

Primary Capital Programme Phase 1 consultation March 2008 - Summary of responses

Response data

Distributed: 49 (primary schools, secondary schools, Diocesan representatives, LSC)

Total responses: 18

Response rate: 36%

Contents

	Page
Questionnaire responses	2
Written/emailed responses	8

Questionnaire Responses

Are you:	A Governor	8
	Head teacher	5
	LA officer	
	Diocesan officer	
	Other	

Do you have the information you need to comment on the options given in phase 1 of the consultation?

Yes	8
No	2
Don't know	1

What other information would be helpful?

- As a parent and a governor I have background knowledge which enables me to understand ECM, BSF etc but if I did not have this background I would find it difficult to understand the importance of PANs (for example) without any context. How can I therefore make a judgement on whether one set of proposals is better than another, i.e. expanding PAN would provide admissions for popular schools more accessible for all; cater for increasing birth rate etc.
- Movement of children between pyramids at or close to age of transfer.
- Both the governing body and the staff would have liked a lot more information re: the issues raised on the responses to options 10 & 11 (Lilliput First School).

What suggestions can you offer for improving this consultation for phase 2 when we intend to involve a wider group of stakeholders?

- Provide a powerpoint presentation for schools to share with their parents
- Put the education and welfare of the children first!
- Regular meetings at appropriate venues so people have an opportunity to ask questions and clarify detail. It also encourages involvement.

- Allow a stage where suggestions can actually be implemented on the proposal. It looks like it is all or nothing because of short response times.
- Parents and staff will all ask “how is this going to be done (Sept 09 option) when we are short of staffroom/office/etc space?” the hall will be too small. (Lilliput First School)
- Opportunities for parents responses to be verbal as well as written to ensure quality and equality of opportunity, e.g.”soundbites”, public meetings at schools.
- Pupils voice from all children involved from Reception to Year 7.

Is the vision one you could support?

Yes	9
No	2

If no please give reasons:

- As a parent, I strongly believe that children entering primary education need a small school environment. A huge primary school of potentially 800+ children is not what the community needs (Governor, Sylvan First School)
- You have not enabled the enthusiasts amongst us to get on board. We all want the same thing but see different ways of getting there. Not at cost money. (Governor, Hillbourne School)

Which aspect of the vision gives you confidence and inspires you?

- Schools at the heart of their communities, meeting the needs of the whole child, design and sustainability.
- Looking at children’s needs n preparation for adulthood in the ‘whole’ – i.e. not just educational needs, this gives them the tools and knowledge to be successful and to fulfil their potential.
- Consistency in age of transfer Borough wide.
- A strategy for the whole area.
- That at long last, Lilliput can take the children who have requested a space – both locally in Poole and on Church grounds. (Lilliput First School)
- Every Child Matters. Equality of opportunity.
- “Aspirations for all our children” – we want to do better. School’s role as central and integral to its community is vital to enable the above to happen and to empower the community as a whole.

Option number	Linked Options	Option	Agree	Disagree	Comment
1		Amalgamate Canford Heath Infant and Junior Schools to create a 4 FE (PAN 120) Primary school.	1	1	No understanding of practical issues from plan. My experience at Hillbourne is combination has not improved outcomes because practical issues were ignored! Buildings! Management stress! Attention to detail. (Governor, Hillbourne)
2	3&4	Amalgamate Canford Heath Infant and Junior Schools to create a 3 FE (PAN 90) Primary school.	1	1	
3	2&4	Increase Ad Astra Infant School from 3 FE (PAN 90) to 4 FE (PAN 120)	1	1	
4	3&2	Increase Haymoor Junior School from 3 FE (PAN 90) to 4 FE (PAN 120)	2		
5	6	Amalgamate Sylvan Infant School and Branksome Heath Junior School to create a 4 FE (PAN 120) Primary school		6	<p>Resulting primary school would be far too large and given the difficulties some of eth children in the area face, a thriving infant school would best meet their needs. (Chair of Governors, Sylvan First)</p> <p>Strongly disagree. Too big a school to support children and raise standards. (Governor, BHMS)</p> <p>This option creates a school that exceeds the BoP School Organisation Plan. The cohesive nature would not be possible with such large numbers. The opportunities to be within such a large school would have a dramatic impact in such young children.</p>

					Community also strongly opposed to this suggestion.
6	5	Extend the age range at Heatherlands Infant School to become a 2 FE (PAN 60) Primary School	3	1	Disagree, but agree if 7 & 8 are supported. (Governor, BHMS)
7	6&8	Increase the PAN of Sylvan Infant School from 90 (3 FE) to 120 (4 FE)	7		Capacity already available. Capacity to provide excellent First school/Infant practice and extended school services in place suited to EYFS and KS1.
8	6&7	Reduce the PAN of Branksome Heath Junior school from 150 (5 FE) to 120 (4 FE)	4	1	
9		Amalgamate Hamworthy Infant and Junior schools to create 3 FE (PAN 90) Primary school.	2		
10	11	Increase PAN of Lilliput CE VC First School from 60 (2 FE) to 90 (3 FE) from September 2009. The school will increase in size incrementally from 2009 and in 2013 will become an Infant school.	3	1	<p>If Lilliput became a Primary school in 2013 Baden-Powell could stay as 5 FE (PAN 150) – (Heatherlands First School)</p> <p>Vacant capacity at Old Town First – could this be used if catchment areas reconsidered? Support for parents with integral Children’s Centre.(anon)</p> <p>We consider that the advantages to the school outweigh the disadvantages on the limited information we have been provided with and given the severely limited time we have been given to make a considered response to an important issue. Our response is solely on the basis of this information. We have some reservations over the accommodation which will be provided both in the short</p>

					<p>and long term. In relation to the capital expenditure we would like to see more details on the vision and scope of this and how this will be funded and implemented. we are concerned that this should have a minimal impact upon the existing facilities in the short term and that this should be fit for purpose in the long term. The ancillary impact upon other facilities should also be brought into the equation as such facilities as the school hall (also used as a dining room) and staff room will need to be extended to accommodate the additional pupils and teachers. We appreciate that there will be a requirement to have some form of temporary accommodation in place whilst any new build is being undertaken and we will need assurances that all works will be done with minimal disruption upon the school and to a standard which meets the high standards to which the school aspires and currently affords. Finally, on a point of clarification, the perceived disadvantage of there being no space for pre-school accommodation seems at odds with the fact the school is apparently capable of a 50% increase in size in the short to medium-term. There is currently no pre-school provision on the site but this could be available in the long term if the capital project is suitably sympathetic to the schools and community's needs. (Lilliput First School)</p>
11	10	Increase PAN of Baden-Powell & St Peter's CE VC Middle School from 150 (5 FE) to 180 (6 FE) from September 2012. In 2013 the school will become a Junior school.	1	1	<p>The majority of our governors broadly support this option, but all have expressed concern that the buildings should not simply be extended to provide 4 extra classrooms, but that the whole site needs upgrading...if we are going to be twice the size we need a hall in which the whole school can be assembled plus many other support areas such as sports changing rooms, larger library, computer suites, cooking and DT areas, storage areas and staffrooms... (BP & SP)</p>

					As the school wishes to ensure that parents of an extended school (which would be the case in 2013 and which we have signalled an agreement in principle to above) we believe there should be sufficient high quality Junior schools in the locality for our children to move on to, then we agree the increase of Baden Powell and St Peter's CE VC Middle school in principle. However, we do this on the understanding that the school must satisfy themselves that the proposals are in their best interest and that the school and site can sustain an increase in numbers of this magnitude. Again, the school has a vested interest that the current high standards at Baden-Powell can be maintained so that our own pupils can achieve their potential and build upon the excellent foundations we ourselves aim to provide those pupils. (Lilliput First School)
12		Increase PAN of Oakdale South Road Middle School from 140 (4 FE) to 150 (5 FE) from September 2012. In 2013 the school will become a Junior school.	2	1	Would accommodate 3FE from Stanley Green and 2FE from Old Town First School and Nursery.

Written/mailed responses

1. Hillbourne School & Nursery
2. Springdale First School
3. Branksome Heath Middle School
4. Baden Powell and St Peters Middle School
5. Haymoor Middle School
6. Carter Community School
7. Ad Astra First School

Headteacher : MRS A DAWSON BA Hons
Deputy Headteacher : MRS S PATTERSON B.Ed

Email: office@hillbourne.poole.sch.uk
Website: www.hillbourne.poole.sch.uk



Kitchener Crescent, Poole,
Dorset BH17 7HX
Tel: 01202-692604/693792
Fax: 01202-691002

19th March 2008

Response from Governing Body of Hillbourne School and Nursery on Consultation of Primary Capital Programme

The Governing Body did not feel it could comment on the individual changes to school PANs. However, it strongly feels that the move of Hillbourne to the Ashdown pyramid without consultation is inappropriate: parents from Creekmoor who send their children to Hillbourne (rather than Upton or Lychett Matravers which is more convenient in terms of car travel) will be less likely to continue to do so as they – along with many Waterloo Estate (or Hillbourne Area as we prefer to say) parents – do not see their children as Canford Heath children. Under 20% of parents chose Ashdown in Year 7 this year: Poole High has been seen for a number of years as the preferred school. Rightly or wrongly, parents see the feeder school as the route to the secondary school and choose accordingly. The Governing Body are disappointed that the Borough did not choose to consult with them on this change of pyramid.

We are also concerned about the lack of clarity when tables are drawn up. An example of this is Table 1 – vulnerability index: in Hillbourne school we have a significant number of vulnerable families on the Waterloo Estate who attend our school. This needs to be recognised – and it is very challenging to parents who live here to understand how this is calculated in terms of numbers or percentages of pupils in different schools.

The Governing Body hopes that these comments will be viewed seriously.

MIKE BURRISS
Chair of Governors



SPRINGDALE FIRST SCHOOL

HEADTEACHER: Mrs R Leach MI Biol - PGCE

Springdale Road, Broadstone, Dorset. BH18 9BW - Tel: 01202 692700

Fax: 01202 693752 – www.springdale.org.uk



Springdale places the highest priority on the safeguarding and protection of children

19th March 2008

Dear Mr Woodcock

I am responding to the Primary Capital Programme Phase 1 consultation document. The Governors of Springdale School have asked me to take this opportunity to express the school's dissatisfaction at the document.

The document does not refer at all to Broadstone which is of grave concern. While we are aware of the reasons for delaying changes in this area we are increasingly anxious that our school will not benefit at all from the allocation of funding. The uncertainty also means that it is difficult to plan strategically for essential improvements to the building.

Due to careful management our school has been well maintained; however the building is over forty years old and many areas of it are unsuitable for our current needs. The consultation document refers to "creating Primary schools equipped for the 21st century" and "creating schools with 21st century learning facilities". Neither of these statements could be applied to our current building. It also states that schools must be "constantly upgraded" if they are to be fit to for purpose.

A key area for development is our Foundation Stage base which Jill Martindale described in a recent SIP visit as barely satisfactory. To create an outstanding learning environment in which the EYFS can be delivered will involve major building work at considerable expense.

I would be very grateful if these views could be taken into account.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Leach (Head)
On behalf of the Governing Body



Branksome Heath Middle School.

In response to the Phase 1 Consultation, the Governors and Headteacher would like the following points to be considered:

We thank the borough for giving the entire range of options for the future of schools as we prepare for the change in age of transfer in September 2013. However, we also feel that as much as we are responsible for our school within the community and Rossmore Pyramid, we should comment on our own locality and not advise as to what happens in other pyramids. In the same way, we feel that Governing Bodies outside of our Pyramid should not be given influence over the changes within our locality.

We have recently written to Mr. Nash requesting a review of our Pupil Admission Number, and although unsuccessful, we firmly believe that the children would benefit from a smaller school and therefore recommend that the Model with Branksome Heath Middle becoming a Junior School (PAN 120), and Sylvan becoming an Infant school (PAN 120) be adopted.

It is recognized within the Consultation Document that this would make Branksome and Sylvan larger than the Borough School Organisation Plan of 3 Form Entry but it would create opportunities for children to develop their self esteem and social development, particularly those who are vulnerable by getting to know the whole staff through whole school assemblies, currently not possible at Branksome, and daily contact in the playground.

The closer links with Sylvan would see a greater ease of transfer and although we would not exclude the possibility of children from other schools joining Branksome Heath, we would expect the vast majority to continue their education by a simple walk across the road! Following the proposal to make a pedestrianised section between the schools, we could develop a sharing of resources with children working on either site for different parts of the day. This would give all children access to the best facilities and resources available and would not incur any huge financial burden to redesign school sites. Staff would be able to share expertise which has already been implemented for the coming academic year.

The disadvantage voiced within the Consultation Document is that of 'surplus capacity' however, the imaginative and creative redesigning of the internal spaces could see Branksome Heath Junior becoming a 'model' where children have access to the best resources to continue the 'exemplary' practice of the school's commitment to include all pupils. We are proud of the recognition given by Ofsted for our care of the most vulnerable and would take this opportunity to develop a more personalized learning with support groups for Parents and small group intervention.

We have emphasized the positive aspects of our preferred option, but we would also like to suggest that an 'all through' Primary would create a possible 840 children. It would be very intimidating for very young children to be part of such a large organization and would outweigh the benefits highlighted in the document. The same PAN across Infant and Junior Schools would create the a far better opportunity to

develop firm foundations into Key Stage 1 before making the transition into Key Stage 2.

Having studied all of the options and the data added across the appendices, we strongly recommend that the future of schools in Poole is one with Branksome Heath becoming a Junior School with a Pupil Admission Number of 120.

Baden Powell & St Peter's Middle School
Mill Lane
Parkstone
Poole
BH14 8UL

19 March 2008

Dear John

Primary Capital Programme – Phase 1 Consultation

Further to your letter of 6 March 2008 in which you sought the views of Chairs and their Governors on the options available to this school within the Primary Capital Programme, I have discussed this with our Head, Geoff Pike, and have now received a response back from most of our Governors on this matter.

My discussions with Geoff Pike concluded that we favoured the option of BP&SP becoming a Primary with the increased PN of 180, as the school is successful and over subscribed, and we believe this to be the viable option for the School to secure a the enlarged facilities which would be required to meet the demand which already exists to a large extent, and the means to secure some additional funding to replace the loss of the higher pupil support given to Year 7, that we shall no longer receive.

It is also clear for the comments received from the majority of our Governors that they all broadly support this option, but all have expressed their concern that the buildings should not simply be extended to provide 4 extra classrooms, but that the whole site needs upgrading to enable past shortcomings and poor planning to be corrected at the same time.

The original school was designed for 3 form entry, and much of the core structure such as the hall and staff accommodation was designed around those numbers. The site has been extended twice in mainly classroom only terms already, and if we are going to go to effectively twice the original size then we definitely need a hall in which the whole school can be assembled, plus many other support areas such as sports changing rooms, larger library, computer suites, cooking and DT areas, storage areas and staffrooms to enable this to work and maintain the current ethos and high standards.

For your information I have attached a document giving the verbatim statements received from Governors by e-mail in response to these two options within the Poole High Pyramid, and I am sure you will see the common concerns regarding the critical expansion of facilities required to make this work successfully.

Please let me know if you need any further discussions around these matters

Yours sincerely

Bob Flint

Bob Flint
Chair of Governors

20 March 2008

Laura Cook
CYPS-SQI
Borough of Poole
Civic Centre
POOLE BH15 2RU

Dear Laura

PRIMARY CAPITAL PROGRAMME PHASE 1 CONSULTATION

HAYMOOR MIDDLE SCHOOL'S RESPONSE

Given the very short notice for consultation on the Primary Capital Programme Phase 1, it is important to draw attention to the fact that the options for our pyramid structure have not been formally discussed at a full governors meeting.

However, consultation 'at a distance' with Haymoor Middle School governors would suggest that there are only two options that we would consider. Our first preference would be for Haymoor to be a Junior School Years 3 – 6 with a Pan of 90 being fed by Ad Astra as an Infant School Years R – 2 with a Pan of 90. This would be mirrored with Canford Heath Junior and Infant both with a Pan of 120.

Our second preference would be for Haymoor Junior School with Years 3 – 6 with a Pan of 120 fed by Ad Astra Infant with Years R – 2 with a Pan of 120. Canford Heath would be a Primary with Years R – 6 with a Pan of 90.

We would reject the third option of Canford Heath Primary having Years R – 6 with a Pan of 120.

The rationale for our choice is based on the belief that:-

- 1) primary schools should not be too large
- 2) the importance of primary schools being easily accessible to the communities they serve enabling pupils and parents to walk to school
- 3) the cost effectiveness of re-organisation both in building and staffing terms
- 4) the fact that the section in the consultation document on school performance was unfortunately restricted to important but very narrow criteria. There is an increasing understanding and acknowledgement by government that schools play a crucial part in the overall development of our young people and that some 'Key Skills for Life and Good Citizenship' are not measured in SAT's tests. Whatever organisation we decide on must be able to deliver this wider curriculum really effectively.

Yours sincerely

PETER SCHOUTEN
Headteacher

From: Judy Mcblain
Sent: 19 March 2008 07:51
To: John Nash
Subject: Feedback on Phase 1 consultation of PCP

Feedback of PCP Phase 1 consultation

As a secondary Headteacher, I was copied in on this document rather than receiving it directly. Therefore I am unsure whether you are formally consulting secondary heads at this stage.

However, having read the document, I would like to provide some feedback. Please accept my apologies if some of my comments are really obvious ones that you are already considering.

Whilst I agree with the concept of combining school to ensure const effectiveness, I also agree that primary schools should not become too large.

However, I think it is difficult to feedback in detail on the options outlined without additional information.

A change in PAN to some schools will inevitably affect the number of students moving into the secondary phase in some pyramids. Therefore, it is not possible to comment on proposals for the PCP without consideration of the BSF programme as these 2 programmes have to link together.

In considering what affect these proposals will have on the secondary system, it is necessary to have access to projected student numbers for all schools for the future. This is because the PAN for schools doesn't always reflect the approximate intake. (For example, a school may have surplus places year on year).

It is only by considering the actual numbers of primary students in each pyramid that the affect on secondary schools can be understood.

I am concerned that the some of the options proposed will enable some secondary schools to get larger at the expense of others.

As you will already be aware, I am concerned that the stated increase in PAN for Ashdown will have the effect of drawing students away from secondary schools in Poole that already have surplus places. This will put Carter at even greater risk of closure. Is the increased PAN for Ashdown still under consideration or has it been finalised?

Is there a typo in the document, or is the current agreed change for 2013 reduce the PAN for Hamworthy Middle school from 90 to 60? (Page 37). If this is the case, then I would be extremely concerned for the future of Carter.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if any of this feedback requires clarification.

Many thanks
Judy

From: Val Arbon
Sent: 20 March 2008 17:03
To: John Nash
Subject: Val Arbon.

Dear John,

I met with the Ad Astra School Governors last night to discuss the Primary Capital programme and the options for change. I will be sending you the consultation document today. However, as it's unlikely to arrive in due time for the closing date I thought I would email their views.

The Governors feel that a move to a four form of entry (this appears to be the likely option considering the proposals for Canford Heath First and Middle) would be acceptable if the school could continue to use **all its current accommodation**. They would strongly oppose the loss of our `bungalow classrooms`.

Four form of entry, restricted to the main school building, would create **high density usage**, something we have experienced in the past, and we feel our current standards would drop. Currently our pupil attainment for the last 2 years has been well above national averages in almost all categories. We believe this is due to the small group teaching and support levels we provide. This type of teaching necessitates space and areas for small group work. If our school moved to four form, without the inclusion of our bungalows, then we would be concerned about `break out areas` and space, leading to a drop in our current standards and level of provision.

However, we appreciate that to include the bungalow classrooms means that floor area would be high in relation to pupil numbers. We would therefore like to consult with the Borough about being included in the PCP priority list of building work, in order that some of our accommodation could be used to **establish a new pre-school setting for the Heath, which could include some community/extended school facilities (health, social care room etc)**. I believe we are recognised as a good school, with some outstanding practice, particularly in the early years. I feel this proposal would be worth serious consideration by the Borough as it may be that, with some small adjustments, we could create a school that truly meets the needs of the Governments Children's plan and a 21st century curriculum.

My apologies this is late but it's been a long day!!

Have a good Easter,

Val