

## **TUC MIDLANDS REGIONAL COUNCIL MOTION- 13 OCTOBER 2007**

Wording in the DCC education trade unions' position statement on Academies

Additional words in DCC [all] unions' position statement

---

1. "The Midlands TUC views The trade unions view with concern recent media reports that there could be up to four academies in Derby, particularly in light of Chris Williamson's acknowledgment that the reports are "largely true", now confirmed by the BSF Board. In particular, Council notes the trade unions note with concern that:
  - 1) Academies represent a form of privatisation which takes all employees in the schools affected into the private sector and, as such, pose a threat to the terms and conditions of employees in the schools that convert to academies.
  - 2) Academies show no improvement for the most disadvantaged pupils in society, with 20% of pupils in academies failing to achieve five GCSE passes (A\* - G), whereas nationally 10% of pupils fail to achieve this target.
  - 3) Academies, though privately controlled, are financed almost entirely from taxation. The £2 million expected from sponsors (about £1.2m after tax relief) is much less than the additional cost of the buildings designed to meet the sponsor's wishes. In the case of Derby schools, three out of the four schools which could possibly be privatised either have new PFI buildings (Merrill, Da Vinci) or are currently in the process of being rebuilt (Sinfin Community). In return for a £1.2m investment, any private sponsor will receive buildings worth far more paid for by national and local taxpayers over the next twenty years.
  - 4) The procurement vehicle for Building Schools for the Future, of which the academies programme is a part, known as the Local Education Partnership (LEP), is designed to exclude the local authority, which has only 20% of the seats on the body. 80% are allocated to the private sector and evidence from Derbyshire (The Shirebrook Academy) indicates that the Office of the Schools Commissioner is also likely to exclude Derby City Council from any contract in favour of the private sector.
  - 5) The LEP may award primary school maintenance contracts to the academy sponsor, or to its associated contractors, in order to make the academy contract more profitable. This represents an additional direct threat to the jobs of many Derby City Council employees. Furthermore, the LEP could outsource other local authority services, in addition to Education, which could at risk the jobs and working conditions of employees across all departments.

- 6) The privatisation of a large number of Derby secondary schools reduces considerably local democratic accountability.

Council condemns The trade unions condemn the pressure put on local authorities to agree to academies as a condition of accessing Building Schools for the Future funding, described by the TUC as “pressure verging on duress.” Council The trade unions particularly condemn any pressure put on Derby City Council, which already has a large number of self-governing schools and one academy.

However, despite this pressure, Council does not the trade unions do not consider that Derby City Council should proceed with privatising its secondary schools as “the only game in town.” We Council calls on the local authority to develop a strategy, jointly with Derby City Council trade unions, us to lobby the Government to release Building Schools for the Future funding without precondition of additional academies in Derby.

Council also undertakes to support local authority trade unions which campaign against privatisation or take industrial action to defend the terms and conditions of members transferred to the private sector.