

***Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement
– 10 June 2008***

Statement of Decision

Primary Capital - Strategy for Change

Present:

Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement : Councillor Michael Waine
Officers: Deborah Miller (Corporate Core)
Irene Kirkman (Children, Young People & Families)

Also in attendance:

Other Councillor Jean Fooks Shadow Cabinet Member)
Members:

Documentation considered:

Report **Primary Capital - Strategy for Change**

A copy is attached to the signed copy of this decision.

Declarations of interest:

Councillor A personal interest on the grounds that

Summary of representations in person

Councillor Fooks expressed concern about the criteria which had been used for accessing which schools would receive capital investment. She believed schools should have been accessed on an individual basis and not by locality and that there should be an 'excellent' school at the heart of any community. She asked the Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement to clarify the following:

- How did the Council define 'excellent'?
- Deprivation index – did the super output areas meet up with reality?
- Would transport be provided – would it be accessible?
- Would 'rural pockets' lose out?
- Accessibility was not in the current criteria – this should be priority for some funding?

Cabinet Member's Comments

The capital investment for schools is decided by the criteria – if a school achieved high marks against the criteria then that school would be highly rated in the priority list for action not withstanding locality rating.

The definition of excellent would have to be the same as what Ofsted called outstanding. The deprivation index and super output areas were out of the Council's control.

Existing rules and regulations regarding transport would apply, though accessibility programmes currently in progress would not be affected by the Primary Capital Programme (PCP).

The criteria consulted on and agreed by the Primary Review Board and the Cabinet must be the basis for funding allocation, though being in a low priority locality would not prevent schools in need from receiving funding. Further, the list was not static and would change over time. The aim was to ensure a balance of schools across Oxfordshire would benefit. The locality was only a framework vehicle for the review so that all issues could be looked at in the round.

Following officer recommendation, I agree to replace 'excellent' with 'outstanding' in the strap line 'Providing an excellent school in the heart of the community', where it is used.

Decision

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before me, the representations made to me and the further considerations set out above, I confirm my decisions on this matter as follows:

to:

- (a) ~~indicate that he approves the changes in criteria as set out in paragraph 3 of the report;~~
- (b) approve the Primary Capital Programme – Strategy for Change for submission to the DCSF including the revised criteria, ~~the revised locality priority list for capital investment,~~ and the completed spreadsheet detailing the school projects including the first wave of expenditure;
- (c) ***omit the locality table from the submission to the DCSF, in that it was for internal use rather than external; and***
- (d) ***ask the Primary Review Board to submit an Annual Report to Cabinet on progress.***

Signed
Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement

Date