

Report to: Children and Young People's Panel Cabinet

Date: 6 March 2008 13 March 2008

Subject: Proposed amendments to the Decision Making Model
for Primary Schools

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

Contact officer: Steve Robertson Chris Parry
01942 486004 01942 486029
s.robertson@wigan.gov.uk c.parry@wigan.gov.uk

Purpose / summary: The purpose of this report is to request elected members' approval for changes to the primary decision making model.

Alternative options considered and reason for selecting the one recommended: Details are contained in the report

Recommendation / decision: Members are recommended to approve the:

- amendment to the parental preference criterion to reflect parental preference as a proportion of the planned admission number;
- amendment to the scoring for the parental preference criterion;
- removal of the community impact and early years and wrap around care provision criteria due to the changes brought about by the extended schools agenda; and
- update of the overall scoring system to reflect the changes.

Key Decision: This report involves a key decision within ground 1.

The decision made as a result of this report will be published within **48 hours** and cannot be actioned until **seven working days** have

elapsed, i.e. before 25 March 2008

This item is included in the Forward Plan.

Risks / Implications:

| | |
|---|------|
| Financial: | None |
| Staffing: | None |
| Policy: | |
| Equal Opportunities - Has a Diversity Impact Assessment been conducted? | No |
| Wards affected: | All |

Property Implications – Does the proposal involve a reduction, addition or change to the Council’s asset base or its occupation?

No

If yes, have the property implications been agreed with the Corporate Property Officer?

Does this proposal have significant implications for the Council and the local population?

A diversity impact assessment is not necessary at this stage, however, equality and diversity implications have been considered when producing this report.

Does this proposal involve a new policy or procedure or significant changes to an existing policy or procedure?

A diversity impact assessment is not necessary at this stage, however, equality and diversity implications have been considered when producing this report.

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Has the Director of Legal and Property Services confirmed that the recommendations within this report are lawful and comply with the Council’s Constitution? | Yes / No * |
| Has the Director of Finance and IT confirmed that any expenditure referred to within this report is consistent with the Council’s budget? | Yes |
| Are any of the recommendations within this report contrary to the Policy Framework of the Council? | Yes |

For Cabinet reports only :

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------------|--|
| Categorisation of the report: | | | |
| | | | |
| Discussion leading to a decision | x | Discussion | |
| Monitoring | | Decision | |
| Sharing for corporate understanding | | Information | |

Tracking/Process:

| | | | |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------|----------|
| | Consultation | Ward Members | Partners |
| Panel | Overview & Scrutiny | Cabinet | Council |
| 6 March 2008 | | 13 March 2008 | |

List of Background Papers in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972:

| Document | Date | File Reference | Place of Inspection |
|--|----------------|----------------|--|
| Wigan's Strategy for School Places and Buildings 2007/2008 | September 2007 | | Children and Young People's Services Progress House Westwood Park Drive Wigan WN3 4HH and www.wigan.gov.uk |

Proper Officer



Date

21st February 08

1 Background

- 1.1 The local authority has a duty to plan school places, ensuring that there are enough places in the area but also that surplus places are kept at an acceptable level and do not rise above 25% at any one school.
- 1.2 The local authority must also secure diversity of school provision and increase opportunities for parental preference as much as possible.
- 1.3 In 2002, Cabinet adopted a decision making model for primary schools. This involves applying a set of criteria to all primary schools annually which generates a score for each school. Elected members are informed of schools achieving a score below the agreed minimum and asked to determine what action to take.
- 1.4 As a result of changing DCSF requirements and local circumstances, the model has been amended several times since being introduced. The existing model is attached at appendix 1.

2 Criterion C: Parental preferences

- 2.1 The model measures parental first preferences for a school as a percentage of the intake for the year. The purpose of this is to illustrate whether a school attracts a high or low level of parental preference.
- 2.2 When the model was introduced the birth rate was higher and many primary schools admitted a considerable number of second and third preference applications. This criterion provided a good measure of parental preference and schools could be compared easily.
- 2.3 However, since 2002 the birth rate has dropped considerably. Although there are some pockets of the borough where schools are oversubscribed there is generally less demand for places and fewer primary schools fill up on second and third preferences. The result is that, at the majority of schools, 100% of the intake is from parents' first preferences, even if the actual level of preference is very low, so the criterion shows no differentiation between schools.
- 2.4 It is therefore proposed that this criterion be changed to show first preferences as a percentage of the school's planned admission number (PAN). This will show levels of parental preference more clearly. This is illustrated in the examples attached at appendix 2. The proposed criterion would ensure that there would still be differentiation between schools if patterns of preference or the level of demand were to change.
- 2.5 The new criterion would result in oversubscribed schools gaining a score of over 100%. It is therefore proposed to alter the scoring for the criterion as follows:

| Criterion | Score | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Parental preferences (first preference as a percentage of PAN) | 0 < 50% | 1 50-74% | 2 75-99% | 3 100%+ |

It is not proposed to change the weighting for this criterion. The criterion should be retained because of the authority's duty to comply with parental preference as far as possible.

3 Criterion J (a): Effect of closure on the community

3.1 This criterion was included to take account of the wider role schools play in the community and the impact of the loss of such facilities if the school were to close.

3.2 It is difficult to score this criterion accurately because there:

- are no accurate details of all community facilities outside of schools in any particular area so officers have to make very subjective judgements; and
- has been no fixed pattern of community facilities at schools so objective comparison is impossible.

3.3 Since the model was introduced, the extended schools agenda has come into force which recognises the role that all schools should play in the wider community. As part of this agenda all primary schools must provide access to a core offer of extended services by 2010. These include:

- parenting support;
- swift and easy access to other statutory services and the voluntary and community sector; and
- community access to facilities such as ICT, sports and arts facilities and adult learning.

All schools will therefore provide access to the same community facilities so the criterion will not differentiate between them.

3.4 It is therefore proposed to remove this criterion from the model. Should any school be identified for urgent review by the model, it would now be at least 2010 before any resulting closure could be actioned. By this time all schools will be providing the core offer.

3.5 The model only identifies schools for review. Any resulting consultation process could consider the effect on the community in detail. The new school organisation regulations also say that the final decision maker on any proposal must take the impact on the community into account so the particular needs of any area will be addressed at these stages.

4 Criterion K: Effect of proposals on out of school provision (a) Early years and (b) Wrap around care

4.1 These criteria were originally included in the model because few schools provided early years and particularly wrap around care. If a school that had this provision closed, it could be difficult for some families to access appropriate early years education or child care.

- 4.2 The extended schools agenda has now changed this. As part of the core offer of extended services all primary schools must provide access to high-quality childcare, 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. five days a week, 48 weeks a year in accordance with their communities' needs by 2010.

All schools will therefore provide access to the same services and attract the same score. As a result this criterion no longer differentiates between schools.

- 4.3 It is proposed to remove this criterion from the model. Should any school be identified for urgent review by the model, it would now be at least 2010 before any resulting closure could be actioned. By this time all schools will be providing the core offer.

5 Adjustment to the scoring system

- 5.1 The current maximum possible score is 120. The actions resulting from the specific scores are as follows:

| Action | Score |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Take no action | 68 and over |
| Investigation into viability | 47 to 67 |
| Urgent review of provision required | 46 or less |

- 5.2 If the changes recommended in sections two to four are agreed the maximum possible score will reduce to 111.

It is recommended that the actions resulting from the specific scores should be amended to reflect this as follows:

| Action | Score |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Take no action | 59 and over |
| Investigation into viability | 38 to 58 |
| Urgent review of provision required | 37 or less |

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 It is recommended that members:

- agree the change in criterion C to reflect parental first preferences as a percentage of planned admission number and the revised scoring for this criterion;
- agree the removal of criteria J (a) and K (a) and (b);
- agree the resulting amended scoring system; and
- adopt the revised decision making model (attached at appendix 3)

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 Elected members adopted the decision making model as a helpful tool in identifying schools in need of review. If the model is to continue to be effective, it must be amended and refined as local and national circumstances and priorities change.

7.2 Elected members are asked to approve the recommended changes outlined in this report.

REVISED DECISION MAKING MODEL FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL REVIEWS

In formulating the criteria the following sources of information have been used:

- 1) Overview and Scrutiny Draft Minutes 30/9/02
- 2) Guidance to School Organisation Committee when making decisions
- 3) BVPI on surplus places
- 4) Work by Primary School Places Working Group agreed by Cabinet and contained within School Organisation Plan
- 5) Cabinet notes of 17/10/02
- 6) Lifelong Learning notes on 7/11/02
- 7) Notes from Cabinet on 14/11/02
- 8) Notes from Cabinet on 17/11/ 05
- 9) Notes from Cabinet 21/09/06

| CODE | CRITERIA | WEIGHTING | SCORE | | | | MAX SCORE |
|------|--|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| A | *SURPLUS PLACES (BVPI measures nos of schools with >25% surplus) | 5 | > 25% | 16% - 24% | 8% - 15% | 0% - 7% | 15 |
| B | PREDICTED SURPLUS PLACES IN 4 YEARS TIME | 3 | > 25% | 16% - 24% | 8% - 15% | 0% - 7% | 9 |
| C | *PARENTAL PREFERENCES (1st preferences as % of intake) | 1 | < 50% | 50% - 74% | 75% - 94% | 95% + | 3 |
| D | NUMBER ON ROLL (exc Nursery) (absorbs unit costs) (absorbs mixed age teaching trigger of PSPWG) | 3 | 105 or less | 106-157 | 158-209 | 210 + | 9 |
| E | PREDICTED PUPIL NUMBERS IN 4 YEARS | 2 | 105 or less | 106-157 | 158-209 | 210 + | 6 |

(includes allowance for new housing)

| F | *CURRENT EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS (based on previous 3 years Fischer Family Trust) percentile rankings) | | FFT percentile rank NC Overall Level 3 years combined | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| | | | 100-80 | 79-50 | 49-20 | 19-1 | |
| | a) KS2 English | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| | b) KS2 Maths | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| | c) KS2 Science | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| | d) OFSTED "overall effectiveness" | 1 | Inadequate | Satisfactory | Good | Outstanding | 3 |
| | e) DfES Floor Targets | | Target for KS2 65% Level 4+ English (E); 65% Level 4+ Mathematics (M) | | | | |
| | | 1 | <65%E and <65% M | <65%E or M and =65% M or E | <65% E or M and >65% M or E | > 65% E and > 65% M | 3 |
| | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| G | *DISTANCE TO ALTERNATIVE PROVISION (NB:LEA must provide assistance if > 2 miles from home to nearest available primary school) | 2 | < 1.0 m | 1.0 - 1.5 m | 1.5 - 2.0 m | > 2.0 m | 6 |
| H | *BALANCE OF PROVISION (Effects if school closed) (Includes balance of number of places available and need to provide children with appropriate faith/non faith provision of parents' choice) | 2 | Unaffected | Affected in review area - pupils to attend same faith schools | Adversely affected in review area - pupils to attend same faith schools but in neighbouring area | Adversely affected in review area - pupils to attend different faith schools/ unwanted community school | 6 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----|---|---|--|---|----|
| I | STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION | | | | | | |
| | a) CONDITION BACKLOG | 2 | 100-76 | 75-51 | 50-26 | 25-1 | 6 |
| | Percentile rank on cost per sq metre | | | | | | |
| | b) SUITABILITY | 1 | 100-76 | 75-51 | 50-26 | 25-1 | 3 |
| | Weighted impacts percentile rank | | | | | | |
| | (Playing fields) | 1 | None on site | On site but too small | Shared with other school | On site + team game area | 3 |
| | (% building accessible - DDA Act) | 1 | <10% | 10-44% | 45-79% | >80% | 3 |
| | Deduction for split site school | no | | | | | -3 |
| J | *SOCIAL EXCLUSION | 1 | Not applicable or facility not essential to community | Other suitable community facilities available in the area | Very few other suitable community facilities available in the area | Facility essential to community | 3 |
| | a)Effect of closure on community if no other community facilities in area. | | | | | | |
| | b) % of free school meals eligibility | 1 | < 10% | 10% - 24% | 25% - 49% | > 50% | 3 |
| K | * EFFECT OF PROPOSALS ON OUT OF SCHOOL PROVISION | | | | | | |
| | a) EARLY YEARS | 1 | Unaffected (or not applicable) | Alternative provision available in area | Alternative provision available in neighbouring areas | No alternative provision available in review area or neighbouring areas | 3 |
| | (include only if part of EYDCP and if used for 50% or more of school week) | | | | | | |
| | b) WRAP AROUND CARE | 1 | | | | | 3 |
| L | RUNNING COSTS | 5 | 100-76 | Cost per pupil, percentile rank | | 25-1 | 15 |
| | Based on non pupil-related CFR Headings | | | 75-51 | 50-26 | | |

School Score **120**

| | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|--|---|-----------------------|
| TOTALS | 40 | 46 or less | 47 to 67 | 68 and over |
| ACTION | | Urgent review of provision required | Investigation into viability | Take no action |

NOTE:
* = SOC must consider when taking decision

Criterion C

(PAN is planned admission number)

Example 1**Effect of current criterion when first introduced**

| | School A | School B |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| PAN | 30 | 30 |
| First preferences | 45 | 15 |
| Second preferences | - | 15 |
| Actual intake | 30 | 30 |
| First preferences as a percentage of intake | 100% | 50% |

Example 2**Effect of current criterion now**

| | School A | School B |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| PAN | 30 | 30 |
| First preferences | 30 | 15 |
| Second preferences | - | - |
| Actual intake | 30 | 15 |
| First preferences as a percentage of intake | 100% | 100% |

Example 3**Effect of proposed new criterion**

| | School A | School B |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| PAN | 30 | 30 |
| First preferences | 30 | 15 |
| Second preferences | - | - |
| Actual intake | 30 | 15 |
| First preferences as a percentage of PAN | 100% | 50% |

PROPOSED REVISED DECISION MAKING MODEL FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL REVIEWS

In formulating the criteria the following sources of information have been used:

- 1) Overview and Scrutiny Draft Minutes 30/9/02
- 2) Guidance to School Organisation Committee when making decisions
- 3) BVPI on surplus places
- 4) Work by Primary School Places Working Group agreed by Cabinet and contained within School Organisation Plan
- 5) Cabinet notes of 17/10/02
- 6) Lifelong Learning notes on 7/11/02
- 7) Notes from Cabinet on 14/11/02
- 8) Notes from Cabinet on 17/11/ 05
- 9) Notes from Cabinet 21/09/06

| CODE | CRITERIA | WEIGHTING | SCORE | | | | MAX SCORE |
|------|--|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| A | *SURPLUS PLACES (BVPI measures nos of schools with >25% surplus) | 5 | > 25% | 16% - 24% | 8% - 15% | 0% - 7% | 15 |
| B | PREDICTED SURPLUS PLACES IN 4 YEARS TIME | 3 | > 25% | 16% - 24% | 8% - 15% | 0% - 7% | 9 |
| C | *PARENTAL PREFERENCES (1st preferences as % of planned admission number) | 1 | < 50% | 50% - 74% | 75% - 99% | 100% + | 3 |
| D | NUMBER ON ROLL (exc Nursery) (absorbs unit costs) (absorbs mixed age teaching trigger of PSPWG) | 3 | 105 or less | 106-157 | 158-209 | 210 + | 9 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| E | PREDICTED PUPIL NUMBERS IN 4 YEARS (includes allowance for new housing) | 2 | 105 or less | 106-157 | 158-209 | 210 + | 6 |
| F | *CURRENT EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS (based on previous 3 years Fischer Family Trust) percentile rankings) | | FFT percentile rank NC Overall Level 3 years combined | | | | |
| | | | 100-80 | 79-50 | 49-20 | 19-1 | |
| | a) KS2 English | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| | b) KS2 Maths | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| | c) KS2 Science | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| | d) OFSTED "overall effectiveness" | 1 | Inadequate | Satisfactory | Good | Outstanding | 3 |
| | e) DCSF Floor Targets | | Target for KS2 | | | | |
| | | | 65% Level 4+ English (E); 65% Level 4+ Mathematics (M) | | | | |
| | | | <65%E and <65% M | <65%E or M and =65% M or E | <65% E or M and >65% M or E | > 65% E and > 65% M | |
| | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| G | *DISTANCE TO ALTERNATIVE PROVISION (NB:LA must provide assistance if > 2 miles from home to nearest available primary school) | 2 | < 1.0 m | 1.0 - 1.5 m | 1.5 - 2.0 m | > 2.0 m | 6 |
| H | *BALANCE OF PROVISION (Effects if school closed) (Includes balance of number of places available and need to provide children with appropriate faith/non faith provision of parents' choice) | 2 | Unaffected | Affected in review area - pupils to attend same faith schools | Adversely affected in review area - pupils to attend same faith schools but in neighbouring area | Adversely affected in review area - pupils to attend different faith schools/ unwanted community school | 6 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|----|--------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|----|
| I | STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION | | | | | | |
| | a) CONDITION BACKLOG | 2 | 100-76 | 75-51 | 50-26 | 25-1 | 6 |
| | Percentile rank on cost per sq metre | | | | | | |
| | b) SUITABILITY | 1 | 100-76 | 75-51 | 50-26 | 25-1 | 3 |
| | Weighted impacts percentile rank | | | | | | |
| | (Playing fields) | 1 | None on site | On site but too small | Shared with other school | On site + team game area | 3 |
| | (% building accessible - DDA Act) | 1 | <10% | 10-44% | 45-79% | >80% | 3 |
| | Deduction for split site school | no | | | | | -3 |
| J | *SOCIAL EXCLUSION | | | | | | |
| | % of free school meals eligibility | 1 | < 10% | 10% - 24% | 25% - 49% | > 50% | 3 |
| K | RUNNING COSTS | 5 | 100-76 | Cost per pupil, percentile rank | | | 15 |
| | Based on non pupil-related CFR Headings | | | 75-51 | 50-26 | 25-1 | |

School Score **111**

TOTALS

37 or less

38 to 58

59 and over

ACTION

Urgent review of provision required

Investigation into viability

Take no action

NOTE:

* = decision maker must consider when taking decision