

Report to: Children and Young People's Panel Cabinet

Date: 19 July 2007 26 July 2007

Subject: Decision making model for primary schools 2007

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

Contact officer: Chris Parry 01942 486029
Email c.parry@wiganmbc.gov.uk

Purpose/summary: To inform members of the results of the assessment of primary schools against the decision making model for 2007.

Alternative options considered and reason for selecting the one recommended: All primary schools have been assessed against the decision making model and the schools identified are those within the category 'Urgent review of provision required'.

Recommendation/decision: It is recommended that the Director of Children and Young People's Services:

- continue to monitor schools A, B, C and D and bring recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate; and
- work with schools B and C to reduce surplus places where possible.

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 **five working days** have elapsed after that (**making a total of seven working days after the meeting**) i.e. before 7 August 2007

This report does not involve a key decision.

Implications:

Financial:	None
Staffing:	None
Policy:	Wigan's Strategy for School Places and Buildings

Equal Opportunities - Has a Diversity Impact Assessment been conducted?

The decision making model is a method to identify schools in need of review. A diversity impact assessment would be done at the next stage, that is as part of the review process for each individual school.

Wards affected:
Special Interest Members –
Which have been consulted

All
None

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**

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? **No**

For Cabinet reports only :

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

Tracking/Process:

	Consultation	Ward Members	Partners
Panel	Overview & Scrutiny	Cabinet	Council
19 July 2007		26 July 2007	

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

Document	Date	File Reference	Place of Inspection
Files on Decision Making Model	Various		School Places Team Children and Young People's Services Progress House Westwood Park Drive Wigan WN2 3JJ
Wigan Strategy for School Places and Buildings 2006/2007	September 2006		School Places Team as above

Proper Officer



Date

5th July 2007

1 Background

- 1.1 The local authority must effectively plan the provision of school places. Our effectiveness in this is measured by the DfES, Ofsted, the Audit Commission, in the Joint Area Review and in the CPA.
- 1.2 Every year we must submit a Surplus Place Return to the DfES to report the amount of surplus places we have in our schools. We must explain what action the local authority will take on individual schools which have more than 25% surplus.
- 1.3 The level of surplus is also reported in Wigan's Strategy for School Places and Buildings which replaced the School Organisation Plan.
- 1.4 In 2002 Cabinet adopted a decision making model for primary schools. A set of criteria is applied to each school and generates a points score. Some of these scores are weighted. The score determines whether a review of provision in a school or a group of schools is necessary.
- 1.5 The model has been refined since 2002 and each change has been approved by Cabinet. The current version of the model is attached at appendix 1.
- 1.6 The model was applied to all primary schools in 2003, 2004 and 2005. Elected Members decided not to run the model in 2006 but requested that the model be run again in 2007. In 2003, 16 schools fell into the category 'urgent review of provision required'. Provision has since been reviewed, resulting in a number of amalgamations and closures.
- 1.7 We have applied the model to all primary schools for 2007.

2 The data used to apply the criteria for 2007

Criteria	Data
Pupil numbers and surplus places A Surplus places B Predicted surplus places C Parental preference D Number on roll E Predicted number on roll	Pupil numbers are based on January 2007 PLASC Projected numbers are based on births data from Wigan and Leigh PCT and include housing impacts notified by Planning Department Parental preferences are based on Reception intake 2006
Educational standards F (a-c) KS2 results F (e) DfES floor targets F (d) Ofsted 'overall effectiveness'	The educational standards information has been provided by the Information and Planning Team and is based on the previous 3 years Fischer Family Trust rankings. Schools which have not yet been assessed under section 5 of the

	Education Act 2005 have been given a default score of 3 (the maximum). Where this is the case, the figure is in italics
Alternative provision	
G Distance to alternative school	Walking distance to nearest school in miles
H Balance of provision	Whether pupils could access the same type of school
Buildings	
I (a) Condition of buildings	Based on information at January 2007 to be consistent with pupil data
I (b) Suitability of buildings	
Social Exclusion	
J (a) Community use	Based on extended facilities information on January 2007 PLASC and discussion with individual schools.
J (b) % free school meals	From January 2007 PLASC
Effect on Early Years Provision	
K (a) early years	Provided by the extended learning team
K (b) wrap around care	
Running costs	
L Percentile rank cost per pupil	Based on 2005/2006 non pupil-related Consistent Financial Reporting headings

3 Findings 2007

- 3.1 In 2007, 4 schools fall into the 'urgent review of provision category' (46 points or less). The reduction from 16 in 2003 reflects the action that has been taken by the local authority and dioceses following the application of the model and provision reviews.
- 3.2 The completed models for the schools which fall into the 'urgent review of provision category' are attached.

Scores for each of the schools:

School	Score	Attached at
School A	41	Appendix 2
School B	40	Appendix 3
School C	44	Appendix 4
School D	43	Appendix 5

Officers have visited the headteachers of the schools concerned and agreed the scores. The schools have not been named to avoid unnecessary speculation which creates instability at schools.

3.3 School A

- 3.3.1 School A's scores are low mainly due to low numbers on roll and high surplus places (45%). The projections for 4 years time show a slight improvement but will still be at unacceptably high levels.

- 3.3.2 There are additional issues at this school which are not identified by the decision making model. The headteacher and deputy have resigned which would leave the school with no management from September 2007.
- 3.3.3 The local authority, Liverpool Archdiocese, the school and a neighbouring school are working together to address this problem. It has been agreed that the two schools will work collaboratively for the 2007-2008 academic year and the headteacher of the neighbouring school will also act as executive headteacher at School A. The schools will retain their individual identities and governing bodies.
- 3.3.4 During the 2007-2008 academic year, detailed information on the area and the success of the collaboration will be gathered and presented to governors and elected members. A decision about the longer term future of School A can then be made.

3.4 School B

- 3.4.1 School B scores are low mainly because of high surplus places (43%) which are predicted to increase slightly over the next 4 years. However, as the admission number of this school is 45, numbers on roll are not excessively low.
- 3.4.2 Work is to take place on the school buildings during the summer which will reduce capacity and therefore surplus places slightly. However, there is a predicted rise in pupils entering Reception in 2008 in the area for one year only and it is therefore necessary to retain the admission number, although the school would prefer to reduce to 1 form entry.
- 3.4.3 The local authority will work with the school when the actual intake for 2008 is known to improve the suitability of the building and further reduce capacity, surplus places and the admission number as necessary.

3.5 School C

- 3.5.1 School C scores are low mainly because of low numbers on roll and high surplus places (43%). The projections for 4 years time show a slight improvement but will still be at unacceptably high levels.
- 3.5.2 The school also scores fairly low on the condition and suitability of the buildings. However, work is scheduled to take place this year which should address some of these issues.
- 3.5.3 School C scores high on educational standards for English, maths and science and also recently achieved a rating of 'outstanding' for overall effectiveness from Ofsted.
- 3.5.4 The school is located in a fairly isolated village community and there are no other community facilities.

3.6 School D

- 3.6.1 School D scores are low mainly because of low numbers on roll and high surplus places (34%). However, projections for 4 years time show a considerable improvement with surplus reducing to under 10%.

- 3.6.2 Projections for the area as a whole show a sustained improvement in pupil numbers and it is expected that the places at School D will be needed to ensure there is adequate provision in the area.
- 3.6.2 The school also scores low on condition of the buildings. However work is planned during this year which should considerably improve this.
- 3.6.3 A Children's Centre is also to be built on the site which the school hopes will further improve pupil numbers.

4 Recommendations

4.1 School A

It is recommended that members ask the Director of Children and Young People's Services to monitor this school closely and bring further recommendations to members when more detailed information is available.

4.2 School B

It is recommended that members ask the Director of Children and Young People's Services to monitor the situation and work with the school to reduce capacity in the future.

4.3 School C

It is recommended that members ask the Director of Children and Young People's Services to monitor the situation and work with the school to reduce capacity and surplus places where possible.

4.4 School D

It is recommended that members ask the Director of Children and Young People's Services to monitor the situation, particularly whether the expected future pupil numbers materialise.

5 Conclusion

- 5.1 The number of schools scoring low on the decision making model has reduced as action has been taken to address schools which achieved consistently low scores.
- 5.2 The Director of Children and Young People's Service must continue to monitor all schools to ensure that we are using resources efficiently.

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 (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) DfES 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: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 Percentile rank on cost per sq metre	2	100-76	75-51	50-26	25-1	6
	b) SUITABILITY Weighted impacts percentile rank	1	100-76	75-51	50-26	25-1	3
	(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 (include only if part of EYDCP and if used for 50% or more of school week)	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
	b) WRAP AROUND CARE	1					3
L	RUNNING COSTS Based on non pupil-related CFR Headings	5	100-76	Cost per pupil, percentile rank 75-51 50-26		25-1	15
	TOTALS	40	46 or less	47 to 67	68 and over	School Score	0
	ACTION		Urgent review of provision required	Investigation into viability	Take no action		120

School A

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	School Score
			0	1	2	3		
A	SURPLUS PLACES (BVPI measures nos of schools with >25% surplus)	5	> 25% 45%	16% - 24%	8% - 15%	0% - 7%	15	0
B	PREDICTED SURPLUS PLACES IN 4 YEARS TIME	3	> 25% 39%	16% - 24%	8% - 15%	0% - 7%	9	0
C	PARENTAL PREFERENCES (1st preferences as % of intake)	1	< 50%	50% - 74%	75% - 94%	95% + 100%	3	3
D	NUMBER ON ROLL (exc Nursery) (absorbs unit costs) (absorbs mixed age teaching trigger of PSPWG)	3	105 or less 96	106-157	158-209	210 +	9	0
E	PREDICTED PUPIL NUMBERS IN 4 YEARS (includes allowance for new housing)	2	105 or less	106-157 107	158-209	210 +	6	2

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	4	
	b) KS2 Maths	2	0	1	2	3	6	2	
	c) KS2 Science	2	0	1	2	3	6	2	
	d) OFSTED "overall effectiveness"	1	Inadequate	Satisfactory	Good	Outstanding	3	3	
	e) DfES 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	0	
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	0	
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	6	
I	STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION								
	a) CONDITION BACKLOG Percentile rank on cost per sq metre	2	100-76	75-51	50-26	25-1	6	6	
	b) SUITABILITY Weighted impacts percentile rank	1	100-76	75-51	50-26	25-1	3	3	
	(Playing fields)	1	None on site	On site but too small	Shared with other school	On site + team game area	3	3	
	(% building accessible - DDA Act)	1	<10%	10-44%	45-79%	>80%	3	2	
	Deduction for split site school	no					-3	0	

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	1
	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% 42.71%	> 50%	3	2
K	EFFECT OF PROPOSALS ON OUT OF SCHOOL PROVISION							
	a) EARLY YEARS (include only if part of EYDCP and if used for 50% or more of school week)	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	1
	b) WRAP AROUND CARE	1						1
L	RUNNING COSTS Based on non pupil-related CFR Headings	5	100-76 98	Cost per pupil, percentile rank 75-51 50-26		25-1	15	0
							School Score	41
TOTALS			46 or less	47 to 67	68 and over	Possible Score	120	
ACTION			Urgent review of provision required	Investigation into viability	Take no action			

School B

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	School Score
			0	1	2	3		
A	SURPLUS PLACES (BVPI measures nos of schools with >25% surplus)	5	> 25% 43%	16% - 24%	8% - 15%	0% - 7%	15	0
B	PREDICTED SURPLUS PLACES IN 4 YEARS TIME	3	> 25% 46%	16% - 24%	8% - 15%	0% - 7%	9	0
C	PARENTAL PREFERENCES (1st preferences as % of intake)	1	< 50%	50% - 74% 72%	75% - 94%	95% +	3	1
D	NUMBER ON ROLL (exc Nursery) (absorbs unit costs) (absorbs mixed age teaching trigger of PSPWG)	3	105 or less	106-157	158-209 178	210 +	9	6
E	PREDICTED PUPIL NUMBERS IN 4 YEARS (includes allowance for new housing)	2	105 or less	106-157	158-209 170	210 +	6	4

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 41	3	6	4
b) KS2 Maths	2	0	1	2 26	3	6	4
c) KS2 Science	2	0	1	2 21	3	6	4
d) OFSTED "overall effectiveness"	1	Inadequate	Satisfactory	Good	Outstanding	3	3
e) DfES 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	2
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	0
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	2
I STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION							
a) CONDITION BACKLOG Percentile rank on cost per sq metre	2	100-76	75-51	50-26 40	25-1	6	4
b) SUITABILITY Weighted impacts percentile rank	1	100-76	75-51 66	50-26	25-1	3	1
(Playing fields)	1	None on site	On site but too small	Shared with other school	On site + team game area	3	0
(% building accessible - DDA Act)	1	<10%	10-44%	45-79%	>80%	3	1
Deduction for split site school	no					-3	0

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	1
	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% 46%	> 50%	3	2
K	EFFECT OF PROPOSALS ON OUT OF SCHOOL PROVISION							
	a) EARLY YEARS (include only if part of EYDCP and if used for 50% or more of school week)	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	1
	b) WRAP AROUND CARE	1	0					0
L	RUNNING COSTS Based on non pupil-related CFR Headings	5	100-76 87	Cost per pupil, percentile rank 75-51	50-26	25-1	15	0
							Possible Score	120
							School Score	40

ACTION

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

School C

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	School Score
			0	1	2	3		
A	SURPLUS PLACES (BVPI measures nos of schools with >25% surplus)	5	> 25% 43%	16% - 24%	8% - 15%	0% - 7%	15	0
B	PREDICTED SURPLUS PLACES IN 4 YEARS TIME	3	> 25% 36%	16% - 24%	8% - 15%	0% - 7%	9	0
C	PARENTAL PREFERENCES (1st preferences as % of intake)	1	< 50%	50% - 74%	75% - 94% 90%	95% +	3	2
D	NUMBER ON ROLL (exc Nursery) (absorbs unit costs) (absorbs mixed age teaching trigger of PSPWG)	3	105 or less 100	106-157	158-209	210 +	9	0
E	PREDICTED PUPIL NUMBERS IN 4 YEARS (includes allowance for new housing)	2	105 or less	106-157 112	158-209	210 +	6	2

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	4	
	b) KS2 Maths	2	0	1	2	3	6	6	
	c) KS2 Science	2	0	1	2	3	6	6	
	d) OFSTED "overall effectiveness"	1	Inadequate	Satisfactory	Good	Outstanding	3	3	
	e) DfES 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	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	4	
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	2	
I	STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION								
	a) CONDITION BACKLOG Percentile rank on cost per sq metre	2	100-76	75-51	50-26	25-1	6	2	
	b) SUITABILITY Weighted impacts percentile rank	1	100-76	75-51	50-26	25-1	3	0	
	(Playing fields)	1	None on site	On site but too small	Shared with other school	On site + team game area	3	3	
	(% building accessible - DDA Act)	1	<10%	10-44%	45-79%	>80%	3	3	
	Deduction for split site school	no					-3	0	

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	3
	a) Effect of closure on community if no other community facilities in area.							
	b) % of free school meals eligibility	1	< 10%	10% - 24% 24.00%	25% - 49%	> 50%	3	1
K	EFFECT OF PROPOSALS ON OUT OF SCHOOL PROVISION							
	a) EARLY YEARS (include only if part of EYDCP and i used for 50% or more of school week)	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	0
	b) WRAP AROUND CARE	1	0				3	0
L	RUNNING COSTS Based on non pupil-related CFR Headings	5	100-76 94	Cost per pupil, percentile rank 75-51	50-26	25-1	15	0
							Possible Score	120
							School Score	44

ACTION

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

School D

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	School Score
			0	1	2	3		
A	SURPLUS PLACES (BVPI measures nos of schools with >25% surplus)	5	> 25% 34%	16% - 24%	8% - 15%	0% - 7%	15	0
B	PREDICTED SURPLUS PLACES IN 4 YEARS TIME	3	> 25%	16% - 24%	8% - 15%	0% - 7% 7%	9	9
C	PARENTAL PREFERENCES (1st preferences as % of intake)	1	< 50%	50% - 74%	75% - 94%	95% + 100%	3	3
D	NUMBER ON ROLL (exc Nursery) (absorbs unit costs) (absorbs mixed age teaching trigger of PSPWG)	3	105 or less 99	106-157	158-209	210 +	9	0
E	PREDICTED PUPIL NUMBERS IN 4 YEARS (includes allowance for new housing)	2	105 or less	106-157 140	158-209	210 +	6	4

F CURRENT EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS		FFT percentile rank NC Overall Level 3 years combined					
(based on previous 3 years Fischer Family Trust) percentile rankings)		100-80	79-50	49-20	19-1		
a) KS2 English	2	0	1 75	2	3	6	2
b) KS2 Maths	2	0	1	2 46	3	6	4
c) KS2 Science	2	0	1 76	2	3	6	2
d) OFSTED "overall effectiveness"	1	Inadequate	Satisfactory	Good	Outstanding	3	3
e) DfES 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	3
G DISTANCE TO ALTERNATIVE PROVISION	2	< 1.0 m	1.0 - 1.5 m	1.5 - 2.0 m	> 2.0 m	6	0
(NB:LEA must provide assistance if > 2 miles from home to nearest available primary school)							
H BALANCE OF PROVISION	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	2
(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)							
I STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION							
a) CONDITION BACKLOG	2	100-76 99	75-51	50-26	25-1	6	0
Percentile rank on cost per sq metre							
b) SUITABILITY	1	100-76	75-51	50-26 27	25-1	3	2
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	3
(% building accessible - DDA Act)							
	1	<10%	10-44%	45-79%	>80%	3	1
Deduction for split site school						-3	0

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	2	
	a) Effect of closure on community if no other community facilities in area.								
	b) % of free school meals eligibility	1	< 10%	10% - 24% 22.22%	25% - 49%	> 50%	3	1	
K	EFFECT OF PROPOSALS ON OUT OF SCHOOL PROVISION								
	a) EARLY YEARS (include only if part of EYDCP and if used for 50% or more of school week)	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	1	
	b) WRAP AROUND CARE	1		1			3	1	
L	RUNNING COSTS Based on non pupil-related CFR Headings	5	100-76 93	Cost per pupil, percentile rank 75-51	50-26	25-1	15	0	
							Possible Score	120	
							School Score	43	

ACTION

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