



Northumberland County Council

Consultation on School Structures in Coquet Partnership

Notes of Meeting

Meeting:	Broomhill First School – Staff Meeting
Location:	North Broomhill, Broomhill, Morpeth NE65 9UR
<hr/>	
Date & Time:	Wednesday 25 th May 2022 at 3.30 pm
<hr/>	
Present:	
<u>NCC</u>	Sue Aviston (Head of School Organisation and Resources)
<u>Representatives</u>	Lorraine Fife (School Place Planning and Organisation Manager) Deborah Anderson (Project Support Officer)
<u>Union</u>	Andrew Gibson, GMB
<u>Representatives</u>	
<u>Broomhill First</u>	Headteacher
<u>School Staff</u>	Six Members of Staff (Teaching and Non-teaching)

1.	<u>Welcome and Introductions</u>
	SA welcomed everyone to the meeting and those present were noted above. NCC Officers briefly outlined their roles: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SA - Head of School Organisation and Resources for the local authority. Has a range of responsibilities, one of which is school re-organisation.• LF - School Place Planning and Organisation Manager. Responsibilities includes managing the consultation process, ensuring it runs smoothly and meets statutory guidelines etc.
2.	<u>Purpose of Meeting</u>
	SA outlined the purpose of the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To explain the proposals which were approved by Cabinet on 10th May 2022 and currently being consulted on.• To provide an opportunity for governors to ask questions about the proposals.• Brief, but not verbatim, notes would be published as part of the report to Cabinet.
3.	<u>Context and Rationale for the Proposals</u>
	SA explained the background: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council has allocated the Coquet partnership funding (£25.5m) to replace or refurbish its school buildings.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to any work commencing the Council seeks assurances that it is investing in a structure that will deliver improved outcomes and will be viable and sustainable for generations to come. • Outlined the work that had been done with school leaders in the partnership over the last year.
4.	<u>Outcomes of Discussions with School Leaders</u>
	<p>Briefly summarised the outcomes of discussions held with school leaders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 'Vision for the Coquet Partnership' agreed. The vision included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ improved educational outcomes/offer for all pupils. ○ improved and extended SEND offer. ○ ensuring that the community supports the model. ○ ensuring that schools work together to further develop the partnership, creating a sustainable and viable model of education for the future. ○ ensuring best value for the capital investment by NCC. • Main views from school leaders regarding the current structure and a two-tier structure. Noted that both models had their pros and cons.
5.	<u>Standards in the Coquet Partnership</u>
	<p>The standards in the partnership were summarised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KS2 standards have been a concern for several years. • 2019 is the last validated data (2020 and 2021 data is not validated due to Covid). • In 2019 only 27% of students met the expected standard for Reading, Writing and Maths - worst result in the county and nationally. This is a significant concern to the local authority and Regional Schools Commission. • KS4 and KS5 performance was much improved, particularly in relation to Progress 8 and Average Point Score.
6.	<u>Viability and Sustainability</u>
	<p>SA advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth rate in the partnership remains steady (this is not the case in other parts of the county). • Challenge for this partnership is retention of pupils (approximately 25% of pupils leave the partnership to attend schools in other areas). • As school budgets are predominately based on pupil numbers this equates to a loss of funding for schools. (Potentially an additional £1m would be available across the partnership if those pupils were retained.)
7.	<u>What are the Proposals</u>
	<p>SA outlined the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is consulting on two proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Model A – this is the current structure. ○ Model B – this is a change to a primary/secondary structure of education (all first schools extend their age range up to age 11 and James Calvert Spence College reduces its age range to become an 11-18 secondary school). • Due to site constraints with the Amble First site, we are proposing that Amble First School relocates to the South Avenue site and takes up part of the building. • As part of the consultation, we are asking for other ideas.
8.	<u>What are the Implications of the Proposals for Staff in the Coquet Partnership</u>
	<p>SA briefly outlined the implications for staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Model A remains in place - no implications for staff apart from the annual 'business as usual' decisions.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Model B is implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First Schools would need to redesign their curriculum and staffing structures - there could be opportunities to look at the leadership structure and recruit additional staff. ○ James Calvert Spence College would need to redesign its staffing structure as it would no longer need teaching staff for Years 5 and 6. Those staff would be deemed to be “at risk”. • Aim is to protect staff and retain the good teaching which is already in the partnership. NCC officers would work with headteachers in the partnership to develop a staffing protocol which all schools in the partnership would be asked to adopt. This would provide stability for both the staff and pupils. • Trade Unions are aware of the consultation and can be contacted, if required, by individual members.
9.	<u>Special Educational Needs in Coquet Partnership</u>
	<p>SA shared predicted forecasts for SEMH and ASD pupils and advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently no specialist provision within the Coquet partnerships for pupils with SEND. • 60 pupils with SEND leave the partnership to be educated in 11 different provisions. • Increases of SEMH and ASD are being seen across the county and nationally. • The capital funding, which has been allocated to the Coquet partnership, together with funding from Central Government and other Council funding gives us the opportunity to meet capacity needs locally. • As local authorities can't open new schools the Council is proposing to create a satellite provision, run by Barndale House School, which would be co-located alongside Amble First School on the South Avenue site. • Stressed that although co-located Amble First School and the SEND provision would be separate schools with their own entrances, outdoor areas and facilities. • This is the Council's suggestion, however, other ideas for meeting SEND demands are welcomed.
10.	<u>Other Implications of Model A and Model B</u>
	<p>LF outlined the implications under both models as follows:</p> <p><u>Catchment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing no changes to catchment areas under either model. <p><u>Admissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing no changes to admission arrangements for nursery/reception pupils. • Under Model B, admission into James Calvert Spence College would change from Year 5 to Year 7. <p><u>Timeline</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential timeline for Model B would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September 2022/2023 – operate as currently. ○ September 2024 – Year 4 pupils would remain at their current first school and become Year 5. James Calvert Spence College would not receive Year 5 and would operate from Year 6 upwards. ○ September 2025 – Year 5 pupils would move up to become Year 6. Pupils in Year 6 at James Calvert Spence College would move up to Year 7. ○ September 2026 – Year 6 pupils from primary schools would transfer to James Calvert Spence College into Year 7. • The current (2022) Year 3 pupils would be the last year group to transfer into Year 5 at James Calvert Spence College. The pupils in Year 2 pupils would become the first Year 5 pupils in the primary schools.

	<p><u>Early Years</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following discussion with colleagues from early years it is believed that there is sufficient, good provision within the partnership. • We are therefore not proposing to increase early years provision as part of this consultation. <p><u>Transport</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing no changes to eligibility for home to school transport under either model. • If Model B implemented pupils in Years 5 and 6 wouldn't have as far to travel which could result in a small saving for the Council's Home to School Transport budget. However, this wouldn't have any bearing on the outcome of this consultation. <p><u>School Buildings/Capital Allocation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated, the Council has allocated £25.5m towards investment in school buildings within the partnership. • Officers will be developing indicative budgets for any potential building work required under either model. This would include the SEND provision. • Outcomes from the consultation, together with the indicative costs, presented to Cabinet for consideration.
11.	<u>Next Steps</u>
	<p>LF advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation runs until midnight on 29th June 2022. • Good to have a response from you, as a governing body, to the proposals. However, can also respond as an individual. • Public event scheduled for Saturday 16th June at Amble Masonic Hall. • Feedback and responses will be analysed, and report presented to FACS and Cabinet Committees in September. • Cabinet would decide whether or not to approve and move to formal "statutory" consultation. If formal consultation approved this would be for four weeks and Cabinet would make a final decision in November 2022.
12.	<u>Questions</u>
	<p><i>Q – What happens if the community doesn't support the proposal, but the schools did?</i> Consultation is not a referendum it is about the quality of the argument not the number of responses received. The local authority takes into account and consideration the impact on the individual.</p> <p><i>Q – If the funding is not used for re-organisation would it be split across the schools within the partnership?</i> Wouldn't say that it wouldn't be split, the funding is there for investment. However, it would be based on need and there would need to be a business case to justify any funding.</p> <p><i>Q – Internally could we move a teacher currently teaching nursery to teach Years 5 or 6 and recruit to the nursery post from the pool of middle school staff?</i> Teachers hold a teaching qualification, not a specific qualification to teach in Year 6 or Nursery. However, we ask that there is an understanding that if the teacher you are recruiting hasn't got the specific experience that they would be given the right level of support and development. In this specific instance would it be best in the first instance to integrate them in the upper years?</p>

Q – Other schools in the partnership have two-year old provision but Broomhill First doesn't offer that. Might that be a disadvantage to Broomhill First if parents compare schools. Is there scope to include two-year old provision at Broomhill?

If you feel there is a rationale, why two year old provision should be offered please include that in your response to the consultation. It would need to be backed up by demand. The local authority aims to ensure there is a sustainable and appropriate offer. The data is currently telling us there is sufficient good quality provision in the Coquet partnership without creating anything else.

Q – In relation to buildings what might happen?

Got to work up costs but can't pre-empt any decision. Team will undertake site visits to acquire indicative costs and what might be required. Headteachers/staff not involved at this stage but if re-organisation approved, they will be involved in the next stages.

Investment is based on what is required to convert to become a primary school (eg. Additional classroom or more toilets). Not about improvements as maintenance is a different budget. However, it could be cost effective to address maintenance issues at the same time.

Schools can enhance the project, but the school would need to cover the additional costs.

SA finished the meeting by thanking staff for attending. The meeting closed at 4.30 pm.