

Questions for the Children and Young People Portfolio Holder – 20.07.10

Question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from Councillor John Getgood

Please will you clarify the situation regarding proposals to close the Entry to Employment service (E2E) based at Castlecombe Youth centre? When was this decision taken?

Reply:

The Entry to Employment programme (E2E) based at the Castlecombe Youth Centre commenced in June 2008 and was commissioned by the Learning and Skills Council. Under these commissioning arrangements the programme required to deliver to a set of qualitative and quantitative criteria. Funding was directly related to the outcomes delivered by the programme. In January 2010 the Learning and Skills Council raised concerns that the programme operated by the Youth Service had not met the criteria and performance profile and that the contract would cease with effect from 31 July 2010. Since 1st April 2010 with the dissolution of the Learning and Skills Council the Local Authority is now responsible for 16-19 commissioning for learners. The funding of programmes such as E2E is the responsibility of the newly created Young Persons Learning Agency (YPLA). We await decisions of this new agency on the future of such programmes. The Local Authority, once the comprehensive spending review outcomes are announced will also be considering how such programmes can be funded in the future.

Supplementary Question:

Cllr Getgood commented that E2E was an important phase of youth service work and asked the Portfolio Holder about the prospects for keeping the service.

Reply:

Councillor Noad responded that until it was clear what would be funded by the Young Persons Learning Agency it would be impossible to say whether the service could continue as a result of the other cuts that were being implemented across Children and Young Peoples Services.

Do you know why Kelsey Park Sports College was included in the Secretary of State for Education's list of BSF projects that would not be proceeding?

Reply:

Under the previous Government's BSF programme the Local Authority submitted in 2008 a bid for capital funding to support schemes to improve the capacity, suitability and condition of its secondary school building stock. This bid featured schemes for 16 schools, grouped into 3 phased projects. We were advised in March 2009 that Bromley had received approval in principle to the first project; this featured 6 schools – Kelsey Park, Cator Park, Kemnal Technology College, The Ravensbourne and The Priory in partnership with Burwood Special School.

Bromley was to receive BSF funding in 2011/12 to address these schemes. The announcement over the last two weeks by the new Secretary of State for Education regarding cuts to the BSF programme, including Bromley, is in relation to the BSF bid of which Kelsey Park features as one of the schemes which would not proceed.

Supplementary Question:

Cllr Getgood stated that the way the news had come out emphasised the chaotic and rushed way that the new Secretary of State was working. Cllr Getgood asked the Portfolio Holder what representations had been made to the Secretary of State.

Reply:

Cllr Noad agreed that it was regrettable that the announcement had been made. But Cllr Noad highlighted that the Secretary of State had corrected himself and apologised. The Portfolio Holder assured Cllr Getgood that the Department would continue to campaign vigorously and would hopefully receive more information in the future.

Question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from Ms Fiona Murphy

1) Why, when both Ed Balls the Labour Education Minister and Michael Gove the new Conservative Education Minister were urging Bromley Council to let Harris Academies turn Kelsey into a mixed Harris Academy from September 2010 would Bromley not agree to this?

Reply

I am aware that you have been in correspondence with the Local Authority regarding the possibility of Kelsey Park Sports College becoming an Academy within the Harris group of academies, and have received responses to the questions you have posed regarding the role and actions of the Local Authority. I would like to take this opportunity to ensure that the facts are publicly known.

Kelsey Park Sports College is a Foundation School and currently enjoys many of the freedoms of an Academy: it is its own admission authority, is the trustee of the land and it is the "employer" of its staff. Any proposal to establish a co-educational academy under the current regulations for changes to school organisation would require a decision of the school's Governing Body as the responsible authority. The Local Authority has no powers to direct the school to become an academy, however, we have worked with the Head Teacher and Governors to secure a trajectory of improvement in achievement of the students.

I can reassure you that the Local Authority has been working in partnership with the Head Teacher and Governing Body of Kelsey Park to pursue academy status. It was only with the previous Prime Minister's announcement of the National Challenge Initiative in Autumn 2008 that Kelsey Park Sports College was identified as a school which could potentially be considered to transfer to academy status. Also in Autumn 2008 the Mayor of London announced his plans to establish a network of 10 academies across

London. As the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People I wrote to the Mayor of London outlining a proposal to explore with him the establishment of an academy in Bromley.

In parallel, the Director (Children and Young People) advised the Office of the Schools' Commissioner of our intention to pursue a potential academy for Kelsey Park Sports College. This work started in early 2009 and continued throughout the Summer and Autumn through a series of meetings with officials from the former Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), Elected Members and Local Authority senior officers. Bromley's priority is to secure a transition to academy status in which Kelsey Park can retain its local accountability and sit within the framework of Bromley Schools.

The process of application for Academy Status involved determining a specification for potential sponsors and seeking a suitable sponsor through a "sponsor competition". It was the role of the Office of the Schools' Commissioner to identify potential sponsors in partnership with the Local Authority. This it failed to do adequately – it was the Local Authority who approached the sponsors, a total of five, with two being interviewed in the Autumn 2009 – Harris Academies Trust and the London Development Agency on behalf of the Mayor of London with its educational partner the Academies Enterprise Trust. Bromley's preferred option in meeting the needs of young people in the Borough as a whole was to work with the Mayor of London as part of his plans to sponsor 10 London academies.

Our submission in March 2010 to the former DCSF, for ministerial consideration, identified the Academy Enterprise Trust (AET) in partnership with the London Development Agency (LDA) on behalf of the Mayor of London as the preferred sponsor partnership to support Kelsey's transition to academy status. These agencies have worked with the London Borough of Enfield during 2009/10 to establish two, highly successful, transition academies. It was Ed Balls as the Secretary of State in April 2010 who decided not to progress our application indicating we would have to apply again under new arrangements planned to be introduced. We await the new Government's guidance.

At no point did Ed Balls, Secretary of State for Children's Services urge or instruct the Local Authority to work with the Harris Academies Trust. The leader of the Council received a letter from Michael Gove when he was Shadow Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families stating his interest in support of Kelsey Park becoming an academy and also his knowledge of Lord Harris's interest in seeing Kelsey Park as part of the Harris Academy Foundation. We also received a letter from Lord Harris expressing interest in the potential of Kelsey Park becoming an academy with the Trust as a potential sponsor. In both instances, we confirmed that we were working with the DCSF Office of the Schools' Commissioner, we wished to develop a co-sponsor arrangement with partnership of the Local Authority, the School Governing Body and an academies sponsor with the London Development Agency. We have received no further communications from Ed Balls, Michael Gove or Lord Harris.

On your question of Kelsey becoming a 'mixed' school, ie co-educational. The Local Authority undertakes a regular review of school places and organisation; at the time of the last review in 2007 it was concluded that there are sufficient pupil places in the Beckenham and related areas and no case

for a new secondary school. However, Members and officers are scheduled to undertake a fresh review across primary and secondary schools in autumn 2010 as part of our 3-year planning cycle.

Supplementary Question:

Ms Murphy asked the Portfolio Holder to clarify his comments regarding Foundation Status.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that Local Authorities could only impose academy status on schools that were considered to be failing and Kelsey was not a failing school.

2) As a direct consequence of Bromley's refusal Kelsey have just lost £25m funding. You continue to favour an unknown combination of Academy provider with no local track record over Harris who have turned failing schools round in every borough surrounding Bromley, will you reconsider?

Reply:

With respect to your second question. The highlighting of Kelsey Park Sports College in recent announcement of the Secretary of State for Education on the future of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme was an error. This has been pointed out to the DfE by Bromley's Director, and should be corrected in future announcements. During our discussion with the Department for Children, Schools and Families on the future of Kelsey Park Sports College we were informed that an academy submission in itself would not give rise to a capital grant – it would need to be identified as part of the Local Authority BSF bid for capital for all schools in the borough

*Under the previous Government's BSF programme the Local Authority submitted in 2008 a bid for capital funding to support schemes to improve the capacity, suitability and condition of its secondary school building stock. This bid featured schemes for 16 schools, grouped into 3 phased projects. We were advised in March 2009 that Bromley had received approval in principle to the first project; this featured 6 schools – Kelsey Park, Cator Park, Kemnal Technology College, The Ravensbourne and The Priory in partnership with Burwood Special School. Bromley was to receive BSF funding in 2011/12 to address these schemes. The announcement over the last two weeks by the new Secretary of State for Education regarding cuts to the BSF programme, including Bromley, is in relation to the BSF bid and **not** to the academy submission which featured Kelsey.*

Supplementary Question

Ms Murphy reported that she had thought that Kelsey had been put in an Ofsted Category with notice to improve and asked the Portfolio Holder to provide further clarification.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder reported that Kelsey had been the subject of a second monitoring inspection and progress had been deemed satisfactory.

Oral Question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from Brian James:

Bromley Family Link Trustees have recently seen their work for children with disabilities diminish through the LBB commissioning process based mainly on cost. Does the Portfolio Holder have a view on the effect this has had on choice for children and the implication for other voluntary sector organisations who have now seen a charity's employees, and all associated costs, transfer into the public sector?

Reply

Commissioning within London Borough of Bromley has to operate within the Council's procurement procedures which are in place to ensure compliance with United Kingdom and European Union procurement law and secure value for money. With contracts which will exceed £50,000 in value the expectation is that there should be a fully open and competitive tendering process, with tender evaluation procedures that take into account both cost, quality and other relevant factors – in this case, the tender panel evaluating the bids included the independent chair of Parent Voice, representing parents of disabled children.

In evaluating bids, a number of factors were considered such as the experience of providing the required services, the accommodation and resources to be used, the ratio of staff to children and the training to be provided. It was considered that the award of the service to Riverside School would result in a great deal more provision for children with disabilities of all needs and age groups and generically offer greater choice than was previously the case

It is not considered that there are significant implications for other Voluntary Sector organisations in Bromley as a result of the outcome of this tendering process. Similar procurement requirements have been in place for several years and there is no evidence to suggest that this has disadvantaged the Voluntary Sector in Bromley in any consistent or identifiable way. Assessment of the information on Children and Young People (CYP) contracts in 2009/10 and 2010/2011 to date show that there has been virtually no change in either the volume of Voluntary Sector contracts or the proportion of annual contracted expenditure that is with the Voluntary Sector.

Supplementary Question:

Mr James commented that the ease of commissioning one provider for the authority to monitor and contact rather than a partnership or consortium of providers seems to have resulted in young people being at school for six days a week and up to 50 weeks a year. This had also resulted in significant costs, such as potential redundancy under TUPE, transferring from the voluntary sector to the public sector. Mr James asked whether the Portfolio Holder supported this restriction of choice for families of children with complex needs.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that he did not have sufficient information to answer the question and would provide a fuller response outside the meeting.

**Written question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from
Councillor Nicholas Bennett**

If he will reproduce the information he provided at the full council meeting on June 28th in response to my written question on the cost per pupil at each of the Borough's primary schools with the following information, in table format, for each school;

Overall finding of last Ofsted Report
Number of pupils in the school
Number of pupils from out of Borough
Date of oldest school building on site

Reply

School	Amount per pupil £	Ofsted Category	Pupil Numbers	Out of Borough Pupils	Date of oldest building
Pratts Bottom Primary School	5990	Good with outstanding	59	11	1885
Dorset Road Infant School	5294	Good with outstanding	62	18	1893
Cudham Church of England Primary School	5273	Good	68	12	1851
Midfield Primary School	5266	Satisfactory	178	5	1953
Poverest Primary School	5211	Satisfactory	183	1	1952
Churchfields Primary School	5150	Good	216	13	1989
Manor Oak Primary School	5063	Good	160	1	1958
Chelsfield Primary School	4579	Good	88	9	1892
James Dixon Primary School	4429	Good with outstanding	266	23	1955
Princes Plain Primary School	4288	Outstanding	334	16	1934
Downe Primary School	4239	Good with outstanding	78	4	1906
Alexandra Infant School	4074	Good	178	11	1929
St Mary Cray Primary School	4041	Special Measures	126	2	1909
St Paul's Cray Church of England Primary School	4007	Good	184	1	1935
Mead Road Infant School	3943	Outstanding	84	5	1886

School	Amount per pupil £	Ofsted Category	Pupil Numbers	Out of Borough Pupils	Date of oldest building
Blenheim Primary School and Nursery	3923	Satisfactory	149	1	1965
Mottingham Primary School	3907	Note to improve	248	62	1938
Burnt Ash Primary School	3871	Good	428	185	1927
Hawes Down Infant School	3840	Good with outstanding	179	17	1931
Malcolm Primary School	3828	Satisfactory	206	16	1953
Castlecombe Primary School	3788	Good with outstanding	201	21	1995
Darrick Wood Infant School	3734	Outstanding	268	0	1968
Hillside Primary School	3720	Special Measures	352	9	1957
Leesons Primary School	3688	Satisfactory	204	0	1954
Raglan Primary School	3683	Good with outstanding	415	4	1891
Green Street Green Primary School	3670	Outstanding	407	8	1851
Hawes Down Junior School	3621	Good with outstanding	233	12	1965
Royston Primary School	3411	Satisfactory	367	17	1949
Tubbenden Primary School	3380	Good	587	5	1958
Unicorn Primary School	3367	Good with outstanding	220	2	2004
St Anthony's Roman Catholic Primary School	3354	Satisfactory	213	22	1890
Darrick Wood Junior School	3320	Satisfactory	359	4	1963
Crofton Infant School	3259	Good	538	2	1950
Worsley Bridge Junior School	3134	Note to improve	207	43	1954
Keston Church of England Primary School	3123	Outstanding	220	11	1971

School	Amount per pupil £	Ofsted Category	Pupil Numbers	Out of Borough Pupils	Date of oldest building
Bromley Road Infant School	3108	Satisfactory	249	44	1853
St John's Church of England Primary School	3092	Satisfactory	300	27	1978
Clare House Primary School	3080	Satisfactory	210	0	1975
Gray's Farm Primary School	3073	Satisfactory	379	10	1953
St Philomena's Roman Catholic Primary School	3071	Good	217	4	1939
St James Roman Catholic Primary School	3058	Outstanding	215	0	1970
Edgebury Primary School	3054	Outstanding	224	25	1955
Farnborough Primary School	3050	Good	211	1	1990
St Peter and St Paul Catholic Primary School	3044	Good with outstanding	210	8	1970
Bickley Primary School	3036	Good with outstanding	269	2	1945
Southborough Primary School	3033	Satisfactory	414	6	1952
Alexandra Junior School	3017	Satisfactory	223	17	1951
Parish Church of England Primary School	3013	Good	429	25	1779
St George's, Bickley, Church of England Primary School	2988	Satisfactory	291	16	1955
Holy Innocents Catholic Primary School	2985	Good	211	5	1950
Red Hill Primary School	2967	Satisfactory	598	133	1951
Stewart Fleming Primary School	2960	Good	303	27	1939
The Highway Primary School	2949	Good	203	0	1951
Valley Primary School	2940	Outstanding	420	30	1880
Oaklands Primary School	2932	no OFSTED judgement	365	53	1967
Biggin Hill Primary School	2907	Satisfactory	431	52	1967

School	Amount per pupil £	Ofsted Category	Pupil Numbers	Out of Borough Pupils	Date of oldest building
Marian Vian Primary School	2869	Outstanding	616	55	1931
Perry Hall Primary School	2859	Good	416	8	1967
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	2857	Note to improve	213	17	1880
Pickhurst Infant School	2828	Outstanding	358	25	1953
Chislehurst (St Nicholas) Church of England Aided Primary School	2822	Good with outstanding	218	11	1868
St Mark's Church of England Primary School	2821	Good with outstanding	430	4	1939
Wickham Common Primary School	2819	Good	432	17	1936
Scotts Park Primary School	2806	Good with outstanding	393	6	1971
Pickhurst Junior School	2801	Good	458	23	1953
St Vincent's Catholic Primary School	2762	Outstanding	225	94	1953
Highfield Infants' School	2761	Outstanding	271	0	1972
Balgowan Primary School	2757	Good	648	10	1930
Crofton Junior School	2748	Good with outstanding	707	11	1936
Oak Lodge Primary School	2714	Good with outstanding	674	130	1955
Warren Road Primary School	2713	Outstanding	845	9	1938
St Mary's Catholic Primary School, Beckenham	2649	Good with outstanding	431	37	1965
Hayes Primary School	2644	Good with outstanding	631	7	1935
Highfield Junior School	2568	Outstanding	380	4	1959

**Written question to Portfolio Holder at CYP PDS 20th July from
Councillor John Getgood**

Please will you provide a list, by school, of capital investments in Bromley Secondary Schools, other than those using per-capita devolved capital budgets, over the last ten years and those that are confirmed for future implementation? Please indicate how they have been or will be funded.

Response

The information in the attached spreadsheet identifies the capital schemes in secondary schools. This information has been collated from the Council's published capital programme and does not include devolved capital to schools, or any specialist schools' status funding and schemes from the council-wide Planned Maintenance Budget.

Approved Secondary School Capital Programme for Children's Services Department

<u>Financial Year Start / End of Project</u>	<u>Capital Scheme /Projects/Schools</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Funding Streams</u>
		£'000	
2000/01	Cator Park Heating & Insulation	110	Capital Receipts
2000/02	Urgent provision at Various Schools	45	Emergency fund to cover demand for school places. Subject to appraisal
2000/09	Expansion of Sec Sch Provision - Bishop Justus	36,600	£4m capital receipts balance from Government grant
2000/01	Cator Park Science lab	645	Capital receipts
2001/07	Kelsey Park School - Consolidation	1,604	DFES Grant £93k; capital receipts
2001/04	The Priory School - Expansion by 1 FE	2,207	Capital receipts
2002/03	Charles Darwin School - Dining Facilities	105	100% New Deals funding
2003/04	Science Labs for 21st Century	298	100% DFES Grant
2003/05	Temporary secondary school accommodation	608	Revenue Contribution £100k, Capital receipts
2003/04	Langley Park Boys -Autistic Spectrum Disorder Provision	233	100% New Deals funding
2005/07	Cator Park Girls School - Suitability issues	535	Capital Receipts
2005/07	Langley Park School for Boys- new mobile classrooms	85	Capital Receipts
2005/08	Post 16 Capital (various schools)	3,575	Fully funded from school revenue budget
2005 / ongoing	Post 16 Infrastructure provision (various schools)	4,759	Funded by additional £8.6m standard fund grant
2006/07	Darrick Wood Specialist - College Status	100	100% Govt grant
2006/10	Coopers Technology /Marjorie McClure School- Car park expansion	130	Capital receipts plus £28k from schools
2006/10	Langley Park School for Boys	35,800	BSF One School Pathfinder - 100% Govt grant
2006/10	Langley Park School for Boys - enhanced performance space	2,006	Capital receipts
2009/13	Secondary School Investment Strategy		
	Newstead Wood	2,500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Darrick Wood	1,700	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Hayes General	1,000	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Hayes SpaLD	500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Riverside Orpington	500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Ravens Wood	2,500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	St Olave's	500	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Bullers Wood (Lower amount approved in principle only)	1,700	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Langley Park Girls (Lower amount approved in principle only)	2,000	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
	Contingency	520	Funded by DSG, Section 106 and Govt Grant
		<u>102,865</u>	