



EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE FORUM

**TUESDAY 27 JANUARY 2009
7.30 PM**

COMMITTEE AGENDA (ADVISORY AND CONSULTATIVE)

**COMMITTEE ROOM 5,
HARROW CIVIC CENTRE**

**PRE-MEETINGS: HTCC 6.45 PM - COMMITTEE ROOM 6, GOVERNORS 6.45 PM -
COMMITTEE ROOM 3, MEMBERS 7.00 PM - COMMITTEE ROOM 5**

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 3 representatives of each side)

Chairman: Councillor Anjana Patel

Councillors:

**Mrs Camilla Bath
Miss Christine Bednell
Janet Mote**

**B E Gate
Raj Ray
Bill Stephenson**

1. Husain Akhtar
2. Julia Merison
3. Mrs Vina Mithani
4. Jean Lammiman
5. Salim Miah

1. Keeki Thammaiah
2. Nizam Ismail
3. David Perry

Teachers' Constituency: (nominated by Harrow Teachers' Consultative Committee)

**Mrs D Cawthorne
Ms C Gembala**

**Ms J Howkins
Ms J Lang**

**Ms L Money
Ms L Snowdon**

Governors' Constituency: (nominated by Association of Harrow Governing Bodies)

**Mrs C Millard (VC)
(Vacancy)**

**Ms H Solanki
(Vacancy)**

**(Vacancy)
(Vacancy)**

Elected Parent Governors:

1. Mr R Chauhan
2. Mrs D Speel

Denominational Representatives:

1. Mrs J Rammelt
2. Reverend P Reece

**Issued by the Democratic Services Section,
Legal and Governance Services Department**

**Contact: Damian Markland, Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1785 E-mail: damian.markland@harrow.gov.uk**

HARROW COUNCIL

EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE FORUM

TUESDAY 27 JANUARY 2009

AGENDA - PART I

1. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

2. **Apologies for Absence:**

To receive apologies for absence (if any).

3. **Declarations of Interest:**

To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Committee, Sub Committee, Panel or Forum;
- (b) all other Members present in any part of the room or chamber.

Enc. 4. **Minutes:** (Pages 1 - 6)

That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2008 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

5. **Matters Arising:**

To consider any matters arising from the last meeting.

6. **Public Questions:**

To receive questions (if any) from local residents or organisations under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

7. **Petitions:**

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

8. **Deputations:**
To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).
- Enc. 9. **School Term Dates 2010 - 2011:** (Pages 7 - 12)
Report of the Director Schools and Children's Development.
- Enc. 10. **INFORMATION REPORT - Draft revenue budget and capital programme 2009-10 to 2011-12:** (Pages 13 - 20)
Report of the Corporate Director of Finance.
- Enc. 11. **INFORMATION REPORT - Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow:** (Pages 21 - 70)
Report of the Director Schools and Children's Development.
12. **Date of Next Meeting:**
To note that the next meeting of the Forum is due to be held on 18 March 2009.

AGENDA - PART II - Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE FORUM

11 SEPTEMBER 2008

Chairman: * Councillor Mrs Anjana Patel

Councillors: * Mrs Camilla Bath * Janet Mote
* Miss Christine Bednell * Raj Ray
* B E Gate * Bill Stephenson

Teachers' Constituency: Mrs D Cawthorne Ms J Lang
* Ms C Gembala * Ms L Money
* Ms J Howkins * Ms L Snowdon

Governors' Constituency: Ms H Solanki
* Mrs C Millard

Elected Parent Governor Representatives: * Mr R Chauhan * Mrs D Speel

Denominational Representatives: Mrs J Rammelt Reverend P Reece

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

104. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

105. **Apologies for Absence:**

RESOLVED: To note that no apologies for absence had been received.

106. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
10. References from Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee – 15 July 2008 – Best Value Performance Plan 2008-09.	Councillor Brian Gate	Personal interest in that Councillor Gate was the Vice Chairman of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee which had made the reference to the Education Consultative Forum. Councillor Gate remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision making on this item.
	Councillor Janet Mote	Personal interest in that Councillor Mote was a Member of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee which had made the reference to the Education Consultative Forum. Councillor Mote remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision making on this item.

107. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

The Chairman informed the Forum that item 13 – Information Report Phase 3 Children's Centre be considered before Item 10 – References from Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED: That all items be considered with the press and public present.

108. **Minutes:**
RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2008, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.
109. **Matters Arising:**
RESOLVED: To note that there were no matters arising that did not appear on the agenda.
110. **Public Questions:**
RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4E of the Constitution).
111. **Petitions:**
RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received at this meeting under the provisions of the Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution).
112. **Deputations:**
RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).
113. **References from Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee - 15 July 2008 - Best Value Performance Plan 2008-09:**
A Member of the Forum explained that the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Sub-Committee had requested that the Forum investigate whether there were measures to improve the reporting of performance indicators relating to schools. The Member explained that the current reporting methods did not identify those pupils who were achieving well beyond what was expected. Further training might be required by Members generally to ensure that they were able to analyse and understand the information being presented to them.
RESOLVED: That (1) the issue of the reporting of the Performance Indicator relating to schools be referred to the Director of Schools and Children's Development and the Performance Team to consider how the information could be better reported;
(2) the report be presented to a future meeting of the Forum.
114. **School Term Dates 2010 - 2011:**
The Director of Schools and Children's Development introduced the report which presented a Harrow proposal for school term dates for 2010 - 2011. The proposal was in line with the model provided by the Local Government Association. The Council were prepared to consider whether 2 days should be taken out of the holiday entitlement for schools, for them to determine when this should be allocated to coincide with the religious festivals which most impact upon them.
The Director explained that this issue had been raised by representatives from schools as different religious events could affect pupil attendance figures and staff attendance.
Members raised a number of issues during the discussion on this item which included:
- That Easter was scheduled to take place later than usual in 2009. If two weeks' leave was granted over the Easter period, the second term would be longer than usual.
 - It was important to take into account the views of teachers and parents on the proposed dates for school terms, especially over the Easter period.
 - Easter was not a fixed festival in terms of the date on which it was celebrated. This caused difficulties when trying to establish school term dates.
 - It was important to compare the proposed school dates with those of neighbouring boroughs to Harrow. However neighbouring boroughs usually prepared their proposed school term dates relatively late.

Members of the Forum were requested to consider the models provided and consult with their constituent groups and provide feedback to the Director of Schools and Children's Development by 4 December 2008.

The Forum were further informed that they would receive a report at a meeting in January 2009 to make a recommendation to the Portfolio Holder for Schools and Children's Development for the adoption of school term dates for 2010 - 2011.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

115. **Amalgamation Policy:**

The Forum received a report which presented a draft revised amalgamation policy and supporting documents for their consideration and comments as part of the consultation process.

The Director for Schools and Children's Development explained that the Council's Amalgamation Policy, was developed in 2005 and updated in autumn last year in response to legislation. This further revision had focused on providing greater clarity about the process and provided supporting guidance for its implementation. The revised documentation also confirmed that the decision as to whether schools could amalgamate or not was a decision made by Cabinet. This responsibility could not be delegated to any other authority.

The Director explained that within the revised policy the circumstances when amalgamation was triggered had not been changed. Amalgamation would normally be triggered by the resignation of the headteacher in one school. In that instance the preferred route was to close the school without a substantive headteacher and extend the age range and size of the remaining school. This would not lead to any implications that one school was better than the other and was an objective criteria.

Alternative routes for amalgamation included closing both schools and opening a new school. New schools could be established by holding a competition where a provider would bid for the school or seek, from the Secretary of State, a waiver for the competition. The Government had indicated, however, that in circumstances where both schools were closed, their preference was for competition.

During the discussion on this item, Members of the Forum raised a number of issues, which officers responded to as follows:

- If it was felt it was in the best interests of schools to amalgamate, but it was apparent that the triggers would not occur for a number of years, the Council would have discussions with the governing bodies and the schools to see how they wished to go forward. The governing bodies could work more closely through a soft federation arrangement or could hard federate to establish one governing body. Both options would retain two schools and two headteachers. When a vacancy arose in either school, amalgamation could then proceed.
- That there was a desirable route and a legal route relating to the constitution of a new governing body once the school amalgamated. Legally, the governors of the school which remained open were the governors of the amalgamated school. The desirable route of the Council was for the governing bodies to form a steering group, with representatives from both schools, to implement the amalgamation process. As part of this process, the governing body would reconstitute to ensure that it was appropriate for the age range and size of the combined school. If this was difficult to achieve then the legal route would have to be followed.
- It was important to highlight to the Director of Schools and Children's Development areas where the document could be improved.
- The underlying principle of the Amalgamation Policy was that it led to improvements in educational outcomes. Additionally, there was evidence that schools which had problems with low standards, improved when amalgamated with a school which was performing to relatively higher standards.
- That the term 'joining together' could be used in addition to the term 'Amalgamation' when stated in the document. This could provide clarity for members of the public.
- There were limited rights of appeal once Cabinet had determined notices. Appeals were made to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator.

RESOLVED: That the comments of the Forum on the Amalgamation Policy be considered as part of the consultation process.

Reason for Recommendation: To engage stakeholder representatives in the consultation process of the revised amalgamation policy and supporting guidance documents.

116. **INFORMATION REPORT - Phase 3 Children's Centres:**

The Forum received an information report of the Director of Schools and Children's Development which summarised the work that the Council had performed to develop nine phase 2 Children Centres and the principles applied to underpin the strategy for phase 3 Children Centres.

An officer reported that the Council were on target to deliver the nine phase 2 Children Centres and that they had been given a further target by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) to develop seven Phase 3 Children Centres.

The officer explained that the Council aimed to develop sustainable models for children centres which would have long term targets and which were responsive to the community's needs. The phase 3 children centres would also focus on developing high quality outreach services.

The officer referred to a map in the report indicating the proposed sites for the Children Centres and explained that it was the Council's intention to provide coverage for the whole of the borough.

During the discussion on this item, Members of the Forum raised a number of issues, which officers responded to as follows:

- Extra funding would be provided by the Government for Phase 3 Children Centres. The money would also be spent to develop existing members of staff and to provide leadership.
- The lack of certainty as to whether funding would continue to be provided by the government after 2010 was an issue that the Council had considered carefully. The Council would be addressing this by ensuring that the model of delivery was sustainable. This would be achieved by working with the voluntary sector and other partners including schools, the Primary Care Trust and the North West London Hospital Trust.
- There would be new buildings accommodating the Cedars Children Centre and the Kenmore Park Children Centre. Additionally, Home Housing had donated a building to use for the Rayners Lane Children Centre.
- The Council had engaged in a wide range of projects to look at the demographics of Harrow and the needs to the Afghan and Somali Communities. As a result, members of these communities had received training to develop their childcare skills. The Council were aware of the need to ensure that adults from different communities had the opportunity to work in childcare.
- Where the Council was providing access to Midwifery services, the midwife would provide a drop in service at the Children's Centre to ensure that expectant mothers' needs were addressed. Ante-natal midwifery services will be provided at those Children's Centres that are located in areas where there are high number of births, a higher number of low birth weight babies and higher rates of Infant mortality.
- The Council was engaging with the Primary Care Trust and Local General Practitioners to define how the Children Centres could work with them in delivering services.
- All centres would be fully inclusive for children from different backgrounds. Staff would be trained to ensure that service users felt welcome.
- Some children centres would have sensory rooms for children with disabilities and outreach workers. The centres would have places for children with complex needs. Additionally, the Council had partnerships with playgroups who catered for those with special needs.

The Chairman commended officers for their work on this project. The Chairman also advised that she would be visiting the Pinner Wood Children Centre on 18 September 2008 and that Members of the Forum were welcome to join her.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

117. **Date of Next Meeting:**

RESOLVED: That the next meeting of the Forum take place on Wednesday 28 January 2009.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.14 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANJANA PATEL
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



Meeting:	Education Consultative Forum
Date:	27 January 2009
Subject:	School Term Dates 2010 - 2011
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Director of Schools & Child Development, Heather Clements
Portfolio Holder:	Portfolio Holder for Schools and Children's Development, Councillor Anjana Patel
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Annexe A – Harrow Options for Consideration

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report presents a Harrow proposal for school term dates for 2010 – 2011 following consultation with constituent groups.

Recommendations:

1. Consider the responses from the consultation
2. Consider the proposals for occasional days
3. Agree the model provided in Annexe A and recommend to the portfolio holder for the adoption of school term dates for 2010-2011.

Reason: (For recommendation)

To fulfil the council's requirement to determine the school term dates for 2010 – 2011.

Section 2 – Report

2.1 Background

The Education Consultative Forum annually agrees the term dates for each school year.

At their meeting in September models available were circulated to the Forum for consideration with their constituent groups. These were the Hampshire Model and two options prepared by Harrow.

The Local Government Association (LGA) issued a model for 2010-2011 and this was circulated to EdCF with a covering note dated 6 November 2008. The LGA's model generated responses from local authorities about the dates for the break over Christmas and the New Year as there were less than 10 days holiday. As a result, the LGA conducted a consultation to assess the extent of the concerns.

It is understood that the LGA are undertaking negotiations and considering whether to re-issue their model when negotiations are completed. The timescale is not known and it is proposed that EdCF are up-dated verbally at their meeting.

At their meeting in September 2008, EdCF also requested information on Occasional Days for schools to use holidays as holidays at times appropriate for their school communities. Information was circulated to EdCF on the Ealing model with a covering note dated 5 December 2008.

2.2 Main Option

Responses from Constituent Groups

Two responses to the consultation were received. The Primary Headteachers reported that their respondents indicated equal support for the two Harrow models. The Union response indicated a preference for the Summer Term to end on a Friday.

LGA Model

Both Harrow models differed from the original LGA model for 2010-2011 in relation to two aspects:

1. The Harrow models included two weeks break over Christmas and New Year, with the term ending on Friday 17 December 2010. This is in accordance with the Harrow principles.
2. The February Half Term in the Harrow models was the week beginning Monday 14 February 2011. The LGA model has the February Half Term a week later, beginning on Monday 21 February 2011. If the Harrow model were changed so the February half term holiday was a week later, then it would be in line with the LGA model. The impact of this proposed change is presented as Model 3, at Annexe A.

Occasional Days

Given the timescale for distributing information on the use of occasional days, there has been no formal feedback from the constituent groups. It would appear that there are two implications for those schools that adopt occasional days. The end of the summer term would be later and would potentially end on Wednesday 27 July 2011. The second implication is that governing bodies would need to identify the days that

were occasional days. Governing bodies may seek further guidance from the local authority on the identification of their occasional days.

It is proposed that EdCF confirm their preferred model and position in regard to occasional days. If there is no further information from the LGA available at their meeting, EdCF may consider that their decision is deferred until confirmation is received from the LGA.

2.3 Staffing/Workforce

Not applicable to this report

2.4 Equality Impact considerations

The Harrow agreed principles were developed following consultation with schools, governors, parents and other partners and takes account of the needs of Harrow's diverse community.

Harrow sets term dates of 195 school days each year and schools/governing bodies have the flexibility to set the 190 pupil contact days within this framework to meet the needs of each school's community.

2.5 Resources, costs and risks

Not applicable to this report

2.6 Legal Implications

Under section 32 of the Education Act 2002, in respect of community schools, the Local Authority shall determine the dates when school terms and holidays are to begin and end, and the Governing Body shall determine the times of the school sessions.

For voluntary aided schools, foundation or foundation special schools the responsibility for determination of school dates and times of school sessions all rest with the Governing Body.

2.7 Financial Implications

None.

2.8 Performance Issues

Not applicable to this report

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Emma Stabler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 12.1.08		
Name: Rosemarie Martin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 16.1.09		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Johanna Morgan, Head of School Organisation Strategy
Tel : 020 8736 6841 e-mail: johanna.morgan@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Paper 1: Note to EdCF dated 6 November 2008.

Paper 2: Note to EdCF dated 5 December 2008.

If appropriate, does the report include the following considerations?

1.	Consultation	Yes
2.	Corporate Priorities	N/A

Annexe A

OPTIONS FOR SCHOOL TERM DATES 2010/11 PROPOSED BY HARROW COUNCIL

Terms	Model 1 Harrow Proposed Model 2010/11	Model 2 Harrow Option 1	Model 3 Alternative Harrow Option in line with LGA
1	Wed 1 Sep – Fri 22 Oct (38 days)	Wed 1 Sep – Fri 22 Oct (38 days)	Wed 1 Sep – Fri 22 Oct (38 days)
HT	Mon 25 – Fri 29 Oct	Mon 25 – Fri 29 Oct	Mon 25 – Fri 29 Oct
2	Mon 1 Nov – Fri 17 Dec (35 days)	Mon 1 Nov – Fri 17 Dec (35 days)	Mon 1 Nov – Fri 17 Dec (35 days)
3	Tue 4 Jan – Fri 11 Feb (29 days)	Tue 4 Jan – Fri 11 Feb (29 days)	Tue 4 Jan – Fri 18 Feb (34 days)
HT	Mon 14 Feb – Fri 18 Feb	Mon 14 Feb – Fri 18 Feb	<i>Mon 21 Feb – Fri 25 Feb</i>
4	Mon 21 Feb – Fri 1 April (30 days)	Mon 21 Feb – Fri 8 April (35 days)	Mon 28 Feb – Fri 8 April (30 days)
5	Mon 18 April – Fri 27 May (27 days)	Tue 26 April – Fri 27 May (23 days)	Tue 26 April – Fri 27 May (23 days)
HT	Mon 30 May – Fri 3 June	Mon 30 May – Fri 3 June	Mon 30 May – Fri 3 June
6	Mon 6 June – Mon 25 July (36 days)	Mon 6 June – Fri 22 July (35 days)	Mon 6 June – Fri 22 July (35 days)
TOTAL	195	195	195

Harrow Agreed Principles:

- The school year to be set with 195 days, incorporating 5 development days;
- Schools to determine the 5 development days;
- The school year to start on the first useful day in September;
- The October break to be one full week, the last full week in October;
- A 10 school day break at Christmas;
- A 10 school day break at spring/Easter;
- A one week break in February and May/June;
- A summer break of 5-6 weeks (not more than 6 weeks).

This page is intentionally left blank



Meeting:	Education Consultative Forum
Date:	27 January 2009
Subject:	Information Report : Draft Revenue Budget 2009-10 to 2011-12
Responsible Officer:	Corporate Director of Finance, Myfanwy Barrett
Portfolio Holder:	Leader encompassing Strategy, Partnership and Finance, Councillor David Ashton
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1 - Medium Term Financial Strategy 2009-10 to 2011-12 Appendix 2 - Detailed Budget Proposals – Children’s Services

Section 1 – Summary

This report provides a summary of the draft Council’s budget plans for 2009-10 to 2011-12, as reported to Cabinet in December. Comments on these proposals are sought from a variety of stakeholders including the Education Consultative Forum. The final budget will be reported to Cabinet on 12 February and Council on 19 February.

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2 – Report

Vision and Priorities

1. The Council’s vision is to be recognised as one of the best London Councils in a borough that is cosmopolitan, confident and cohesive. The

Council has adopted an integrated planning framework to ensure that the corporate plan and medium term financial strategy (MTFS) are developed in tandem. The development of the corporate plan and MTFS is an iterative process which takes place over 6-9 months every year.

2. Cabinet approved the Year Ahead Statement in September, including draft corporate priorities as follows:
 - Better streets
 - Improve support for vulnerable people
 - Build stronger communities

Financial Context

3. The development of the medium term financial plan is increasingly challenging because:
 - Harrow is already a relatively low spending council
 - Large parts of the budget are outside the Council's control
 - Considerable savings have been made in previous years (£35m in the last 3 years) and this makes it increasingly difficult to identify new areas for efficiencies and reductions
 - The demand for services and expectations from central government are growing all the time
 - The local government settlement is poor
 - There is considerable uncertainty in a number of areas
 - Reserves are still very low
4. In addition to these demands there is very significant added pressure in the medium term due to the recession including:
 - Additional demands on services, for example an increase in the number of people presenting as homeless, and a reduction in income.
 - High inflation, especially in relation to energy. Whilst it is expected to fall in the coming months, there is considerable residual pressure particularly in relation to contracts.
 - Pressure on investment income following the dramatic cut in the base rate. In addition the credit crunch will prompt a more reduced risk approach to investment which will affect returns.
5. Currently the proposed budget allows for additional costs or reduced income directly attributable to the economic position of £3.5m in 2009-10. In addition, Directorates are absorbing an estimated £1m of cost pressures due to the economy, particularly in relation to general price inflation and loss of income.

Current Position

Central Government Funding

6. Last year the government announced a 3 year settlement for 2008-09 to 2010-11. The grant increase for Harrow was 2% this year and will be 1.75% in 2009-10 and 1.5% in 2010-11. Like the great majority of London councils, this settlement is the minimum it can be under the settlement, ie it is "on the floor". Harrow's settlements will remain on the floor for several

years to come. Given the current economic conditions the outlook for the local government settlement is poor, therefore the assumed grant increase for 2011-12 is zero.

Council Tax Strategy

7. The assumption at this stage for Harrow is that Council tax will rise by 3% each year. However this is a challenging strategy given all the additional pressures created by the economic climate.
8. The administration is committed to stabilising council tax in real terms over the medium term. The administration is also committed to producing prudent and achievable budgets and therefore must be mindful of the financial context outlined above, in particular the added pressure due to the economy.

Draft Summary Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)

9. The draft summary MTFS as submitted to Cabinet in December is attached at Appendix 1. The change in the budget requirement for 2009-10 can be summarised as follows:

	£m
Budget Requirement 2008-09	162.8
Base budget and technical changes	4.8
Inflation	5.3
Investment in services	4.6
Efficiency Programme	(4.7)
Remaining funding gap (assuming 3% council tax increase)	(4.2)
Budget Requirement 2009-10	168.6

10. The draft MTFS includes investment in services of 4.6m in 2009-10, £4.6m in 2010-11 and £4.2m in 2011-12. The main areas of investment in 2009-10 are:
 - Social care for Adults and Children
 - Neighbourhood Resource Centres (a PFI scheme)
 - Waste management and disposal
11. The efficiency programme in 2009/10 totals £4.7m in 2009-10. It aims to minimise the impact on front line services and focuses on:
 - Benefits of new technology
 - Better procurement
 - Service Reviews
 - Service transformation in Adults
 - West London and pan-London initiatives
 - A range of small savings across all service areas
12. Further details of the investment and efficiency savings relating to Children's Services is provided in Appendix 2.

Current Funding Gaps

13. The current funding gaps are £4.2m in 2009-10, £8.2m in 2010-11, £7.3m in 2011-12. These figures include:

- Prudent amounts for technical issues
- Basic inflation plus provision for economic pressures across the 3 year period
- Provision for two PFI schemes
- Additional investment in services
- The efficiency programme

14. It has not been possible to produce a balanced budget for 2009-10 at this stage due to all the additional financial pressures the council is facing and the growing demand on services. The council is legally required to set a balanced budget for next year and the funding gap must be closed by the time the final budget proposals are presented in February.

15. In order to close the remaining funding gap, officers will:

- Continue to review and refine the technical assumptions, particularly given rapidly changing economic position
- Review the capacity for investment
- Further develop the efficiency programme with a view to significantly increasing the value of the programme across the three year period

SCHOOL'S BUDGETS

2008/09 to 2010-11 Settlement

16. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is used to fund both the individual schools budget (ISB) and centrally retained items. The former goes to schools, whilst the latter is held by the Local Authority to spend on specific items such as Early Years (private and voluntary sector nurseries) and fees for out of borough pupils at independent special schools.

17. 2009-10 is the second year of a three year Government funding cycle for schools. The Department of Children's Schools and Families (DCSF) has announced DSG funding allocations for the years 2008-09 (actual) and 2009-10 and 2010-11 (provisional). The per pupil funding for 2009-10 has been confirmed as £4,669 (a 3.6% increase on 2008/09) and for 2010-11 as £4,862 (a 4.1% increase on 2009-10). The calculation of the total of Dedicated Schools Grant for 2009-10 and 2010-11 will depend on the January 2009 and January 2010 pupil counts respectively.

18. Harrow received £133m DSG grant for 2008/09. The 3.6% increase per pupil in 2009-10 and 4.1% in 2010-11 results in an estimated grant of £138m, and £143m in the respective financial years, assuming pupil numbers remain constant. These projections were reported to School's Forum in November. Contained within these figures are amounts allocated for ministerial priorities, and Schools Forums and Local Authorities are expected to bear this in mind when setting the schools budget. For 2009-

10 the settlement includes a provisional £1m for the ministerial priority of personalised learning in schools. This figure rises to £2.8m in 2010-11.

19. The January 2009 pupil count will differ from pupil projections used to estimate the grant, and this will result in a change in the final grant allocation. The final 2009-10 budget, based on the January pupil level annual school census (Plasc) numbers, will be reported to the School's Forum in March and provided to schools by the 31 March 2009. The final grant is not expected to be finalised by DCSF until summer 2009.

20. The minimum funding guarantee for 2009-10 is set at 2.1%, i.e. the minimum increase any school will receive is 2.1% per pupil.

21. Schools Forum is in the process of considering the formula factors and data, which may need to be updated for 2009-10 and subsequent years. Final decisions will be made by Schools Forum in December/January. Issues facing Schools Forum are:

- Increasing pressures on special educational needs including numbers of statemented pupils in mainstream schools, special school places, specialist provision for autistic pupils, and increasing demands for places in out-borough residential schools.
- Making provision for personalised learning as suggested by ministerial priorities.
- School improvement initiatives, including the coordination of the advanced skills teacher programme, leadership development in schools, and support for schools aspiring to move from good to outstanding.
- The need to make adequate contingency provision for in-year increases in pupil numbers and statements of special educational needs.
- Support for the new Krishna-Avanti school as it builds up its pupil numbers.
- Changes to the funding formula so as to better target protection funding for schools that suffer a reduction in budget as a result of unplanned changes in pupil numbers.

22. Schools will also receive provisional 2010-11 budgets before 31 March 2009, and the 2010-11 budgets will take into account the outcome of Cabinet's deliberations in January on proposed changes to school organisation and the age of transfer. Schools Forum is giving consideration to supporting primary schools should Cabinet decide to proceed with the Change of Age of Transfer. Individual schools will need to accrue some revenue over the next two years to offset reductions that will occur as pupils move from the primary to the secondary sector and to support the transition years in high schools.

23. DCSF does not require budgets for 2011-12 to be issued at this stage, as it has not yet concluded a review of DSG for that year. This may result in a shift in resource allocation between Councils. An indicative figure of 2.5% is currently being reported to the School's Forum for planning purposes however this will be refined as the conclusion of the DSG review become known.

Reserves

24. Assuming that the pressures identified in 2008-09 can be effectively managed, reserves are forecast to reach £4m by the end of the year. In February 2008 the risk assessment showed that the minimum level the Council should hold is £3.5m. The draft MTFS is based on the assumption that the contribution of £0.5m will continue in each of the 3 years. Subject to actual spending, this will result in general balances of £5.5m by the end of 2011-12.

GLA Precept

25. The GLA precept is currently £309.82 for a band D property and it is anticipated that there will be a low or nil precept increase next year.

Capital Programme

26. Planned capital Investment in 2009/10 totals £60m including:

- Housing improvement programme
- Improvements to schools and social care establishments
- Improvements to leisure facilities
- New technology to improve services
- Highways, lighting, transportation, parks and public conveniences

27. The capital programme is funded from a number of sources. These include:

- External funding in the order of £25m, primarily from the DCSF and Transport for London
- Major Repairs Allowance (Housing Revenue Account)
- Capital receipts (but none anticipated next year)
- Borrowing

Consultation and Information Sharing

28. Consultation has been carried out on priorities via the residents' panel and via a campaign entitled "Have Your Say", supported by the Harrow Times. The consultation activity produced consistent results and generally the three proposed priorities were supported. The corporate priorities provide the framework for the corporate plan which will be considered by Cabinet alongside the final budget in February.

29. The Education Consultative Forum is one of a series of meetings being held with stakeholders in January and February to share information on the Council's budget plans and to seek comments.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Emma Stabler, Finance Business Partner – Children's Services
020 8424 1978

Background Papers: Draft Revenue Budget 2009-10 to 2011-12, 18th
December 2008 Cabinet

Appendix 1

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2009-10 to 2011-12

	2008-09 Budget £m	2009-10 Budget £m	2010-11 Budget £m	2011-12 Budget £m
Budget Requirement Brought Forward		162.837	168.599	172.628
Technical changes		4.786	4.105	2.840
Inflation		5.300	5.200	5.750
Investment in priority areas - years 2 and 3		0.000	2.000	2.000
Adults and Housing		-0.598	0.743	0.250
Children's Services		0.098	-0.380	-0.076
Community and Environment		0.313	1.411	0.900
Corporate Directorates (Assistant Chief Executive, Legal, Finance)		0.049	-0.814	-0.958
FUNDING GAP		-4.186	-8.236	-7.286
Total Change in Budget Requirement		5.762	4.029	3.420
Revised Budget Requirement	162.837	168.599	172.628	176.048
Collection Fund Deficit	1.365	0.000	0.000	0
Government Grant	-65.698	-66.786	-67.764	-67.764
Amount to be raised from Council Tax	98.504	101.813	104.864	108.284
Council Tax at Band D	£ 1,152.55	£ 1,187.14	£ 1,222.78	£ 1,259.51
Increase in Council Tax (%)	2.95	3.00	3.00	3.00

Tax Base	85,466	85,763	85,759	85,973
Assumed collection rate	98.50%	98.25%	98.00%	98%

Appendix 2

Detailed Budget Proposals – Children’s Services

Proposal	2009-10 £000	2010-11 £000	2011-12 £000
Investment in Services			
Placement procurement	37	39	42
Child Protection Chair	24	25	26
School Improvement Partners	45	47	49
Services for 16-18 year olds	50	25	
Children With Disabilities	41	42	44
Duty and Assessment function	37	39	41
Extended Schools	248	-400	
Positive Activity for Young People	95	68	
Carer's Grant (Children and Adults)	67	66	
Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS)	28	27	
Child Death Review	1	2	
Sub Total	673	-20	202
Efficiency Programme			
Efficiency projects in partnership with Capita	-140		
Corporate Director's budget	-24		
Young People's service	-6	-5	-5
Integrated Early Years and Community Services	-203	-203	-196
Children's Placements	-150	-100	-75
Achievement and Inclusion	-2	-2	-2
Special Needs Services	-50	-50	
Total Efficiency Programme	-575	-360	-278
TOTAL	98	-380	-76



Committee:	Education Consultative Forum
Date:	27 January 2009
Subject:	INFORMATION REPORT – Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow
Responsible Officer:	Director of Schools and Children’s Development, Heather Clements
Portfolio Holder:	Portfolio Holder for Schools and Children’s Development, Councillor Anjana Patel
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Cabinet Report and Annexes 15 January 2009

Section 1 – Summary

The January Cabinet report on Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow is attached for the Forum to consider. The Forum asked to be kept updated on the progress of the project.

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2 – Report

1. The statutory consultation on proposals for school reorganisation in Harrow closed on 5 December 2008. On 15 January 2009, Cabinet considered the outcome of the consultation and decided whether to publish statutory proposals that if approved would have the effect of reorganising the schools in Harrow. The Director of Schools and Children’s Development will provide a verbal update to the Forum about the Cabinet decision.

2. The consultation responses have been analysed by officers and high level reporting has been included in the report to Cabinet. The consultation outcomes indicate that there is support for the proposals to change school organisation in Harrow. Although the response rate was low, this could be for a range of reasons and is not believed to reflect on the consultation process. Of the 686 individual responses received, 55% agreed with the proposals, 30% did not agree, and 15% were not sure. The majority of these respondents were parents of children in Harrow schools. Of the 50 responses received from governing bodies, 66% agreed with the proposals, 20% did not agree and 14% were not sure. The majority of the views expressed by young people were supportive of the proposals.
3. Throughout the consultation activities and the responses several themes have emerged, usually posed as questions for the local authority or as reasons given by those who disagree with the proposals. If Cabinet decides to publish statutory proposals that are subsequently approved, the Stakeholder Reference Group (SRG) will be well placed to address the issues and concerns raised by stakeholders during the consultation. The SRG workstreams are correlated closely to the main theme areas of the comments made by respondents including themes related to staffing, finance, implementation and accommodation. The SRG and the workstream sub-groups provide a structure and mechanism to address issues raised by stakeholders and build on their progress. The report to January Cabinet presents an up-date on the work of the SRG.

Section 3 – Further Information

4. If Cabinet decided to publish statutory proposals, these would be determined by Cabinet at its meeting on 23 April 2009.
5. The report to January Cabinet also presents information on the Primary Capital Programme and the Building Schools for the Future government initiatives.
6. Harrow's submission for the Primary Capital Programme made in June 2008, received category 1 approval. This approval means that the indicative allocations for 2009-10 and 2010-11 are confirmed.
7. Harrow has submitted its Expression of Interest for Building Schools for the Future funding to the Department for Children, Schools and Families. All the eligible high schools have been allocated into two waves. The DCSF will announce the outcome of the submissions in March 2009 and confirm when local authorities will receive funding.

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Chris Melly, Senior Professional, Transforming Learning Team
020 8420 9270 chris.melly@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers: None

Meeting:	Cabinet
Date:	15 January 2009
Subject:	Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow
Key Decision:	Yes
Responsible Officer:	Heather Clements, Director of Schools and Children's Development
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr Anjana Patel, Portfolio Holder, Schools and Children's Development
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Annexe 1 Consultation Responses and Analysis Annexe 2 Proposals for Individual Schools Annexe 3 Equalities Impact Assessment Annexe 4 Risk Register

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report presents:

- the outcome of the consultation on proposals to change school organisation in Harrow,
- an up-date on the work of the School Reorganisation Stakeholder Reference Group and
- information on the Primary Capital Programme and the Building Schools for the Future government initiatives.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is requested to:

1. Consider the outcomes of the consultation on proposals for school reorganisation in Harrow and to make decisions while having regard to the statutory and non-statutory decision makers guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
2. Note the outcome of the consultation in respect of the following voluntary aided schools: Krishna-Avanti Primary School, St John Fisher Catholic First and Middle School, St John's Church of England School, and St Teresa's First and Middle Catholic School.

3. Adopt the proposals for school reorganisation across Harrow that will change:
- i) separate first schools (Reception to Year 3) to become infant schools (Reception to Year 2) as proposed for individual schools in Annexe 2i;
 - ii) separate middle schools (Year 4 to Year 7) to become junior schools (Year 3 to Year 6) as proposed for individual schools in Annexe 2ii;
 - iii) combined first and middle schools (Reception to Year 7) to become primary schools (Reception to Year 6) as proposed for individual schools in Annexe 2iii;
 - iv) high schools (Year 8 to Year 13) to become secondary schools with 6th form provision (Year 7 to Year 13) as proposed for individual schools in Annexe 2iv; and
 - v) to publish statutory proposals to give effect to these changes

Reason: (For recommendation)

For Cabinet to:

- consider the outcome of the consultation undertaken on proposals for school reorganisation in Harrow.
- exercise the local authority's statutory responsibility in relation to school organisation.
- consider whether to publish statutory proposals to effect the change.

Section 2 – Report

Introduction

1. The Strategic Approach to School Organisation and the potential outcome to change the ages of transfer will contribute to the Corporate Priority to extend community use of schools while making education in Harrow even better.
2. The Vision for Education agreed by Cabinet at their meeting on 21 May 2008 underpins the development of the strategic approach to school reorganisation.
3. Cabinet's commitment to changing school organisation in Harrow is consistent with a range of National and Local policies impacting currently on Children's Services and schools. These include:
 - the aspirations from the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) Children's Plan.
 - outcomes of Every Child Matters.
 - the local authority's role as champion for pupils and parents.
 - the council's aspirations to extend and localise services.

Background

4. At their meeting in October 2007, Cabinet agreed a Strategic Approach to School Organisation. The rationale for changing school organisation was outlined in the report grouped under the headings: Organisation, Education and Social Factors, and Stakeholder Support. At this meeting, Cabinet also agreed to establish the Stakeholder Reference Group (SRG), which is a representative group of headteachers, governors, union representatives and members. SRG is chaired by the

Portfolio Holder for Children's Services and supported by officers. There is a range of sub-groups leading on workstreams related to the school reorganisation proposals. Up-dates on the progress of these workstreams are included in this report.

- At their meeting in June 2008, Cabinet agreed that a consultation on proposals for school reorganisation would be undertaken. The proposed reorganisation for Community Schools is summarised in the table below.

Current Organisation	Year Groups	Proposed Organisation	Year Groups
First Schools	Reception to Year 3	Infant Schools	Reception to Year 2
Middle Schools	Year 4 to Year 7	Junior Schools	Year 3 to Year 6
Combined First and Middle Schools	Reception to Year 7	Primary Schools	Reception to Year 6
Special Primary Schools	Reception to Year 7	Special Primary Schools	Reception to Year 6
High Schools	Year 8 to Year 11	Secondary Schools	Year 7 to Year 13
Special High Schools	Year 7 to Year 13	Special High Schools	Year 7 to Year 13

- The proposals for individual schools are presented at Annexe 2i-iv.

Consultation

- The School Reorganisation Consultation commenced on 8 September 2008 and ended on 5 December 2008.
- The SRG considered the proposed consultation process and draft materials. A consultation document was published and circulated to parents via schools, interested parties including neighbouring Boroughs, Diocesan Boards and local Members of Parliament. Headteachers and Chairs of Governors were asked to consult with their school stakeholders, including pupils, parents, staff and governors, using their established communication mechanisms. A powerpoint presentation was prepared for schools to use at their meetings. This provided the headline information regarding the school reorganisation proposals and the flexibility for Headteachers and Chairs of Governors to add specific impacts for their schools.
- Officers met with both Student Advisory Groups (SAG High School and SAG Year 6 and Year 7 students) and with the Harrow Youth Council. Formal consultation forums including the Education Consultative Forum and the Governors' Forum considered the proposals. In addition, two public meetings were held at the Civic Centre.
- The consultation proposals and materials were published on the Council's website together with an on-line response facility. All the

responses received have been made available to Cabinet. Consultation response form transcripts are available to view on the Harrow Website.

Options considered

Consultation Outcomes and Analysis

11. The full analysis of the responses is presented at Annexe 1. The headlines are as follows. Of the 686 individual responses received, 55% agreed with the proposals, 30% did not agree, and 15% were not sure. The majority of these respondents were parents of children in Harrow schools. Of the 50 responses received from governing bodies, 66% agreed with the proposals, 20% did not agree and 14% were not sure. The governing bodies that did not respond included some voluntary aided schools which are organised already as Reception to Year 6, with pupils transferring to high schools at the end of Year 6. The majority of the views expressed by young people were supportive of the proposals.
12. The consultation outcomes indicate that there is support for the proposals to change school organisation in Harrow. Although the response rate was low, this could be for a range of reasons and is not believed to reflect on the consultation process.
13. Many of the responses included comments, and these provide a greater insight into the reasons for the responses made. These comments have been grouped into main themes at Annexe 1 and are listed as:
 - School Organisation
 - Staffing
 - Educational
 - Pupils
 - Implementation in September 2010 Logistics/Transition Issues
 - Finance/Resources
 - Buildings
 - Admissions
14. The number of comments making reference to these themes by respondents who agree, disagree or are not sure about the proposals is presented in Appendix 2 of Annexe 1.
15. Where support has been expressed, this is for a number of reasons including schools' alignment with national curriculum key stages and neighbouring Boroughs. Even where support was expressed, there were some concerns raised about the management of the transition, size of the high schools and the number of pupils on the sites.
16. Where the respondents indicated they were opposed to the proposals, a range of reasons has been cited. These include retaining the existing school organisation, concerns about staffing, resources, and overcrowding on high school sites.
17. Those respondents who were unsure cited school reorganisation issues, concerns about staffing, implementation and pupil maturity.
18. Ten governing bodies disagreed with the proposals and their responses are included at Annexe 1. The eight separate first and middle schools

were concerned primarily about: the financial impact on the schools; the impact on the quality of education; and the impact on staffing. Additional issues included: parents thinking this is a done deal and not understanding the proposals; the issue of losing children at Year 6 has not been sufficiently tested; and lack of proper preparation.

19. Stanburn First School requested that, if the proposals are agreed by Cabinet, consideration is given to either the provision of a fourth class in each year group, or the provision of a three class nursery at the school. The Director of Schools and Children's Development will continue to monitor the demand for school places and early years provision. Where there is a change in demand, proposals will be developed accordingly. Currently, there are no proposals for expansion and it is proposed that this proposal is not supported.
20. An alternative proposal was received from Alexandra School and Shaftesbury School. The proposal is that both schools have Year 7 classes, with the expectation that children at Alexandra would remain there, and young people moving from mainstream school to special school at the end of Year 6 would have Year 7 at Shaftesbury. The proposal had the support of the headteachers, staff and governors.
21. If reorganisation in Harrow occurs as proposed, this alternative proposal would mean there would be different organisation for Alexandra School which would not be aligned with the other schools in Harrow, adjacent Boroughs or the national curriculum. It is proposed that this alternative proposal is not supported. If there are instances where pupils would benefit from an additional year at Alexandra School then this could be achieved on an individual basis. However, the Director of Schools and Children's Development will explore other options for the development of these schools as part of strategic planning for special schools provision.

Voluntary Aided Schools

22. The school reorganisation project is inclusive of the voluntary aided sector although the governing bodies of these schools have responsibility for the organisation of their schools. Local authority officers worked with the governing bodies of four voluntary aided schools to co-ordinate the consultation process. These schools are:
 - Krishna-Avanti Primary School
 - St John Fisher Catholic First and Middle School
 - St John's Church of England School
 - St Teresa's First and Middle Catholic School.
23. The governing bodies of these schools consulted on proposals to change their school age range from Reception to Year 7 to Reception to Year 6. It is understood that the governing bodies will publish statutory proposals that would effect the change in the age range of their schools with effect from 1 September 2010.

Strategic Matters

24. Throughout the consultation activities and the responses several themes have emerged, usually posed as questions for the local authority or as reasons given by those who disagree with the proposals.

25. A factor that is relevant to all the concerns is the need for clarity about the direction for school organisation in Harrow. If Cabinet agrees the proposals and statutory proposals are published that would effect the changes, then there will be greater certainty. Whilst not pre-empting the outcome of the publication of the statutory proposals and their determination, the intended format of school organisation would be known and initial planning would be able to happen in this context. Cabinet would consider the determination of the statutory proposals in April 2009, and, if approved, there would be four academic terms to prepare for implementation. This would not be from a standing position as considerable progress has been made across a range of related workstreams that report to the SRG.
26. Cabinet established the SRG at their meeting in October 2007, and the SRG have met regularly since February 2008. The SRG, which is not a decision-making group, has considered a range of focused workstreams regarding school reorganisation and include:
- Admissions
 - Capital
 - Consultation and Communication
 - Curriculum, Teaching and Learning/ School Leadership, Governance and Management
 - Early Years and Extended Schools
 - Pupil Projections and Demographics
 - School Finance
 - Special Education Needs
 - Workforce Strategy
27. The SRG workstreams are correlated closely to the main theme areas of the comments made by respondents including themes related to staffing, finance, implementation and accommodation. The SRG and the workstream sub-groups provide a structure and mechanism to address issues raised by stakeholders and build on their progress.
28. If the proposals were agreed, Cabinet would want to continue their support for SRG in its role to support the implementation.
29. Up-dates on the SRG are provided below.

Stakeholder Reference Group Up-Dates on Key Workstreams

Admissions

30. Admissions authorities are required to consult on their admission arrangements annually, and determine admission arrangements by 15 April the year before they are implemented. This process would happen regardless of the proposals for school reorganisation in Harrow.
31. The consultation started on Monday 8 December 2008 and will end on Friday 13 February 2009. The consultation outcomes will be reported to Cabinet at their meeting on 26 March 2009.

Capital

Secondary School Sector

32. In preparation for proposals for school reorganisation and the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) submission, the local authority has

developed strategic masterplan proposals with the headteachers and governors for each high school. A holistic approach was adopted to address all Asset Management Plan (AMP) issues, including the incorporation of:

- permanent post-16 accommodation which is under construction.
- potential for Year 7 pupils being in all high schools.
- additional capacity for future population growth.
- Harrow's Education Vision including the vision for schools in the community have informed these plans.

33. If the proposals for school reorganisation are agreed, the temporary accommodation for Year 7 pupils will be required on school sites for use from September 2010. Funding for this is expected to be approximately £6m and provision would be through DCSF Education Modernisation funding.

Primary School Sector

34. In the primary school sector, there is a rolling programme to complete strategic plans for each school. These will be developed along similar lines to the high school master plans. Part of this process will be to identify accommodation that will be surplus to school requirements if the proposals to change school organisation are agreed. Also, a desktop exercise is being undertaken to identify potential capacity in schools, which could be used to expand capacity for places in the future.

Consultation and Communications

35. If the proposals are agreed, the focus of this group will be to ensure that stakeholders are informed throughout the implementation process. This will include key actions for headteachers, schools' staff, governors and up-dates for wider stakeholders.

Curriculum, Teaching and Learning/Leadership, Governance and Management

36. The approach adopted to address School Improvement and Leadership issues is to match mainstream activities arising from changes to school organisation to Harrow's School Improvement Strategies.
37. A joint meeting of these workstreams was held in November to agree the full scope of the work areas that this group needs to consider within a defined and realistic timescale.
38. A priority identified by this group was the need for a structured support mechanism for headteachers to be put in place promptly if the proposals are implemented. The joint meeting endorsed the need for headteacher briefings and the need to include school phase specific discussion. Provisional dates from February to June 2009 were agreed and these will be published in the Gold Bulletin.

Pupil Projections and Demographics

39. Pupil population and roll projections are being monitored and a new set of projections will be produced in March 2009, using the projections from the GLA and the January 2009 School Census data.
40. Officers are liaising with neighbouring Boroughs about the projections and the impact on school place planning. This will continue and

proposals to make changes to the number of school places will be developed accordingly.

School Finance

41. The School Finance workstream sub-group has completed considerable work on the schools' funding formula and modelled the impacts on individual school budgets. They have developed and agreed a set of principles to be applied as the protection factor for schools.
42. The working group has developed a model to calculate transitional protection. The model takes account of the savings schools should be able to make, generated by the changes in pupils numbers, and balances held by schools that are above the Audit Commission level at April 2008. The model provides limited protection over two years where appropriate, though this would of necessity be at a modest level to ensure the total protection is affordable as there is no additional funding. The model was presented to the Schools' Forum on 18 December 2008. At this meeting the Forum supported the proposed model and recommended that it be distributed to individual schools for comment. The working group will consider the comments from schools, and will report to the Schools' Forum in February.
43. By using balances at April 2008 as a baseline, the model ensures that any additional savings made by schools over the next couple of years would be retained by them to encourage prudence. There would be scope for schools to apply for assistance should there be extraordinary circumstances.

Special Educational Needs

44. If the proposals are agreed, then the statements of all pupils transferring in September 2010 will require their annual review to take place from the Summer term 2009. Preparations will be made for this to happen. In addition, consideration is being given to the need to increase capacity in the secondary sector.

Workforce Strategy

45. The Workforce sub-group has developed three strands to support both headteachers and staff through the transition. A termly workforce planning survey will be collated from schools and Workforce Planning Briefings will be planned for the Spring and Summer terms. These will be supplemented by support for individual schools and a scheme called 'Springboard' will be launched for staff to express their interest in gaining posts for career progression.

DCSF Capital Funding

Building Schools for the Future

46. The DCSF invited local authorities to submit an Expression of Interest (Eol) for BSF funding. As part of the process to develop the Eol, criteria were developed and applied to identify the priority schools to receive funding. On the basis of the application of these criteria, the schools in Harrow are allocated to two groups:

Wave 1 Priority Project;
Wave 2 Follow-on Project.

Wave 1:

Canons High School
 Harrow High School
 Rooks Heath College for Business
 and Enterprise
 Salvatorian College

Wave 2:

Bentley Wood High School
 Hatch End High School
 Nower Hill High School
 Park High School
 Sacred Heart Language College
 Shaftesbury High School

47. The DCSF cost calculator generated a total of £84m for the Wave 1 project and £126m for Wave 2. The DCSF will announce the outcome of the EoI submissions in March 2009 and confirm when local authorities will receive funding.

Primary Capital Programme

48. The submission for the Primary Capital Programme made in June 2008, received category 1 approval. This approval means that the indicative allocations for 2009-10 and 2010-11 are confirmed. The schools that will receive funding were identified by the application of criteria developed with headteachers, chairs of governors and the SRG. The table below summarises the funding and schools for the first two years.

School	2009 - 10	2010 - 11
Marlborough First and Middle School	£1m	£1m
St Anselm's RC Primary School	£750k	£750k
Elmgrove First School and Elmgrove Middle School	£700k	£800k
Roxbourne First School and Roxbourne Middle School	£700k	£800k
Stanburn First School and Stanburn Middle School	£250k	£920k
Weald First School and Weald Middle School		£1.5m
Total Funding	£3.4m	£5.77m

Effect on Standards and School Improvement

49. The consultation proposals set out a range of reasons why Harrow Council decided to consult on school reorganisation proposals. These include:
- the duty to promote high standards, fair access to educational opportunity and the fulfilment of every child's potential.
 - improving learning and teaching for pupils and staff through changing school organisation in line with the national curriculum key stages.
 - addressing pupil mobility issues of a loss of approximately 26% of pupils at the end of Year 6 to neighbouring boroughs.
 - ensuring Harrow maintains and improves on its high education achievement and responds to future changes in its demographic profile.
50. Decision makers must have regard to statutory and non-statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State when making decisions on proposals. The factors to be considered include: a system shaped by parents; standards; diversity; Every Child Matters; equal opportunities issues; need for places; funding; special educational needs; views of interested parties. Views of interested parties are one of the factors in the decision making process. However, all proposals should be considered on their individual merits and take account of all the relevant factors.

Implications of the Recommendations

Equalities Impact

51. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken and this will be reviewed throughout the project. A copy is at Annexe 3. There is no identified detrimental impact on any of the equality groups. Overall the alignment of Harrow community schools with the VA sector and neighbouring boroughs will enhance the equality of opportunity and choice for young people.

Legal comments

52. Section 14 of the Education Act 1996 is a general duty that requires local authorities to have regard to the need to secure primary and secondary education in separate schools.
53. The Education and Inspections Act 2006 provides a framework for consultation, publication and determination of statutory notices in respect of proposals for schools, including changing the age range. There are responsibilities for both local authorities and governing bodies within this legislation to bring forward proposals for changes to schools. Changes to admissions arrangements are also included in this legislation.
54. If the project proceeds school governing bodies will have access to legal advice under the terms of their Service Level Agreement (SLA) for Legal Services and for Human Resources and Development Services.

Financial Implications

55. The school reorganisation project is being managed currently within existing resources. It is expected in some areas that there will be pressures on resources, for example, managing four cohorts of admissions for September 2010 and supporting schools to restructure accordingly. In the formation of the implementation strategies, each of the workstream leads is developing the business case and is considering any additional resources that may be required. Current expectation is that additional costs would not be substantial and any additional costs would have to be contained within existing resources.
56. The School Finance workstream sub group is considering the revenue implications for schools. Any changes to the funding formula need to be agreed by the Schools' Forum and contained within the Dedicated Schools' Grant (DSG). Using indicative figures, the transitional protection model estimates the total cost of the protection model to be £360k for 2010/11 and £180k for 2011/12. This will be factored into the forward plan for the DSG budget. The school reorganisation is likely to trigger the statutory Minimum Funding Guarantee for some schools and a submission to the Secretary of State would be required to waive these requirements, which is a formality expected to be approved.
57. Capital funding will be available from a range of sources including Schools' Devolved Formula Capital, DCSF Modernisation Funding, the Primary Capital Programme and BSF.

Performance Issues

58. Delivering school reorganisation so that Harrow's schools are in line with the national agenda is Council Improvement Plan project IP7D and

contributes to a range of performance indicators, in particular the following from the new National Indicator Set. NI 72 – 109 ‘Enjoy and Achieve’ indicators covering Key Stage achievement and progression, narrowing the gap for lower performing and vulnerable groups, attendance, behaviour, special educational needs.

59. Whilst Harrow’s performance is currently above national and statistical neighbours’ averages at all Key Stages, Harrow’s targets, which are set annually for the DCSF, are highly challenging. The table below presents Harrow’s performance against its targets and the national averages.

Harrow's 2006-07 Results

KS1	Actual	Target	National
Reading L2+	84.7%	Not set	84%
Writing L2+	81.0%	Not set	80%
Maths L2+	90.5%	Not set	90%
Science L2+	88.2%	Not set	89%
KS2	Actual	Target	National
English L4+	82%	85%	80%
Maths L4+	79%	85%	77%
Science L4+	88%	Not set	88%
KS3	Actual	Target	National
English L5+	79%	82%	74%
Maths L5+	79%	80%	76%
Science L5+	75%	78%	73%
GCSE	Actual	Target	National
% 5+ A*-C	68.0%	67.5%	62.0%
% 5+ A*-C incl E&M	56.1%	Not set	46.8%

Risk Management Implications

60. There is a risk register for the school reorganisation project that is reviewed by the School Organisation Officer Group. It contains a high level risk for each of the workstreams and is subject to on-going review and development. A copy is provided at Annexe 4.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name:	Emma Stabler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date:	18 December 2008		
Name:	Helen White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date:	6 January 2009		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name:	David Harrington	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Divisional Director (Strategy and Improvement)
Date:	15 December 2008		

Section 5 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Johanna Morgan, Head of School Organisation Strategy
020 8736 6841

Background Papers:

- Paper 1 Cabinet Report on the Strategic Approach to School Organisation 19 June 2008
- Paper 2 Consultation document Proposals for Harrow Schools
- Paper 3 Report to the Schools Forum 18 December 2008
- Paper 4 DCSF School Organisation Unit guidance for decision makers
www.dcsf.gov.uk/schoolorg
- Paper 5 Consultation Responses (to view the consultation responses please access the Harrow Council website or contact Harrow Council on 020 8416 8733)

School Reorganisation Statutory Consultation

Consultation list

The writing in bold type is taken from the DCSF School Organisation Unit Guidance for Local Authorities and Governing Bodies.

The ordinary type lists the actions identified to be undertaken.

[Blue type denotes actions completed and date.](#)

The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools)(England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) require proposers to consult the following interested parties:

1. the governing body of any school which is the subject of proposals (if the LA are publishing proposals)

Write to: Headteachers and Chairs of Governors of Harrow primary sector schools:

i.e. All community first, middle and combined first & middle schools in Harrow, including special schools

Headteachers and Chairs of Governors of Harrow secondary sector schools:

i.e. All community high schools in Harrow, including special schools

In the letters ask the schools to organise opportunities for parents, staff and governors to meet and discuss the proposals during the Autumn Term 2008. This could be part of planned meetings such as annual governors' meetings or open evenings etc. Also, ask the schools to consult their pupils through established mechanisms, for example, the school council.

Request a formal collective response to the consultation from the school, as well as asking them to encourage individuals to respond.

[Letters sent to Heads and Chairs of all Harrow schools on 5/9](#)

Provide a proforma at the beginning of the Autumn Term 2008 for the school to complete after half-term indicating the activities that have been undertaken. [Sent November.](#)

2. the LA that maintains the school (if the governing body is publishing the proposals)

Advise the Harrow VA schools that are publishing proposals to write to Harrow Council.

[Letters sent November.](#)

3. families of pupils, teachers and other staff at the school

As point 1 - ask the schools to organise opportunities for parents, staff (teaching and non-teaching) and governors to meet and discuss the proposals during the Autumn Term. This could be part of planned meetings such as annual governors' meetings or open evenings, etc. Also, ask the schools to consult their pupils through established mechanisms, for example, the school council. [In the letters sent to Heads and Chairs on 5/9](#)

4. any LA likely to be affected by the proposals, including neighbouring authorities where there may be significant cross-border movement of pupils

Write to: Director of Education of:

Barnet, Brent, Ealing, Hertfordshire, Hillingdon

Enclose the consultation booklet. [Letter A sent and enclosed the consultation booklet 12/9](#)

In the letter ask the directors to forward the letter to any schools in their area that they consider may be affected by the proposals, and for those schools to consider how to engage with their parents and staff as they think appropriate. [Included in the letters.](#)

5. the governing bodies, teachers and other staff of any other school that may be affected

Write to: Headteachers and Chairs of Governors of:

All VA primary schools and Roman Catholic high schools

[Letters sent to Heads and Chairs of all Harrow schools on 5/9](#)

All private sector schools in Harrow

[Letter D sent to all private schools, and enclose the consultation booklet 12/9](#)

In the letters invite the schools to consider how they can best engage with their staff and parents, for example, through meetings or other means as appropriate. [Included in letters.](#)

6. families of any pupils at any other school who may be affected by the proposals including where appropriate families of pupils at feeder primary schools

Letters sent under points 1, 4 and 5 will ask schools to consider how to engage with their parents and staff as they think appropriate. [Included in the letters under points 1, 4 and 5.](#)

7. any trade unions who represent staff at the school; and representatives of any trade union of any other staff at schools who may be affected by the proposals

Write to: NUT; Unison; ATL; NAHT; NASUWT; GMB

Enclose the consultation booklet. [Letter C sent, and enclosed the consultation booklet 16/9](#)

Discuss at Adults and Children Services Joint Committee.

Discuss at:	Employee Consultative Forum on 29 October 2008	Lesley	Done 12/12
	Children's Services Departmental Joint Committee		Done
	Corporate Joint Committee		Done 28/10

8. (if proposals involve, or are likely to affect a school which has a particular religious character) the appropriate diocesan authorities or the relevant faith group in relation to the school

Write to:	Archdiocese of Westminster	(Roman Catholic)
	Society of the Divine Saviour	(Salvatorian Fathers)
	London Diocesan Board	(Church of England)
	United Synagogue	(Jewish)
	I-Foundation	(Hindu)

Enclose the consultation booklet. [Letter B sent, and enclosed the consultation booklet 12/9](#)

9. the trustees of the school (if any)

Not applicable.

10. (if the proposals affect the provision of full-time 14-19 education) the Learning and Skills Council (LSC)

Write to: London West Learning and Skills Council
London North Learning and Skills Council
Learning and Skills Council Hertfordshire

Enclose the consultation booklet. [Letter C sent, and enclosed the consultation booklet 12/9](#)

11. MPs whose constituencies include the schools that are the subject of the proposals or whose constituents are likely to be affected by the proposals

Write to: All MPs in Harrow, Barnet, Brent, Ealing, Hertfordshire, Hillingdon

[Letter C sent, and enclosed the consultation booklet 15/9 \(Harrow 12/9\)](#)

12. the local district or parish council where the school or proposed school that is the subject of the proposals is situated

Not applicable.

13. any other interested party, for example, the Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership (if one exists), or any local partnership or group that exists in place of an EYDCP (where proposals affect early years and/or childcare provision), or those who benefit from a contractual arrangement giving them the use of the premises

Write to: Harrow Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership

All pre-school providers [Letter sent 24/9](#)

[Presentation given to Early Years Forum on 20/10 and booklets distributed.](#)

All Children's Centres

[Letter E sent, and enclosed the consultation booklet and poster](#)

14. such other persons as appear to the proposers to be appropriate

Post the consultation on the Harrow website and the intranet. [Information posted](#)

Write to: All Harrow elected Members [12/9](#)

Harrow College [12/9](#)

St Dominic's College [12/9](#)

Stanmore College [12/9](#)

Libraries [poster and 20 copies to 11 libraries 18/9](#)

Leisure Centre [poster and 10 copies 18/9](#)

Art Centre [poster and 10 copies 18/9](#)

Pinner Road Children's Service [poster and 30 copies 18/9](#)

Alexandra Avenue [poster and 30 copies 18/9](#)

Corporate Leadership Group (all corporate directors and directors) [email 16/9](#)

Children's Services Management Team [email via Director's PA 16/9](#)

Achievement & Inclusion Service (School Improvement Partners) [email 16/9](#)

Teacher Centre Reception [20 copies sent 12/9](#)

Harrow Council for Racial Equality [12/9](#)

Northwick Park Children's Service [poster and 5 copies sent 18/9](#)

Harrow Family Learning Network [12/9](#)

Faith in Community [12/9](#)

Harrow Association for the Disabled [12/9](#)

Harrow Association of Voluntary Services [12/9](#)

Harrow Refugee Forum [12/9](#)

Harrow Mencap [12/9](#)

Enclose the consultation booklet. [Letter C sent, and enclosed the consultation booklet](#)

Write to: Harrow PCT, North West London Hospitals NHS Trust, Central and North West London (CNWL) NHS Foundation Trust, Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital NHS Trust, Harrow CAMHS

Enclose the consultation booklet. [Sent 30/9.](#)

Email to all community and voluntary organisations in Harrow using Policy & Partnership group email list of 200+ organisations. [Letter C emailed + pdf of consultation booklet 30/9.](#)

Posters in community locations (including 40 Surgeries and 5 Clinics via PCT). See separate distribution list. [Sent letter 1, and enclosed the poster 19/9.](#)

Presentation on screen in Access Harrow and posters and consultation booklets available. [Posters and consultation booklets provide 37 presentation not appropriate format for screen.](#)

Public Meetings 3 and 17 November – have consultation booklets available. [Done](#).

Article about the consultation in September ([Done](#)) and November publications of Harrow People, which goes to every Harrow household. [Done](#)

Newsletter in October to remind about consultation period and promote public meetings. [Done](#)

Under Section 176 of the Education Act 2002 LAs and governing bodies are also under a duty to consult pupils on any proposed changes to local school organisation that may affect them

Ask the schools to consult their pupils through established mechanisms, for example the school councils (see point 1).

Write to: Harrow Youth Council [Attended meeting 24/9](#).

High School Student Advisory Group [Attended meeting 15/9](#)

[distributed consultation booklet](#) [Attended further meeting 20/10](#)

Middle School Student Advisory Group [Attended meeting on 7/11](#)

Young Voices Group

Enclose the consultation booklet. [Letter C sent, and enclosed the consultation booklet](#)

Chris Melly 5 January 2009

Appendix 2 Annexe 1

Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow

Consultation Responses and Analysis

High Level Reporting of Views

Contents

1. Introductory comments
2. Consultation response form
3. Key themes
4. Governing bodies
5. Interested party responses

1. Introductory comments

1. Over 30,000 response forms were distributed in the consultation booklets to parents of children attending Harrow schools, and to a wide range of interested parties. There was also publicity about the consultation given through posters, Harrow People, newsletters and Harrow Council website.
2. The response rate for a consultation of this size is low, and the numbers contained in this analysis number fewer than 1,000 responses. It is difficult to give a definitive reason for the low response rate, though the following possibilities are suggested by comments on responses and anecdotal comments:
 - A view that this is a 'done deal' and therefore there is no point responding
 - General support for the proposals leading to a low response rate
 - Not responding to this consultation because view has been expressed previously
3. The low response rate could be for a range of reasons and is not believed to reflect on the consultation process. The view of officers is that the low response rate reflects general support among Harrow's community for the proposals. This view draws on:
 - Support for change in the ages of transfer in the school organisation debate and consultation of 2002/3.
 - Support from representatives of key stakeholder groups on the Stakeholder Reference Group

2. Consultation response form

4. A consultation response form was included in each consultation booklet and also was available on the Harrow Council website to download or complete online. Additional copies were sent to schools. This high level analysis is of those who identified themselves as individual respondents (i.e. pupil, parent/carer, school governor or employee at a Harrow school). High level analysis of those who identified themselves as representing an organisation or governing body is given in the interested party responses section below.

5. The high level analysis needs to be considered in light of the following caveats:
- It is evident from paper copies received and from comments on response forms that some individuals have completed more than one response form. This would usually be because a parent has more than one child attending a Harrow school(s). Sometimes a parent has completed both an electronic and a paper form. All these responses are counted in this analysis because there was no means of identifying all multiple responses (e.g. those completed on-line).
 - It is apparent that some respondents experienced difficulty with completion of the response form. For example, some respondents expressed different views in the two consultation questions, without the reasons for this being consistent or apparent from the comments entered. Also there may have been confusion experienced by some in completing the form electronically, or leaving the on-line facility before completion of all fields.
 - For high level reporting purposes, a view has had to be taken at times about the status of the individual respondent. This has been necessary because of difficulty interpreting some handwritten individual responses, and because of difficulty inputting multiple status on to the electronic system. Where more than one role is entered, the priority order used for entering status has been parent/carer, pupil, governor, employee.
 - If an individual respondent has named a primary sector school, but not specified whether it is the first or middle school, then both schools have been entered.
 - Comments have been produced as written, and not corrected for grammar or spelling.

Do you agree with the proposals to change the ages of transfer in Harrow by creating Infant, Junior, Primary and Secondary Schools in September 2010?

Table 1

Total	Yes	No	Not Sure
686	376 (54.8%)	206 (30.0%)	104 (15.2%)

Status of individual respondents as declared on consultation response forms

Table 2

Status	Totals	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Pupil	17	9	6	2
Parent	595	327	178	90
Governor	18	13	4	1
Employee	44	24	10	10
Not specified	12	3	8	1
Totals	686	376	206	104

Self declaration by respondents on consultation response forms

Table 3

Total	White	Mixed	Black or Black British	Asian or Asian British	Chinese or Other Ethnic Group	Not declared
686	260	22	66	277	20	41

13 of the respondents self declared that they are registered disabled.

Do you agree with the proposals for an individual school?

Notes: The table below shows the numbers of views made about specified schools. The figures are shown by the phase of the school specified.

Not all respondents stated views about individual schools.

The totals do not match the number of respondents because some respondents specified more than one school when giving views. Figures have been entered for the numbers of views made about specified schools, and also where views were given but no school specified.

The responses and comments have been transcribed and made available to Cabinet and are available to view as background information.

Table 4

	Totals	Agree		Disagree		Not Sure	
First school	166	75	45%	65	39%	26	16%
Middle school	148	83	56%	46	31%	19	13%
Combined school	95	55	58%	14	15%	26	27%
High school	77	47	61%	21	27%	9	12%
No school specified	25	10	40%	9	36%	6	24%

3. Key themes from analysis of consultation responses

6. The following tables show the count of comments grouped into eight main theme areas, with twenty-eight sub-theme areas. These theme areas contain all the comments made by respondents who are agreeing, disagreeing and not sure about the proposals.

Table 5

Theme	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
School Organisation				
General comments	21	25	4	50
Unique and successful	0	39	6	45
Alternative suggestions for school organisation	4	8	1	13
Amalgamation	2	1	2	5
In line with other LA school organisation	38	1	5	44
Timing	13	6	1	20
Total number of comments	78	80	19	177

Appendix 2 Annexe 1 of Cabinet Report dated 15 January 2009
Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow

Theme				
Educational	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Curriculum – including Year 7	11	4	1	16
Benefits/ Best interests	2	12	3	17
Continuity including key stage alignment	15	1	1	17
Total number of comments	28	17	5	50
Pupils				
	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	Total
Maturity	6	37	9	52
Age range	0	2	1	3
Special needs	1	2	0	3
Total number of comments	7	41	10	58
Staffing				
	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
General staffing	3	6	7	16
High School staffing	1	6	2	9
First School staffing	2	2	3	7
Middle School staffing	1	1	1	3
Headteacher	1	0	0	1
Total number of comments	8	15	13	36
Implementation in September 2010				
Logistics/Transition Issues	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Management of two year groups transferring during the first year	6	9	7	22
Planning for transition	5	6	6	17
Total number of comments	11	15	13	39

Appendix 2 Annexe 1 of Cabinet Report dated 15 January 2009
Proposals for School Reorganisation in Harrow

Theme				
Finance/Resources	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Revenue	6	9	5	20
Capital	2	5	0	7
Transition period	4	8	1	13
Total number of comments	12	22	6	40
Buildings				
	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Temporary Accommodation	2	5	1	8
School size	6	8	1	15
Crowding on high school sites	3	8	3	14
Availability/access to playground/outside space on high school sites	1	2	0	3
Total number of comments	12	23	5	40
Admissions				
	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Total
Choice	3	6	0	9
Admission arrangements	4	0	4	8
Total number of comments	7	6	4	17

4. Governing bodies

7. All school governing bodies were asked to consider the consultation proposals and to give their views. Responses were received from 50 of the 68 governing bodies about the overall proposals to change the ages of transfer in Harrow. The responses are as follows:

Table 6

Total schools	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	No view expressed
68	33 (48.5%)	10 (14.5%)	7 (10.3%)	18 (26.7%)

Table 7

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Percentage of responses received	66%	20%	14%

5. Interested party responses

8. A number of responses to the consultation were received that have not been analysed with the consultation response forms. The reasons for this include:
- a. response from an organisation;
 - b. responses received by email or letter.
 - c. responses on forms that represented views of more than one person;
 - d. Harrowkidz website (that used different wording for the consultation questions asked).

a. Response from an organisation

9. A letter from the Paediatric Therapy Services supported the changes. An on-line response stated to be from Harrow Association of Disabled People did not state a view but gave the comment: *The proposals are basically positive. I have some concerns about the situation for Shaftesbury High – is it excluded because it already takes that age group? It is important that it is in line with all the other schools, as the transition process is already very difficult for disabled children.*

b. Responses received by email or letter

10. 35 letters and emails were received from persons associated with five schools: Alexandra and Shaftesbury (6); Cannon Lane (27); Grange (1); Pinner Park (1). 29 of these responses were from persons identifying themselves as parents.

Table 8

Question	Totals	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure	No view expressed
Proposals for all Harrow schools	35	2	29	4	0
Proposals for an individual school	35	0	28	4	3

The responses and comments have been made available to Cabinet and are available to view as background information.

11. 136 letters by pupils of Stanburn First School were sent to Heather Clements, Director of Schools and Children’s Development, and were received on 17 December 2008. The main themes were:
- keep the school the same, and not to be one big school
 - become Stanburn Infant School and:
 - make a Nursery out of Year 3 classrooms, for brothers, sisters and friends to be able to come
 - more children to come to the school, and have another class in each Year
 - have more teachers, and keep two headteachers.

c. Responses on forms that represented views of more than one person

12. There were five responses from Cedars Manor year groups/classes that contained figures about views.
- one group agreed with the proposals, and another group mainly agreed
 - two groups disagreed with the proposals, and another group mainly disagreed

d. Harrowkidz website

13. Harrowkidz website posed two questions about the consultation on its website.

Q1 Do you agree with the changes to the age when you move into Middle and Secondary Schools?

- 12 responses were posted
- Two agree
- Seven disagree (though two respondents appear to have repeated their answer)
- Three appear to disagree, though do not state this directly

Q2 Do you agree to the changes that may happen at your school?

- 2 responses were posted
- Both agree

This page is intentionally left blank

Statutory Proposals for Separate First Schools

The statutory proposals are to lower the upper age limit for the first schools and establish infant schools. The individual school proposals are outlined as follows:

Cannon Lane First School

- Cannon Lane First School becomes Cannon Lane Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity 270 pupils.

Elmgrove First School

- Elmgrove First School becomes Elmgrove Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 82 per year and a total of 246 pupils, plus nursery.
- The School will continue to have specialist provision for children with physical impairment.

Grange First School

- Grange First School becomes Grange Infant School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 180 pupils, plus nursery.

Kenmore Park First School

- Kenmore Park First School becomes Kenmore Park Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils, plus nursery.

Longfield First School

- Longfield First School becomes Longfield Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils, plus nursery.

Pinner Park First School

- Pinner Park First School becomes Pinner Park Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils, plus nursery.

Priestmead First School

- Priestmead First School becomes Priestmead Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils, plus nursery.
- The Infant School will have a shared Special Educational Needs base with Priestmead Junior School for children with autistic spectrum disorders.

Roxbourne First School

- Roxbourne First School becomes Roxbourne Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7.

- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils.

Roxeth Manor First School

- Roxeth Manor First School becomes Roxeth Manor Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils, plus nursery.

Note: Cabinet are considering statutory proposals to combine Roxeth Manor First School and Roxeth Manor Middle School at their meeting on 15 January 2009. If Cabinet agrees the statutory proposals that will effect the combining of the schools, this proposal will not be applicable and reference should be made to Annexe 2iii.

Stag Lane First School

- Stag Lane First School becomes Stag Lane Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils, plus nursery.

Stanburn First School

- Stanburn First School becomes Stanburn Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils.

Weald First School

- Weald First School becomes Weald Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils, plus nursery.

Welldon Park First School

- Welldon Park First School becomes Welldon Park Infant School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 180 pupils, plus nursery.
- The School will continue to have specialist provision for children with specific language impairment.

Whitchurch First School

- Whitchurch First School becomes Whitchurch Infant School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 7, plus nursery.
- The Infant School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 270 pupils, plus nursery.

Statutory Proposals for Middle Schools

The statutory proposals are to lower the lower age limit and lower the upper age limit for the middle schools. This will establish junior schools. The individual school proposals are outlined as follows:

Cannon Lane Middle School

- Cannon Lane Middle School becomes Cannon Lane Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Elmgrove Middle School

- Elmgrove Middle School becomes Elmgrove Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 82 per year and capacity for 328 pupils.
- The Junior School will continue to have specialist provision for children with physical impairment.

Grange Middle School

- Grange Middle School becomes Grange Junior School, a two-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 240 pupils.

Kenmore Park Middle School

- Kenmore Park Middle School becomes Kenmore Park Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Longfield Middle School

- Longfield Middle School becomes Longfield Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Pinner Park Middle School

- Pinner Park Middle School becomes Pinner Park Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Priestmead Middle School

- Priestmead Middle School becomes Priestmead Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year (a reduction of three from the current 93) and capacity for 360 pupils.
- The School will have a shared Special Educational Needs base with Priestmead Infant School for children with autistic spectrum disorders.

Roxbourne Middle School

- Roxbourne Middle School becomes Roxbourne Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Roxeth Manor Middle School

- Roxeth Manor Middle School becomes Roxeth Manor Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7– 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Note: Cabinet are considering statutory proposals to combine Roxeth Manor First School and Roxeth Manor Middle School at their meeting on 15 January 2009. If Cabinet agrees the statutory proposals that will effect the combining of the schools, this proposal will not be applicable and reference should be made to Annexe 2iii.

Stag Lane Middle School

- Stag Lane Middle School becomes Stag Lane Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Stanburn Middle School

- Stanburn Middle School becomes Stanburn Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Weald Middle School

- Weald Middle School becomes Weald Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Welldon Park Middle School

- Welldon Park Middle School becomes Welldon Park Junior School, a two-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 240 pupils.

Whitchurch Middle School

- Whitchurch Middle School becomes Whitchurch Junior School, a three-form entry school for children aged 7 – 11.
- The Junior School would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 360 pupils.

Statutory Proposals for Combined First and Middle Schools

The statutory proposals are to lower the upper age limit for combined first and middle schools. This will establish primary schools. Proposals for four voluntary aided schools are also included, these are in italics. The individual school proposals are outlined as follows:

Alexandra School

- Alexandra School becomes a primary school for children aged 3 – 11 with special educational needs, plus nursery
- No change is proposed to the type of provision provided at Alexandra School

Aylward First and Middle School

- It is proposed that Aylward First and Middle School becomes Aylward Primary School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.
- The School will have a Special Educational Needs base for children with autistic spectrum disorders.

Belmont First and Belmont Middle School

- Belmont First and Middle School becomes Belmont Primary School, a two-form entry primary school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.

Cedars Manor School

- Cedars Manor School becomes a two-form entry primary school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.
- The School will continue to have specialist provision for children with hearing impairment.

Earlsmead First and Middle School

- Earlsmead First and Middle School becomes Earlsmead Primary School, a two-form school for children aged 5 – 11.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils.

Glebe First and Middle School

- Glebe First and Middle School becomes Glebe Primary School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year (an increase of eight from the current 52) and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.

Grimsdyke First and Middle School

- Grimsdyke First and Middle School becomes Grimsdyke Primary School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils.

Krishna-Avanti Hindu Primary School

- *The Governing Body will publish notices that will effect that Krishna-Avanti Hindu School becomes a one-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11 plus nursery, with a planned admission number of 30 per year and capacity for 210 pupils, plus nursery.*

Little Stanmore First and Middle School

- Little Stanmore First and Middle School becomes Little Stanmore Primary School, a one-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 30 per year and capacity for 210 pupils, plus nursery.

Marlborough First and Middle School

- Marlborough First and Middle School becomes Marlborough Primary School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils.

Newton Farm First and Middle School

- Newton Farm First and Middle School becomes Newton Farm Primary School, a one-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 30 per year and capacity for 210 pupils, plus nursery.

Norbury School

- Norbury School becomes a two-form entry primary school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.

Pinner Wood School

- Pinner Wood School becomes Pinner Wood Primary School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.

Roxeth First and Middle School

- Roxeth First and Middle School becomes Roxeth Primary School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 56 per year group and capacity for 392 pupils plus nursery.

Roxeth Manor First and Middle School

- Roxeth Manor First and Middle School becomes Roxeth Manor Primary School, a three-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 630 pupils, plus nursery.

Note: Cabinet are considering statutory proposals to combine Roxeth Manor First School and Roxeth Manor Middle School at their meeting on 15 January 2009. If Cabinet does not agree the statutory proposals that will effect the combining of the schools, this proposal will not be applicable and reference should be made to Annexes 2i and 2ii.

St John Fisher Catholic First and Middle School

- *The Governing Body will publish notices that will effect that St John Fisher Catholic First and Middle School becomes St John Fisher Catholic Primary School, a two-form entry voluntary aided Catholic school for children aged 5 – 11 with a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils.*

St John's Church of England School Stanmore

- *The Governing Body will publish notices that will effect that St John's Church of England School becomes a two-form entry voluntary aided Church of England primary school for children aged 5 – 11 with a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils.*

St Teresa's First and Middle Catholic School

- *The Governing Body will publish notices that will effect that St Teresa's First and Middle Catholic School becomes St Teresa's Primary Catholic School, a two-form entry voluntary aided Catholic primary school for children aged 5 – 11 plus nursery, with a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.*

Vaughan First and Middle School

- Vaughan First and Middle School becomes Vaughan Primary School, a two-form entry primary school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.
- The School will have a special educational needs base for children with autistic spectrum disorders.

West Lodge First and Middle School

- West Lodge First and Middle School becomes West Lodge Primary School, a three-form entry primary school for children aged 5 – 11.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 90 per year and capacity for 630 pupils.

Whitefriars First and Middle School

- Whitefriars First and Middle School becomes Whitefriars Primary School, a two-form entry school for children aged 5 – 11, plus nursery.
- The primary school would have a planned admission number of 60 per year and capacity for 420 pupils, plus nursery.

Woodlands School

- It is proposed that Woodlands School becomes Woodlands Primary School for children aged 3-11.
- No change is proposed to the type of provision provided at Woodlands School, which is a special school.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statutory Proposals for High Schools

The statutory proposals are to lower the lower age limit for high schools. This will establish secondary schools. There will also be a statutory proposal to expand the school for all schools. Rooks Heath will also have a statutory proposal to increase pupil numbers due to its increase in Planned Admission Number. The individual school proposals are outlined as follows:

Bentley Wood High School

- Bentley Wood High School becomes a secondary school with a planned admission number of 180 students per year.
- As a secondary school for girls, Bentley Wood would have capacity for 900 students aged 11 – 16, plus sixth form.

Canons High School

- Canons High School becomes a secondary school with a planned admission number of 180 students per year.
- As a secondary school, Canons would have capacity for 900 students aged 11 – 16, plus sixth form.

Harrow High School

- Harrow High School becomes a secondary school with a planned admission number of 180 students per year.
- As a secondary school, Harrow High would have capacity for 900 students aged 11 – 16, plus sixth form.

Hatch End High School

- Hatch End High School becomes a secondary school with a planned admission number of 300 students per year.
- As a secondary school, Hatch End would have capacity for 1,500 students aged 11 – 16, plus sixth form.
- The School will continue to have specialist provision for students with hearing impairment.

Nower Hill High School

- Nower Hill High School becomes a secondary school with a planned admission number of 300 students per year.
- As a secondary school, Nower Hill would have capacity for 1,500 students aged 11 – 16, plus sixth form.

Park High School

- Park High School becomes a secondary school with a planned admission number of 300 students per year (an increase of 20 per year from the current 280).
- As a secondary school, Park High would have capacity for 1,500 students aged 11 - 16, plus sixth form.

Rooks Heath College for Business and Enterprise

- Rooks Heath College for Business and Enterprise becomes a secondary school with a planned admission number of 270 students per year (an increase of 60 per year from the current 210).
- As a secondary school, Rooks Heath would have capacity for 1,350 students aged 11 – 16, plus sixth form.

Whitmore High School

- Whitmore High School becomes a secondary school with a planned admission number of 270 students per year (an increase of 10 from the current 260).
- As a secondary school Whitmore would have capacity for 1,350 students aged 11 – 16, plus sixth form.
- The school will continue to have specialist provision for students with physical impairment and those with autistic spectrum disorders.

FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE/CHECKLIST

Directorate	Children Services		Section	Harrow Transforming Learning Team		
1 Name of the function/ policy to be assessed	School Re-organisation: Proposed change in ages of transfer	2 Date of Assessment	December 2008	3 Is this a new or existing function/policy?	New	

4 Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the function/policy

The objectives for the school reorganisation in Harrow is to establish schools that are aligned with the national curriculum key stages and schools across London. Harrow schools are high performing and popular. Whilst this level of achievement has been maintained, there is a range of reasons for school reorganisation to be proposed:

- The local authority, as the champion of pupils and parents, has the duty to promote high standards, fair access to educational opportunity and the fulfilment of every child's potential. The School Organisation Debate in 2002, undertaken in response to the Ofsted Inspection Report, demonstrated that there was a strong consensus that stakeholders wanted to change the ages of transfer so that all schools in Harrow reorganise to introduce infant, junior and primary schools. Harrow, as the local authority needs to provide leadership in responding to parental views.
- In principle, Harrow considers that by changing school organisation in line with the National Curriculum Key Stages there would be improved learning and teaching for pupils and staff. The proposed organisation would mean that pupils would complete their Key Stages in one school. Infant Schools would have Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1, Junior Schools Key Stage 2, and Secondary Schools Key Stages 3, 4 and 5. Schools would be able to focus on specific Key Stages, and there would no longer be a need for schools to cover part of a Key Stage and as a result there would be greater continuity.
- There is a loss of approximately 26% of pupils at the end of Year 6 to neighbouring boroughs. Although out-borough pupils fill some of these places it has several impacts. There are smaller Year 7 classes, which can create financial uncertainties, new pupils stay for one year and require support during an induction period, this in some instances can be challenging and affect progress, and it can be challenging for schools to provide a broad and balanced Key Stage 3 curriculum with specialist teaching.
- Harrow is experiencing a changing demographic profile and needs to ensure that it responds to this change to maintain and improve on its high education achievement.

<p>5 Are there any associated objectives of the function/policy? Please explain</p>	<p>This policy change will contribute to maintaining and improving education achievement in Harrow, contribute to meeting stakeholder aspirations, contribute to wider corporate priorities of increasing schools as the centre of the community.</p> <p>There will be some opportunities for schools to increase the use of their school sites to provide services and facilities for the community. For example, adult learning, co-location of services.</p>
<p>6 Who is intended to benefit from the function/policy and in what way?</p>	<p>There are potential benefits to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and young people who attend Harrow Schools. The teaching and learning will be aligned with the national curriculum and there will be a reduced number of transitions. This is expected to contribute to improving the achievement of Harrow young people. • Families and communities in Harrow will benefit from increased opportunities to access school facilities and co-located services. • Governors and Headteachers will need to manage the transition, but the proposals should contribute to the retention of pupils through their primary. This will have a positive impact for the schools with Year 7 classes, who experience mobility and its effect on the budget. • The implementation of these proposals may increase potential opportunities for staff in Harrow schools to work in different phases or settings.
<p>7 What outcomes are wanted from this function/policy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to raising standards by aligning schools with the national curriculum key stages • Meet stakeholders aspirations • Put schools at the heart of the community, with a range of community activities to increase opportunities for local communities.

8 What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?

Contributory Factors:

- High levels of support and response from stakeholders during the consultation.
- The role of the Stakeholder Reference Group is essential to the process of planning, consultation and implementation if agreed.
- Consensus regarding the proposals on school budgets and transitional funding arrangements
- Capital investment available for development on high schools to accommodate additional pupils.

Factors that could detract from the outcomes

Changed aspirations of stakeholders emerge through consultation or opposition to the proposals from the majority of stakeholders.

Changes to the pupil population projections, requiring more/less school places. The projections indicate an increase by 2015, and increases have also been identified from potential housing developments. However, this impact is uncertain both in terms of the actual demand for school places and given the current economic climate and decline of the construction industry and investment in developments including housing.

Workforce reviews will be required to ensure appropriate staffing for age range and size of school. Recruitment and training needs to support the changes.

Admission arrangements being reviewed in respect of the new Admissions Code of Practice. Consultation from December to February after the school reorganisation consultation. Stakeholders may link the consultations as the proposed date for any changes to the admissions arrangements is September 2010 and the date for the implementation of the proposed changes to school organisation is the same.

<p>9 Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the function/policy?</p>	<p>Children and young people, families School staff and governors Voluntary aided schools Other interested parties including neighbouring local authorities, primary care trust, MPs, diocesan boards, voluntary sector organisations.</p>	<p>10 Who implements the function/policy and who is responsible for the function/policy?</p>	<p>Local authority has a statutory responsibility to make provision for sufficient school places in its area, and to bring forward proposals to make changes to community schools. Once determined, the local authority has a duty to implement proposals. Governing bodies have statutory responsibility to bring forward proposals to make changes to voluntary aided schools. Once determined, governing bodies have a duty to implement proposals.</p>		
<p>11 What data or other existing evidence have you used to assess whether the function/policy might have a differential impact? (please continue on a separate piece paper if necessary)</p>	<p>Current pupil performance data including data on performance by ethnic groups, SEN etc.</p>				
<p>12 Has the data or other evidence raised concerns that the function/policy might have a differential impact? If so in what area (please circle)?</p>	<p>Race No</p>	<p>Gender No</p>	<p>Disability No</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>(If other please specify) Pupils with SEN</p>

61

13 What are the concerns? (please continue on a separate piece paper)

Race:

- Within the proposals are no issues that will impact change the equality of accessing school places or impact on ethnic groups.
- Non-English speakers, asylum-seekers and new migrants may find it hard to understand the proposed changes in the system: need to ensure good communication through the consultation [period and on-going communication.

Gender:

- Within the proposals there are no reduction to the number of single sex girls community high school places. There are proposals to increase the number of places in mixed community schools.
- There are no proposals to change the number of single sex places at the voluntary aided, single sex catholic schools.

Disability

- Within the proposals there are no reductions to change the current levels of provision for pupils with disabilities, including physical and sensory impairments. Through the investment in the high school sites, there will be greater accessibility for pupils with disabilities. In addition, investment in the primary schools will aim to improve the physical environment for al pupils with disabilities.

Pupils with special educational needs:

- Within the proposals special schools will be aligned with mainstream schools and pupils attending special schools will experience the same chronological progression as their peers.
- The programme to increase the provision for pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASD) will continue. All high schools will have potential for ASD pupils and 3 primary schools.
- Some pupils with special educational needs who attend out-of-borough schools may return to Harrow Schools.
- Within the proposals, in September 2010, there will be two year groups transferring into middle schools – Year 3 and Year 4. There will be two year groups transferring to high schools Year 6 and Year 7. For pupils within these year groups who have statements of special educational needs, they will all be reviewed and revised statements issued.
- All pupils with SEN, will be supported through the transition period.

14 Does the differential impact amount to adverse impact i.e. could it be discriminatory, directly or indirectly?	NO	15 If yes, can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?	N/A
16 Have you considered ways in which the adverse impact might be reduced or eliminated?	There is a Stakeholder Reference Group, with headteachers, governors, unions representatives. This group is considering all work-streams relating to the development of proposals for changing the age of transfer and its potential implementation. The work-streams have sub-groups that are considering in detail the implementation planning and this will contribute to minimising the impact on all pupils, staff and parents.		
17 How have you made sure you have consulted with the relevant groups and service users from Ethnic Minorities? Disabled people? Men and women generally?	<p>Wide range of consultation was undertaken from 5 September to 8 December 2008. A consultation document was distributed widely and all schools were requested to consult with their parents and school communities using their established mechanisms.</p> <p>Formal consultation mechanisms within the Council were also used including the Unions and Education Consultative Forum.</p> <p>In addition, the consultation document was sent to all interested parties including voluntary organisations representing people with disabilities and ethnic minorities.</p>		
18. Please give details of the relevant service users, groups and experts you are approaching for their views on the issues	A list is attached in Annexe A of all recipients of the consultation proposals.		
19 How will the views of these groups be obtained? (Please tick)	Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meetings <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone <input type="checkbox"/> Workshops <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fora <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Questionnaires <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20 Please give the date when each group/expert was contacted	This information is contained in Annexe A1 of the Cabinet Report January 2009.
21 Please explain in detail the views of the relevant groups/experts on the issues involved. (Please use a separate sheet if necessary)	The consultation responses will be presented to Cabinet in January 2009.		

22 Taking into account the views of the groups/experts, please clearly state what changes if any you will make, including the ways in which you will make the function/policy accessible to all service users, or if not able to do so, the areas and level of risk (Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)	Not applicable yet		
23 Please describe how you intend to monitor the effect this function/policy has on different minority groups (Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)	School performance is regularly monitored, including links with free school meals, ethnicity etc. There is range of initiatives and support for underachieving pupils and those at risk of underachievement, which are monitored. This will continue.		
24 If any elements of your function/policy are provided by third parties please state, what arrangements you have in place to ensure that to ensure that the Council's equal opportunities criteria are met	N/A		
25 Please list any performance targets relating to equality that your function/policy includes, and any plans for new targets (Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)	School performance data at key stages		
26 How will you publish the results of this Impact assessment?	Make available in project documentation and Cabinet	27 Date of next assessment	TBC

64

Signed:
NAME: J. Morgan
Completing officer

Date:

Signed:
NAME: H.Clements
Lead Officer

Date:

Risk Register

Directorate Name: Children's Services
Risk Register Name: School Re-organisation - January 2009 Onwards Implementation
Contact Name: Johanna Morgan
Date of Register: Dec-08

Risk no.	Risk Description	Controls/Mitigants	Risk Rating after controls	Further possible actions	Target Risk Rating	Action Owner	Risk Owner	Current Risk status
1	Admissions - admission arrangements for 2010 do not meet the DCSF Code of Practice, failure to secure stakeholder support and not agreed by Cabinet by 15 April 2009. Consequence would be referral to OSA.	Sub-group of Admission Forum established with representatives and also reporting to SRG, review admission arrangements, gather initial views (soundings), develop models to meet new requirements of code of practice, undertake annual consultation and report to Admissions Forum. Cabinet to approve by 15 April 2009 or possible referral to the OSA if fail to approve.	D2	Powerpoint presentation for head teachers to use with meeting with parents etc. Offer of officer attendance at school meetings., item in Head teacher Gold Bulletin and article in Harrow People to reach all Harrow households.	F2	M.Hitchens	Children's Services	Amber
65 2	Capital - failure to complete post 16 accommodation on time, provide sufficient temporary accommodation for Year 7 pupils and secure funding for permanent accommodation through BSF. Changes to the BSF programme that have a negative impact on the local authority's ability to deliver	Development of master plans for all high schools including permanent accommodation for Year 7 pupils. Submit BSF expression of interest and implement BSF procurement in line with DCSF announcements and requirements. Plan and procure temporary accommodation for Year 7 pupils commissioned with effect from September 2010.	D2	Local authority and schools working together to develop master plans and identify capital resources.	D3	A.Gibbons	Children's Services	Amber
3	Communications and Consultation - failure to engage stakeholders resulting in low response rate and misrepresentation of minority views.	Communication strategy - newsletters etc to stakeholders. Consultation Sept to Dec 2008 with all stakeholders, including consultation material, consultation documents, on-line, PowerPoint for meetings etc. Stakeholder Reference Group established February 2008. Established key work-stream groups reporting to SRG. Chaired by Portfolio Holder for Children's Service. Representative head teachers, governors, unions and Members.	D2	On-going communication strategy, regular SRG meetings, current focus on planning, if proposals agreed focus revised to implementation	E3	C.Melly	Children's Services	Amber

Risk no.	Risk Description	Controls/Mitigants	Risk Rating after controls	Further possible actions	Target Risk Rating	Action Owner	Risk Owner	Current Risk status
4	Curriculum, Teaching and Learning/Leadership, Governance and Management - not maintaining and improving education standards	Established representative work stream group. Agreed scope of work. Planning activities to support head teachers and staff	D2	Review of work stream scope.	E3	A.Parker	Children's Services	Amber
5	Pupil projections and Demographics - changes in pupil demographics impacting on school place planning	Monitoring pupil numbers and preparing roll projections using GLA and other models. Maintaining and developing pan-London networks and neighbouring local authority relationships and data sharing. Presentation to SOOG and SRG.	D2		E3	L.Defries	Children's Services	Amber
6	Finance School Budgets - ensuring affordable transition and sustainable school organisation funding model	Established representative work stream group. Principles and agreed to guide transitional funding agreed by sub-group and schools forum	D2	On-going monitoring of school budgets and support for individual schools	E3	E.Stabler	Children's Services	Amber
66	3 Special Education Needs - ensuring the needs of pupils with SEN are met through the school reorganisation process, including the need to review statements for all pupils transferring in September 2010. Completion of ASD bases and impact of SEN transport review.	Planning for additional volume of annual reviews when certainty about the proposals is known. Including communication with parents, professionals, schools etc and planning transition process accordingly. Planning for ASD bases with head teachers.	D2			R.Rickman	Children's Services	Amber
9	Workforce strategy - ensuring the workforce are supported through the transition and head teachers and governors are supported to manage the change and align their staffing structures accordingly.	Established workforce sub-group with representative head teachers, governors, unions. Termly monitoring of school workforce planning, briefing sessions for head teachers and chairs of governors, springboard scheme	D2			P.R.Turner	Children's Services	Amber
10	Statutory processes meeting legal requirements	Appointment of external lawyers consider and advice on legal aspects of making changes to schools and admissions arrangements	D2			J.Morgan	Children's Services	Amber

Risk no.	Risk Description	Controls/Mitigants	Risk Rating after controls	Further possible actions	Target Risk Rating	Action Owner	Risk Owner	Current Risk status
11	Insufficient local authority resources	Monthly officer meetings to address issues and challenges of work streams. Additional funding to be considered only where additional work is evidenced and resources identified.	D2	Reviewing officer work programmes	E3	H.Clements	Children's Services	Amber
12	School reorganisation delayed implementation and timescale not met	Established officer group chaired by Director of Schools and Children's Development. SRG monitoring workstream progress. Corporate Children's Services project reported to improvement board	D2			H.Clements	Children's Services	Amber

89								

69								
