



**ROCHDALE**  
METROPOLITAN BOROUGH  
**COUNCIL**

## REPORT FOR DECISION

Agenda item no:

**The Cabinet: 29 January 2007**

**Report of the Head of Schools Service**

---

### **Building Schools for the Future (BSF)**

#### **A new pattern of provision 11-19**

---

Wards affected: All wards

Report author: John Bollington

Telephone: (01706) 925049

---

**This report informs Cabinet of the outcome of initial consultations on a new pattern of organisational provision for pupils aged 11-19 to be funded through the Government's BSF Programme and the Learning and Skills Council (LSC). The report also confirms Rochdale's prioritisation as a Wave 4 Authority to receive funding through the BSF Programme**

---

**1. It is recommended that the Cabinet:**

- 1.1 Welcome the decision of the Department for Education and Skills (DFES) to prioritise Rochdale in Wave 4 of the BSF programme.
- 1.2 Consider the comments received during the informal consultations with stakeholders during the Autumn Term 2006.
- 1.3 Confirm plans to move forward on a model comprising 12 mainstream secondary schools (a reduction of 2) and the closure of the Rochdale and Pennines Townships School-based sixth forms.
- 1.4 Initiate further consultations listening to views on :
  - proposals to site the replacement school for the St Joseph's RC High School (Holy Family RC and CE College) on the site of the Heywood Community School and to discuss admission arrangements to this new school
  - the choice of site for the school to replace the Balderstone and Springhill High Schools with a remodelled school, probably with Trust status,
  - the planned admission numbers for the Hollingworth Business and Enterprise College and Wardle High schools.
- 1.5 Decide whether any further changes are required to the proposals outlined in Appendix A of this report, taking account of the views expressed (see sections 6-10 below).
- 1.6 Agree to the establishment of a project board (see Section 14) and project team to co-ordinate the development of our BSF Strategy for Change and to oversee procurement.
- 1.7 Agree an initial procurement strategy (with delegated powers) to allow the project to move forward (see section 11).

- 1.8 Agree an initial budget of £100,000 for procurement support in 2006/7 to support the development of the Strategy for Change and to start to carry out surveys and feasibility studies in respect of plans for each site.
- 1.9 Approach Salford RC and Manchester CE Dioceses regarding Diocesan contributions to procurement costs.
- 1.10 Recognise the expectation that the Council needs to establish a Local Education Partnership (LEP), a joint venture company to manage local delivery of the BSF programme (see section 11.3).

## **2 Reasons for the recommendations:**

- 2.1 Building Schools for the Future (BSF) is a major Government Investment Programme to transform secondary education standards by providing 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning environments. This is a massive opportunity for the Authority to invest in its secondary schools. DFES announced on 15<sup>th</sup> December that Rochdale MBC had been prioritised as a Wave 4 Authority. This will allow the Authority to transform secondary teaching and learning, and therefore contribute to improving educational standards.
- 2.2 Alongside BSF we have been in dialogue with LSC to secure a transformation of post 16 provision. Although this is the subject of a separate report the proposals are complementary and linked, as are those for the Academy in Middleton.

## **3 Alternatives considered:**

- 3.1 Before Cabinet agreed to consult all stakeholders in Autumn 2006 different options had been considered. These had to take account of a range of factors e.g. the projected number of pupils and overall number of schools required by 2016, the condition and suitability of buildings, the need to provide a breadth of provision with different types of schools and specialisms across the Borough, the need to secure excellent teaching and learning in every school, the future of post-16 provision and whether that is school-based, or a different form of provision.
- 3.2 The consultation process itself introduced a number of alternative suggestions and these are dealt with in Section 6 of this report.

## **4 Consultation Process:**

- 4.1 Proposals considered by Cabinet on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2006 were put forward after informal discussions with secondary headteachers, the Learning and Skills Council, Roman Catholic and Church of England Dioceses, party leaders and spokespersons.
- 4.2 Since September there have been over 70 consultation meetings, listening to secondary school pupils, parents, staff and governors, township committees, primary parents, teacher associations/unions, dioceses, LSC, neighbouring authorities, New Heart for Heywood, Governors Forum and the Pride Partnership Board.
- 4.3 Full details of the comments made at all these meetings, via the website and through questionnaires are held within the Schools Service and packs have been provided in the Members' Rooms for each political party.
- 4.4 With such a major reorganisation it is difficult to secure a complete consensus of support for the full package of proposals. However the positive message that came through the consultation was that there was a high level of support for BSF investment and recognition that change was inevitable.
- 4.5 There have been campaigns coordinated by Springhill and Heywood Community Schools to keep their schools open. To a lesser extent there has been opposition to

the closure of school-based sixth forms particularly from staff groups. This was tempered with recognition that a new sixth form centre for Rochdale could offer greater opportunities for pupils and could result in existing school-based sixth forms, which already have vacancies, becoming unviable. Further concerns were expressed about plans to increase the admission number of Oulder Hill Community School if its sixth form were to close and the number of places planned for Rochdale Township. In Middleton and Heywood there were some concerns about the future viability of the Queen Elizabeth School and over-provision of post-16 places in Middleton. In Pennines the planned admission number for Hollingworth Business and Enterprise College was a concern to that school.

4.6 The issues outlined above are dealt with in more detail in sections 6-10 below.

## **5 Background:**

5.1 Rochdale has now received its BSF Wave 4 allocation from the DFES which is excellent news. The Government have, through a competitive process, prioritised 15 bids. Wave 4 will allow construction to commence from 2009/10 with a development programme of around five years. Before then a significant procurement and schools reorganisation process will need to be coordinated through the Schools Service with support from various services across the Council, Impact Partnership, outside consultants, DFES and Partnerships for Schools (an organisation established by Government to oversee the delivery of the nation-wide BSF programme).

5.2 The BSF programme should secure very substantial resources over a period of 5-6 years. Members are already aware that these resources will not be sufficient to replace all secondary schools. The mix promoted by DFES is 50% new build, 35% refurbishment/remodelling, and 15% minor works. Now that we have received our Wave allocation we need to agree our transformational vision and intensively review the condition and suitability of our schools to determine the exact scope of works by site. This will allow us to confirm both the scope and affordability of our project. This needs to be done over the next eight months.

5.3 The Government expects that local authorities will address any issues of surplus places/changing demand as part of BSF. In Rochdale the overall number of secondary places required will continue to fall over the next few years and it is necessary to reduce surplus capacity. GCSE performance, although improving, remains below the national average and BSF affords the opportunity to transform teaching and learning. Headteachers and other key school stakeholders have been invited to work with the National College for School Leadership over the next three months to develop our vision for transforming learning.

5.4 Within Rochdale's planned programme, individual schemes have to be prioritised in terms of deliverability and each phase has a mix of new build, refurbishment/remodelling and refresh works. The work will need to be packaged so that there is the capacity to deliver the project within planned timescales. We will be guided by Partnerships for Schools on our planned programme, taking account of issues which have arisen in other Authorities managing large BSF procurements. The earliest any BSF development could commence would be September 2009, with any new build scheme not being completed until early 2011 (Phase 1). Phase 2 would be at least 12-24 months behind (2011/12) and Phase 3 12 months later (earliest opening 2013/14).

5.5 Members need to be aware that all-new schools provided through the BSF programme will be funded through the Private Finance Initiative whilst remodelled schools will be funded by conventional capital grant (not PFI). Academies are

delivered more traditionally through design and build contracts and will not be PFI schools.

- 5.6 One of the Teacher Associations took the view that through the published information it had not been possible to determine a sound rationale for school based sixth form provision in the Middleton Township compared with plans for the rest of the Borough. They were also concerned about the long-term impact on education in the Borough with regard to future demographics, PFI contracts and schools operating outside Authority control. Post-16 plans are covered in a separate report. Demographics will be fully tested by the Government over the next few months. Diversity, choice and access are central to the delivery of the Government's BSF objectives.
- 5.7 We have taken advice from Knowsley, a first wave BSF Authority. Their view is that this is the biggest single project in their 30+ year history (corporately, not just education). All political parties need to be committed to the BSF programme. It will affect all wards. The plans being developed will secure at least one new secondary school in each Township and significant investment in other school facilities. BSF should also facilitate more extended use of schools. It is not only about the education of children and young people – there is the opportunity to transform adult skills and attitudes to learning. Party Leaders agreed an all-party approach was necessary at their meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> July. The Portfolio Holder and opposition party spokespersons endorsed this when they met on 21<sup>st</sup> July, and reaffirmed this at their informal meeting on 18 December. Such informal meetings will continue. A further report covering increased member engagement will be brought to the March Cabinet.

## **6 Outcome of Informal Consultation process**

- 6.1 Rochdale's specific proposals for change which were used as the basis for discussions with stakeholders have been developed to address the demographic need for places across the town, reducing the overall number of 11-16 places by 1565 places overall (compared with published admission numbers). It is not planned to remove 2000 surplus places (our early plans) as it is anticipated that pupil numbers will grow slightly from 2013.
- 6.2 The proposals focus on choice and diversity, particularly targeting changes at schools where demand is falling.
- 6.3 Details of existing and proposed secondary provision are shown in Appendix A.

## **7 Heywood Township**

- 7.1 In Heywood the BSF proposals envisage an overall reduction from three to two secondary schools with the closure of Heywood Community School in the third phase of the BSF process. There are marked reductions in primary pupil numbers in Heywood and primary schools have just reorganised. The plans reduce overall provision in Heywood by 750 places, which will require, over time, a much higher proportion of pupils at Siddall Moor being Heywood pupils rather than pupils resident in Middleton. This shift will take place over time and it is not the Council's intention to move pupils from Middleton out of Heywood schools midway through their secondary education. The planned opening of an Academy on the Queen Elizabeth site from September 2007 will support this transition.
- 7.2 There was significant opposition to the proposal to close Heywood Community School from stakeholders at this school. There was a determination to retain some secondary provision on the Darnhill estate and a preference for a community school. Comments included, "more children will have to travel across Heywood for their education", "the hairdressing course is very popular", "Larger schools can't provide the level of support offered by Heywood Community School", "the school

was improving - why close it?" Stakeholders felt Heywood Community was more popular than Siddal Moor (not accurate, based on first preference admission data) and was being closed to save Queen Elizabeth. This is also not accurate. Current and projected numbers for Heywood Township do not support the retention of three schools.

- 7.3 Siddal Moor supported the remodelling plans for their school (evidenced by a parental survey, which shows over 66% of those responding in favour). St Joseph's RC supported the replacement of their school and plans to increase their admission number which assumed the admission of more non-faith pupils. There is no firm commitment as to site but it is the view of the Authority that the former Heywood Community School site offers the best way forward as it is a larger and much more accessible site for a new school, and maintains secondary provision on both sides of the Township. A more detailed option appraisal of the sites is necessary as well as further consultation with the Dioceses and the School.
- 7.4 During the consultation period the Acting Headteacher of Heywood Community School submitted a counter-proposal to amalgamate Heywood Community and Siddal Moor in a new school on the Heywood Community site and to transfer St Joseph's RC School into a remodelled Siddal Moor building. This proposal has not received support from the other schools.
- 7.5 Managing any transition is always very important, so that the education of students is not disrupted, standards are maintained and that the concerns and issues raised by parents, staff and Governors are recognised and dealt with. Clearly if the proposals for Heywood are accepted there will be a need for greater collaboration between the secondary schools, building on existing relationships, potentially leading to joint planning and possible soft federation before the changes take place. As the plans are developed these issues will be identified and addressed.
- 7.6 It is the Authority's view that the original proposals for Heywood are sound, subject to a refined proposal to rebuild St Joseph's RC High School (which will become Holy Family RC and CE College in September 2007) on the site of Heywood Community School and that consultations take place with the Manchester and Salford Dioceses and School accordingly together with a review of the admission policies for this new school.**
- 7.7 With regard to post-16, stakeholders were disappointed that there is no specific provision proposed for Heywood. Given the overall numbers of pupils in the Township requiring post-16 provision it is difficult to support the creation of a post-16 centre. The planned Centre for Rochdale would offer Heywood pupils significant opportunities. There was some support for the new post-16 centre in Rochdale with some linked Support Unit in Heywood (with opportunities for remote learning) but it is acknowledged that significant improvements in transport would be required to encourage Heywood pupils to travel to the new Centre. Officers have also visited Oldham Sixth Form College, which runs a successful partnership scheme with local schools. This promotes an easy transition from secondary to post-16: a progression which many students come to view as inevitable and obvious.

## **8 Middleton Township**

- 8.1 The BSF proposals take account of the significant reductions in primary pupil numbers in Middleton. The stakeholders at Middleton Technology School fully supported the BSF plans to remodel their school as did the stakeholders at Cardinal Langley RC High School.

- 8.2 There were some concerns expressed by the above schools and the Heywood Schools about the viability of the Academy planned to replace the Queen Elizabeth High School. Whilst it is expected that the Academy will have a CE faith ethos there was some scepticism that the School would attract pupils that have for some time sought their CE secondary education in neighbouring Oldham. Cabinet, in a separate report on the agenda, is being asked to approve plans for an Academy on the Queen Elizabeth site. This school is the one attracting least pupils and a decision needs to be taken as to the admission number. **It is proposed that this should be 150 per year (removing 300 places in Middleton).**
- 8.3 Meetings at the Queen Elizabeth School focused on the change in governance arrangements as well as the plans for the school to move outside the Local Authority (LA) family of schools. More information is provided in the separate report produced about the Academy plans.
- 8.4 There was general support for the collaborative plans for post-16 provision across all Middleton providers. The November 2006 decision of LSC to support a 350 place post-16 centre at Middleton Technology School makes less likely the plans for substantial post-16 provision in the Academy and this is covered in more detail in the Academy report.
- 8.5 Should the Academy not proceed following feasibility, then alternative proposals would need to be considered by the Authority, involving the expansion of other schools.

## **9 Pennines Township**

- 9.1 The BSF proposals envisage the replacement of Hollingworth Business and Enterprise College with a new build and the remodelling of Wardle High School. Stakeholders from both schools supported plans for investment through BSF. However there were some specific issues, which need to be reviewed.
- 9.2 Hollingworth are concerned that the Planned Admission Number (PAN) of 210 could lead to redundancies and did not recognize the popularity of the school whereby the school had consistently admitted between 230 and 240 pupils for the last few years. They did not agree that their success in attracting pupils was as a consequence of the reduction in popularity of Wardle High School. We understand the concerns expressed by Hollingworth. Whilst the school's admission number has increased from 210 to 230 in 2006 the school is attracting pupils at record levels (262 applications for 2007). These representations therefore must be given serious consideration.
- 9.3 Wardle High School feel threatened by plans to replace Hollingworth with a new school when their refurbishment is scheduled for a later part of the BSF programme. The school is recovering from a poor Ofsted but is close to exiting from Special Measures. Admissions have fallen significantly over two years and demand for places in 2007 stands at 165. The school has, however, in the past been more popular than Hollingworth and, assuming plans to close the sixth form are agreed, the school can readily accommodate up to 240 pupils per year.
- 9.4 In recent years more Littleborough, Smithybridge and Wardle pupils have chosen Hollingworth. This poses an issue, which needs to be addressed. Do we revise the plans on which we have consulted and increase the size of Hollingworth by 150 pupils to better match its popularity or do we recognize that there are sufficient places across the Pennines by fully utilizing the Wardle High premises?
- 9.5 Wardle is making good progress in addressing Ofsted concerns and results are improving. Providing additional places at Hollingworth is likely to restrict Wardle's recovery in numbers and we would not maximize the use of the existing secondary

schools' infrastructure in the Township. Those schools in Rochdale Township which are closest to Hollingworth are likely to be opposed to greater investment in places at Hollingworth. Such a proposal would however create some capacity in the system between Rochdale and Pennines to cover any general pressure points in terms of place demand.

- 9.6 A final concern at Hollingworth raised through consultation relates to the ability to redevelop the site whilst keeping pupils in their existing buildings (a concern of Governors). Initial surveys are being undertaken but clearly a 1200 place school will create bigger demands of the site than a 1050 place school.
- 9.7 Whilst we recognise the current high demand for places at Hollingworth we are planning for the next 25 years. Hollingworth's catchment has expanded and doesn't necessarily match tradition. Wardle High School is well on the road to recovery and was the authority's most improved secondary school in 2006 (GCSE 5 A\*-C's). The long-term aim must be to provide two good quality local schools.
- 9.8 It is recommended that the Council invite stakeholders from both Hollingworth and Wardle to jointly review the options for the PANs prior to further consideration by Cabinet.**

## **10 Rochdale Township**

- 10.1 There are a range of issues, which Members need to review. The most popular Community schools are currently Oulder Hill, Falinge and Matthew Moss. The closure of Oulder Hill sixth form would allow additional pupils aged 11-16 to attend this school. Amalgamation of Springhill and Balderstone would see a redistribution of pupils across the Township as a whole (and would allow the net removal of around 490 places). In addition, RC Primary School numbers are falling which will allow a small reduction in the planned admission number at St Cuthbert's RC High School (removing 150 places). The proposals for Rochdale encourage the continued integration of pupils of different ethnic backgrounds and support our focus on community cohesion.
- 10.2 There was general support from all schools for BSF investment.
- 10.3 In terms of specific issues, Falinge Park fully supported the proposals for its replacement school. Brownhill fully supported the investment plans. Matthew Moss fully supported the refurbishment plans for their school but had two concerns, firstly that the school should receive an equitable share of the BSF grant to deal with the condition and suitability issues at the school, and secondly that the plans to increase Oulder Hill's 11-16 admission number would provide too many places in Rochdale Township and therefore threaten the future viability of the school.
- 10.4 At Oulder Hill there were some differences of opinion. The school staff and some pupils supported the retention of the sixth form, whereas the Governors were very clear that they supported the establishment of a sixth form centre in central Rochdale and an increase in the 11-16 admission number from 240 to 300. Only one in four pupils moves into the existing sixth form.
- 10.5 At St Cuthbert's RC High, whilst Governors supported plans for a major remodel of the school and a reduction in admission number, there was strong support for the retention of the sixth form. In 2006/7 around 126 pupils were attending the sixth form with about 30% of pupils staying on. Whilst the school achieved its best ever results in 2006 in the longer term the Authority believes that the provision for post 16 students would be best met through a sixth form centre. With regard to 11-16 provision stakeholders felt that the school was in very poor condition, preferred a rebuild, but as a minimum needed sufficient funds to transform the existing facilities.

- 10.6 This leaves Springhill and Balderstone. Springhill are opposed to the amalgamation plans and prefer the retention of both schools. Their main points are that Springhill is a successful school as evidenced by their recent Ofsted. However, a recent report from the government's National Strategy unit about Rochdale points out that there is one English department, one maths department and one science department achieving below the 50% mark in the borough at Key Stage Three. All three are at Springhill. The school serves a deprived community and with its smaller classes is able to give pupils the support they require (this cannot be sustained over a long period as funding is based on pupil numbers and as numbers fall the more difficult it is to manage the budget). They are concerned that standards will fall if the schools amalgamate. They report major rivalry between the two schools, which will complicate any amalgamation. They are concerned about the size of the planned school and nervous about the Council's pupil projections. They oppose the expansion of Oulder Hill and Wardle High 11-16 numbers and don't want to lose the Springhill site. They are opposed to the waste and loss of the new sports facilities (again this is misleading as there are no plans to close such facilities). They feel the proposals will undermine their Arts College status.
- 10.7 The Authority could not recommend the retention of both schools for a number of reasons. Educationally, larger schools can offer more effective curriculum provision particularly when taking account of planned curriculum changes e.g. the new 14-19 curriculum that includes specialised diplomas. Larger schools are clearly more cost effective as management and other overheads utilise a smaller proportion of the overall school budget. The two schools will continue to reduce in size (eventually challenging viability). The BSF funding allocation would need to be shared across more - 13 mainstream secondary schools rather than 12.
- 10.8 In contrast to Springhill, Balderstone Governors are not opposed to an amalgamation but feel their site is the best to be redeveloped. Balderstone attracts about 250+ pupils more than Springhill so more families would be affected by any transfer to the Springhill site. The Balderstone site is central to the catchment areas of both schools (this could be disputed). The school focuses on community cohesion and is already an extended school. Balderstone out-performs Springhill at both Key Stage 3 and 4 (from an Authority perspective we would say 'They have a significantly higher percentage of pupils achieving expected levels at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4). Governors recognised that larger schools can offer a much broader curriculum and that using BSF monies over a reduced number of schools will make best use of BSF resources.
- 10.9 Balderstone School had concerns about the potential shifts in catchments bearing in mind plans to increase admissions at Oulder Hill, concerns about the transitional process and finally the likelihood of becoming a Trust school. (Trust Schools are very similar to Foundation schools in that they manage their own assets, employ their own staff and set their own admission policy. Trust Schools are state funded in the same way as other maintained schools. They are expected to remain part of the LA 'family' of schools and are supported by a Charitable Trust, the members of which might include education charities, further or higher education institutions, business foundations or community groups, for example. A Trust might work with a single school, a group of local schools or a network of schools across the country.) Springhill has already shown interest in Trust status; Balderstone has close links with The Ogden Trust, an educational organisation. Some pupils and staff were opposed to the amalgamation particularly as a result of uncertainty and change that this would bring. Teacher Associations were opposed to the establishment of Trust Schools outside local authority strategic control. All stakeholders at Balderstone supported the development of a sixth form college in Rochdale.

- 10.10 The proposals for Rochdale Township do envisage some surplus capacity in 2016. Nevertheless the Balderstone/Springhill amalgamation is linked to an increase in the Oulder Hill admission number and potential shift in patterns across the area. Members will appreciate that some Balderstone and Springhill pupils live closer to Oulder Hill, Falinge Park and Matthew Moss and assuming the proposals are approved, that over time, catchment areas will change.
- 10.11 Members are recommended to agree to the original proposal to amalgamate the two schools and assuming this is agreed as the way forward, to consider the issues over which site should be chosen.**
- 10.11 From a buildings perspective, the buildings and facilities on the Springhill site with its new Sports Hall and Athletics Track are better than those on the Balderstone site. Furthermore the Springhill building was enhanced around 1990 when it was converted into an 11-16 school. At Balderstone the buildings are much older and remodelling costs will be more expensive.
- 10.12 In addition to the condition and suitability of the buildings and the impact of such on the cost of the remodelling, members will wish to take account of other factors. These will include location and accessibility, safety of access, disruption, size of site and development options, stakeholder views, as well as any additional extended services offered or able to be offered.
- 10.13 Springhill have accused the Council of wanting to secure the Springhill site for other uses. This is not the case. There are no plans to demolish the athletics track or Sports Hall. There is currently joint management of these facilities. If over time the new school is developed on the Balderstone site it would be necessary to ask the Leisure Trust to manage these facilities 24/7 rather than out of school hours. These are community facilities that will be retained as such.
- 10.14 On the above basis, further consultation will need to focus on these issues.**
- 10.15 A local resident proposed a different way forward for Balderstone/Springhill which was to use the Lowerplace site and land of the former St Joseph's Middle School, off Kingsway, for the new school, with Lowerplace moving into Springhill. This would require a completely new secondary school and the site is not as attractive as either of the existing Balderstone /Springhill sites.
- 10.16 Stakeholders of Brownhill School supported the planned investment in improved facilities for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties. Clearly this will involve a separate planning exercise, nevertheless, the plans need to be incorporated in, and delivered through, the BSF programme.

## **11 Procurement**

- 11.1 The next steps required of the Council are to prove our readiness to deliver by developing a Strategy for Change. This will involve the engagement of Impact Partnership and other advisers and the submission of reports and documentation to DFES and Partnerships for Schools.
- 11.2 Members are asked to agree the delegation of certain responsibilities in terms of procurement to others as shown in Appendix B.
- 11.3 BSF is likely to require a new procurement approach based on the setting up of a Local Education Partnership (LEP), a joint venture company with the public sector and private sector working together sharing certain risks and rewards. (LEPs are similar to the Health Service LIFT procurement vehicle and they are established to procure all the individual BSF contracts). Some general concerns have been expressed about the need for a LEP, recognising our existing partnering arrangements. Nevertheless it is the Government's preferred model and can only be challenged if different options offer better value for money. The LEP will comprise

the Private Sector Partner, the Authority and Partnerships for Schools (the national organisation set up to deal with this). The Authority is expected to have a 10% share in this company. Internal discussions are taking place to establish whether the establishment of a LEP offers best value for money.

- 11.4 Our strategic partner, Impact Partnership are keen to support the BSF programme and Mouchel Parkman are already heavily involved in the Liverpool BSF project, and working with our neighbours in Oldham, who have also been allocated BSF Wave 4. Discussions are underway as to how the Authority can best use the expertise that exists within and through the Partnership.
- 11.5 A major feature of BSF relates to the upgrading of ICT in schools. This is an area where we will need to use the further expertise afforded through the Impact Partnership and beyond.

## **12 Personnel Issues**

- 12.1 Like all reorganisations, major changes in provision do have personnel implications. We recognise that the Teacher Associations and Unions are opposed to PFI and the removal of schools from the LA system particularly where such proposals may compromise staff pay and conditions by removing them from the good auspice of the local authority and national framework. We plan to maintain an ongoing dialogue with Trade Unions and Teacher Associations in relation to BSF. The Council has a good track record in dealing with human resources issues, particularly in relation to TUPE, salary protection and staff reorganisation. The development of an Academy and potentially a Trust School will introduce new issues to be faced by the Authority and staff. There will continue to be full consultation with members and unions as we proceed. We will involve both Members of Council and Trade Unions in overseeing the BSF Programme.
- 12.2 As BSF is a five to seven year programme, the long procurement and construction time allows significant forward planning to take place to properly manage the transition process. This will involve temporary and already-established governing bodies, Headteachers and Headteachers-designate as well as pupils, and will build on lessons learned during the primary and special school reorganisations.

## **13 Consultation Programme**

- 13.1 Informal consultations on the proposals in this report have been ongoing since July 2006. The publication of this report updates members on the outcome of consultations with a wider range of invited stakeholders over the September to December 2006 period.
- 13.2 These can be summarised as follows:

Symposium of key stakeholders – Heads/Chairs, Head Boy/Girl from each secondary school, MPs, Lead Members, Township Chairs - 22nd September 2006  
Chairs of Governors – Secondary Schools – 13<sup>th</sup> Sept 2006  
Rochdale Association of Secondary Headteachers – ongoing  
School Governors – Autumn Term  
Teacher Associations/Trade Unions – September/October  
Parents/Prospective Parents – Sept/December  
Township Committees – November 2006  
Hopwood Hall College/LSC – Ongoing  
Rochdale Borough Independent Governors Forum  
The Pride Partnership Board  
New Heart for Heywood

## **14 Project Governance**

- 14.1 The Project Board will comprise:

- Roger Ellis, Chief Executive (Chair)
- Terry Piggott, Executive Director for Children, Schools and Families (Vice Chair & Project Owner)
- Margaret Carney, Executive Director (Resources)
- Catherine Witham, Head of Service, Legal
- Sue Brown, Head of Service, Schools
- Ann Tipton, Head of Service, Learners & Young People
- John Barber, Head of Service, Impact Partnership (Technical/ICT)
- Mike Cavanagh, School Transformation and Improvement
- John Bollington, BSF Project Director
- Secondary Headteacher (representing all the Headteachers affected by BSF)
- Phil Jones, 4Ps representative
- Peter Hodge, PFS Education and Planning Project Director
- [TBC], DFES representative
- [TBC], Learning and Skills Council representative
- Derek O'Toole, Principal, Hopwood Hall College

14.2 It is the view of DFES that there should be more member engagement in the Governance of the Building Schools for the Future Programme. This view is supported by the Project Board. Whilst there are already regular meetings between the Executive Director and party spokespeople on the Programme a separate report with detailed proposals on member engagement will be brought to the Cabinet on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2007. In view of the inter-relationship between the BSF Programme, the Academy Project and plans for a sixth form centre in Rochdale it is proposed that the governance arrangements should cover each of these streams of work.

## **15 Financial Implications**

15.1 The BSF indicative funding allocation notified to the Authority is under review and is expected to be around £152million (a corrected allocation, not the £163million recently announced). This resource cannot be used to cover initial procurement costs. Academies are separately funded and assuming the Academy proceeds we can expect another £20 million. A post-16 centre funded by LSC also attracts separate grant.

15.2 The cost of drafting the initial BSF bid in 2006/7 and engaging in a consultation programme was resourced from existing School Service Budgets. Now that Rochdale has been accepted into the Programme and to enable work to commence in 2006/7 it is recommended that £100,000, of existing School Service building maintenance revenue resource, is reserved for use on BSF preparations.

15.3 An increasing commitment will be required to support procurement in 2007/8 and it is planned that this be top sliced from the Secondary Schools modernisation programme. This will be the subject of Cabinet review in March 2007 following discussion at the Schools Forum.

15.4 The Authority needs the capacity to deliver the BSF programme in terms of staffing and resources. It must be prepared to fund the appointment of external advisers to secure the necessary expert support. This will be the Council's largest ever procurement and will need to be properly staffed and resourced. Each Authority in waves 1-3 has spent in the region of £2 million - £3 million to date. The Council will also need to invest 10% of the working capital of the LEP which will cost between £100,000 and £200,000 when this joint venture company is established. We are fortunate to have in-house specialist expertise in the team that is successfully delivering the Grouped Schools PFI (worth £57m) but the team will need to expand,

as will the input from other services across the Council. Recognising that some of the schools to be redeveloped are voluntary aided schools it is proposed that the Salford and Manchester Dioceses are approached to explore how they can contribute financially to procurement costs.

- 15.5 Regular reports will need to be brought to Cabinet to identify the likely BSF procurement costs/timescales, so that the necessary budget provision can be allocated.
- 15.6 All authorities within the BSF programme have found that their BSF allocation falls short of the cost of the works proposed. This is called the affordability gap. The Council and Schools will be required to bridge any such gap through land disposals (surplus school or other sites), prudential borrowing, reallocation of resources or increasing the Council's contribution to the service. Clearly the scope of the Council commitment will be determined by the overall scope of works and negotiations with the Private Sector partner. DfES will, however, expect Authorities as a minimum to contribute to the programme any proceeds from the disposal of surplus secondary school sites.

## **16 Summary**

- 16.1 We have already made outstanding progress in primary education and our new special schools will be the best in the land. BSF offers a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to transform secondary education in Rochdale. We are in a unique position where we can also reorganise post-16 provision at the same time (currently our weakest link). It is imperative that we take this opportunity to secure the resources to transform educational provision and achievement, which underpin all the Council's other key objectives.

For further information and background papers relating to this report please contact John Bollington, Senior Schools Development Officer, Schools Service, Municipal Offices, Smith Street, Rochdale OL16 1YD. Telephone (01706) 925049.

**SUSAN J. BROWN**  
**Head of Schools Service**

**Appendix A**

Township	School	Age Range (PAN)	Proposal	Age range	Proposed Published Admin numbers	Phase	Latest Proposal
Pennines	Hollingworth Business and Enterprise College	11-16 (230) Revised 2006	New Build on existing site	11-16	210	One	Admission Number under review
Pennines	Wardle	11-18 (240) Revised 2006	Refurbish	11-16	240	Three	Admission Number under review
Middleton	Queen Elizabeth School	11-16 (210)	New Academy	11-18(includes collaborative post 16 provision)	150 + post 16	Located within wider Academy programme	Proposed admission number 150
Middleton	Middleton Technology	11-16 (210)	Major refurbishment/remodel	11-18 (includes collaborative post 16 provision)	210 + post 16	One	Unchanged
Middleton	Cardinal Langley RC	11-18 (180)	Refurbish	11-18 (includes collaborative post 16 provision)	180	One	Unchanged
Heywood	Heywood Community	11-16 (180)	Close, with changes in catchment/flows across Heywood and north Middleton		0	Three	Unchanged
Heywood	Siddal Moor	11-16 (210)	Refurbish	11-16	210	Two	Unchanged
Heywood	St Josephs RC / C of E	11-16 (120)	Explore new build on different site	11-16	150	Three	Propose rebuild on Heywood Community Site
Rochdale	Oulder Hill	11-18 (240)	Restricted BSF Investment	Under review	300	N/A	Unchanged
Rochdale	Matthew Moss	11-16 (180)	Refurbishment	11-16	180	One	Unchanged
Rochdale	Falinge Park	11-16 (240)	New Build on existing site	11-16	240	Two	Unchanged
Rochdale	Springhill	11-16 (180)	Amalgamate with Balderstone (Major remodelling on one site)	11-16	240(across Springhill/B'stone)	Three	Proposed site – Under review
Rochdale	Balderstone	11-16 (240)	Amalgamate with Springhill (major remodelling on one site)	11-16	240 (across Balderstone/Sp'hill)	Three	Proposed site- Under review
Rochdale	St Cuthbert's	11-18 (270)	Refurbishment/Remodelling	11-16	240	Three	Unchanged
Rochdale	Brownhill	11-16	Remodel with support units in all new build schools to accommodate some existing pupils	11-16	Not applicable	Two	Unchanged
Rochdale / Heywood	Pupil Referral Units Saxon Hall / Darnhill	11-16	Refurbish/Remodelling as required	11-16	Not applicable	Two	Unchanged

## **Appendix B**

### **Delegated responsibilities – Building Schools for the Future Project**

Cabinet are asked to delegate the following responsibilities to the Executive Director of Children, Schools and Families (after consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member for the same service area and the Schools BSF Project Board):

1. Authority to prepare and submit to DfES Parts 1 and 2 of the strategic business case (“Strategy For Change”)
2. Authority to prepare and submit to DfES the Outline Business Case for the Project, including agreement as to the scope of work for the individual sites.
3. Authority to incur costs on surveys and feasibility studies.
4. Authority to appoint consultants and advisors as required to assist in the preparation and carrying out of the above within the constraints of BSF procurement budgets.

The Building Schools for the Future Project is expected to realise at least £150m in a combination of PFI credits and grant.

Cabinet will be requested to delegate further responsibilities in respect of the tendering and negotiation of the Project once the Outline Business Case has been submitted to, and approved by, DfES.