

Title of Report:	Proposed School Mergers – Winchcombe and Thatcham	Item 11
Report to be considered by:	Executive	
Forward Plan Ref:	EX0855	

Corporate Plan Priority:	S4 – Maintaining high standards of educational achievement across all our schools
The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Corporate Plan priority by: Maximising the use of available resources by reducing surplus places.	

Purpose of Report: To seek Members approval for the recommended action.

Recommended Action: That the Executive agree to:

1a) To merge Dunston Park Infant School with St Mary's CE Junior School, to form a single all through (3-11yr) primary school on the same site and serving the current catchment area, opening in September 2005

b) That the all through Primary School referred to in a) is of Church of England, Controlled status.

2 To merge Winchcombe Infant and Nursery School with Winchcombe Junior School to form a single all through (3-11yr) primary school on the same site and serving the current catchment area, opening in September 2005

Reason for decision to be taken: To reduce the level of surplus places in schools in West Berkshire.

List of other options considered: Maintaining schools as they are

Key background documentation:

- None

Portfolio Member:	Councillor Mollie Lock
Tel. No.:	0118 9332858
E-mail Address:	Mlock@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details

Name:	John Powell
Job Title:	Service Development Manager Access
Tel. No.:	01635 519031
E-mail Address:	jrpowell@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Financial:	These are set out within the report
Personnel:	These are set out within the report
Legal:	Notices would be required under Schools Standards and Framework Act
Property:	Significant development of sites required, capital programme to be built

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 The provision of primary education within West Berkshire has historically taken place in schools that are well below the national average in terms of numbers on roll. This position leads to more costly provision, with greater fixed costs than would be the case in the majority of other LEAs, and with only very limited additional funding attracted from central government through the sparsity factor in the Education Funding Formula.
- 1.2 Audit Commission guidance indicates that between 5% and 10% is the appropriate level of surplus places to allow for efficient use of resources, whilst also meeting some level of parental preference. The current level of primary surplus stands at 10.8% across the whole of West Berkshire.
- 1.3 Given this background, officers were tasked with identifying options for the removal of surplus places within West Berkshire.

2. Initial Option Selection

- 2.1 From the initial brief to look at removing surplus places within West Berkshire, a list of criteria was drawn up for consideration. These criteria included: level of surplus places; unit cost; school performance and value added; pupil mobility and turbulence; trend in number on roll; rural deprivation; popularity and community impact.
- 2.2 Based on the research carried out into these areas, discussions with Children and Young People Strategy Group and School Improvement Advisers, and with the Executive Member for Children and Young People, a range of options was identified for further consideration.
- 2.3 On the basis of further analysis and strategic planning impact, it was agreed that three infant/junior school mergers were appropriate to take forward for consultation. Executive approved the proposals that these three options be taken forward to formal consultation at its meeting on 17th June 2004.

3. Consultation Process

- 3.1 Following Executive, the consultation process began on 18th June 2004 with a closing date of 18th August 2004. Consultation consisted of a full length document (made available online and as a paper copy version), a summary leaflet delivered to the local community, letters to parents through the schools, and a series of formal meetings with school staff, unions, governors and the local community, as well as at the relevant Area Forum and local town or parish councils, where the item was accepted for the agenda. Briefings were also provided for local members to keep them informed of progress.
- 3.2 Copies of the full document for all parents were made available on request to schools, and this was taken up by both Winchcombe Schools.
- 3.3 Unfortunately, the initial drop of leaflets for the Winchcombe catchment area did not go according to plan was flawed. Some households received the leaflet referenced to Calcot and others failed to receive a leaflet at all. Once this issue was reported to the council a further print run was ordered and these leaflets were then delivered to the correct households. Whilst this re-distribution was after the date of the public meeting, all information available at that meeting was contained in the consultation document to which the leaflet directed interested parties.

- 3.4 Consultation meetings were held with staff and unions, governors, and the local community, on dates organised to be most convenient to the schools involved. Meetings were held with Newbury and Thatcham Town Councils. The item was also offered for the agendas of Local Area Forums, and was discussed at the Kennet and Pang Valley Area Forum. The minutes of the public meetings at the schools are attached as appendices to this report.
- 3.5 Meetings were also held between the Corporate Director, Executive Member, Headteacher and Chair of Governors for all four schools.

4. Consultation Feedback

Winchcombe

- 4.1 The following numbers of formal response were received, broken down by category of responder:

Category	Potential Responses	Actual Responses	%age
Non teaching Staff	41	6	14.6
Teaching Staff	21	9	42.9
Governors	22	6	27.3
Parents	281	23	8.2
Other	-	8	-
Total (excl other)	365	44	12.1

- 4.2 The overall response rate was therefore less than one in eight. The consultation leaflet inviting comments was distributed to approximately 2500 houses within the catchment area, and therefore the response rate could be said to have been significantly lower.
- 4.3 Of those that responded, the majority response was in favour of maintaining the status quo. The responses can be broken down into (the percentages given are for the responses over the total responses that could have been given)
- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|-------|
| 42 | Maintain the status quo | 11.5% |
| 3 | Merge into 1.5 fe primary | 0.8% |
| 7 | Other | 1.9% |
- 4.4 In addition, prior to the formal consultation, a petition from parents was sent in with 164 signatories, opposing the merger.
- 4.5 A similar list of staff signatures was submitted by the infant school, with 26 members of staff having signed.
- 4.6 Neither governing body is in favour of the proposal, although the junior school feels that with further information their position could potentially move towards supporting the proposed merger.

- 4.7 The infant school have referred to their own actions in removing surplus places. They are planning on leasing a classroom to a private day care provider, effectively taking it out of use. This move would also have a significant impact on the school's admission number, and on their potential to deliver classes on the single year basis they currently operate. In due course, this unplanned change could have an impact on the junior school.
- 4.8 Both governing bodies have requested more information, covering financial and site issues. The site issue has been discussed, and both schools at least understand, the Council's reasoning on this as outlined in a following section. The schools have already received a financial breakdown showing how any merged school budget would be financially neutral over the first three years, in line with West Berkshire's LMS scheme. Given actual costs would reduce this would provide development funding (more detail is set out below).

Thatcham

- 4.9 A total of 38 responses were received from the following groups:

Category	Potential Responses	Actual Responses	%age
Non teaching staff	34	3	8.8%
Teaching staff	18	1	5.6%
Governors	21	6	28.6%
Parents	236	24	10.2%
Other	-	4	-
Total (excl Other)	309	34	11%

- 4.10 The overall response rate was therefore less than one in eight. The consultation leaflet inviting comments was distributed to approximately 2500 houses within the catchment area, and therefore the response rate could be said to have been significantly lower
- 4.11 Of those that responded, the majority response was in favour of maintaining the status quo. The responses can be broken down into (the percentages given are for the responses over the total responses that could have been given)
- | | | |
|----|-----------------|------|
| 31 | Maintain | 10% |
| 3 | Community | 1% |
| 2 | Voluntary aided | 0.6% |
| 2 | Other | 0.6% |
- 4.12 Other responses included: preferring a Voluntary Controlled Primary, teaching staff and parents wanting to know who will run the school before deciding.
- 4.13 However, both governing bodies, having weighed the pros and cons of the proposal, are in favour of the merger, and discussions with Thatcham Town Council seem to indicate that they would also support this move, although no formal response has been received.

- 4.14 The Diocese of Oxford has indicated it would support a move to Voluntary Aided or Voluntary Controlled. Officers are working closely with Diocesan representatives to take forward issues around site ownership and possible status of the school.

General

- 4.15 A joint response to West Berkshire's proposals was received from all unions involved. Not unexpectedly, response was not in favour of the proposed mergers, and raised issues on sites and buildings, governance and financial implications.
- 4.16 This response also raised the issues of catchment areas, although this was clearly dealt with in the consultation document. There would be no change to any catchment area as a result of any of these proposals.

Issues Arising During Consultation

5. Projected Demand - Accuracy of Forecasting Model

- 5.1 The current forecasting model was devised in 2002 and refined since, and so it is difficult to assess the accuracy over more than two years. Nevertheless the accuracy of West Berkshire projections can be seen below since 1999. The table compares actual numbers on roll, with the numbers on roll forecast by the model in use.

	Percentage Accuracy		
	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
1999 Forecast (Old Method)	95.4	96	92.9
2000 Forecast (Old Method)	97.1	97.7	98.5
2001 Forecast (Old Method)	95.9	96.7	97.9
2002 Forecast (New Method)		96.9	97.5
2003 Forecast (New Method)			98.9
2004 Forecast (New Method)			

- (1) The model uses numerous data sources as its inputs. These include birth data from Primary Care Trust, transfer rates between year groups and between schools, admissions data including feeder schools and catchment areas, and current numbers on roll.

- (2) A standard model for all schools is applied, in order to avoid bias caused by expectation.

- 5.2 Although the model as a whole and by geographical area has fairly high accuracy, the accuracy of individual schools where peaks and troughs in admissions occur is less accurate. Nevertheless the forecasts are useful for showing trends.

Oversubscribed schools

- 5.3 Generally the accuracy of forecasting for schools that are significantly oversubscribed is very good, due to intake being fairly stable. However if a school was to have a sudden increase in popularity

then the model may take time to catch up with this change. The % inaccuracy of 5 such schools in West Berkshire is shown below, together with the overall inaccuracy of those 5 schools:

School A	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	8.8%	6.1%	0.8%
2002 Forecast		1.8%	1.8%
2003 Forecast			2.4%
School B	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	7.7%	5.5%	10.0%
2002 Forecast		-9.4%	-3.6%
2003 Forecast			-0.5%
School C	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	-3.2%	-0.7%	-0.7%
2002 Forecast		-1.8%	1.1%
2003 Forecast			6.9%
School D	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	4.6%	1.6%	-3.4%
2002 Forecast		10.6%	6.1%
2003 Forecast			1.7%
School E	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	-0.9%	1.5%	0.8%
2002 Forecast		-3.6%	0.0%
2003 Forecast			-3.2%
All 5 Schools	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	1.6%	1.7%	0.1%
2002 Forecast		0.5%	1.7%
2003 Forecast			2.0%

Undersubscribed schools

5.4 The forecasting for schools that are undersubscribed follows the same pattern as above, although generally tends to overestimate pupil numbers significantly the more years ahead we look at the forecasts, although the accuracy still appears to be better than the old forecasting model.

School V	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	72.4%	46.8%	11.6%
2002 Forecast		23.4%	21.3%
2003 Forecast			5.8%
School W	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	10.9%	8.9%	3.8%
2002 Forecast		3.2%	4.7%
2003 Forecast			-2.0%
School X	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	2.0%	3.6%	0.1%
2002 Forecast		-5.0%	0.3%
2003 Forecast			-0.3%
School Y	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	7.6%	6.3%	3.1%
2002 Forecast		9.1%	7.9%
2003 Forecast			-2.0%
School Z	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	16.2%	7.6%	-0.1%

2002 Forecast		5.1%	3.9%
2003 Forecast			-2.3%
Total All 5	3 years ahead	2 years ahead	1 year ahead
2001 Forecast	19.4%	13.4%	3.7%
2002 Forecast		5.7%	6.9%
2003 Forecast			-0.2%

6. Sites and Buildings

- 6.1 Throughout the consultation process the Council has taken a consistent line on the issue of the development and use of the sites and buildings for any merged school.
- 6.2 This position has always been that the configuration and use of the buildings and site would be agreed with the new governing body and headteacher, and it would be important to involve the local community in these discussions as well as determining what additional services could also be delivered from the same site, meeting central government's extended schools during and beyond the school day/year agenda as well as delivering on West Berkshire's aim for primary schools for the future as neighbourhood hubs for service delivery.
- 6.3 Such services could include, childcare, healthcare, family learning, adult learning, out of school clubs, ICT, community sports facilities, focus on community activities, extended opening times, to name but a few, dependant on community need and aspirations.
- 6.4 Currently the Council's position is not to approve the disposal of school playing fields, except in exceptional circumstances. It should also be noted that the DfES have also adopted a position that assumes the Secretary of State will not permit any disposal that adversely affects the provision of team game areas. Whilst this has not been formally adopted as policy by the Council, it is clear that there is no intention, or support, for any of the proposed mergers to lead to a disposal of playing fields.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 All maintained schools are funded via a delegated budget calculated by means of a formula. The funding formula is mainly driven by the number of pupils in the school, but there are also fixed elements of funding which all schools receive to help support their fixed costs e.g. the Head Teacher, Deputy Head and site manager. Small schools (i.e. those with less than 200 pupils) also receive some additional funding to reflect the fact that their fixed costs are proportionately higher than those of larger schools, and to boost the funding generated by their pupil numbers in order to ensure that the full national curriculum to be delivered.
- 7.2 If two schools are merged, the basic formula budget for the new school will be lower than the combined budgets for the former schools (assuming pupil numbers are unchanged) because the new school will only require funding for one Head Teacher, Deputy and Site Manager etc. It is also unlikely that the new schools would require small school protection as the combined pupil numbers are likely to be sufficient to generate enough funding to contribute towards fixed costs and to ensure that the full curriculum can be delivered.
- 7.3 However, under West Berkshire's Schools' Funding Formula newly opened schools will receive transitional funding in addition to their basic formula budget for up to three years from the date of opening. This is to allow for costs such as additional staffing, management allowances, or site management, or to compensate for any temporary fluctuation in pupil numbers which may surround the opening of the new school.

- 7.4 The ongoing full year savings arising from the proposed mergers are currently estimated to be in the region of £70,000-£80,000 per pair of merged schools. These savings would be used for the first three years of operation to meet the transitional costs of the new schools.
- 7.5 The figures quoted above may be affected if changes are made to the funding formula following annual consultation with schools during the autumn term 2004. However, if the mergers go ahead as planned, the closing schools and the temporary governing bodies of the new schools will be informed of the final level of funding for the whole of the 2005/06 financial year (including transitional funding for the new schools) by March 2005. Comparative 2004/05 figures have already been shared with schools.
- 7.6 The current DfES regulations concerning passporting of increases in education funding to schools require that any savings in individual schools' delegated budgets must either be used to increase the amount delegated to other schools or to increase funding of services within the School's Block of the Education Budget (e.g. centrally managed services for children with special educational needs). The DfES has also set rules to ensure minimum year on year increases in delegated budgets and that central expenditure does not increase at a faster rate than schools delegated budgets. These rules are also likely to mean that any such savings must be recycled into the overall amount available for delegation to schools. The Council is also required to consult with the Schools Funding Forum on changes to the deployment of funding within the School's Block.
- 7.7 It is therefore clear that the efficiency savings, which may be generated if the proposed mergers go ahead as planned, would be used in the short term to help the new schools through a period of change and to support the raising of standards in those schools and in the longer term, to benefit the education of children in all schools across West Berkshire.

8. Performance and Standards

- 8.1 When comparing the achievement outcomes of children against national benchmarks it is important to take account of the socio-economic circumstances of the communities they serve. Individual schools benchmark their performance against similar schools based on pupils' prior attainment. This information is provided to each school by Ofsted in a PANDA report each year.
- 8.2 Achievement of pupils in Baseline Assessment on entry into schools 2001/02

Average score per pupil out of a maximum total of 32	WBC average all schools	WBC Average Primary Schools only	WBC Average All Infant schools only	Calcot Infant School	Winchcombe Infant School	Dunston Park Infant School
Average score	16.6	16.9	16.2	17.7	20.6	10.1

- 8.3 The attainment of pupils in national tests suggests that pupils attending infant and junior schools are less likely to reach the standards of literacy and numeracy expected nationally than their peers in primary schools. In some schools this may be due to pupils starting from a lower base level on entry to the school system. However, the average for West Berkshire Infant schools is close to the average for primary schools as shown above.

8.4 Achievement of 7 year olds in Summer 2004 national tests

Percentage of pupils achieving level 2 or above	WBC average all schools	WBC Average Primary Schools only	WBC Average All Infant schools only	Calcot Infant School	Winchcombe Infant School	Dunston Park Infant School
READING	83.8	86	81.6	91.5	66.7	77.5
WRITING	79.5	82.4	76	70.4	68.6	90
MATHS	92.3	93.7	92.2	95.8	82.4	97.5

8.5 The averages for primary schools are above those for infant schools

8.6 Achievement of 11 year olds in Summer 2004 national tests

Percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above	WBC average all schools	WBC Average Primary Schools only	WBC Average All Junior schools only	Calcot Junior School	Winchcombe Junior School	St. Mary's Junior Thatcham
ENGLISH	80	83.8	76.3	83.3	60.9	60.4
MATHS	73.9	78	69.1	62.5	67.4	60.4
SCIENCE	88	90.4	84.1	86.1	76.1	90.6

8.7 The averages for primary schools are above those for junior schools

8.8 The progress that children make can be measured by comparing their achievement between 2 points in time with the average for children of similar ability. This is called a "value-added" measure. Value added measures tend to show average progress for pupils in most West Berkshire infant schools but negative value added in junior schools. This may be attributable to the disturbance to children in making the transition from one school to another at age 7 which their counterparts in primary schools do not experience.

8.9 Other areas of potential benefit would include:

- (1) The ease of transfer of key pupil information relating to curriculum level targets and the identification of whole school improvement targets, providing consistent support for pupils with Special Educational Needs, developing schemes of work that cover key transition periods within the school,
- (2) Maximising the potential for consistency in approaches to Teaching and Learning, Curriculum Innovation, Behaviour Management, Assessment Procedures, Pupil Welfare and Guidance (pupil access to well-informed support, advice and guidance as they progress through the

school), links with outside agencies supporting the pupil or family and links with parents which can be established over six to seven years.

9. Staffing

- 9.1 Meetings have taken place with the staff of all schools and trade unions have been involved throughout the process. An agreed procedure for the appointment of staff following a reorganisation of schools is now under discussion with union representatives

10. Governance

Arrangements for the constitution of temporary governing bodies

- 10.1 The new schools (general) (England) regulations 2003 specify the consultation of the temporary governing body and the methods of appointment.
- 10.2 Once proposals for a new school have been approved and the Council have determined to implement the proposals, the Council must set up a temporary governing body for the new school in accordance with sections 19-22 of the regulations. Where it is essential to do so, Councils can make arrangements to establish temporary governing bodies in anticipation that the proposals will be approved.
- 10.3 The Council must consult the promoters where arrangements are being made for the establishment of a new voluntary controlled school. The Council and the promoters must agree the arrangements where a new voluntary aided or foundation school is being established.

Existing Governor Constitution

Winchcombe Schools

- 10.4 Currently the Infant School Governing Body comprises 14 governor positions with 11 currently filled. Similarly the Junior School Governing body comprises 14 governor positions, with 11 currently filled. In both cases the headteacher is included, and in both cases the schools are community schools.

St Mary's Junior

- 10.5 St Mary's Junior School Governing Body comprises 15 governor positions with 12 currently filled, the headteacher is included. St Mary's is voluntary controlled therefore governors have foundation status.

Dunston Park Infant School

- 10.6 Dunston Park Infant school Governing Body comprises 14 governor positions with 9 currently filled. The headteacher is included. Dunston Park is a Community School.

Types of Governors and Method of Appointment

- 10.7 In appointing members or nominating candidates for membership of the temporary governing body of new schools, the Council and other appointing or nominating bodies should ensure that the individuals being appointed or nominated have relevant experience which will contribute to the success of the new school.

Community

- 10.8 Temporary community governors are appointed by the Council to represent wider community interests. The definition of temporary community governor is wide and can include people from a business or professional background and minor authority nominees who are committed to the good governance or success of the new school.

Foundation

- 10.9 Temporary foundation governors are appointed in accordance with the agreed arrangements set out in the draft instrument of government of new schools which will be voluntary schools or foundation schools which have a foundation. Where the new school will have a religious character, the temporary foundation governors will be appointed for the purpose of securing that the religious character of the new school is established and developed. Where a new school has a trust deed, the temporary foundation governors will ensure that the school operates in accordance with that trust deed.

LEA

- 10.10 Temporary LEA governors are appointed by the Council. Councils can appoint any eligible person but they are encouraged to appoint high calibre governor candidates to new schools that need most support and to appoint candidates irrespective of any political affiliation or preferences.

Parent

- 10.11 Temporary parent governors are appointed by the Council from parents whose children are likely to become registered pupils at the new school or if that is not practicable, a person who has a child under or of compulsory school age. At new voluntary aided or a foundation schools proposed by promoters. A person is disqualified from appointment as a temporary parent governor if they are an elected member of the Council or if they work or are likely to work at the new school for more than 500 hours in a school year.

Staff

- 10.12 Temporary staff governors are individuals who work at Council maintained schools. They should be appointed by the temporary governing body. At new voluntary aided or foundation schools established by promoters, the temporary staff governors must be nominated by the promoters before they can be appointed. At least one temporary staff governor must be a teacher unless no school teacher is willing to serve. Where there are three or more temporary staff governor places, one place should be filled by a non-school teacher unless no such person is willing to serve.
- 10.13 The headteacher or headteacher designate is a member of the temporary governing body by virtue of their office and counts as a member of the staff category.

Partnership

- 10.14 Temporary partnership governors are appointed on temporary governing bodies of foundation or foundation special schools which do not have a foundation. Where such a school is established by the Council, the temporary partnership governor will be appointed by the Council. In other cases the

promoters will nominate the appointees who will be appointed by the temporary governing body. Nominations for temporary partnership governors must be sought from the community the new school will serve or they should be people who are committed to the success of the school.

Sponsor

- 10.15 Temporary sponsor governors may be appointed by the temporary governing body following nominations by the sponsors of the new school (if any). The temporary governing body can decide to appoint as temporary sponsor governors persons who provide or have provided the new school with considerable support, financial or in kind. Persons providing the new school with substantial services will also be eligible to be appointed as temporary sponsor governors.
- 10.16 In addition to temporary governors, persons interested in contributing to the work of temporary governing bodies can be appointed as temporary associate members. Associate members are not governors. They can attend meetings of the temporary governing body but they do not have voting rights at these meetings. They can be given voting rights at committee meetings but will not be able to vote on staffing, finance, admissions and discipline matters and on election or appointment of temporary governors.

Transition from Temporary Governing Body to Governing Body

- 10.17 The Council must ensure that every new school has an instrument of government before its opening date, made in accordance with regulations 28 to 30 of the School Governance (Constitution) (England) Regulations 2003. The instrument of government is the document which records the name of the school, the number and category of governors and other relevant information relating to school. The instrument takes effect from the date it is made for the purpose of making appointments to the permanent governing body, but for other purposes the instrument takes effect from the date the school opens.
- 10.18 Once a temporary governing body has prepared a draft instrument, it must be submitted to the local education authority that will check if it complies with the statutory requirements, including the guiding principles for the constitution of governing bodies of the relevant category of school. Governing bodies and Councils can review and change the instrument at any time. The same procedures will be followed each time any detail on the instrument is amended.

Implications

- 10.19 In order to reflect the bringing together of two existing schools into one new primary school, it is suggested that the temporary governing body be constituted of governors from both existing schools, as well as governors new to both schools, perhaps in equal proportions of one third of the new governing body from each group.

11. Way Forward

- 11.1 If the Executive decides to proceed, it is likely that the process will follow this timeline:

- (1) Notices published mid October
- (2) 8 week objection period ends mid December
- (3) School Organisation Committee meeting to determine proposal mid December
- (4) Appointment of shadow governing body confirmed mid December
- (5) Appointment of headteacher Dec/Jan if existing head of one of merged schools.

- (6) Appointment of headteacher Spring term if external advertisement/appointment
- (7) Staffing structure agreed spring term
- (8) Sites and buildings discussions begin spring term
- (9) New school opens September 2005

Appendices

Appendix 11(A) - Consultation Document for Winchcombe Schools

Appendix 11(B) - Minutes of Winchcombe public meeting

Appendix 11(C) - Consultation Document for Dunston Park and St Mary's Schools

Appendix 11(D) - Minutes of Dunston Park/St Mary's public meeting

Consultation Responses

Local Stakeholders:	Local communities (through public meetings, Town Councils and Area Forums), School staff and governors
Officers Consulted:	Richard Hubbard, Ian Pearson, Andy Tubbs, Tim Kuhles, Jeanne Lapsley, Gabrielle Esplin, Andrew Butler, Donald Fraser, Maxine Slade
Trade Union:	ATL, GMB, Unison, NAHT, NUT, NASUWT