junior School – amalgamate to 2.5 FE (capital works in phase 2)	Primary Capital Programme 2011/12 £250,000 Primary Capital Programme 2012/13 £750,000 Primary Capital Programme 2013/14 £1,000,000 TOTAL COST £2,000,000
EAST CENTRAL 3	
Bannerman Road Primary – expansion to 2 FE	New Places 2008/9 £750,000 New Places 2009/10 £750,000 New Places 2010/11 £500,000

Name of School	Estimated costs and funding streams to be used
	TOTAL COST £2,000,000
PHASE ONE (CONT'D)	
EAST CENTRAL 3	
Whitehall Primary School – new build to 2 FE	Modernisation 2008/9 £100,000 Primary Capital Programme 2009/10 £250,000 Modernisation 2010/11 £495,954 New Places 2010/11 £2,000,000 Primary Capital programme 2010/11 £604,046 New Places 2011/12 £750,000 Primary Capital Programme 2011/12 £700,000 New Places 2012 /13 £1,100,000 TOTAL COST £6,000,000
NORTH 1	
Bankleaze Primary School – refurbish to 1 FE	Modernisation 2008/9 £350,000 Modernisation 2009/10 £500,000 Targeted Capital Fund 2008-11 £1,150,700 TOTAL COST £2,000,700
Sea Mills Infant and Junior School – amalgamation to 1 FE	Primary Capital Programme 2009/10 £1,000,000 Capital Receipt 2009/10 £1,050,000 Modernisation 2010/11 £900,000 Targeted Capital Fund (subject to approval) £2,950,000 TOTAL COST £5,900,000
Weston Park Primary/Bluebell Valley Nursery – amalgamation to 1 FE	Modernisation 2008/9 £350,000 Primary Capital Programme 2010/11 £1,000,000 TOTAL COST £1,350,000
NORTH 2	
Henbury Court Primary School – refurbish as part of children centre development to 1 FE	Modernisation 2007/8 £500,000 Modernisation 2008/9 £328,000 Modernisation 2009/10 £372,000 TOTAL COST £1,200,000
Horfield Primary School – expand to 2 FE	New Places 2007/8 £803,000 New Places 2008/9 £953,000 Extended School 2008/9 £70,000 School Devolved Capital £30,000 New Places 2009/10 £474,000 TOTAL COST £2,330,000
Upper Horfield Primary School - refurbishment	Awaiting feasibility
Westbury on Trym Primary School – expand to 2 FE	Modernisation 2006/7 £500,000 New Places 2007/8 £653,000 New Places 2008/9 £1,567,000 TOTAL COST £2,720,000
SOUTH 1	
Parson Street Primary School – refurbishment at 2 FE	Primary Capital Programme 2009/10 £500,000 Primary Capital Programme 2010/11 £500,000 Modernisation 2010/11 £500,000 Primary Capital Programme 2011/12 £500,000 Modernisation 2011/12 £500,000 TOTAL COST £2,500,000
South Street Primary School (Compass Point) – refurbishment at 1 FE	Awaiting feasibility
SOUTH 2	
Victoria Park Infant and Junior School – amalgamate at 1.5 FE	Primary Capital Programme 2009/10 £1,500,000 TOTAL COST £1,500,000
SOUTH 4	
Bishopsworth and Highridge – amalgamate at 1.5 FE	Capital Receipt £500,000 TOTAL COST £500,000 (subject to feasibility)
Teyfant Primary School – federate at 2 FE	Part of BSF Project

Name of School	Estimated costs and funding streams to be used
PHASE TWO	
EAST CENTRAL 1	
Glenfrome Primary School – refurbish to 1 FE and co-locate Elmfield School for the Deaf Primary	Primary Capital Programme 2011/12 £1,000,000 Capital Receipt £2,000,000 TOTAL COST £3,000,000
St Barnabas Primary School – new build	New Places 2009/10 £2,000,000 New Places 2010/11 £2,500,000 New Places 2011/12 £1,500,000 TOTAL COST £6,000,000
EAST CENTRAL 2	
Hillfields Primary School – refurbish to 1 FE	Modernisation 2011/12 £500,000 Modernisation 2012/13 £500,000 TOTAL COST £1,000,000
Two Mile Hill Infant and Junior School – amalgamate at 2 FE	New Places 2011/12 £750,000 TOTAL COST £750,000
EAST CENTRAL 3	
May Park Primary- refurbish at 2 FE	Modernisation 2006/7 £250,000 Primary Capital Programme 2010/11 £1,000,000 Primary Capital Programme 2011/12 £1,600,000 TOTAL COST £2,850,000
Millpond Primary School – rebuild at 2 FE	Modernisation 2011/12 £1,000,000 New Places 2011/12 £1,000,000 New Places 2012/13 £1,000,000 Primary Capital Programme 2012/13 £500,000 Modernisation 2013/14 £500,000 New Places 2013/14 £500,000 Primary Capital Programme 2013/14 1,000,000 TOTAL COST £6,000,000
St Nicholas of Tolentine VA Primary – refurbish at 1 FE	Primary Capital Programme 2012/13 £1,000,000 TOTAL COST £1,000,000
NORTH 2	
Badock's Wood Primary – refurbishment	Modernisation 2012/13 £1,000,000 TOTAL COST £1,000,000
Fonthill Primary School – refurbish at 1 FE	Modernisation 2011/12 £500,000 Modernisation 2012/13 £500,000 TOTAL COST £1,000,000
NORTH 3	
St Bonaventure's	Subject to feasibility
St Michael on the Mount Primary – new build	New Places 2011/12 £2,000,000 Primary Capital Programme 2011/12 £500,000 Capital Receipt £1,000,000 Capital Receipt £2,500,000 TOTAL COST £6,000,000
SOUTH 2	
Connaught Primary and Illminster Avenue Primary Schools	Primary Capital Programme 2011/12 £1,000,000 Capital Receipt £2,000,000 Primary Capital Programme 2012/13 £2,000,000 Modernisation 2012/13 £1,000,000 TOTAL COST £6,000,000
School of Christ the King – expansion to 1.5 FE	New Places 2012/13 £1,100,000 Primary Capital Programme 2012/13 £100,000 TOTAL COST £1,200,000
SOUTH 3	
Burnbush Primary School – expansion at 1 FE	New Places 2012/13 £750,000 Primary Capital Programme 2012/13 £250,000 TOTAL COST £1,000,000
Waycroft Primary School – refurbishment	Primary Capital Programme 2012/13 £500,000 Modernisation 2012/13 £500,000 TOTAL COST £1,000,000
Wansdyke Primary School – refurbish to 1 FE	Primary Capital Programme 2012/13 £500,000 Modernisation 2012/13 £500,000

Name of School	Estimated costs and funding streams to be used
	TOTAL COST £1,000,000

Surplus Places – based on initial recommendations

Reception Places – now and in 2013

Year	2007/08	2013/14	Change to end Phases 1 & 2
Total places available	4,443	4,493	1%
Total numbers of reception aged children	4,170	4,405	6%
Surplus Places	273	88	
% Surplus Places	6%	2%	

Overall places available in primary schools now and at the end of Phase 2

Year	2007/08	2013/14	Change to end Phases 1 & 2
Total places available	31,058	31,211	0%
Total number of primary aged children	27,320	29,083	6%
Surplus Places	3,738	2,128	
% Surplus Places	12%	7%	

Only if all the initial recommendations are implemented do we manage to reduce surplus places to below 10%.

If any scheme is removed, another scheme to reduce places will need to be considered.

Currently there are 20 primary schools in Bristol with a surplus capacity between 20-25% based on PLASC return January 2008

Schools with > 25% Surplus Places

DCSF No.	School		Net Capacity	Roll	Surplus Places	SP %age	Outcomes of review will address issue
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

Phase 1

School	Added places	Places removed
Sea Mills		15
Henbury Court		15
Horfield	6	
Westbury on Trym	15	
Cabot	30	
Sefton Park	30	
Whitehall	30	
Oldbury Court		15
Bishopsworth/Highridge		15
Victoria Park Infant/Junior	1	
Bannerman Road	15	
TOTAL	127	60

Phase 2

School	Added places	Places removed
St Barnabas	35	
Two Mile Hill		15
Hillfield		30
Millpond	30	
St George/St Michael	15	
Stockwood Green/Burnbush/Waycroft		12
St Pius/School of Christ the King		10
Connaught/Ilminster Ave		30
TOTAL	80	97

School Data Sheets

***All KS2 data for 2008 is provisional**

Scheme: St. Pius Xth Primary School

Summary

The proposal is to close the school and expand The School of Christ the King and is consistent with the policy that small units of provision (educating less than 30 in each age group) are overly expensive and so should be removed. The Faith balance of schools will be maintained.

Specific issues include:

- Small size leads to poor value for money.
- Too high a level of surplus places in this school and locally.
- Diversity of provision to be maintained by linked proposals.
- Condition and suitability of building poor

“As part of the expansion plan for the School of Christ the King to 1.5FE (S2) St Pius RC Primary close in Phase 2.”

Standards

OfSTED report – September 2007, Satisfactory

%ge of roll achieving Level 4 combined English & Maths scores:

2005	2006	2007	2008*
56.5	57.1	46.7	76.5 E 70.6M

Note that the national floor target (the minimum expected level) is 65% but expected to be 55% from 2009

Standards at St Pius are improving

English results in 2008 at L4 (76.5%) were above FFTB, though L5 (18%) were below.

In mathematics performance was better than FFTD at L4 (71%) this illustrates the value added by the school

Value for Money

Information taken from the Section 52 return for the 2008/09 period (to be published formally).

School total budget share per pupil at this school **£3,928**

Average budget share per pupil in a Bristol primary phase school **£3,115**

The cost per child is therefore **26.1%** above the average

The budget share per pupil at this school places it in the top (most expensive per child) quartile amongst Bristol Schools

It is therefore clear, as stated in the October report, that the school does represent a very expensive form of provision due to its small size.

Premises issues

Rank amongst Bristol schools for premises condition: **39**

Rank amongst Bristol schools for the combined score for suitability and condition: **7**

The combined suitability and condition score takes condition into account, but also considers how the suitable the buildings are for curriculum delivery. The higher the rank (or the lower the number) the greater the problems the school faces.

Site

	Current capacity in Sq. Metres
Actual site	14,217

DCSF recommended site	9,760
Site area surplus	4,457
%ge surplus	45.7 %

This site exceeds the DCSF recommended site area.

School at the heart of the community

The level of surplus places is too high and can only be sustained where either increased demand is forecast or other related proposals will lead to increased rolls. Neither is the case.

Number of first preference applicants for this school (or if this is a junior school for the related infant school): 11 out of 30

Number of surplus places: 94

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 21 in the most deprived Bristol primary schools. This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure.

This school is in the most deprived quartile of Bristol schools. This points to the need to address condition, suitability and sufficiency needs as a matter of urgency. The opportunity to expand The School of Christ the King, a rapidly improving school could resolve this issue.

Diversity

Category of school: Voluntary Aided

Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for recommendation

This is seen as one project. The area is one affected by falling rolls. 13% surplus capacity at St Pius with first preferences at 11 for Sept. 2008. The School of Christ the King is a rapidly improving school (OfSTED) and there is an opportunity to make it 1.5FE. The cost of education per pupil at St Pius is very high (£793 more, per child, per year). St Pius has made improvement, but rates of progress are not secure. Expansion at The School of Christ the King could not be justified if St Pius remains open as it would add to surplus capacity.

This proposal would remove 10 surplus places per year group (-10)

Scheme: School of Christ the King

Summary

An expansion would allow this strong school the opportunity to raise standards for an increased number of families in the Knowle West area.

Specific issues include:

- School achieves improving levels of attainment.
- Needs of local community not being met.
- Popular school
- Small size leads to concern regarding value for money

“Expand School of Christ the King in Phase 2 to 1.5FE.”

Standards

Ofsted – November 2006, Good

%ge of roll achieving level 4 combined English & Maths scores:

2005	2006	2007	2008*
60.9	85.7	64.5	63.2E 94.7M

Note that the national floor target (the minimum expected level) is 65% but expected to be 55% from 2009.

The School of Christ the King is making significant improvements in standards as the OfSTED report of 2006 indicates.

In 2008 English results at KS2 remained below the floor target at L4(63%) and below FFTB at L4 and L5 (21%)

However, in mathematics performance at L4 (95%) exceeded FFTD, though L5 (26%) was below FFTB

Value for Money

Information taken from the Section 52 return for the 2008/09 period (to be published formally).

School total budget share per pupil at this school **£3409**

Average budget share per pupil in a Bristol primary phase school **£3,115**

The cost per child is therefore **9.4%** above the average

This school is in the top quartile for spend on SEN and AEN per child

Premises issues

Rank amongst Bristol schools for premises condition: 54

Rank amongst Bristol schools for the combined score for suitability and condition: 32

The combined suitability and condition score takes condition into account, but also considers how the suitable the buildings are for curriculum delivery. The higher the rank (or the lower the number) the greater the problems the school faces.

Site

	Current capacity in Sq. Metres
Actual site	6666
DCSF recommended site	8500
Site area shortfall	1834
%ge shortfall	21.6 %

This site is smaller than DCSF guidance recommends for this size of school. Further development may require enhanced external facilities to ensure curriculum delivery, though creative use of space would allow expansion and meet curriculum need.

School at the heart of the community

This school is oversubscribed on first preferences, it is currently smaller than 1FE

Number of first preference applicants for this school: 30 for 25 places

To ensure value for money, expansion of The School of Christ the King must be significant to benefit from the investment. The addition of five places to provision, does not provide this opportunity

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 13 for the most deprived school roll amongst Bristol primary schools.

This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure.

This school is in the most deprived quartile of Bristol schools.

Diversity

Category of school: Voluntary Aided

Area comment on diversity: Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for recommendation

This is seen as one project. The area is one affected by falling rolls. 13% surplus capacity at St Pius, where first preferences are 11 for Sept. 2008. The School of Christ the King is a rapidly improving school (OfSTED) and there is an opportunity to make it 1.5FE. The cost of education per pupil at St Pius is very high (£793 more, per child, per year). St Pius has made improvement, but rates of progress are not secure. Expansion at The School of Christ the King could not be justified if St Pius remains open as it would add to surplus capacity.

This proposal would remove 10 surplus places per year group (-10)

Scheme: Burnbush Primary School

Summary

The proposal would reduce the number of surplus places and would allow the strengths of Waycroft school to be shared by a larger number of children.

Specific issues include:

- Federation to raise levels of attainment.
- Too high a level of surplus places in this school and locally.
- Sufficient site area for proposals.

“Federate Burnbush Primary School with Waycroft Primary School and close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 maintaining 2FE at Waycroft with refurbishment and 1FE at Burnbush through expansion, with one leadership team and governance led by Waycroft.”

Standards

Ofsted – September 2007, Good

%ge of roll achieving level 4 combined English & Maths scores:

2005	2006	2007	2008*
70.0	68.8	52.6	70.8E 50.0M

Note that the national floor target (the minimum expected level) is 65% but expected to be 55% from 2009.

Burnbush is an improving school making steady progress

In 2008, English results at L4 (71%) and L5 (33%) were better than FFTB

In mathematics, progress is less secure, at L4 (50%) is below the floor target and performance at L4 and L5 (17%) are below the FFTB target

Value for Money

Information taken from the Section 52 return for the 2008/09 period (to be published formally).

School total budget share per pupil at this school **£3,609**

Average budget share per pupil in a Bristol primary phase school **£3,115**

The cost per child is therefore **15.9% above the average**

The budget share per pupil at this school places it in the top (most expensive per child) quartile amongst Bristol Schools

Premises issues

Rank amongst Bristol schools for premises condition: **54**

Rank amongst Bristol schools for the combined score for suitability and condition: **38**

The combined suitability and condition score takes condition into account, but also considers how the suitable the buildings are for curriculum delivery. The higher the rank (or the lower the number) the greater the problems the school faces.

Site

	Current capacity in Sq. Metres
Actual site	25233
DCSF recommended site	8500
Site area surplus	16733
%ge surplus	196.9 %

This site exceeds the DCSF recommended site area. There is space to expand on this site. A Children’s Centre has recently been added to this site.

School at the heart of the community

The level of surplus places here is too high and can only be sustained where either increased demand is forecast or other related proposals will lead to increased rolls. Otherwise remedial action is indicated.

Number of first preference applicants for this school: 13 out of 25

Number of surplus places: 61

High levels of surplus places and moderate increases in local demand point to the need to reduce the number of school places in this locality.

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 57 for the most deprived school roll amongst Bristol primary schools. This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure.

Diversity

Category of school: Community

Area comment on diversity: Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for Recommendation

This is seen as one project. The area is one affected by falling rolls. 13% surplus capacity for a small community, served by three schools. If any one of the three closed, no child would have to walk over one mile to go to another of the schools. Waycroft is an outstanding school (OfSTED) Burnbush has recently had a Children's Centre built. There is an opportunity to make Burnbush one full form of entry. Stockwood Green is very expensive per child (£844 more, per child, per year) when compared with other Bristol primary provision. Latest plans being 8,000 homes within Bath NES and 1,500 in adjacent Bristol.

An approximation for 8,000 units in a suburban area would be 4 x 420 place schools i.e a class of 30 children per year group for every 1,000 homes in Bath & NE Somerset. In Bristol, decisions about location are not yet confirmed. Waycroft and Burnbush schools have enough space to expand if needed to support such development in the Stockwood area.

This proposal would remove 12 surplus places per year group (-12)

Scheme: Stockwood Green Primary School

Summary

This is a small school, with a high level of surplus places. Other neighbouring schools have sufficient capacity to meet local need.

Specific issues include:

- Small size leads to poor value for money.
- Too high a level of surplus places in this school and locally.
- No evidence of sustained rising demand in next five years with capacity on other sites to expand if needed.
- Needs of local community can be met in neighbouring schools.

“Federate Burnbush Primary School with Waycroft Primary School and close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 maintaining 2FE at Waycroft with refurbishment and 1FE at Burnbush through expansion, with one leadership team and governance led by Waycroft.”

Standards

OfSTED – June 2007, Satisfactory

%ge of roll achieving Level 4 combined English & Maths scores:

2005	2006	2007	2008
45.0	66.7	44.4	82.4E 76.5M

Note that the national floor target (the minimum expected level) is 65% but is expected to be 55% from 2009

Stockwood Green has made significant improvements in 2008.

In English performance at L4 (82%) is above FFTB, though at L5 (23.5%) it is below this target measure

In mathematics performance at L4 (76.5%) and L5 (23.5%) is below FFTB and indicates a failure to meet a significant benchmark indicator of performance against the prior attainment of the pupils.

Value for Money

Information taken from the Section 52 return for the 2008/09 period (to be published formally).

School total budget share per pupil at this school **£3,979**

Average budget share per pupil in a Bristol primary phase school **£3,115**

The cost per child is therefore **27.7% above the average**

The budget share per pupil at this school places it in the top (most expensive per child) quartile amongst Bristol Schools

It is therefore clear, as stated in the October report, that the school does represent a very expensive form of provision due to its small size.

Premises issues

Rank amongst Bristol schools for premises condition: **54**

Rank amongst Bristol schools for the combined score for suitability and condition: **5**

This school is one of the poorest facilities for learning in Bristol

The combined suitability and condition score takes condition into account, but also considers how the suitable the buildings are for curriculum delivery. The higher the rank (or the lower the number) the greater the problems the school faces.

Site

	Current capacity in Sq. Metres
Actual site	19744
DCSF recommended site	6484
Site area surplus	13260
%ge surplus	204.5 %

This site exceeds the DCSF recommended site area.

There is a private nursery provider (Abbeywood Tots Day Nursery) on site. Consideration would be given to relocation of this nursery at the next stage of the Review

School at the heart of the community

Number of first preference applicants for this school (or if this is a junior school for the related infant school): 5 out of 17

Number of surplus places: 30

High levels of surplus places and moderate increases in local demand point to the need to reduce the number of school places in this locality.

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 77 for the most deprived school roll amongst Bristol primary schools. This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure.

Diversity

Category of school: Community

Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for Recommendation

This is seen as one project. The area is one affected by falling rolls. 13% surplus capacity for a small community, served by three schools. If any one of the three closed, no child would have to walk over one mile to go to another of the schools. Waycroft is an outstanding school (OfSTED) Burnbush has recently had a Children's Centre built. There is an opportunity to make Burnbush one full form of entry. Stockwood Green is very expensive per child (£844 more, per child, per year) when compared with other Bristol primary provision. Latest plans being 8,000 homes within Bath NES and 1,500 in adjacent Bristol.

An approximation for 8,000 units in a suburban area would be 4 x 420 place schools i.e a class of 30 children per year group for every 1,000 homes in Bath & NE Somerset. In Bristol, decisions about location are not yet confirmed. Waycroft and Burnbush schools have enough space to expand if needed to support such development in the Stockwood area.

This proposal would remove 12 surplus places per year group (-12)

Scheme: Waycroft Primary School

Summary

The proposal would reduce the number of surplus places and would allow the strengths of Waycroft school to be shared by a larger number of children.

Specific issues include:

- School achieves high levels of attainment.
- Federation to raise levels of attainment.
- Too high a level of surplus places locally.

“Federate Burnbush Primary School with Waycroft Primary School and close Stockwood Green Primary School in Phase 2 maintaining 2FE at Waycroft with refurbishment and 1FE at Burnbush through expansion, with one leadership team and governance led by Waycroft.”

Standards

OfSTED - January 2007, Outstanding

%ge of roll achieving Level 4 combined English & Maths scores:

2005	2006	2007	2008*
91.5	82.7	89.1	100E 100M

Note that the national floor target (the minimum expected level) is 65% but expected to be 55% from 2009.

Waycroft achieves excellent Key Stage 2 results year on year

In 2008, English performance at L4 (100%) and L5 (56%) exceeded FFTD targets
In mathematics performance at L4 (100%) and L5 (69.5%) exceeded FFTD targets

Value for Money

Information taken from the Section 52 return for the 2008/09 period (to be published formally).

School total budget share per pupil at this school	£2,649
Average budget share per pupil in a Bristol primary phase school	£3,115

The cost per child is therefore **15.0%** below the average

Premises issues

Rank amongst Bristol schools for premises condition: 39

Rank amongst Bristol schools for the combined score for suitability and condition: 15

The combined suitability and condition score takes condition into account, but also considers how the suitable the buildings are for curriculum delivery. The higher the rank (or the lower the number) the greater the problems the school faces.

Site

	Current capacity in Sq. Metres
Actual site	30685
DCSF recommended site	17320
Site area surplus	13365
%ge surplus	77.2 %

This site exceeds the DCSF recommended site area. There is space to expand on this site

School at the heart of the community

Number of first preference applicants for this school (or if this is a junior school for the related infant school): 57 out of 60

Number of surplus places: 10

High levels of surplus places and moderate increases in local demand point to the need to reduce the number of school places in this locality.

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 92 for the most deprived school roll amongst Bristol primary schools. This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure. This school's roll is in the least deprived quartile of Bristol's schools.

Diversity

Category of school: Community
Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for Recommendation

This is seen as one project. The area is one affected by falling rolls. 13% surplus capacity for a small community, served by three schools. If any one of the three closed, no child would have to walk over one mile to go to another of the schools. Waycroft is an outstanding school (OfSTED) Burnbush has recently had a Children's Centre built. There is an opportunity to make Burnbush one full form of entry. Stockwood Green is very expensive per child (£844 more, per child, per year) when compared with other Bristol primary provision. Latest plans being 8,000 homes within Bath NES and 1,500 in adjacent Bristol.

An approximation for 8,000 units in a suburban area would be 4 x 420 place schools i.e a class of 30 children per year group for every 1,000 homes in Bath & NE Somerset. In Bristol, decisions about location are not yet confirmed. Waycroft and Burnbush schools have enough space to expand if needed to support such development in the Stockwood area.

This proposal would remove 12 surplus places per year group (-12)

Scheme: St. George Cof E VC Primary

Summary

This is a very small school on two small sites. Expansion is not considered a realistic option (on grounds of both value for money and appropriateness of provision). It is proposed instead to close this school and enlarge the nearby St Michael on the Mount.

Specific issues include:

- Small size leads to poor value for money.
- Premises are unsuitable.
- Site area is too small or constrained to allow further practical, cost effective development.
- Diversity of provision (Cof E) to be maintained by linking proposals.

“Close St George CE Primary in Phase 2 after the expansion work at St. Michael on the Mount.”

Standards

OfSTED category. Inspected November 2005 – Satisfactory outcome
%ge of roll achieving Level 4 combined English & Maths scores:

2005	2006	2007	2008*
44.4	70.0	66.7	70.0E 60.0M

Note that the national floor target (the minimum expected level) is 65% but expected to be 55% from 2009.

Standards at St Georges are satisfactory with some key improvements noted.

In 2008 English performance at L4 (70%) exceeded FFTD though performance at L5 (20%) failed to reach FFTB as measures of progress based on prior attainment.

In mathematics, performance was below FFTB at both levels (60% & 20%) and was below the 65% floor target.

Value for Money

Information taken from the Section 52 return for the 2008/09 period (to be published formally).

School total budget share per pupil at this school £4,017

Average budget share per pupil in a Bristol primary phase school £3,115

The cost per child is therefore 29.0% above the average

The budget share per pupil at this school places it in the top (most expensive per child) quartile of Bristol Schools

The school does represent a very expensive form of provision due to its small size.

This school is half the size of a 1FE school

Premises issues

Rank amongst Bristol schools for premises condition: 17

Rank amongst Bristol schools for the combined score for suitability and condition: 1

The combined suitability and condition score takes condition into account, but also considers how suitable the buildings are for curriculum delivery. The higher the rank (or the lower the number) the greater the problems the school faces.

Site

	Current capacity in Sq. Metres
Actual site	1676
DCSF recommended site	5980
Site area shortfall	4304
%ge shortfall	72.0 %

This is a very confined site.

This school is on two sites. These are very small, and development is constrained by the local context. The main (larger) site sits in the Brandon Hill Park area (highly valued for its amenity value and noted for its protected archaeological remains). Although discussion has taken place with Culture & Leisure Services regarding the use of other land. This is not being taken forward.

School at the heart of the community

Number of first preference applicants for this school (or, if this is a junior school for the related infant school): 11 out of 15

Number of surplus places: 6

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 68 in the most deprived Bristol primary schools. This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure. (1 being the most deprived and 110 being the least deprived)

Diversity

Category of school: Voluntary Controlled

Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for Recommendation

This is seen as one project. Pupil numbers in this part of Bristol are broadly static, expansion is small. There is no evidence that the increase in building has generated occupancy by families with children of school age. There is evidence that children attend St Georges from outside the local area. The Diocese has provided extra accommodation for expansion at St Michaels and feasibility is underway to look at 1.5FE and 2FE on this site. This cannot happen if St Georges remains open as it would generate surplus places. The St George site is very small and would be very expensive to expand.

This proposal adds 15 places to the capacity in the area per year

Scheme: St. Michael on the Mount Primary

Summary

The Primary Review proposal for expansion must be seen in its broader context – as part of a wider range of measures to drive up standards of attainment in the primary sector across the city and address surplus places/place shortages. Capital investment will support this process, but funding will be limited and must be focused to be effective.

It is proposed to expand this school and to address a variety of accommodation issues to meet expanding local need and to maintain the balance of faith based provision.

Specific issues include:

- Significant site constraints.
- Maintain diversity of provision
- Cost per child in line with Bristol average
- Opportunity for expansion

“Expand St. Michael on the Mount CE Primary in Phase 2 to be 1.5FE”

Standards

OfSTED category – April 2008, Satisfactory

%ge of roll achieving level 4 combined English & Maths scores:

2005	2006	2007	2008*
58.6	41.9	60.0	73.3E 53.3M

Note that the national floor target (the minimum expected level) is 65%. But expected to be 55% from 2009

Standards at St Michael on the Mount are improving

English results in 2008 were better than FFTB at L4 (73%) and L5 (27%), indicating the value added to performance

In mathematics, results in 2008 was below FFTB at both levels (53% & 17%) and was below the 65% floor target

Value for Money

Information taken from the Section 52 return for the 2008/09 period (to be published formally).

School total budget share per pupil at this school **£3,312**

Average budget share per pupil in a Bristol primary phase school **£3,115**

The cost per child is therefore **6.3% above the average**

This school is in the top quartile for spend on SEN and AEN per child

Premises issues

Rank amongst Bristol schools for premises condition: **17**

Rank amongst Bristol schools for the combined score for suitability and condition: **62**

The combined suitability and condition score takes condition into account, but also considers how suitable the buildings are for curriculum delivery. Again, the higher the rank (or the lower the number) the greater the problems the school faces.

Site

	Current capacity in Sq. Metres
Actual site	2538
DCSF recommended site	9760
Site area shortfall	-7222
%ge shortfall	- 74.0 %

This is a confined site. Feasibility on the use of adjacent accommodation, provided by the Church of England is underway

School at the heart of the community

Number of first preference applicants for this school (or if this is a junior school for the related infant school): 11 out of 30

Number of surplus places: 8

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 35 for the most deprived school roll amongst Bristol primary schools. This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure.

This school is in the second most deprived quartile of Bristol schools. This points to the need to address condition, suitability and sufficiency to help raise levels of attainment.

Diversity

Category of school: Voluntary Controlled

Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for Recommendation

This is seen as one project. Pupil numbers in this part of Bristol are broadly static, expansion is small. There is no evidence that the increase in building has generated occupancy by families with children of school age. There is evidence that children attend St Georges from outside the local area. The Diocese has provided extra accommodation for expansion at St Michaels and feasibility is underway to look at 1.5FE and 2FE on this site. This cannot happen if St Georges remains open as it would generate surplus places. The St George site is very small and would be very expensive to expand.

This proposal adds 15 places to the capacity in the area per year

Scheme: Ilminster Avenue Primary

Summary - The proposal would create a strong, new school for the Knowle West community to help drive standards of attainment up and address surplus place issues.

Specific issues include:

- Amalgamation to be pursued when "trigger points" reached.
- School in Special Measures
- Too high a level of surplus places in this school and locally.
- No evidence of sustained rising demand.

“Amalgamate Connaught Primary School and Ilminster Avenue Primary School in a newly built school in Phase 2 at 2FE.”

Standards

OfSTED – December 2006, Special measures

%ge of roll achieving Level 4 combined English & Maths scores:

2005	2006	2007	2008*
23.7	25.0	35.5	50.0E 70.0M

Note that the national floor target (the minimum expected level) is 65% but expected to be 55% from 2009.

Ilminster Ave made improvements in results in 2008, but the combined English and mathematics total is still below the 65% floor target and improvement is not yet sustained.

In English, L4 (50%) and L5 (5%) continue to be below the floor target and below expected outcomes represented by FFTB

In mathematics, improvement is significant at L4 (70%) above expectation target of FFTD, though L5 (10%) remains below FFTB target.

Value for Money

Information taken from the Section 52 return for the 2008/09 period (to be published formally).

School total budget share per pupil at this school **£3,619**

Average budget share per pupil in a Bristol primary phase school **£3,115**

The cost per child is therefore **16.2%** above the average

The budget share per pupil at this school places it in the top (most expensive per child) quartile amongst Bristol Schools This school is in the top quartile for spend on SEN and AEN per child

Premises issues

Rank amongst Bristol schools for premises condition: **49**

Rank amongst Bristol schools for the combined score for suitability and condition: **48**

The combined suitability and condition score takes condition into account, but also considers how the suitable the buildings are for curriculum delivery. The higher the rank (or the lower the number) the greater the problems the school faces.

Site

Note that where infant and junior school amalgamations are proposed the tabled data is for the whole site.

	Current capacity Ilminster Ave	Current capacity Connaught
Actual site	26344	23244.26
DCSF recommended	13540	13540
Site area surplus	12804	9704.26
%ge surplus	94.6 %	71.7 %

This site exceeds the DCSF recommended site area.

School at the heart of the community

The level of surplus places here is too high and can only be sustained where either increased demand is forecast or other related proposals will lead to increased rolls. Otherwise remedial action is indicated.

Number of first preference applicants for this school (or if this is a junior school for the related infant school): 23 out of 45

Number of surplus places: 98

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 10 for the most deprived school roll amongst Bristol primary schools. This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure.

This school is in the most deprived quartile of Bristol schools. This points to the need to address condition, suitability and sufficiency needs as a matter of urgency.

Diversity

Category of school: Community

Area comment on diversity: Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for Recommendation

This is seen as one project. Both schools have a significant falling roll. Surplus places in the area are also significant, currently 18%. Outcomes at KS2 are amongst the weakest in Bristol. Ilminster Avenue is in Special Measures. There is an opportunity to build a new school and give the community a fresh start. The nursery on the Ilminster Ave. site would remain in place. Any plans for this development would be part of the Knowle West regeneration scheme. There may also be an opportunity to add a Children's Centre to the scheme and consideration could be given to some space to be set aside for play areas depending on the location chosen for a new school.

A possible location could be on land adjacent to Connaught though such a decision would depend on the support of community groups. The opportunity for such a development to secure community use as part of extended provision makes this an exciting possibility.

In the data set for deprivation measures in Bristol 2007, 10% of the 50 most deprived super output areas in Bristol are within Knowle/Filwood with regard to Education, Training & Skills.

This amalgamation would remove 30 surplus places from the area per year (-30)

Number of first preference applicants for this school (or if this is a junior school for the related infant school): 18 out of 30
Number of surplus places : 56

Deprivation

This school is ranked number 9 for the most deprived school roll amongst Bristol primary schools. This figure is derived from the DCSF's new Tax Credit based measure. This school is in the most deprived quartile of Bristol schools. This points to the need to address condition, suitability and sufficiency needs as a matter of urgency.

Diversity

Category of school: Community
Proposals maintain balance between faith and community provision.

Context for Recommendation

This is seen as one project. Both schools have a significant falling roll. Surplus places in the area are also significant, currently 18%. Outcomes at KS2 are amongst the weakest in Bristol. Ilminster Avenue is in Special Measures. There is an opportunity to build a new school and give the community a fresh start. The nursery on the Ilminster Ave. site would remain in place. Any plans for this development would be part of the Knowle West regeneration scheme. There may also be an opportunity to add a Children's Centre to the scheme and consideration could be given to some space to be set aside for play areas depending on the location chosen for a new school. A possible location could be on land adjacent to Connaught though such a decision would depend on the support of community groups. The opportunity for such a development to secure community use as part of extended provision makes this an exciting possibility. In the data set for deprivation measures in Bristol 2007, 10% of the 50 most deprived super output areas in Bristol are within Knowle/Filwood with regard to Education, Training & Skills.

This amalgamation would remove 30 surplus places from the area per year (-30)

Appendix 10

2008 Performance against Floor Targets and Fisher Prior Attainment Data

Fisher Family Trust data, uses prior learning information which in most cases is KS1 results, to provide a target for attainment by individual children at the end of Key Stage 2. Because they have access to the information for the whole of England, they are able to provide information based on 'expected rates of progress for children in similar schools' (known as FFTB) and information based on rates of progress for children in the best 25% of schools in England (known as FFTD)

If a school does not achieve the FFTB target it means the children in that school have not made the appropriate progress in learning for that school.

Over the last two years, Secondary schools have been aspiring to meet FFTD targets as these are more challenging and reflect more rapid improvement.

In 2008, KS2 results showed 26 schools below the floor target in English

Ashton Vale	Connaught	Bannerman Road	Fonthill
Henbury Court	Iminster Ave	Parson St	Upper Horfield
Perry Court Junior	Cabot	Weston Park	Hareclive
Four Acres	Gay Elms	May Park	Whitehall
Millpond	Badock's Wood	Bishopsworth	Horfield
Easton	St Mathius	School of Christ the K	Greenfield
Lockleaze	Barton Hill		

And in mathematics there were 31 schools below 65%

Cheddar Grove	Ashton Vale	Connaught	Bannerman Road
Begbrook	Hillfields	St Werburgh's	Shirehampton
Sea Mills	Upper Horfield	Burnbush	Perry Court Juniors
Cabot	Weston Park	South St	Hareclive
Teyfant	Gay Elms	May Park	Whitehall
Millpond	Badock's Wood	Bishopsworth	St George
St Michael on the M	Easton	St Mathius	Greenfield
Lockleaze	New Oak	Barton Hill	

As combined scores, 19 primary schools are below the 65% floor target.

However, this hides good progress by some and does not pick up some underperformance by others where a school has failed to make the rate of progress expected by the Fisher targets.

32 schools were below the FFTB L4 target in English

Avon	Connaught	Bannerman Rd	Begbrook
Colston's	Glenfrome	Henleaze Junior	Parson St
Sea Mills Junior	Sefton Park Junior	Southville	Two Mile Hill Junior
Victoria Park Junior	Headley Park	Perry Court Junior	Weston Park
Hareclive	Four Acres	Gay Elms	May Park
Whitehall	Badock's Wood	Bishopsworth J	Horfield
Easton	St Mathius	School of Christ the K	St Peter & St Paul
St Bernard's	Greenfield	Lockleaze	Barton Hill

40 schools were below the FFTB L4 target for mathematics

Cheddar Grove	Ashton Vale	Connaught	Bannerman Rd
Begbrook	St Werbergh	Hillcrest	Shirehampton

Filton Ave Junior	Glenfrome	Henleaze Junior	Luckwell
St Annes Junior	Sea Mills Junior	Sefton Park Junior	Summerhill Junior
Two Mile Hill Junior	Victoria Park Junior	Westbury Park	Holymead Junior
Burnbush	Perry Court Junior	Stockwood Green	Weston Park
Hareclive	Gay Elms	May Park	Badock's Wood
Bishopsworth Junior	St George	St John	St Michael on the M
Stoke Bishop	Easton	St Nicholas of T	St Patricks
Greenfield	Lockleaze	New Oak	Barton Hill

20 schools are below their FFTB target in English and mathematics, 21% are Junior schools.

This information should be looked at in the context of where the most deprived wards in the city are. Of the 20 schools, 15 appear on both lists, however, a significant number serve wards where we have most need for places. Closing these schools would not solve the issue of poor performance in Bristol primary schools.

The review aims to offer solutions to these schools and a wide range of more successful schools through adjusting the balance of provision to meet the needs of communities and accelerate improvement. To provide more funding for all schools we must look at best value for money and make sure we are not short changing some schools who have greatest need.