DERBY CITY COUNCIL

2008

Primary Strategy for Change

1.   The local perspective

Derby's Children and Young People's Plan sets out the ways in which the City Partnership responds to the challenges of securing better outcomes for children and young people in the city. We have a well established, effective Partnership committed to the shared vision of:

"building a brighter future for children and young people that provides a healthy, safe and happy childhood, with the opportunity to achieve their full potential."

The overarching principles, priorities and outcomes for the Plan provide a framework and strategic vision for the delivery of children and young people's services in Derby.

The Partnership Principles are:
➢ equality at the forefront of everything we do
➢ to focus on prevention and early intervention
➢ narrowing the gap
➢ to promote enjoyment for children, young people, and their families at home, in learning and in the community.

As well as the five Every Child Matters (ECM) outcomes, the Partnership has local priorities and outcomes:

Priorities	Outcomes
➢ Parenting	➢ Derby has positive, caring and responsible parents, who enable children and young people to meet the Five Outcomes.
➢ Safety, belonging and being valued in the community	➢ To ensure all children and young people are listened to and can participate in decision making in their local communities.
➢ Building ambition, aspiration and achievement	➢ Children and young people are supported to develop and maintain positive relationships and have access to new opportunities.
➢ Physical, emotional wellbeing and safe choices	➢ Children, young people and their families are supported to understand risk and how to make safe choices.

The Partnership has an Outcome Group for each of the ECM Outcomes. The Groups monitor the key actions for each Outcome. Schools are represented on these Groups and on the Partnership's Executive.

2. Baseline analysis

2.1 Overall context and inspection results

Derby has 19,654 pupils aged between 5 and 11 in 22 infant, 19 junior, 37 primary and two special schools. There are 64 community schools, one voluntary controlled school, 11 voluntary aided schools and two foundation schools. 40 infant and primary schools have the full Foundation Stage age range. From August 2008, three schools in the Normanton area are closing and will be replaced by a new primary school.

The Council's 2007 Annual Performance Assessment stated that the "overall effectiveness of the council's contribution to improving outcomes for children and young people is good. The work of Children and Young People's Services is underpinned by strong leadership, clear direction and good partnership working. A good level of service has led to a number of improvements. For example, a range of partnerships are supporting improvements in the health of children and young people and robust and effective procedures are implemented to keep them safe; there is outstanding involvement of children and young people, including those who are vulnerable and hard-to-reach. Significant improvements were made in educational attainment at Key Stages 3 and 4 in 2006; this has dipped in 2007 prompting careful analysis and planned strategies to regain previous improvements. The economic wellbeing of young people is improving: the percentage of young people over 16 in employment, education and training is increasing to meet challenging targets. Effective partnership working is providing increasing and varied pathways for students from 14 to 19. The council is aware of its strengths and areas to develop and has good capacity to improve."

The key findings of the Joint Area Review, which also took place in 2007, were:

- The contribution of local services to improving outcomes for children and young people at risk, or requiring safeguarding, is good. There is effective interagency and preventative work to identify, and respond, to the needs of children at risk in an appropriate and timely way, although the proportion of initial assessments completed on time has fallen. There are clear separate protocols for defined groups to identify missing children. These have not yet been brought together into an over-arching strategy.

- The contribution of local services to improving outcomes for looked after children and young people is good. Strong and effective partnerships are making a discernible difference to children's lives. The care leavers' service is good and corporate parenting responsibilities are well understood and fulfilled effectively. Further progress needs to be made to ensure that all children in care are allocated to a qualified social worker.

- Local services make a good contribution to improving outcomes for children and young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. There is a high commitment to their inclusion in schools and in the locality. The integrated disabled children's service is a model of good practice. The services provided by the Lighthouse and the support for the hearing-impaired are also major strengths, as are the excellent recreational facilities available for those with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. There is insufficient collation of data to give an accurate city-wide picture of attainment and progress. College courses lack flexibility and there are insufficient opportunities for work-based learning for these young people.

- Access to, and the effectiveness of, sexual health services for children and young people, including teenage pregnancy support, are adequate. A wide range of often imaginative projects has been introduced to educate young people about sexual health but their impact has not been evaluated sufficiently. The rate of teenage pregnancy remains higher than average.

- The authority offers suitable accommodation for adequately meeting the needs of most children and young people in the local population. There are effective intervention strategies to minimise homelessness and good partnership working between the authority and other agencies. However, there is insufficient accommodation to meet the needs of some vulnerable groups and data analysis does not ensure that provision is consistently targeted on those in greatest need.

- Service management is good. The Council has outstanding ambitions, prioritises well and, through close collaboration with partner agencies, has extended its capacity for delivery. Some services, however, are heavily reliant on time-limited funding. Monitoring and review mechanisms are effective but action plans are not consistently detailed and best use is not always made of data. There is good capacity for further improvement.

- There are excellent mechanisms for ensuring that a wide and representative range of children and young people is able to take an active and central role in the reviewing and planning of services.

2.2 *Attainment and deprivation*

Derby is a compact urban area with nearly all the contiguous built-up area within the city boundary. There is, therefore, a wide variation in levels of deprivation within the city. Tax credit data produced by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) indicates that four schools are among the schools with the 1% most deprived intake in the country, and a further 18 are among the 10% most deprived. A third of pupils live in the 20% most deprived areas nationally. These are concentrated in the Osmaston, Normanton/Rosehill, Derwent and Sinfin areas.

Derby's overall scores at Key Stage Two in English and Maths in 2007 were in the bottom 20 authorities nationally, while we are around 50th on most indicators of relative deprivation.

The most pressing issue we have to address in primary schools is the attainment gap between pupils in the most and least deprived areas. Data from the DCSF shows that this is significantly wider than the national average: only 60% of pupils living in the 20% nationally most deprived areas achieved level 4 at Key Stage Two in Maths in 2006 against a national average of 65%, while the gap for English was 62% against an average of 68%. Conversely, pupils living in the 20% least deprived areas nationally performed better than the national average for those areas. The attainment gap is impacting adversely on the city-wide results, and the number of schools below floor targets - 21 schools failed to reach at least one floor target in 2007 (see Appendix 1). The 38 schools with Contextual Value Added scores below 100 in 2007 included 15 out of the 19 junior schools. Other groups of low-achieving pupils include those with English as an additional language, "other White" ethnicity, reflecting Roma and other new arrivals from the EU accession states, and pupils with special educational needs – particularly at School Action level.

The Council has a number of strategies in place to address low attainment. School Improvement Partners work very closely with schools to identify the key issues where under-attainment is evident. Through its School Support Policy the Council supports and challenges schools in inverse proportion to need. All schools are categorised on a four point scale and schools with significant under-achievement are targeted for higher levels of support and intervention.

The Primary Strategy Team works with a target group of schools where raw attainment or contextual value added is low. These schools are supported through the Intensive Support Programme and agree to draw up Raising Achievement Plans which include six-weekly monitoring of pupil progress.

In a small number of schools, where achievement has caused particular concern, the Council has introduced Executive Headteacher arrangements and in a number of cases appointed additional governors to drive improvement in school.

In supporting its priority schools the Council has a well-developed case conferencing system which brings together school leaders, governors and key officers in planning support and monitoring performance. There has been a sharp decrease in the number of schools in Ofsted categories, currently two (one special measures and one notice to improve) against nine in autumn 2003 and seven in autumn 2005.

Particular support for bi-lingual learners and pupils recently arrived into the country is provided by the Access and Traveller Services who have a range of initiatives which target schools with low achievement.

No school closures are currently planned as a result of school under-performance. The Council has a good relationship with the National Strategies Regional Teams.

2.3   *Place planning*
The Council has previously consulted on a Primary School Place Planning Strategy in 2005. This was approved by the Council Cabinet in January 2006. The Strategy concluded that there was no need for a city-wide reorganisation, but that there would be area reviews of school provision in Alvaston/Boulton, Sinfin, Normanton/Arboretum and Oakwood/Derwent/Chaddesden. The Strategy also concluded that the Council's preferred organisational model was for a two form entry primary school.

Primary surplus places are not a significant issue in total. The overall level in 2007 was 12.4%, which was only marginally above the national average of 11.9%. Forecasts of pupil numbers over the next 10 years indicate that the overall surplus will reduce from 11.9% to 8.4% (see Appendix 2 for breakdown by cluster), which will be below the 10% DCSF threshold. The Audit Commission's toolkit indicates that Derby's projected level of surplus places for 2011/12 will be well below the national, regional and statistical neighbour averages. The projections take into account birth data in different parts of the city and planned new housing developments. Derby is economically buoyant, and around 700 additional pupils are expected in the city from new housing. It remains the case, therefore, that there is no need for a city-wide reorganisation.

There are, however, pockets within the city where surpluses are higher, and the proportion of schools with more than 25% surplus places in 2007 was well above the national average, at 18% compared to the national average of 14.5%. At the time of the 2008 pupil census, 13 schools had 25% or more surplus places (see Appendix 3). Of these, two are closing in August 2008 as part of an amalgamation.

Figures on primary admissions indicate that 89.6% of first preferences at reception intake and 97.6% at junior transfer were satisfied in 2008. There were 15 schools where the number of first preferences exceeded the admission limit, but only one where the number of first preferences within the catchment area was greater than the number of places available.

There is a good working relationship with the diocesan authorities, and we see maintaining current provision for faith schools as a key priority in this strategy. Many of the faith schools in the city take in a high proportion of pupils from areas of deprivation, and are key partners in the drive to improve attainment and improve pupils' life-chances in these areas.

Discussions have taken place with governors where opportunities for federation have arisen. One federation is already in existence, and another will be by the end of this academic year.

2.4 *Schools capital programme*
The existing capital programme is informed by condition, suitability and sufficiency, information on expected lifespans of buildings and legislative requirements relating to issues such as disabled access. The schools capital programme for 2008-11 has already been agreed by the Council. Existing DCSF funding is being used to address key condition issues. There is, however, a maintenance backlog of £30.5m in primary schools, and this does not include work relating to asbestos removal, the outcomes of fire risk assessments, or Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) work. There is no direct relationship between the condition of schools and the level of deprivation or attainment – two of the three schools with the highest maintenance backlog are in affluent parts of the city.

In recent years, there has been active bidding to the Targeted Capital Fund. This has enabled three small schools in old buildings in an area of deprivation to be amalgamated into a new primary school, while a second project is co-locating an all-age special school to a secondary school site. Three primary schools have also been rebuilt under the Private Finance Initiative (PFI), again in areas of deprivation and again taking out of use old buildings in poor condition and unsuitable for the modern curriculum. A small infant school has also been closed.

The priority for building condition work in the period of this programme will be dealing with timber-framed Vic Hallam buildings as a significant amount of funding is being spent on monitoring and maintenance of these buildings.

2.5 *Inclusion*
The Council has a strong emphasis on inclusion. Enhanced resource schools have been developed at seven mainstream primary schools. These are units for pupils with special educational needs (SEN). The location of these units within a mainstream school setting promotes inclusion and is more cost-effective than building a new special school. Nurture groups have also been established at three primary schools to provide a well-resourced supportive environment for children with complex behavioural difficulties.

Given that good behaviour is a pre-requisite for good learning, the Council has targeted a number of schools for specific behaviour support programmes; this has led to a reduction in overall permanent and fixed term exclusions and reported better behaviour in classrooms.

2.6   *ICT*
In ICT, the Council decided to develop its own local network in 2007 to meet local needs, with a consequent financial benefit for schools. This involved withdrawal from the East Midlands Broadband Consortium (EMBC). This will also enable us to join up with corporate ICT arrangements, which to date have only covered the administrative PC in schools. Investment will be required across all schools to develop learning platforms in line with national targets.

2.7   *Healthy Schools*
The Council's catering service is bought back by most primary schools. The level of take-up of school dinners across all schools in the city is 45.5%. As in many authorities, there has been a recent dip following the introduction of healthy eating initiatives. The price charged for paid meals is lower than in many authorities as a conscious decision to make meals affordable in areas of deprivation. Investment is needed to make dining areas more attractive and to enable these to be used more flexibly.

The Council has a track record in multi-agency strategic partnership work in PE, sport and physical activity, and has achieved Beacon Status for Healthy Schools. There has been recent investment in six schools through Space for Sports and Arts and the New Opportunities Fund. This has enabled the development of multi-use games areas, a gym/dance studio, associated changing facilities and an arts room. Schools in areas of deprivation have been targeted. There is still, however, a need to improve space for PE, sports and physical activity at a number of schools in the inner city, particularly where outdoor space is constrained by the site. This links to the Local Area Agreement (LAA) target on children and young people's participation in high quality PE and sport. This indicator is considered critical in contributing to obesity targets. Encouraging children and young people to become active through sport and active recreation within and outside schools is crucial to the government's offer to pupils of five hours a week for sporting activities. There is also growing evidence both nationally and locally that levels of physical activity have a profound impact on children's learning.

2.8   *Local Area Agreement indicators*
There are 17 mandatory indicators in the LAA, linked to pupil achievement and attendance. There are other local targets within the Council's 35 discretionary indicators which are relevant to this strategy:

- children becoming the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time
- first time entrants into the Youth Justice System aged 10-17 – developing behaviour support services in and through schools, including partnership working with the Youth Offending Service
- effectiveness of child and adolescent mental health services – through developing services for early intervention in and through schools

Development of community, adult learning and sporting facilities in schools would also help other indicators:

- working age population qualified to at least level 3 or higher
- adult participation in sport
- percentage of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood
- percentage of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality

We also have a local indicator relating to:

- services for disabled children

2.9 *Children's centres and extended services*

Derby will need to have 18 Children's Centres open by 2010 to fulfil the government target of a Children's Centre in every community. 14 out of the 18 will have been designated by August 2008. Of the remaining four in phase 3, one already has a preferred location and the other three are subject to consultation on their location imminently. Most are now being built as attachments to local schools rather than stand-alone new buildings, because they are in areas of lower deprivation and do not need to include the full childcare offer. While there will be the required number of children's centres by the target date, we recognise that there are certain areas of the city where families do not travel beyond their immediate neighbourhood and there will need to be further developments using schools as the bases for services.

We are working with schools to ensure that they can all meet the requirement to offer extended services by 2010. There is a management group for each of the five areas in the city, including partners from the private and voluntary sector. These groups regularly audit provision in the area so that extended services can be developed to meet local needs. Capital funding is being used as necessary to enable space to be adapted. Family learning projects are taking place in each Children's Centre with a focus on language development and learning opportunities in the home.

The childcare sufficiency assessment indicates that there is sufficient childcare across the city, and that out of school provision has a good geographical coverage with a few exceptions. Holiday provision in schools is, however, poor, though this reflects organisational issues rather than the lack of space.

2.10   *Locality Services*
We are developing locality structure for the delivery of children's services. A trailblazer project has been running in the north-east of the city. Services which were formerly categorised as within education and social care have been integrated in age-specific teams alongside health. The model is currently being evaluated with a view to introducing this across the city from April 2009.

A number of consistent positive messages are emerging:

- improved communication, information sharing and co-ordination
- increased understanding of worker roles
- development of shared language, trust and co-operation
- improved service to vulnerable children and young people (bridging to prevention)
- shared responsibility; efficiencies arising as duplication is avoided
- gaps in service covered more easily and closed
- progress on quantitative performance targets maintained or improved
- improved consistency of key professionals around the child and service response
- professionals in integrated teams learning from one another

3.   Long-term aims

3.1   *Design and learning*
Our vision for the primary capital programme is that we should create or reshape school buildings and grounds to ensure that they are appropriate for the delivery of a 21st century curriculum and to meet the Every Child Matters outcomes. Buildings and grounds need to be designed to remove the barriers to learning, to encourage children to be engaged with education, learning and physical activity, and also to have a positive impact on children, staff and families. Buildings will be redesigned to be more flexible internally, so that classes can be split into smaller groups to aid personalised learning. Breakout spaces or small rooms are particularly suitable for individual study, soft play, time out, targeted intervention, mentoring, homework or small group and project work. Alternatively, spaces may need to be brought together for year group activities.

Learning spaces, whether inside or outdoors, need to be sufficiently flexible to be suitable for curriculum needs and technological developments decades into the future. Colours are important to encourage a safe, comfortable, relaxing and calm environment, as well as to meet the needs of those who are sight impaired. There needs to be adequate soundproofing to aid concentration. Individual toilet rooms near the classrooms are preferable to toilet 'blocks' and large areas as they enable better supervision. New schools should have adequate playground and outdoor space to encourage improved social interaction, healthy activity and outdoor learning.

Designs at individual schools will be tailored to the learning needs of the local pupils and community, and to facilitate the work of the wide range of staff in schools. The balance of the most effective learning styles between auditory, visual and kinaesthetic may vary between individuals and areas of the city, so we would not envisage a standard design as being appropriate. There will be a particular focus on unsuitable buildings in areas of deprivation and low attainment because of the need to address the attainment gap, particularly for groups of pupils such as those with special educational needs or English as an additional language. This prioritisation of deprivation is aligned with the revenue budget, in which all growth above inflation is being targeted at deprivation indicators, including pupil mobility. Where schools have insufficient playground space and/or no green space, these will be a particularly high priority for rebuild or remodelling. There will be links to regeneration initiatives in Rosehill, Osmaston and Derwent, where masterplans are being developed for those communities as a whole in the context of renewal of their housing markets.

There will be an open and transparent prioritisation process to determine which schools should benefit from funding. Within the constraints of the funding available, we will join up funding from the Primary Capital Programme with DCSF Condition and Modernisation funding, Devolved Formula Capital and, potentially, capital receipts to target the 10% worst school buildings and significantly improve a further 40%.

3.2 *School organisation principles*
Without pre-empting the outcome of statutory consultation processes, we reiterate that our preferred organisational model is for a two form entry all-through primary school. We believe this model to be the most effective in an urban area for promoting a shared vision across the age range, minimising the disruption caused by transition, enabling wider professional development within a school and making the most effective use of resources. Other school organisational models might be appropriate locally, for example if an amalgamation would create an excessively large school, but there would need to be an educational justification for this. The school may also have a Foundation Stage unit and Children's Centre depending on the locality and existing provision.

We believe that there are great advantages to pupils attending their local school, except where there is a parental preference for a faith school or where a pupil's needs can be better met elsewhere, as with enhanced resource provision. Schools should, therefore, be located at the heart of their communities, within reasonable walking distance, and catchment areas should avoid crossing busy roads or other geographical obstacles such as railway lines. Planning policies should ensure that safe walking or cycling routes to schools are built in to new developments. There will be suitable facilities within and outside schools to encourage cycling. Where area reviews are proposed, we will use the opportunity to review admission limits and catchment areas. We believe that admission limits should, where possible, be multiples of 30, and that catchment areas should reflect geographical communities. The top priority will be to

ensure that schools can meet first preference requests within their catchment area. There will also need to be sufficient space across the city to deal with in-year admissions.

To address the Every Child Matters agenda, we will actively seek to co-locate community services, including primary healthcare and play/sporting facilities, in schools, particularly in areas of deprivation, or where there is a need to improve community cohesion, or where there are gaps in local provision. This will also make best use of buildings and grounds which have historically been under-used in schools. Buildings will be designed to be welcoming to local communities, for example to promote sporting activity and adult and family learning. There will need to be easy access for the community to indoor and outdoor facilities while ensuring the protection of children at all times. The design of buildings will enable out of school and holiday provision to take place, especially in schools which are some distance from alternative provision. Community rooms should be flexibly designed to be multi-purpose, suitable for parents coming in for meetings as well as for crèche facilities, multi-agency use or additional learning needs. All new schools should have space for an extended services delivery point, including enabling parents and carers to have easy access to information.

We are committed to maintaining a diversity of provision for pupils with special educational needs, including special schools, enhanced resource schools and mainstream classes, to meet parental preference. There may be a need to extend provision for pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD), as growing numbers are diagnosed. We will also seek to further develop the partnership between the Royal School for the Deaf, which is located in Derby, and a maintained school, to reflect the need to support the large deaf community in the city. We will seek to develop local provision for pupils with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties.

All schools should meet the needs of pupils with SEN and ensure they meet Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) requirements. Where appropriate, we will use the latest technology such as sound field systems for children with hearing difficulties. We have signed up to the Every Disabled Child Matters Local Authority Charter, which states that we will ensure that "our Children and Young People's Plan explains how we will provide specialist services and also make all universal services including extended schools and children's centres accessible to disabled children."

3.3   *Area reviews*
There will be area reviews where there are high levels of surplus places linked to building condition needs and attainment/deprivation issues. Specific solutions may be considered for individual schools where action could be taken without impacting on other schools in the locality – for example, by rebuilding at a lower capacity or remodelling and using part of the building for other services. There will need to be the flexibility to respond to future pupil number trends, and there will need to be a certain

level of surplus remaining to enable the admissions system to work, to cope with in-year movement and deal with unexpected events. We may also need to retain some surplus capacity if pupils need to be educated elsewhere while building takes place. The list in Appendix 3 indicates whether a school with high levels of surplus places will be included in an area review. Those which are not and for which there are no immediate schemes planned will be subject to a separate discussion over their designation and use of space.

Schools which are not part of area reviews will still be equally eligible for funding to address condition or suitability issues. We do not, however, wish to have an unnecessarily wide area review programme where places broadly match demand.

Area reviews will take place covering:

- Osmaston/Allenton
- Alvaston/Boulton
- Derwent/Chaddesden/Oakwood
- Rosehill/Castleward

There are some differences from the areas identified in the previous Primary School Place Planning Strategy:

- Osmaston/Allenton needs to be a separate review area because of the links to the Regeneration Area masterplanning. The review will include Nightingale Infant and Junior, Allenton Primary and Moorhead Primary.

- The Alvaston/Boulton review area will, therefore, cover the remainder of the schools previously identified – Lakeside Primary, Boulton Primary, Alvaston Infants and Junior, Oakwood Infant and Junior, and St John Fisher Catholic Primary. Although only one school has a high level of surplus, other schools in the area have high condition needs and the effects of new housing developments must be considered

- The Derwent/Oakwood/Chaddesden area will be reviewed as previously planned. There is a high level of surplus places across the area as a whole, as well as high building condition needs at some schools, and long standing place planning issues in Oakwood

- Instead of a full review of the Normanton/Arboretum area, there will be a more focused review of the Rosehill and Castleward area. This will link to the Rosehill Market Renewal regeneration masterplan and the Cityscape plans for the Castleward area. While there is some overlap between the Market Renewal Area and other school catchment areas, surplus places are not a significant issue and it makes little sense to involve a larger number of schools. The schools covered by the review will be Rosehill Infants, St James' Church of

England (Aided) Infants and Juniors and any potential new school on Castleward.

Whether an area review for Sinfin is necessary depends on the outcome of the Secretary of State's decision on potential housing developments in South Derbyshire, expected later in the year. Two of these developments have Sinfin schools as their planned catchment area if they go ahead.

Consideration will be given to the expansion of popular schools as part of these reviews, but this will need to be balanced against the risk of destabilising other schools in terms of their pupil numbers and intake.

The reviews will include any faith schools located in those areas. The diocesan authorities would need to contribute the usual 10% share towards any capital costs, though it is recognised that this could be difficult if capital receipts are not available. Faith schools will be assessed on the same basis as other schools for prioritisation.

We will actively promote federations as a way of sharing expertise between schools and providing opportunities for flexibility and efficiency without the complexities of formal amalgamation. Trust schools and links to academies will be considered when specific proposals are outlined, particularly where there is a continuing need to raise attainment above floor targets and there would be value in bringing in expertise from external partners. We will consider the possibility of 0-19 schools in the longer term, though this will not be immediately possible because of the extent to which BSF plans are already advanced.

Primary age special schools within the review areas will be part of the reviews, and we will consider the principle of co-location with a mainstream primary school. This would encourage inclusion and sharing of staff expertise, and would be consistent with the developments planned for Ivy House School, which is being co-located with Derby Moor Community Sports College, and St Martins School, which is proposed to be co-located with Noel Baker Community School, as part of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme. Related changes are also proposed for St Andrew's School for better linkage and collaboration with da Vinci Community College.

3.4   *ICT*
We will be introducing a learning platform for primary schools by the deadline of March 2010. The learning platform needs to allow for flexible personalised learning, accessible by pupils, parents and staff anytime anywhere using wireless networks and other new technology, including within the school grounds and at home. We support the principle of a managed service supporting both curriculum and management systems and which will include replacement of equipment as well as technical support and the maintenance of networks. In new buildings, we would aspire to the ICT support including telephony, security, CCTV, heating systems as well as administrative and curriculum ICT. The primary

learning platform will be integrated as far as possible with the secondary platform to support transition and achieve economies of scale. ICT provision will be critical to the achievement of flexible learning spaces and effective development of family, adult and community learning on school sites.

3.5   *Healthy schools*
We aim to improve the take-up of school meals by making the dining experience more attractive and ensuring all schools have hot serveries. Where new schools are built or there is major refurbishment, we will seek to remodel the kitchen and dining areas as well, for example by introducing wheelable serveries and introducing different points of service. Expanded kitchen areas in new schools could enable poor quality kitchens elsewhere to be taken out of use. The food would still be fresh and prepared on the day even though produced off-site. Off-site production means opportunity to be more cost-effective and keep price to pupils down. We would aim to create a halal kitchen in the city as part of these developments.

Facilities and learning spaces have a key part to play in ensuring high quality physical and cultural education, school sport and physical activity. They are critical to delivering the government's offer to pupils of five hours a week for both sporting and cultural activities. Data on children's physical activity levels will be used to inform plans in specific areas of the city. We would want all of our primary schools to have access to:

- one main multi purpose hall where gym, dance, drama, music and games activities can be delivered. This would require adequate storage space for PE equipment and other school equipment such as dining tables, chairs and performance stages. Greater flexibility in the layout of dining areas will enable schools to use these more effectively during the rest of the day
- a smaller movement hall, as at Lakeside Community Primary School, where indoor physical activity clubs and class activities can take place during the curriculum, lunchtimes and wet weather etc
- a playground which is zoned, as in the new Village Primary School, to accommodate sport, general physical activity and quiet areas. The playground needs to be stimulating, safe yet challenging and fit for purpose, with appropriate line markings, adequate storage space for play, physical activity and sports equipment
- playing fields which have space for running, sport and socialising, but that also provide natural woodland and wildlife spaces for outdoor learning, particularly in areas where pupils may have more limited opportunities for other outdoor activity

3.6   *Children's Centres and extended services*
As locality services are introduced across the city, we will examine accommodation within new or remodelled schools as a possibility for the delivery of integrated multi-agency or other community services. The programme will link to plans for Children's Centres and extended services provision. These are nearly complete, but remaining

developments will join up with plans for schools and areas prioritised through this process. Even where Children's Centres and extended services are already operational, their reach and suitability will be subject to review.

4.   Approach to change

The initial discussions prior to the production of this consultation document involved meetings with school clusters, the diocesan authorities, the Children and Young People's Executive, Primary Care Trust, Heads' Liaison Group and the School Admissions Forum. There were meetings with Council officers responsible for asset management, admissions, school place planning, school improvement, ICT, SEN, extended services, early years, children's centres, PE and Sport, school meals and regeneration.

4.1   Organisational structure
The primary strategy for change is a long-term programme supplementing existing planned capital expenditure. It will need to achieve close links with the BSF project for secondary schools – Derby is in wave 5 and is about to submit its Secondary Strategy for Change 2. The Local Education Partnership (LEP) set up for BSF is likely to deliver the major projects in the Primary Capital Programme, and there also needs to be consistency in our approach to ICT. As there is no need for a city-wide reorganisation, the workload is insufficient to justify a separate organisational structure. Instead, the capacity of existing teams needs to be enhanced and the current departmental structure will in any case be reviewed as part of the Council's Transforming Derby programme, assisted by the Council's Change Management team. In the case of specific projects, eligible capital costs of project management, including release time for the Headteacher or other senior school manager, can be charged to the scheme budget. Overall programme management will need to be resourced as a separate addition to the budget.

The Council has substantial experience of commissioning services through the BSF Board and the Children and Young People's Executive, to which a Commissioning Board reports. This experience will be used in developing effective processes for consultation with stakeholders, and approaches to using funding to transform education through visioning events.

There is an existing BSF Programme Board. The proposal is for the BSF Board also to be responsible for School Planning, with a smaller sub-group of key players such as representatives from finance and ICT meeting more frequently. Further consideration will need to be given to establishing a Stakeholder Forum, including governor representatives. Items relating only to primary or secondary schools can be dealt with at separate points on the agenda of the BSF Board. The BSF Board's membership will need to be reviewed in due course.

4.2   Area Reviews
The area reviews will be conducted by a project team reporting into the BSF and Place Planning Board. The team would be led by a senior officer and include membership covering personnel, finance, school improvement, place planning, asset management, property services, housing strategy and early years. Full consultation would follow data collation and analysis, before proposals were formulated.

The area reviews will be timed to take into account planning decisions in the area. As this is a long-term programme, any proposals will also need to link to availability of funding through to 2023. The Osmaston/Allenton review will be shaped by the number and type of houses on the Rolls Royce site. As Outline Planning Permission is expected in 2009/10, the review will start after that date. The Rosehill/Castleward review will need to be timed so that it can inform the content of any community provision contained in the Planning Permission, also expected in 2009/10.

There is greater certainty over future pupil number trends in the other two review areas, and it is proposed that these areas progress first. The sequence of reviews would, therefore, be:

- Derwent/Oakwood/Chaddesden
- Alvaston/Boulton
- Osmaston/Allenton
- Rosehill/Castleward

As this is a long-term programme, data will be updated annually and priorities reviewed in line with this. We will, therefore, take account of demographic changes and new condition information as asbestos and fire risk assessments are undertaken.

4.3   Capital funding
With the existing capital programme, we are already used to joining up funding streams. We have an established protocol for school contributions from devolved formula capital to projects; this makes modernisation and condition funding stretch further. As we are in wave 5 of BSF, the vast majority of existing DCSF funding will be spent on primary schools over the next few years. We are using prudential borrowing from the Schools Budget for a new primary school where there are savings within the school funding formula as a result of the amalgamation of three existing schools, and will continue to use this in similar situations. The Council's policy on the use of capital receipts from school sites is that 25% returns automatically to the schools capital programme. There is then the opportunity to bid for the remaining 75%. The case would be stronger as part of a strategy and given DCSF expectations on recycling of receipts. Existing DCSF condition and modernisation funding will also be used to contribute, subject to the need to retain contingencies to deal with urgent health and safety issues and other needs such as responding to fire risk assessments. The diocesan authorities are committed to the strategy but recognise that the required 10% contribution towards any schemes will be difficult to find without

generating capital receipts. The use of aided school capital funding streams will be prioritised in partnership with the diocesan authorities and schools.

The Council has a corporate Asset Management Group with representation from each department. This Group reviews the priorities for Council capital spending and the Council's Asset Management Plan. The group will therefore be able to advise on linkages with other service needs and area developments. There is also an Asset Management Group with school representation. This will be used as a sounding board for buildings issues as the programme develops. Schools have already agreed collectively that devolved formula capital should be treated flexibly, with some schools bringing funding forward and others saving it up over a three year timescale. We will continue this approach and would wish to make use of the greater flexibility promised by DCSF over a longer period.

We have recent experience of new primary schools being built both through PFI and conventional procurement, and of Children's Centres being built attached to schools. We will take account of lessons learned in design, contract specification, environmental sustainability, cost control and other issues.

4.4 *ICT*
In ICT, the Council is currently out to tender for its corporate ICT FM contract. The specification includes the need to work with schools, and we would envisage working with the successful tenderer and the Local Education Partnership (LEP) - which is being set up for the BSF programme - to support the introduction of Learning Platforms and provide a managed service for primary schools. Though Learning Platforms would need to be mainly funded by schools from their devolved Harnessing Technology grant, it may be possible to contribute to the capital costs from this programme. There would initially be a pilot in a group of schools for the managed service. We have an existing ICT improvement group for schools to act as a reference group and promote collaboration between schools.

4.5 *Procurement*
Wherever there is a commercial advantage, the LEP, once it is operational, will be used for procuring the major projects within this programme to ensure best value for money is secured for schools being built or refurbished. We will work closely with the Primary Care Trust to identify opportunities for joint procurement, particularly relating to the development of primary care centres in neighbourhoods.

4.6 *Children's Centres and extended services*
Of the 18 Children's Centres which need to be delivered by 2010, 15 are already open or have a site identified. The outcomes of the consultation for the three remaining phase 3 centres in Chaddesden, Oakwood and Chellaston will take account of the issues within the Primary Capital Programme. We will seek to use the location of the Chaddesden centre

to reduce surplus places in that area. In some areas of the city, Children's Centre services may need to be delivered more locally within neighbourhoods at individual schools as well as the formally designated bases.

4.7   *Design principles and consultation*
Where new building or major refurbishment is proposed, there will be full consultation with both staff and pupils. All primary schools have school councils in place, and these can be involved at an early stage. The experience of the design of other new schools in improving behaviour and learning will be taken into account.

Facilities will be planned and designed with regard to the latest Building Bulletins, design guidance and standards issued by DCSF, including DDA requirements, and other partner organisations such as Sport England and the Arts Council. We will also consider exemplar designs and good practice to ensure that innovative and inspirational solutions provide effective, efficient facilities that meet the aspirations of the building users as well as support 21st century learning.

We will ensure that sufficient attention is placed on future proofing design solutions, not just in terms of supporting a high level dependence on technology but also in the:

- o potential to remove walls between teaching areas so that spaces could be easily adapted
- o potential to extend the schools should numbers increase
- o increasing use of the external environment as a classroom for a variety of curriculum areas including science, humanities, modern foreign languages, design technology and art.

Environmental sustainability is important and the Council has given a commitment to reducing carbon emissions by 25% by 2012. Careful consideration will be given to the design for each facility in respect of energy efficiency. We are committed to achieving a 'Very Good' or 'Excellent' rating by the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM).

There will be consultation with a range of key stakeholders in relation to individual proposals including school workforce, pupils, parents and school communities as well as Council representatives. They will be actively encouraged to be involved in establishing briefs, developing design solutions and contribute to design solutions. A consultation and communication plan will be developed to determine the mechanisms for achieving this.

The design, management and operational briefs for new and remodelled schools will be informed by an analysis of community and sports facilities across the city. There will be wide consultation in the local area to assess local needs and demand for community use. Wherever possible we will consider how simple interventions can create more opportunities

for physical activity and sport to contribute to health, behaviour and educational attainment, not just within the areas of the school specifically designated for PE and sport, but throughout the building and external environment. Outdoor sports and recreational facilities like grass pitches, playgrounds, and synthetic surfaces will be designed to reflect the needs of curriculum and out of lesson time learning delivery and of the local community. We will use strategic planning tools and guidance on the effective management of community provision on school sites.

School premises will be rationalised, remodelled or re-built to meet the changing requirements and provide optimum facilities subject to available resources and site conditions.

4.8 *School Councils* were asked to complete a questionnaire about what they thought of their buildings and outdoor space. Responses were received from 33 schools. The most frequent comments made by School Councils were:

- Interactive Whiteboards are among the things they like most about their classrooms
- Natural light and spaciousness are important features of classrooms
- Temperature control is often not very effective
- Windows often don't open properly
- Displays are as important as the physical structure
- More storage space is often needed
- Cloakrooms and toilets often need to be improved
- Dining areas can be overcrowded and in poor condition
- Separate dining areas are good
- Computer rooms and ICT suites are often too small
- Outside, benches and shelters are important
- Playground surfaces should be softer
- Playgrounds and fields should be marked and zoned for different activities
- There needs to be more play equipment in playgrounds

These issues will be taken into account in individual projects, except for that relating to ICT suites, which will soon become outdated as technological advances mean that ICT should be considered as a fundamental part of the design of each classroom.

5. Initial investment priorities

We have developed a scoring mechanism to indicate which schools and areas should be regarded as particular priorities. The weightings used are:

- Building condition   40%
- Low attainment   20%
- Deprivation   20%
- Surplus places/Oversubscription   20%

The building condition indicator is based on a combination of the backlog of maintenance at each school and information on when buildings will reach their "out of service" date. The attainment indicator is based on a combination of Key Stage One or Two scores, and schools not meeting one or more floor targets at Key Stage Two. Foundation Stage scores could also be considered in future. The deprivation indicator is based on the DCSF's national figures for deprivation based on tax credit data at each school. The surplus places indicator reflects 2008 pupil numbers, while the oversubscription indicator covers those schools where the number of first preference applications exceeds the admission limit.

Appendix 4 shows the total weighting for each school. This is not going to be used rigidly, but is more to inform priorities. Where there are poor quality buildings in areas of deprivation and low attainment, and with surplus places, these will receive a high priority. There will be some schemes not in deprived areas where building condition is so poor that rebuild or remodelling is required. Equally, there will be some schools in deprived areas with few building needs. New schools built in the last 10 years will not be eligible for condition-related investment. We will also take into account the suitability of buildings for the 21st century curriculum.

Where there is a need for organisational review, the timescale for going to competition and through the statutory processes on consultation mean that implementation will be beyond 2011.

Under the Education and Inspections Act 2006, we have to hold a competition if we:

- identify a need for a brand new school
- wish to rationalise existing provision, as with an amalgamation
- wish to close a failing school and reopen it as a new school

The government wishes to see proposers other than local authorities coming forward to set up new schools. These could include parents and community groups, universities and further education colleges, education charities, voluntary and religious groups, and existing schools.

For a new build school, the estimated timescale is around a year to go through the statutory processes including a competition once specific proposals have been agreed by the Council's Cabinet, followed by two years for tendering and construction. We will, therefore, be looking for "quick wins" which do not require organisational change and can be implemented in 2009/10 and 2010/11. The projects proposed as priorities for 2009/10 and 2010/11, subject to the outcomes of consultation with the schools concerned, are set out in Appendix 5.

Appendix 1		
Schools not meeting floor targets in 2007		
	Points score	Floor targets not met
Allenton Community Primary School	174	2
Arboretum Primary School	178	1
Ashgate Primary School	212	1
Beaufort Community Primary School	213	1
Becket Primary School	220	1
Bishop Lonsdale Church of England (Aided) Primary School	174	2
Boulton Primary School	147	3
Brackensdale Junior School	163	3
Breadsall Hill Top Junior School	222	1
Derwent Community School	179	2
Firs Estate Primary School	214	1
Hardwick Primary School	203	1
Lakeside Community Primary School	219	1
Moorhead Primary School	163	3
Nightingale Junior School	185	2
Pear Tree Community Junior School	190	2
Roe Farm Primary School	171	2
Sinfin Primary School	187	2
St James' Church of England (Aided) Junior School	215	1
St John Fisher Catholic Primary School	174	2
Village Primary School (Normanton junior score)	185	2
Schools in italics are those which have recently been rebuilt		

Appendix 2						
Overall surplus by cluster 2008 and 2018						
	Actual	Forecast				
	2008	2018				
Cluster 1	4%	-31%	Rosehill/Pear Tree			
Cluster 2	12%	12%	Abbey/Stockbrook			
Cluster 3	8%	19%	Mackworth/Mickleover/Heatherton			
Cluster 4	17%	18%	Derwent/Oakwood/Breadsall Hill Top			
Cluster 5	15%	23%	Chaddesden/Spondon			
Cluster 6	8%	2%	Allestree/Darley			
Cluster 7	15%	8%	Alvaston/Boulton			
Cluster 8	13%	9%	Normanton/Sinfin/Sunnyhill			
Cluster 9	13%	3%	Osmaston/Allenton/Shelton/Chellaston			
City total	12%	8%				
Negative figure indicates shortfall of places						
Note: pupil planning numbers are projected at cluster level rather than by individual schools						

Appendix 3							
Schools with 25% or more surplus places in 2008							
			Notes				
Boulton Primary		53%	Area review				
Firs Estate Primary		46%	Proposed scheme				
Nightingale Junior		41%	Area review				
Nightingale Infant		35%	Area review				
Ashgate Primary		35%	Proposed scheme				
Normanton Junior		35%	Closing				
Derwent Primary		33%	Area review				
Ash Croft Primary		32%	To be reviewed when housing development decisions known				
Sunnyhill Infant		29%	Closing				
Meadow Farm Primary		27%	Area review				
Ravensdale Infant		27%	New housing planned in area				
Beaufort Primary		26%	Area review				
Redwood Infant		25%	To be reviewed when housing development decisions known				

Appendix 4	Deprivation	Condition	Attainment	Places	Total	Scheme	Area Review	New
Nightingale Junior School	20	19	14	16	69		▓	
Ashgate Primary School	17	28	8	14	67	▓		
Boulton Primary School	19	7	20	20	66		▓	
Beaufort Community Primary School	19	25	8	10	62		▓	
Nightingale Infant School	20	20	6	14	60		▓	
Firs Estate Primary School	18	14	8	18	58	▓		
Roe Farm Primary School	19	12	15	8	54		▓	
Chaddesden Park Junior School	14	26	3	10	53		▓	
Chaddesden Park Infant School	15	26	2	9	52		▓	
Reigate Primary School	17	24	5	5	51		▓	
Derwent Community School	20	2	15	13	50		▓	
St James' Church of England (Aided) Infant School and Nursery	20	17	4	8	49		▓	
Brackensdale Junior School	16	10	19	4	49		▓	
Allenton Community Primary School	20	1	15	10	46		▓	
Lakeside Community Primary School	18	0	8	20	46		▓	▓
Moorhead Primary School	18	7	19	2	46		▓	
Pear Tree Community Junior School	20	6	14	5	45			
Grampian Primary School	19	14	4	8	45			
Markeaton Primary School	12	26	2	2	42	▓		
Cavendish Close Junior School	13	21	5	3	42			
Sinfin Primary School	20	0	14	7	41			▓
Village Primary School	19	0	14	7	40			▓
St John Fisher Catholic Primary School	16	5	15	3	39		▓	
Cherry Tree Hill Junior School	13	16	5	5	39			
Meadow Farm Community Primary School	15	11	3	10	39	▓	▓	
Lawn Primary School	2	20	0	16	38			
Brackensdale Infant School	16	7	6	8	37			
Arboretum Primary School	20	4	11	0	35	▓		
Cavendish Close Infant School	14	14	1	6	35		▓	
Hardwick Primary School	20	0	9	5	34			▓
Redwood Junior School	17	10	5	2	34			
Oakwood Junior School	15	13	4	2	34		▓	
Rosehill Infant and Nursery School	20	9	3	1	33		▓	
Wren Park Primary School	5	18	1	9	33			
Becket Primary School	19	3	8	2	32			
Bishop Lonsdale Church of England (Aided) Primary School	16	1	15	0	32			
Breadsall Hill Top Junior School	16	4	8	4	32		▓	
Ash Croft Primary School	13	5	2	12	32			
Dale Community Primary School	19	5	6	2	32			

School								
Pear Tree Infant School	20	7	4	1	32			
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	15	4	1	12	32			
Breadsall Hill Top Infant School	16	8	3	5	32		▓	
St George's Catholic Primary School	15	9	4	4	32			
Redwood Infant School	18	1	2	10	31			
St James' Church of England (Aided) Junior School	20	3	8	0	31		▓	
St Chad's Church of England (Controlled) Nursery and Infant School	20	7	3	0	30			
Ridgeway Infant School	13	13	0	3	29			
Alvaston Junior Community School	14	6	5	2	27		▓	
Oakwood Infant School	15	4	3	5	27		▓	
Shelton Junior School	16	6	1	4	27			
Asterdale Primary School	15	2	1	8	26			
Alvaston Infant and Nursery School	14	4	3	5	26		▓	
Chellaston Junior School	6	18	1	1	26			
Shelton Infant School	17	7	1	1	26			
Gayton Community Junior School	12	10	3	0	25			
Silverhill Primary School	5	4	5	10	24			
Parkview Primary School	2	2	0	18	22		▓	▓
Springfield Primary School	9	2	3	8	22			
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	13	2	3	4	22			▓
Borrow Wood Infant and Nursery School	8	2	2	9	21			
Homefields Primary	5	1	0	14	20			▓
Borrow Wood Junior School	9	7	1	3	20			
Cherry Tree Hill Infant School	13	4	2	0	19		▓	
Ravensdale Infant School	3	4	1	10	18			
St Alban's Catholic Primary School	11	2	3	2	18			
Mickleover Primary School	2	15	1	0	18			
Ravensdale Junior School	3	12	2	0	17	▓		
St Werburgh's Church of England (Aided) Primary School	8	1	1	7	17			
Portway Infant School	2	5	0	10	17			
Chellaston Infant School	7	7	1	0	15			
Carlyle Infant School	7	5	1	0	13			
St Peter's Church of England (Aided) Junior School	8	1	4	0	13			
Walter Evans Church of England (Aided) Primary School	2	2	0	8	12			
Griffe Field Primary School	2	2	1	6	11			▓
Portway Junior School	2	6	2	0	10			
Brookfield Primary School	6	1	2	0	9			

Schools in italics have been built in the last 10 years, so would not be eligible for condition related work