

Please address any general enquiries on this agenda to Julie Dean, on Oxford 815322. Press enquiries should be directed to the Public Relations Unit on Oxford 815266.

---

Committee	Education	Day	<b>WEDNESDAY</b>
Sub-Committee	<b>EDUCATION MANAGEMENT</b>	Date	<b>27 NOVEMBER 1996</b>
Place of Meeting	<b>County Hall, Oxford</b>	Time	<b>10.00 am</b>

---

**Note: Those items marked \* have been circulated to Members and Officers of the Council only and are available for public inspection.**

## **A G E N D A**

1. **Election to Chair** - (Liberal Democrat Group)
2. **Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments**
3. **Minutes**

Minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 1996 (**EM3**).

4. **Matters arising from the Minutes**
5. **Petitions and Public Address**

### **OPERATIONAL ITEMS**

6. **ST NICHOLAS ASSESSMENT UNIT**

Report by Chief Education Officer (**EM6**).

St. Nicholas Assessment Unit caters for twelve First school children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. Its role has been reviewed in the light of DfEE Circular 2/94 which clarified the legal status of free-standing units. A number of options for the future of the unit have been considered as part of the consultation process. There is support from officers, Inspectors and Oxford City First School Headteachers for the proposal to close the unit and use the resources to enhance alternative provision for young children with EBD in Oxford City.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to approve the closure of the St. Nicholas Assessment Unit and use the resources to:**

- (a) **increase planned places at Northern House by six; and**
- (b) **appoint additional staff to provide family support for Oxford City First school children with emotional and behavioural difficulties and their families on a two year pilot basis.**

7. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

Report by Chief Education Officer and County Treasurer (**EM7**).

At their meeting in October 1996, Strategy and Resources Committee agreed that service committees should determine their service strategy for capital investment, and prioritise their preparation pools. This report proposes a service strategy for Education capital investment and addresses the question of priorities to be applied to the Education Committee's preparation pool. The schemes held in the preparation pool are identified in Annex 2 as is the prioritisation which officers wish to accord to them at this time. Officers will be reviewing shortly how it is intended to prioritise within each priority group. A report will be brought back to the February 1997 meeting of the Sub-Committee.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to endorse the proposed service strategy as set out in Annex 1 to the report, to approve the prioritisation of schemes in the preparation pool (Annex 2) and to RECOMMEND Education Committee and Strategy & Resources Committee accordingly.**

8. **PROJECT APPRAISALS**

(a) **Detailed Project Appraisal prepared by relevant Chief Officers (EM8(a)):**

Didcot Girls School, Didcot - ED430/1

The Sub-Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to approve the project appraisal for submission.

(b) **Outline Project Submissions prepared by relevant Chief Officers (EM8(b)):**

(i) Bishopswood School, Sonning Common - ED349

The Sub-Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to:

(a) **authorise the service of notice of proposals under the Education Act 1993 to expand the nursery and primary departments of Bishopswood School;**

(b) **instruct officers to formally consult on the Council's plans to expand the nursery and primary departments of Bishopswood School; and**

(c) **approve the outline project submission.**

(ii) Bardwell School, Bicester - ED438

The Sub-Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to:

(a) **authorise the service of notice of proposals under the Education Act 1993 to expand the nursery and primary departments of Bardwell School;**

(b) **instruct officers to formally consult on the Council's plans to expand the nursery and primary departments of Bardwell School; and**

(c) **approve the outline project submission.**

(iii) Springfield School, Witney - ED440

The Sub-Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to:

(a) **authorise the serving of notice of the Council's proposals to transfer Springfield School, Witney to a new site, once a site has been identified;**

(b) **instruct officers to formally consult on the Council's plans to transfer Springfield School to a new site; and**

(c) **approve the outline project submission.**

(iv) Long Hanborough/The Manor Schools - ED441

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to approve the outline project submission.**

9. **NON-DELEGATED BUDGET PROVISION FOR REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS 1997/98**

Report by the Director of Environmental Services (**EM9**).

The Operations Sub-Committee have made proposals for the apportionment between committees of the 1997/98 Repair and Maintenance Budget. This report outlines the allocation for non-delegated repairs to Education Committee premises together with a comparison of assessed need.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to submit their observations (if any) on the proposals for the 1997/98 budget for Repair and Maintenance of buildings held by the Education Committee to the next meeting of the Operations Sub-Committee.**

10. **SCHOOLS' SECURITY**

Report by Chief Education Officer (**EM10**).

On 11 September 1996, the Sub-Committee received a report on Schools' Security and requested officers to report back with proposals for implementing further security measures in schools in the light of further advice from the Department for Education and Employment, once the Government's funding arrangements were known.

This report details the security measures and security initiatives which the Education Department intends to implement in all Oxfordshire schools, subject to funding being identified. Endorsement is sought for these proposals and the report requests that the unmet costs are included exceptionally as a growth bid in the Council's 1997/98 budget.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to endorse the proposals set out in paragraph 3 of the report and to RECOMMEND Education Committee, that the cost of these proposals is included as a growth bid in the Council's 1997/98 budget.**

11. **PROPOSED TRANSFER OF FORMER CARETAKER'S BUNGALOW, FITZHARRY'S SCHOOL, ABINGDON**

The Director of Environmental Services and the Chief Education Officer report as follows:-

The caretaker's bungalow at Fitzharry's School, Abingdon is currently held by the Education Committee. It has not been used for housing for some years but it is proposed that it should be returned to staff housing use for occupation by a school caretaker. The house should therefore be transferred from the Education Committee to the Operations Sub-Committee. It is proposed that the transfer should be at nil cost but with the cost of the adaptations which will be required to return the property to residential use being funded from the staff housing improvements budget.

The Operations Sub-Committee on 10 October 1996 agreed to the transfer.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to agree that the caretakers bungalow at Fitzharry's School, Abingdon be transferred from the Education Committee to the Operations Sub-Committee at nil cost.**

12. **FARINGDON SCHOOL, FARINGDON - SWIMMING POOL**

The Chief Education Officer and the Director of Environmental Services report as follows:-

This report seeks the Sub-Committee's approval to declare land on the Faringdon School site,

edged black on the attached plan (**EM12 - Annex 1**) temporarily surplus to the Committee's requirements, to enable the Vale of White Horse District Council to provide and manage a new indoor swimming pool.

The proposal, which has the support of County Council officers and the school's Governing Body, includes a 4 lane 25 metre length indoor swimming pool, and a small pool for disabled users and learner swimmers accessed by way of shallow steps and a ramp. The small pool will be further enhanced by the provision of a spa pool, associated steam room, sauna and small plunge pool. The new pool will be accessed via the existing main entrance to the sports hall. The scheme also includes a new traffic management system and additional car parking.

The capital costs associated with this work are being met by the Vale of White Horse District Council and by the Sports Council to whom a successful lottery bid was made in June of this year. All revenue costs are being met by the District Council.

The project will be the subject of a formal lease and joint use agreement. The detailed terms have not yet been agreed, but it has been accepted that Faringdon School and local primary schools will have free priority use for up to 20 hours a week. The detailed terms will be agreed by the Director of Environmental Services.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:**

(a) **declare land adjacent to the sports hall at Faringdon School edged black on EM12 - Annex 1, temporarily surplus to the Committee's requirements, on condition that it is used as an indoor swimming pool subject to all costs associated with the project being met by the Vale of White Horse District Council;**

(b) **RECOMMEND the Operations Sub-Committee to agree that the land be leased to the Vale of White Horse District Council on terms to be agreed by the Director of Environmental Services and the Chief Education Officer.**

### 13. **CHANGES TO CONTRACT REVIEW AREAS**

Report by Director of Environmental Services (**EM13**).

The present schedule of reviews of subsidised bus services (shown in Annex 1 ) was devised some 20 years ago to suit the needs, at the time, of the Education Department. The areas are now of unequal size in terms of workload, and some groups of places with strong linkages between their bus services are split into two or even three separate review areas.

On 14 November 1996, the Public Transport Sub-Committee adopted a proposed revised schedule (Annex 3 of the report) which aimed to create a pattern of reviews better suited to current needs, whilst minimising the change in contract lengths from the "standard" four years during the transitional period.

The Chief Education Officer is in agreement with the changes proposed as a basis for future reviews of school transport contracts. It is important that both sets of contracts are reviewed in a given area simultaneously, in order to retain the facility for joint tendering for school and public transport contracts. The proposed revised review arrangements should offer increased scope for joint tendering as a result of more logical grouping of services under review.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to adopt the revised schedule of reviews of subsidised bus services shown in Annex 3, and authorise changes in the end-dates of subsidy contracts accordingly.**

### 14. **GROVE TO KING ALFRED'S SCHOOL BUS SERVICE**

This item was referred back by the Education Committee on 1 October 1996 to enable the Sub-Committee to receive a full monitoring report.

The Director of Environmental Services reports as follows:-

Monitoring of the current situation involving pupils of King Alfred's school who live in Grove has continued and it can be reported that no accidents have occurred at the time of writing this report.

The ending of British Summer Time and the winter weather will play a significant part in the consideration of the safety of pupils making the journey, thus monitoring will continue until the end of term. This will allow a full report to be made to this Sub-Committee on 26 February 1997.

The implementation of the County Council's alternative routes will have also been in place for some weeks. The report will also include an assessment of the use of the routes and the pupils' and school's perception of the safety and convenience of the routes.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to RECOMMEND the Education Committee to receive the monitoring report and note that a full report will be made to this Sub-Committee on 26 February 1997.**

15. **DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION ACT 1995 : EMPLOYMENT ISSUES**

Report by Chief Education Officer (EM15).

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 contains employment provisions which come into force on 2 December 1996. From that date it will be unlawful for an employer to discriminate against a disabled person in the field of employment for a reason which relates to the disability if the employer cannot show that this treatment is justified.

The report sets out the actions being taken to advise schools and others within the Education Service of their responsibilities under the Act.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to note the report and endorse the actions taken or proposed.**

16. **FORMER STOKE LYNE ST. PETER'S (VA) PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Report by the Chief Education Officer and the Assistant Chief Executive & Solicitor to the Council (EM16).

The site of this school was sold for approximately £75,000 for development in 1988, having become redundant for educational purposes. The Secretary of State who has to rule, or "determine", to whom the proceeds of sale are to be paid under the Education Act 1946, is "minded to make a determination" in favour of the Local Education Authority. The Diocesan Trustees argue that instead, they should receive a proportion of the proceeds and have invited the County Council to agree to accept a reduction of 20% in order to bring the dispute to an end.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:-**

(a) **decline the offer by the Trustees, and that the Secretary of State be asked to proceed with the determination which she has stated she is minded to make, without further delay; and**

(b) **the Association of County Councils (ACC) be asked to press for a change in the law so that interest on the proceeds of sale in cases of this kind is apportioned between the parties in the same shares as the Secretary of State's determination.**

17. **URGENCY SUB-COMMITTEE\***

Unconfirmed Minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 1996 (EM17).

**EXEMPT ITEMS**

The Sub-Committee will be invited to resolve to exclude the public for the consideration of the following exempt items (marked E) by passing a resolution in relation to each such item in the following terms:

**"that the public be excluded during the consideration of the following items in the Agenda since it is likely that if they were present during those items there would be a disclosure of "exempt" information as described in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 and specified below each item in the Agenda".**

**THE REPORTS RELATING TO THE EXEMPT ITEMS HAVE NOT BEEN MADE PUBLIC AND SHOULD BE REGARDED AS STRICTLY PRIVATE TO MEMBERS AND OFFICERS ENTITLED TO RECEIVE THEM.**

#### 18.E **NORTHFIELD SCHOOL - RELOCATION**

- (a) Report by Chief Education Officer and Director of Environmental Services (**EM18E(a)**).

The report details the main findings of the feasibility study of the site identified at the last meeting as suitable for the possible relocation of Northfield School.

In addition, during the further search of sites, which are not owned by the County Council, as requested by the Sub-Committee at their last meeting, a further OCC owned site was identified. The report proposes that officers undertake a feasibility study on this site and also suggests that those selected out of the 10 non OCC owned sites identified in this search be considered further at the next meeting of the Sub-Committee, following visits by the Headteacher and Chair of Governors.

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:**

- (a) **hold in reserve the identified site (which has been the subject of the feasibility study);**

**(b) instruct officers to undertake feasibility studies on further sites identified in the report following visits by the Headteacher and Chair of Governors and to report back to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee.**

- (b) Revised Outline Project Submission prepared by relevant Chief Officers (**EM18E(b)**).

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to agree to the publication of statutory proposals, and to instruct officers to formally consult on the authority's plans to transfer the Northfield School to a new site.**

*(Information Exempt in that it relates to any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.)*

#### 19.E **PROJECT APPRAISAL**

Outline Project Submission prepared by relevant Chief Officers (**EM19E**) for Slade Farm, Bicester - ED437

**The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to approve the outline project submission.**

*(Information Exempt in that it relates to any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.)*

JOHN HARWOOD  
Chief Executive

November 1996

**NOTE FOR SPOKESPERSONS/GROUP LEADERS AND RELEVANT OFFICERS ONLY**

The pre-meeting briefing will be held at County Hall on Friday 22 November 1996 at 10.00 am.

**EM3**

Education Committee

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 11 SEPTEMBER 1996**

**MINUTES** of the meeting commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 1.05 pm

Present:

Voting Members:

Councillors Hugh Cundall, Mrs C. Fulljames, Caroline Lucas, MacKenzie, Julie Mayhew-Archer (in place of Councillor Bob Morgan), Janet Morgan, Betty Roberts, Mrs Delia Smith, Jack Steer and Sylvia Tompkins.

Non-Voting Members

Mr M. Forder, Mr R. Leach and Mrs M. Randolph.

Ex Officio:

Councillors Brian Hodgson (in place of Councillor R.J. Langridge), Dermot Roaf and D.L.B. Spencer (in place of Councillor C.H. Shouler).

Officers:

Whole of meeting: J.T. Hehir and J.A. Dean (Chief Executive's Office); K. Borien, R. Smith and G. Tee (Education Department).

Part of meeting: N. Monaghan (Environmental Services); I. Pearson and S. Tanner (Education Department); E. Carrington (Environmental Services); K. Bellew and J. Barker (County Treasurer's Department).

By Invitation: Councillor J.E. Jones (for Agenda Item 11(b)).

*The Sub-Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with additional items and information circulated at the meeting, copies of which agenda, reports, additional items and information are attached to the signed Minutes, and in relation thereto determined as follows:-*

**41/96 ELECTION TO CHAIR**

**RESOLVED:** that Councillor Steer (Labour) be elected to chair the meeting.

**42/96 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS**

Apologies for absence, temporary appointments and Group Leader substitutions were reported as follows:-

<u>Apology from</u>	<u>Temporary Appointment/Substitute</u>
Councillor Langridge	Councillor Hodgson
Councillor Bob Morgan	Councillor Julie Mayhew-Archer
Councillor Shouler	Councillor Spencer
Father Armstrong	
Rev. Dr. J.D. Gay	

**43/96 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 1996 were approved and signed.

#### **44/96 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

##### Outline Project Submission - St. Birinus School, Didcot

In accordance with Standing Order 19(3) and the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the Chair asked the Sub-Committee to discuss as a matter of urgent business an outline project submission for St. Birinus School, Didcot which was subsequently tabled and is attached to the signed Minutes. The Chair declared himself satisfied that the item was urgent because the proposed start date was 1997/98 and an outline submission was necessary in order that the project could be implemented in the scheduled timescale. He therefore agreed that it be added to the Agenda.

The Sub-Committee agreed to discuss the item following Agenda Item 7, at 8(b).

##### Public Transport Sub-Committee - 5 September 1996

##### Draft Minute 41/96 - Grove to King Alfred's School Bus Service

In accordance with Standing Order 19(3) and the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information Act 1985, the Chair asked the Sub-Committee to discuss, as a matter of urgent business, a request from the Public Transport Sub-Committee for this Sub-Committee to urgently consider the reintroduction of the Grove to King Alfred's School Bus Service in the interests of the safety of the children travelling between Grove and King Alfred's School in view of the delay in producing the proposed enhancements to the cycle routes for the area, due to the objections received. A report was subsequently tabled and is attached to the signed Minutes. The Chair declared himself satisfied that the item was urgent to enable consideration to be given to the issue of further temporary funding for the bus service, the earliest opportunity being the Sub-Committee's meeting. He therefore agreed that it be added to the Agenda.

The Sub-Committee agreed to discuss the item following Agenda item 10, at 11(b).

#### **45/96 ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**RESOLVED:** to take Agenda Item 10 after Agenda Item 7.

#### **46/96 THE DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION ACT 1995 - IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOLS, FE COLLEGES AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS**

(Agenda Item 6)

The Sub-Committee had before them a report (EM6) outlining the breadth of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and its impact on schools, FE Colleges and other educational settings, including the responsibility of Headteachers and Governors, with particular reference to special educational needs.

The Sub-Committee were informed that the Colleges of Further Education had been requested by the officer responsible for links with the Further Education sector, to lodge copies of their disability statements with the County Council by the end of December 1996.

It was reported that Central Government had not yet produced their advice to Local Authorities in any detail and thus any requirements of the Act and the resulting financial implications for the Council were not possible to quantify at the present time.

**RESOLVED:** to:

- (a) receive the report and commend the general thrust of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 in seeking to end discrimination;
- (b) (on a motion by Councillor Janet Morgan, seconded by Councillor Roberts, as amended by

Councillor Cundall, with the consent of the proposer and seconder and carried nem con) request a further report dealing with employment issues and possible legal issues to be brought to the next meeting;

(c) (on a motion by Councillor Janet Morgan, seconded by Councillor Tompkins and carried nem con) ask the Chief Education Officer to write to the Department for Education and Employment enquiring if the financial implications of the Act for Local Authorities were to be borne in mind when calculating Local Authority funding; and

(d) instruct the officers to report further to the Sub-Committee when the implications of the Act became clearer.

#### **47/96 PROVISION FOR PUPILS WITH EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIOURAL DIFFICULTIES (EBD) AT KEY STAGES 3 AND 4**

(Agenda Item 7)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM7) which gave details of a County Development Plan for pupils with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (EBD) at Key Stages 3 and 4, which had been produced following a consultation process with schools. Approval was also sought for the proposed use of £100,000 allocated by the Education Committee, to develop a single cross-age, outreach service for Key Stages 1, 2, and 3. The report also provided an update on progress in relation to the review of the St Nicholas Assessment Unit.

During a lengthy debate Members commented that there were still some issues regarding the role of the proposed Head of Service and the proposed structure and management of the outreach service and its relationship to the Pupil Referral Units which still needed to be considered.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Delia Smith, seconded by Councillor Cundall, as amended by Councillor Janet Morgan in relation to (a), with the consent of the proposer and seconder and by 9 votes to 0) to:

- (a) approve the County EBD Development Plan which has been produced following the consultation process with schools with the exception of the appointment of a Head of Service and that a further report on the management of the outreach service and the relationship to Pupil Referral Units be considered by an Urgency Sub-Committee;
- (b) approve the appointment of 3.5 fte posts for the development of a cross-age behaviour outreach service for Key Stages 1, 2 and 3;
- (c) instruct the officers to address the full year effect for 1997/98 of the balance from the allocated £100,000 once the 3.5 fte had been taken out; and
- (d) note that a report would be brought back to the November 27 meeting following further discussions with the staff of St Nicholas Assessment Unit and with Oxford City First School Headteachers, and also that the balance of the £100,000 in 1996/97 be addressed in the Education Committee Quarterly Financial report.

#### **48/96 CHARLBURY OLD PRIMARY SCHOOL - COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTRE**

(Agenda Item 10)

The Sub-Committee had before them a report (EM10) advising them that, in accordance with the criteria agreed by the Community Education Development Working Party, the Education Policy Implementation Sub-Committee and the Operations Sub-Committee during the Spring 1995 cycle, a suitable site had now been identified for the replacement community education building. Further, that a consultant acting for the owners of the new building, the Trustees of the Thomas Gifford Charity, had advised that the scheme was viable subject to lottery funding. On the basis of an exhibition and public meeting held in July and followed by a ballot undertaken on behalf of Charlbury Town Council by Electoral Reform Ballot Services, the Charlbury Town Council had confirmed that it accepted the result of the ballot as evidence that the proposal had local support.

Councillor Hodgson, the Local Member, spoke in support of the proposed recommendations and also read out a letter received from a town councillor which contained representations on behalf of those local electors who were not in favour of the scheme.

Members joined in thanking all the officers concerned who had been involved with the scheme for all their hard work, particularly Mr Monaghan.

**RESOLVED:** that authority be given to enter into an agreement with the Trustees of the Thomas Gifford Charity and Beechcroft Ltd whereby: the County Council agreed to the sale of that part of the old primary school at Charlbury in its ownership to Beechcroft Ltd at a price to be agreed by the Director of Environmental Services, and to the use of the sale proceeds as a contribution towards the cost of a new community building in Charlbury - the completion of the sale and the use of the sale proceeds for that purpose to be conditional upon the granting of the planning permissions, lottery funding, and agreement of terms for a lease of that part of the new building to be used for community education, all as referred to in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the report.

#### **49/96 PROJECT APPRAISALS**

(Agenda Item 8)

The Sub-Committee considered the following detailed Project Appraisals and Outline Project Submissions prepared by relevant Chief Officers:

##### **Detailed Project Appraisals (EM8(a))**

- (a) Marlborough School, Woodstock - ED406/1
- (b) The Cooper School, Bicester - ED407/1
- (c) Wood Green School, Witney - ED 410/1
- (d) Gosford Hill School, Kidlington - ED427/1
- (e) Ducklington CE School, Ducklington - ED428/1
- (f) Wheatley Park School, Wheatley - ED433

##### **Outline Project Submissions (EM8(b))**

- (a) Watlington County Primary School - ED421/1
- (b) Didcot Girls' School - ED430
- (c) Chiltern Edge School, Sonning Common - ED431
- (d) Mabel Prichard School, Littlemore - ED434
- (g) St Birinus School, Didcot - ED435

**RESOLVED:** to approve the Detailed Project Appraisals and Outline Project submissions.

#### **50/96 SCHOOLS' SECURITY**

(Agenda Item 9)

The Sub-Committee had before them a report (EM9) summarising the initiatives undertaken by the Education Department to reduce levels of vandalism, arson and theft and generally improve the security of Oxfordshire's Schools, and, in the light of the Dunblane Primary School tragedy, to effect a change in emphasis with regard to measures to protect the personal safety of staff and pupils.

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - ITEM ED21**

**\*Following comments at the pre-meeting briefing minute 52/96 has been altered to clarify the motion put by Councillor Janet Morgan and the resolution.**

It was reported that since the report had been written, the DfEE's guidance on School Security had been received. This document was available to schools from the DfEE at no cost. The advice contained in this document did not, however, add to that already included in the Education Department's current Guide to Risk Management. Guidance from the Susi Lamplugh Trust on personal safety for people working in Education was still awaited for possible inclusion into a revised version of the Department's Guide.

**RESOLVED:** to receive this report and to ask officers to report back with proposals for implementing further security measures in schools in the light of forthcoming advice and the Government's funding arrangements.

#### **51/96 SEATBELTS IN SCHOOL TRANSPORT; NEW REGULATIONS**

(Agenda Item 11(a))

The Sub-Committee had before them a report (EM11(a)) detailing implications for the Education Service of the new Seatbelts in School Transport Regulations 1996, which affected the use of minibuses and coaches on school and Youth Service trips and on home-to school transport. In the light of the regulatory requirements, the Sub-Committee's views were sought on a number of issues described in the report including whether or not to allow vehicles without seatbelts to be used on College transport.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Tompkins, duly seconded and carried nem con) to:

- (a) receive the report EM11(a);
- (b) ask officers to advise governing bodies on arrangements for volunteers to travel on home-to-school journeys; and
- (c) require operators to provide coaches with seatbelts on all home-to-school journeys with effect from 10 February 1998;

#### **\*52/96 PUBLIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE - 5 SEPTEMBER 1996 - DRAFT MINUTE 41/96 - GROVE TO KING ALFRED'S SCHOOL BUS SERVICE (Agenda Item 11(b))**

The Sub-Committee had before them a request by the Public Transport Sub-Committee to consider further temporary funding for a bus service between Grove and King Alfred's School, Wantage, if after a month of the new school term safety problems for the children attending the school were evident as a result of delay in the provision of the proposed enhancements to the cycle routes. A report (EM11(b)) setting out further information on Education Committee policy and the financial implications of subsidising the service was tabled for Members information.

Councillor Janet Morgan moved and Councillor Mayhew-Archer seconded, that pending the resolution in implementing the Cycle Tracks Order, the officers be asked to monitor the safety problems of children attending King Alfred's School; if such monitoring indicated a problem requiring transport assistance, the Education Committee be recommended to enter into arrangements with a bus contractor to provide a service at a cost not exceeding £6,407 per term (or pro-rata for a period less than a term) and on the basis that a higher parental contribution than was previously the case was expected, and that the arrangements be reviewed during the Spring Term 1997. On being put to the vote the motion was lost by 4 votes to 3, the Chair having exercised a second vote.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Carrington reported that objections had been received during the consultations on the enhancements to the cycle routes on the grounds of their width for the shared use of pedestrians and cyclists.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Steer, seconded by Councillor MacKenzie, and carried by

three votes to 2, the Chair having exercised a second vote), to reject the request by Public Transport Sub-Committee as set out above.

**53/96 STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING: EDUCATION DEPARTMENT CENTRAL STAFF**

(Agenda Item 12)

The Sub-Committee had before them a report (EM12) which reviewed Staff Development and Training of centrally employed staff (other than teachers and Community Education professionals) in 1995/96 and which initiated plans and objectives for 1996/97.

**RESOLVED:** to:

- (a) receive and note the Review of Training 1995/96; and
- (b) endorse the proposed Training Plan for 1996/97.

**54/96 BURFORD SCHOOL**

(Agenda Item 13)

The Sub-Committee's approval was sought to declare land edged black as shown on the plan at **EM13 Annex 1**, temporarily surplus to their requirements, to enable the Foundation Governors of Burford School to establish and manage a caravan park for up to 15 caravans at the school.

**RESOLVED:** to declare land adjacent to the Sports Hall at Burford School edged black on Annex 1 temporarily surplus to requirements for use as a caravan park subject to:

- (a) all costs associated with the venture being met by the new partnership or company formed from the Foundation Governors of Burford School;
- (b) all income generated to be used for the benefit of pupils attending Burford School;
- (c) the terms of the agreement being agreed by the Sub-Committee and Operations Sub-Committee.

**55/96 STADHAMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL**

(Agenda Item 14)

The Sub-Committee were requested to approve the declaration of a small part of Stadhampton School playing field (approximately 52 square metres) as shown on the plan at agenda item EM14 - Annex 1 surplus to education requirements.

**RESOLVED:** to declare the land surplus to education requirements.

**56/96 SCHOOL TERM AND HOLIDAY DATES FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1997/98**

(Agenda Item 15)

The Sub-Committee were requested to approve the school term and holiday dates for the academic year 1997/98 as set out in Annex 1.

**RESOLVED:** that the school term and holiday dates for the academic year 1997/98 should be as set out in Annex 1.

**57/96 SURPLUS PROPERTY**

(Agenda Item 16)

The Sub-Committee were informed that the Strategy & Resources Committee at their meeting on 25 June 1996, resolved to ask all Committees to continue to make efforts to identify and release surplus property.

**RESOLVED:** to note the request.

## **EXEMPT ITEMS**

**RESOLVED:** that the public be excluded during the consideration of items 17E, 18E(a) & 18E(b), 19E and 20E in the Agenda since it was likely that if they were present during those items there would be a disclosure of "exempt" information as described in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 and specified below each item in the Agenda, i.e. information relating to:-

- (a) any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services (Agenda Item 17E, 18E and 19E);
- (b) a particular employee, former employee or applicant to become an employee of, or a particular office-holder, former office-holder or applicant to become an office-holder under, the Authority (Agenda Item 20E); and
- (c) any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of a crime (Agenda Item 20E).

## **PROCEEDINGS FOLLOWING THE WITHDRAWAL OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

### **58/96 HILL END RESIDENTIAL AND FIELD STUDY CENTRE**

(Agenda Item 17E)

The Sub-Committee considered a report (EM17E) which set out the financial implications of renewing and ending the lease for the Hill End Residential and Field Study Centre. The report also made reference to the interest being shown by various organisations, including departments of Oxford University, in taking on the lease which was due to expire in 1997.

**RESOLVED:** to:

- (a) request the officers to negotiate with the University on the short term renewal of the lease as may be required to allow for the exploration and development of proposals which had been put forward for the use of Hill End;
- (b) request officers to report back to the Education Management Sub-Committee in November on progress.

### **59/96 NORTHFIELD SPECIAL SCHOOL - RELOCATION**

(Agenda Item 18E(a) and 18E(b))

The Sub-Committee had before them a report (agenda item 18E(a)) which identified and evaluated a number of sites for the relocation of Northfield Special School and which indicated the site at Eynsham as the Chief Education Officer's preferred option.

Councillor MacKenzie commented on the length of time taken in trying to resolve the issue which amounted to approximately 10 years.

Some members were concerned that in considering only the preferred site as notified in the report, they were limiting the options available, though they were mindful of the cost of feasibility studies.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Cundall, seconded by Councillor Steer and carried nem con) to note the study so far, to instruct officers to undertake a detailed feasibility study (including a detailed financial assessment) of the preferred site and to instruct officers to extend the search to include non-OCC property.

**60/96 OUTLINE PROJECT SUBMISSION - NORTHFIELD SCHOOL RELOCATION**

(Agenda Item 18E(b))

**RESOLVED:** to approve the outline project submission for submission.

**61/96 SANDHILLS PRIMARY SCHOOL - REPLACEMENT SCHOOL**

(Agenda Item 19E)

The Sub-Committee considered an Outline Project Submission - ED432 to provide a replacement school at Sandhills Primary School.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the outline project submission for submission.

**62/96 FINANCIAL IRREGULARITY AT AN OXFORDSHIRE PRIMARY SCHOOL**

(Agenda Item 20E)

The Sub-Committee had before them a report (EM20E) informing them of a recent internal audit investigation into a financial irregularity at an Oxfordshire School and the subsequent management action taken. They were informed that a full internal audit report had been prepared for the Chief Education Officer and the School's governing body.

Mr Barker assured the Sub-Committee that management action had already been taken to tighten controls.

**RESOLVED:** to receive the report and note the action taken.

.....in the Chair

Date of signing .....1996

Division(s) affected: Ploughley

**AGENDA ITEM EM16**

Education Committee

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 27 NOVEMBER 1996**

**FORMER STOKE LYNE ST PETER'S (VA) PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Report by the Chief Education Officer and the Assistant Chief Executive & Solicitor to the Council

Introduction

1. The site of this school was sold for approximately £75,000 for development in 1988, having become redundant for educational purposes. The Secretary of State who has to rule, or "determine", to whom the proceeds of sale are to be paid under the Education Act 1946, is "minded to make a determination" in favour of the Local Education Authority. The Diocesan Trustees argue that instead, they should receive a proportion of the proceeds and have invited the County Council to agree to accept a reduction of 20% in order to bring the dispute to an end.

Background

2. This Church School was closed in the 1980's and sold for development in 1988. In addition to the County Council as Local Education Authority the Diocesan Trustees had an interest in adjoining land and it was agreed that the sale should be undertaken as a joint exercise in order to attract a better price. The agreed portion of the proceeds attributable to the sale of the school buildings was £74,738.14. Because this land had been provided by the County Council under their statutory duty, it became the responsibility of the Secretary of State to decide who is entitled to the proceeds of sale of a redundant voluntary or church school site under the Education Act 1946.

Contention of the Trustees

3. The Trustees have argued that as they or rather their predecessors, had contributed in the past to the building and decoration of the school, they should receive a part of the proceeds. However, the Department of Education have rejected this claim on the basis that that is outside the grounds which the Secretary of State is allowed in law to take into account. They take the view that the two factors on which the decision must be based are
  - (a) the value of the site itself, and
  - (b) any sums which the LEA may have already received in respect of the premises
4. No previous sums have been received in respect of the site. Accordingly in 1994 the Secretary of State indicated that he was minded to "determine that the whole of the proceeds ... should be paid to the County Council". There followed representations on behalf of the Diocesan Trustees that some part of the proceeds should be paid to them in recognition of the contribution they had made.

The "Historical Valuation"

5. In February of 1996 the Department confirmed that the Secretary of State was still so minded. The Department specifically rejected the argument that historical costs should be taken into account, as they noted that the buildings themselves had been demolished on acquisition by the developers and could not therefore be regarded as having enhanced the value of the site.

Proposed Compromise

6. The Diocesan Trustees have continued to press their point, partly

because they see this case as establishing a precedent which may have an adverse effect on subsequent cases in particular a case involving the Bishop Kirk School, which has still to be disposed of. They have invited the County Council to consider accepting less than the whole sum accruing from the sale of the school site, say 80%, in return for their agreement not to contest the issue further. They have suggested that such a compromise would be welcomed by the DFEE, but the Department, with whom a meeting has been held to discuss the matter, make it clear that they do not see it as their responsibility to influence the attitude of the parties, though if invited by them to make a determination in terms which were agreeable to both, the Secretary of State might be willing to endorse them.

#### The Advice of The Solicitor to the Council

7. (a) as a matter of law it is doubtful whether it is in the power of the County Council to accept a lesser sum in place of a larger sum unless there is valid "consideration" received in return;
- (b) it should be pointed out that at a time of pressure to expedite all conveyancing transactions which may yield capital receipts, it is hardly opportune to forego any part of such sums;
- (c) the value of the proceeds of sale, £74,738 has already depreciated since 1988;
- (d) the Diocesan Trustees will be entitled as a matter of law to the interest on the capital sum which has accrued since 1988. This is estimated to amount to £61,425 gross up to 1 November 1996. They will not therefore be unduly disadvantaged by the Secretary of State's proposed determination; and
- (e) the Department for Education & Employment have stated that "each case has to be determined on its merits and the facts of the Bishop Kirk case are not identical to Stoke Lyne".

#### Financial Implications

8. The matter for the decision of Members is essentially a financial one:-

Should the County Council as Local Education Authority be prepared to accept a reduction of say £15,000, from the total proceeds of sale of £75,000 as a means of settling the argument and obtaining the release of the funds which have been on deposit with the Diocesan Trustees since 1988. (During this time interest has accrued to the Trustees not to the Council). A compromise on this basis, would also mean the end of any litigation for judicial review with which the Trustees' Solicitors have threatened the DFEE. Such litigation would of course still further delay the handing over of the proceeds of sale to the LEA.

#### Staffing and Environmental Implications and Implications for People Living in Poverty

9. There are no staffing or environmental implications or implications for people living in poverty arising directly from this report.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

10. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:-**
  - (a) **decline the offer by the Trustees, and that the Secretary of State be asked to proceed with the determination which she has stated she is minded to make, without further delay; and**
  - (b) **the Association of County Councils (ACC) be asked to press for a change in the law so that interest on the proceeds of sale in cases of this kind is apportioned between the parties in the same shares as the Secretary**

**of State's determination.**

G.M. BADMAN  
Chief Education Officer

C.J. IMPEY  
Assistant Chief Executive &  
Solicitor to the Council

Background Papers: Correspondence with DFEE  
Specifically, 4 February 1994, 23 January 1996 and  
23 September 1996. (These are available in the Members  
Resource Centre).

Contact Officers: Howard Perkins, Joint Head of Legal Services  
Tel: (01865) 810250  
John Clark, Legal Consultant Tel: (01865) 815514  
David Brown, Principal Premises Development Officer, Education  
Department Tel: (01865) 815609

November 1996

Division(s) affected: All

**AGENDA ITEM EM15**

Education Committee

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 27 NOVEMBER 1996**

**DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION ACT 1995: EMPLOYMENT ISSUES**

Report by the Chief Education Officer

Background

1. The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) contains employment provisions which come into force on 2 December 1996.
2. In brief, from that date it will be unlawful for an employer to discriminate against a disabled person in the field of employment for a reason which relates to the disability if the employer cannot show that this treatment is justified. The Government has produced a Code of Practice which gives guidance to employers in eliminating discrimination, and which may be used in evidence in Tribunals.
3. Employers with fewer than 20 employees are exempt from these provisions (but not the other provisions of the DDA). Therefore small Voluntary Aided Schools will not be required by law to comply.
4. The Act will, however, have an impact on all other sectors of the Education Service, either directly or via governing bodies. The requirements apply not only to recruitment but also to all other terms of employment and prohibit discrimination in affording opportunities for promotion, transfer or training, by dismissing or subjecting an employee with disabilities to "any other detriment".

Recruitment

5. The County Personnel Officer has produced a new application form which is already in use for centrally-employed staff and which is being amended for use by schools. The typeface is slightly larger than before in order to help candidates with visual impairments and the monitoring sheet at the back (copy enclosed at Annex 1) is designed to collect the information which will be required to allow us to comply with the Act.
6. The County Council's Model Recruitment Policy for School-based Employees has been amended in the light of the DDA, after consultation with employee representatives at the Teachers Joint Committee on 17 October 1996 (Minute 47/96 refers). It will be presented to Education Committee on 17 December for approval and will then be sent to schools with a recommendation that it should be adopted.

Other Employment Issues

7. Attached at Annex 2 is the guidance note which is being sent to all schools along with the new application forms, and to all managers of centrally-employed staff, including those in Community Education. It is being made clear to governing bodies of schools with delegated budgets that they are responsible for complying with the Act and may have to defend their actions in an Industrial Tribunal.
8. The Department for Education and Employment proposes to issue a circular to all schools at the beginning of next term, to inform them about their new duties under the DDA. A draft circular has been sent to Local Education Authorities and others for comment by 27 November.
9. The County Personnel Officer has produced a leaflet (attached at Annex 3) to be issued to all existing employees with November payslips. This is intended to comply with the requirement in the Code of Practice that "all staff should be made aware that it is unlawful to discriminate against disabled people, and be familiar with the policies and practices adopted by their employer to ensure compliance with the law".

Financial and Staffing Implications

10. The Act does not require us to adapt all our premises in anticipation of appointing disabled people. We only have to respond to the needs of applicants and employees as they present themselves. However, the Act is almost certain to require adaptations to premises and equipment at some point and may also involve additional staffing in order to assist individual disabled employees. The cost of these developments will have to be made from delegated and/or central budgets, and no additional provision has been made for this.
11. Managing and implementing the requirements of the Act are likely to involve additional staff time.

Environmental Implications

12. There are none arising directly from this report.

Implications for People Living in Poverty

13. Individuals with disabilities are disproportionately represented within the poorest sections of the community. Measures designed to help them gain and keep employment are therefore likely to have a beneficial impact on poverty levels.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

14. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to note the report and endorse the actions taken or proposed.**

G M BADMAN  
Chief Education Officer

Background Papers:            Disability Discrimination Act 1995  
  
   Code of Practice for the elimination of  
   discrimination in the field of employment against  
   disabled persons (issued by the Secretary of State  
   for Education and Employment)

Contact Officer: Sue Tanner, Senior Education Officer (tel:(01865) 815472)

November 1996

**AGENDA ITEM EM6**

Education Committee

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB COMMITTEE - 27 November 1996**

**ST. NICHOLAS ASSESSMENT UNIT**

Report by the Chief Education Officer

Background

1. St. Nicholas Assessment Unit was established as an assessment unit for pupils with a range of learning problems. Over time the role of the unit has changed and it now caters for twelve First school children predominantly with emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD).
2. The role of the unit has been reviewed in the light of:
  - (a) the development plan for provision for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties which was approved by the Sub-Committee on 11 September 1996;
  - (b) Department for Education & Employment Circular 2/94 which clarifies the legal status of free-standing units and states that funding for such units should either be delegated to a host school or the unit should be designated as a pupil referral unit. Maintaining the unit as a free-standing unit managed by the Local Education Authority, as at present, is not an option.

Consultation process

3. A consultation paper was circulated to all Oxford City Nursery, First and Middle schools and to officers and support service staff. Two meetings were held with all the Oxford City First school Headteachers. As part of the review process two Local Education Authority Inspectors spent two days in the unit and provided a report of their findings. (A copy of the full report has been placed in the Members' Resource Centre.)
4. The consultation paper makes it clear that there is no question of reducing the resources available for young children with emotional and behavioural difficulties in Oxford City. The consultation process has looked at different options for using these resources in the most effective way possible.

Options

5. A number of options for the future of the unit have been considered:
  - (a) Retain the unit and delegate funding and management responsibility to a mainstream school

There was an initial suggestion that, as a group, the City Headteachers would be prepared to take on all the duties that the management of the unit would entail. This was not subsequently supported by First school Headteachers. No individual school has offered to take on management responsibility for the unit.
  - (b) Establish the Unit as a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)

St. Nicholas Assessment Unit has not, to date, been designated as a PRU. The County's review of provision for primary aged children with EBD (April 1995) proposed that PRUs should focus predominantly on the middle and secondary age range and that primary aged pupils should be supported by the establishment of the KS1 and 2 outreach services and Northern House special school. All six of the County's PRUs work with middle/secondary aged pupils.

- (c) Close the unit and use the resources to enhance provision through a combination of an additional six planned places at Northern House and an additional teacher for outreach support

Feedback from LEA Inspectors

The Inspectors report supports the view that the unit should, at an appropriate time, be closed and that children with identified emotional and behavioural difficulties from the City's First schools should be supported by additional places at the County's primary-aged EBD special school and through the more recently established key stage 1 and 2 behaviour outreach service. They give the following reasons:

- (i) when larger numbers of children are present in the assessment unit the quality of education appears to suffer. This is associated with a wide range of ages (potentially from 5+ to 10+) and levels of maturity as well as individual needs (both learning and behavioural). Within a larger group, disruption to the learning process by very challenging children is a real possibility. Accommodation does not currently provide an appropriate area for 'time out' for individuals who need, on occasions, to be removed from the main teaching area;
- (ii) the role of the Assessment Unit has changed over time and its current use was established before the introduction of the statutory requirements of the National Curriculum and its assessment. While the statements of special educational needs for children who are full time at the Unit require access to a broad and balanced curriculum, including the National Curriculum, there is clearly an issue about two teachers, working in isolation from others, having sufficient curriculum expertise to have knowledge of the progression and continuity in all subjects of the National Curriculum. In First/Primary and Special schools classroom teachers have access to subject co-ordinators to assist with curriculum plans, schemes of work and teaching strategies;
- (iii) the arrangements for entry to, and transition from, the Assessment Unit are unsatisfactory. In the past some children have been admitted at age 5+. Currently children appear to be referred after approximately two years of First schooling and sometimes transfer to either Middle or Special schools after the age when other children in the City do so. This creates a number of real difficulties. Transfer from First school into the Assessment Unit for a few years before moving on again is disruptive for children who are already vulnerable. It would be more appropriate for these children who have to leave First school that their placement is less tenuous with the possibility of reintegration retained. Some children remain at the Assessment Unit beyond the age of nine. The delay in transfer is associated with either uncertainty about appropriate placement, or, where appropriate placement has been identified, no space is available; and
- (iv) this situation is unacceptable for all concerned - pupils, parents and staff. It is inappropriate to educate the youngest with the oldest pupils. Uncertainty of next school places unnecessary stress on children and their families who may already be in a vulnerable position. The wider age and ability together with range uncertainty about future destination places real difficulties in the way of staff to plan appropriately. Preparation of reintegration or transition arrangements, essential if progress is to be maintained by the child, are

constrained by the air of uncertainty. The review of provision, as currently proposed, would tackle what is an unsatisfactory position.

#### Feedback from City First School Headteachers

Initial feedback from City First school Headteachers highlighted a reluctance to see any reduction in the number of off-site places for young children with EBD. There was reference to the value of outreach support but not at the expense of off-site places. A number of Headteachers referred to the need to develop early family support for children with EBD. At a meeting of Oxford City First school Headteachers on 17 October 1996 the overwhelming majority of Heads voted in favour of the proposal to close the unit with the proviso that, in addition to an increase in six planned places at Northern House, the remaining resources are used to appoint an additional teacher to undertake preventative Family Support work with City First school children with EBD and their families.

- (d) To close the unit and use the resources to enhance the provision at Northern House Special school by an additional 12 planned places

City First school Headteachers have highlighted the need to retain this option for further consideration if the additional time allocated to Family support work proves ineffective in meeting the needs of children with EBD and their families.

#### Views of Staff at the Unit

6. Staff at the Unit consider that the Unit plays an important role in the continuum of provision for children with EBD which cannot be filled either by outreach support or a special school place.
7. This view is supported by several individuals who wrote in support of the role of the Unit in the consultation process.

#### Conclusions

8. A number of options for the future of St. Nicholas Assessment Unit have been considered as part of the consultation process.
9. There is support from Inspectors, officers, and Oxford City First school Headteachers for the proposal to close the St. Nicholas Assessment Unit and use the resources for:
  - (a) an additional six planned places at Northern House school for Oxford City First school children; and
  - (b) the appointment of additional staff to provide preventative family support work with Oxford City First school children.
10. It is proposed that the family support work should be developed as a pilot project which, if successful, could be developed further. If not successful, the resources could be translated into a further six planned places at Northern House.

#### Costings

11. St. Nicholas Assessment Unit budget  
£68,700
- Cost of six planned places at Northern House school  
£33,616
- Additional staffing for Family Support work with  
Oxford City First school children  
£35,084

See Annex 1 for detailed costings.

#### Financial, Staffing, Environmental and Poverty Implications

12. The recommendation can be achieved within existing resources using the budget already allocated to the St Nicholas Assessment Unit. Detailed costings are set out fully in Annex 1.
13. Families living in poverty are more likely than other families to have children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. Provision aimed at family support for children with EBD is likely to have a positive impact on families living in poverty.
14. If the recommendation for closure of the Unit is supported, additional posts will be created at Northern House School and staff will need to be appointed to provide family support work with Oxford City first schools. Staff within the Unit will be subject to the normal redundancy and redeployment procedures.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

15. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to approve the closure of the St. Nicholas Assessment Unit and use the resources to:**
  - (a) **increase planned places at Northern House by six; and**
  - (b) **appoint additional staff to provide family support for Oxford City First school children with emotional and behavioural difficulties and their families on a two year pilot basis.**

G.M. BADMAN  
Chief Education Officer

Background Papers: DfEE Circular 2/94 The Education of Children  
Otherwise than in School  
LEA Inspection report on St. Nicholas Assessment Unit July  
1996.

Contact Officer: Gillian Tee, Principal Educational Psychologist  
and Head of Family Services Tel: (01865) 815125

**AGENDA ITEM EM9**

Education Committee

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 27 NOVEMBER 1996**

**NON-DELEGATED BUDGET PROVISION FOR REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS  
 1997/98**

Report by the Director of Environmental Services

Introduction

1. The Operations Sub-Committee have approved proposals for the apportionment between committees of the 1997/98 Repair and Maintenance Budget. The proposed allocation for the Education Committee is outlined below, together with a comparison with assessed need. The allocation is shown at 1997/98 Outturn Prices including an allowance of 3% for inflation.
2. The budget delegated to schools is the responsibility of the Education Committee and is not dealt with in this report.
3. The assessed need for delegated repairs to primary, secondary and special schools is £6,563,900 and the budget provision is £1,625,900.

Proposed Repair and Maintenance Budget 1997/98

4. The provisional budget allocated for non-delegated repair and maintenance of buildings administered by the Education Committee is £6.10m and comprised of as follows:-

	Primary Total	Secondary	Special	School Meals	Other
	£	£	£	£	£
External Decorations	194,000 411,700	154,000	18,000	23,000	22,700
Internal Decorations	- 14,400	-	-	14,400	-
Building Works	518,000 1,619,700	855,500	51,000	106,000	89,200
Engineering Works	626,700 1,761,500	889,300	38,100	137,800	69,600
Day to Day Repairs and Urgent Works	903,400 2,295,300	956,900	82,700	213,800	138,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,242,100 6,102,600</b>	<b>2,855,700</b>	<b>189,800</b>	<b>495,000</b>	<b>320,000</b>

5. The proposed budget represents 20.4% of the assessed need. The total budgetary provision controlled by Operations Sub-Committee for 1997/98 is expected to be £8,322,200 against an assessed need of £39,604,400 (21.0%).
6. All planned repairs included in the overall 1997/98 programme are in

the highest priority category. Further prioritisation has therefore been necessary to ensure that repairs most critical to the provision and maintenance of services are carried out with particular attention given to residential accommodation including homes for the elderly. As a result the ratio of budget provision to assessed need for the Education Committee is slightly lower than the overall ratio.

7. No account has been taken of any adjustments to the Repair and Maintenance budget which may be required under the 1997/98 Policy and Budget plans. If the total budget is reduced then the allocation for Education buildings will be reviewed.
8. Full details of provision and assessed need by Committee and for individual premises have been placed in the Members' Resource Centre.

Financial and Staffing Implications

9. There are no direct financial or staffing implications arising from this report.

Environmental Implications

10. The chronic gap between budget provision and assessed need will inevitably lead to further deterioration in the internal and external condition of Council buildings.

Implications for People Living in Poverty

11. There are no direct implications for people living in poverty arising from this report.

**RECOMMENDATION**

12. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to submit their observations (if any) on the proposals for the 1997/98 budget for Repair and Maintenance of buildings held by the Education Committee to the next meeting of the Operations Sub-Committee.**

DAVID YOUNG  
Director of Environmental Services

Background Papers: Nil

Contact Officer: Greg Lowe, Buildings Officer (Maintenance/Temporary Building) Tel: (01865) 8155532

November 1996

Division(s) affected: Bicester Divisions

AGENDA ITEM EM8 (b)

**OUTLINE PROJECT SUBMISSION**  
**APPRAISAL NO: ED 438**

**NAME OF SCHEME:** Bardwell School, Bicester - Extensions

**COMMITTEE:** EDUCATION  
Proposed Start Year: 1997/98

**BASIS OF ESTIMATE:** Initial Budgetary Assessment

INTRODUCTION

1. The Local Education Authority has included in its Annual Capital Guideline (ACG) bid for 1997/98 a submission on behalf of Bardwell Special School. As the submission refers to a significant increase in the school's capacity, this basic need scheme will require the publication of statutory proposals. The Authority will be unable to fulfill its legal responsibility to provide specialist facilities for children with severe learning difficulties in Bicester unless these works are undertaken. The Chief Education officer is therefore requesting the Sub-Committee's approval to publish these proposals and to formally consult on the authority's plans to expand the school.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

Bardwell school is situated on a large campus which it shares with Glory Farm Primary School and the Cooper School. The work at the school will include extensions to the general accommodation to provide 2 additional classrooms, a nursery class, toilets, storage, and improvements to the school's existing specialist science and technology facilities and main hall. Some additional work to provide an additional classroom within the Cooper School will be undertaken funding permitting.

3. JUSTIFICATION

The agreed Department for Education & Employment capacity of Bardwell School is 55. This figure is an unrealistic one as the school was not designed to meet the needs of children with complex special needs. The classrooms are too small to accommodate 55 children. In addition, the pupil roll is increasing. There are currently 51 children on roll. The roll rises to 70 in 1999. There is currently a waiting list of pre-school children. The school is the only special school for children with severe learning difficulties in Bicester.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

(a) Capital

The estimated total cost of work at the Bardwell School including fees is £250,000. A bid has been made to the DFEE for loan sanction to undertake this work.

(b) Revenue

Additional running costs and day to day maintenance costs will have to be met from the special school's delegated budget. These costs have still to be quantified. Additional structural maintenance will be financed from the central non-delegated maintenance budget.

5. STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

There are none arising from the proposed work.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

The building work will be carried out in accordance with any planning permission issued by the Council. Plans submitted with the application will show the proposed landscaping works.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) authorise the service of notice of proposals under the Education Act 1993 to expand the nursery and primary departments of Bardwell School;
- (b) instruct officers to formally consult on the Council's plans to expand the nursery and primary departments of Bardwell School; and
- (c) approve the outline project submission.

G.M. BADMAN  
Chief Education Officer

CHRIS GRAY  
County Treasurer

DAVID YOUNG  
Director of Environmental Services

November 1996

Contact Officer: Keith Borien - Senior Education Officer Tel. (01865) 815134

**AGENDA ITEM EM8(b)**

OUTLINE PROJECT SUBMISSION

**APPRAISAL NO: ED 349**

**NAME OF SCHEME:** Bishopswood School, Sonning Common - Extensions

**COMMITTEE(S):** EDUCATION  
Proposed Start Date: 1997/98

**BASIS OF ESTIMATE:** Initial Budgetary Assessment

INTRODUCTION

1. The Local Education Authority has included in its Annual Capital Guideline (ACG) bid for 1997/98 a submission on behalf of Bishopswood School. As the submission refers to a significant increase in the school's capacity, this basic need scheme will require the publication of statutory proposals. The Authority will be unable to fulfil its legal responsibility to provide specialist facilities for children with severe learning difficulties unless this work is undertaken. The Chief Education Officer is therefore requesting the Sub-Committee's approval to serving notice of these proposals and to formally consult on the authority's plans to expand the school.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

Since 1990 Bishopswood Special School has been totally co-located on three mainstream school sites. The nursery is located at Valley Road Nursery School, the primary department is located at Sonning Common Primary School, the senior department at Chiltern Edge Secondary School, Sonning Common. This project involves extensions to the nursery and primary schools only. It includes additional teaching areas, additional storage space, a resources space, 1:1 rooms, additional toilet facilities and office space.

3. JUSTIFICATION

The agreed DFEE capacity for Bishopswood School is 55. The school currently has 59 children on roll. This number will rise to 65 in 1997 and to 71 in 1998. There is currently a waiting list of pre-school aged children requiring access to the specialist facilities available at the school. Bishopswood is the only special school for children with severe learning difficulties serving a large part of South Oxfordshire. It caters for a very wide range of complex special needs.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

(a) Capital

The estimated total cost of work on both the nursery and primary school sites including fees, is £455,000. A bid has been made to the DFEE for loan sanction to undertake this work.

(b) Revenue

Additional running costs and day to day maintenance costs as yet unquantified, will have to be met from within the special schools' delegated budget. Additional structural maintenance will be met from within the central non-delegated maintenance budget.

5. STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

There are none arising from the proposed work.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

The building work will be carried out in accordance with any planning permission issued by the Council, when environmental and landscape requirements will be taken into account.

7. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Sub-Committee are **RECOMMENDED** to:

- (a) **authorise the service of notice of proposals under the Education Act 1993 to expand the nursery and primary departments of Bishopswood School;**
- (b) **instruct officers to formally consult on the Council's plans to expand the nursery and primary departments of Bishopswood School; and**
- (c) **approve the outline project submission.**

Chief Education Officer

G.M. BADMAN    CHRIS GRAY  
County Treasurer

DAVID YOUNG  
Director of Environmental Services

Contact Officer: Keith Borien - Senior Education Officer  
Tel. (01865) 815134

November 1996

EM8(a) - page

Division(s) affected: Didcot Divisions

**AGENDA ITEM EM8(a)**

**DETAILED PROJECT APPRAISAL  
APPRAISAL NO: ED430/1**

Name of Scheme: Didcot Girls School, Didcot  
Improvements and Extensions to Technology

Committee(s): EDUCATION  
Proposed Start Year: 1997/98

Basis of Estimate: W S Atkins Estimate based on Agreed Sketch Scheme

**INTRODUCTION**

1. At their meeting in September 1996, the Education Management Sub-Committee approved a scheme to upgrade the technology accommodation at Didcot Girls School. The work involves the demolition of an out building, and the construction of a new classroom for Textiles, a new wood store, and a refurbished Home Economics and Technology area.

**JUSTIFICATION**

2. The justification remains as stated in the outline project submission. New and improved accommodation for technology is needed to meet the demands arising from increased pupil numbers.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

3. (a) Capital

The estimated total cost of this work, including fees, is £217,00. These costs will be met by Annual Capital Guideline (ACG).

- (b) Revenue

Additional running costs and day to day maintenance costs will be met from the school's delegated budget. Additional structural maintenance will be financed from the central non delegated maintenance budget.

**STAFFING IMPLICATIONS**

4. There are none arising directly from this work.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. The school site will be significantly enhanced by the demolition of the out building and by the construction of the new classroom.

G.M. BADMAN  
Chief Education Officer

CHRIS GRAY  
County Treasurer

DAVID YOUNG  
Director of Environmental Services

Contact Officer: Keith Borien - Senior Education Officer  
Tel. (01865) 815134

November 1996

**AGENDA ITEM EM10**

Education Committee

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 27 NOVEMBER 1996**

**SCHOOLS' SECURITY**

Report by the Chief Education Officer

Introduction

1. On 11 September 1996, the Sub-Committee received a report on Schools' Security, and requested officers to report back with proposals for implementing further security measures in schools in the light of further advice from the Department for Education and Employment once the Government's funding arrangements were known.
2. This report details the security measures and security initiatives which the Education Department intends to implement in all Oxfordshire schools subject to funding being identified. The report seeks the Sub-Committee's endorsement of these proposals and requests that the unmet costs are included exceptionally as a growth bid in the Council's 1997/98 budget.

The Proposals

3. The Education Services Risk Reduction Group has met twice since the Dunblane incident. It includes representatives from Thames Valley Police Authority, Oxfordshire Fire Service, the Oxfordshire Secondary Schools Headteachers' Association, (OSSHTA), the Oxfordshire Primary Schools Headteachers' Association, (OPHTA), and the Council's Education and Treasurers' Departments. The group has considered advice emanating from the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) and has recommended the adoption of the following security initiatives and security measures. It is the Education Department's wish that all the recommendations which follow are implemented as soon as is practicably possible:
  - (a) the securing of all external doors by either upgrading existing door locks with coded entry systems or by the use of crashbar/pushbar devices in all Oxfordshire schools to prevent intruders entering school buildings. Although over 80% of Oxfordshire Schools operate a visitor identification system, it is evident that schools still find it difficult to monitor all entrances. All new schools and extensions will include secure external doors;
  - (b) the provision in all schools of panic alarm systems, which are either linked to the school's intruder alarm system or are a self contained system. The panic alarm systems range from the fixed button type, which can be positioned in the school's reception areas and other vulnerable areas, to the system which allows staff to carry a small key fob unit which, when activated, will operate the alarm. In some schools a combination of both systems might be appropriate;
  - (c) linking up with the Thames Valley Police Authority Schools Security Project to ensure that Oxfordshire schools benefit from this initiative which is funded by commercial sponsorship. This project which provides some security improvements is limited to one school in each police area;
  - (d) in conjunction with Thames Valley Police Authority the introduction throughout Oxfordshire of the SAFE SCHOOL INITIATIVE. This initiative which has been successfully pioneered in Hereford and Worcester by the Local Education Authority and West Mercia Constabulary, provides a framework by which schools can ultimately obtain formal certification in

recognition of their work in providing a safe and secure environment;

Through this initiative schools are provided with a practical guide which will help them to set up and run a Risk Management Group, provide a series of classroom activities to support the initiative and provide a simple guide to security which meets the need for short term measures and provides a basis for longer term solutions. This proposal is particularly relevant to schools as they will need to undertake, on a regular basis, risk assessments to identify problems and possible solutions. This will become increasingly important as staff in Premises Development Group come under increasing pressure to provide advice and to undertake with schools reviews of their security;

- (e) the inclusion of all schools in the Ring-Master telephone system so that all schools can receive information swiftly and alert other educational establishments;
- (f) provide a framework of training based on the Lamplugh Trust advice in personal safety to all school staff; and
- (g) the use by Oxfordshire schools of literature produced by the Lamplugh Trust which contains advice for children on personal safety both in and out of school.

#### Financial Implications

- 4. It is estimated that the cost of introducing secure doors and panic alarm systems as identified in paragraphs 3(a) and 3(b) above will be in the region of £530,000. This figure is based on a total spend of £1600 per school, which in turn is based on an average of 10 external doors per school and the cost of the panic alarms. It is acknowledged that secondary schools and larger primary schools will have a higher number of external doors. In addition to this there will be some schools with reception areas some distance from the entrance. These will need automatic door entry systems e.g. intercom/remote unlocking of door.
- 5. The LEA has submitted a bid under the Grants for Education Support and Training (GEST) funding arrangements for 1997/98 but since no guide figures have been issued by the DFEE it is impossible to provide any estimate of what allocation may be received. The provision of secure doors and panic alarm systems will be the top priority for expenditure in 1997/98 from whatever allocation is received.
- 6. Realistically, any allocation is likely to fall well short of the £530,000 identified. Any shortfall will need to be considered as a bid for Policy and Budget Plans.

#### Environmental Implications

- 7. There are no environmental implications arising from these proposals.

#### Implications for People Living in Poverty

- 8. There are no implications for people living in poverty arising directly from this report.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 9. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to endorse the proposals as set out in paragraph 3 of the report and to RECOMMEND Education Committee that the cost of these proposals is included as a growth bid in the Council's 1997/98 budget.**

G.M. BADMAN  
Chief Education Officer

Background papers: 'Statement by the Chief Education Officer in response to the recent tragedy in Dunblane Primary School - Education Committee, 19 March 1996 (Min 14/96)

Previous report to Education Management Sub-Committee, 11  
September 1996 (Min 50/96)

Contact Officer: Keith Borien, Senior Education Officer,  
Tel: (01865) 815134

November 1996

**AGENDA ITEM EM8(b)**

**OUTLINE PROJECT SUBMISSION**  
**APPRAISAL NO: ED 440**

**NAME OF SCHEME:** Springfield School, Witney - Relocation

**COMMITTEE(S):** Education  
Proposed Start Year: 1998/99

**BASIS OF ESTIMATE:** Initial Budgetary Assessment

INTRODUCTION

1. The Local Education Authority has included in its Annual Capital Guideline (ACG) bid for 1997/98 a submission on behalf of Springfield School, Witney. As the submission refers to the transfer of the school from its present site to a new site in N E Witney, this scheme will require the publication of statutory proposals. The Chief Education Officer is requesting the Sub-Committee's approval to publish these proposals and to formally consult on the authority's plans to transfer the school.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

2. This scheme, which has the support of the school governing body, involves the relocation of Springfield School from its present inadequate site in Moorland Close to a new site in N E Witney. The current location has restricted access, and has little scope for expansion. The authority intends to construct the new special school alongside the new Madley Brook Primary School, which is likely to open 12 - 24 months after the new special school. Upon completion it is envisaged that the 2 schools will operate with two governing bodies and 2 separate management teams, but operationally as the County's first integrated primary school. The new special school will be designed to meet the special needs of these pupils and will include 10 classrooms, appropriate toilet changing and showering facilities, storage, and specialist facilities such as a community hydrotherapy pool, soft play room and a sensory room.
3. When the new primary school is open it is planned that the new primary school will become the focus for the special school's integration programme for primary aged children.

JUSTIFICATION

4. The current Springfield School building was built in the late 1960's as a Junior Training Centre to accommodate 45 children. Since then not only has the function of the building changed, but the nature of the children's needs have also changed. The school now caters for children with severe learning difficulties living in West Oxfordshire. In 1990 the school roll was 36. In September of this year it had risen to 82. Although 47 of these children are educated full-time within 3 local mainstream schools, two of these schools are unable to absorb any more Springfield pupils.
5. It is clear that
  - (a) there are insufficient school places for children with severe and profound special needs at Springfield School in West Oxfordshire;
  - (b) the building is too small to accommodate the existing number of pupils and classrooms. External play areas are limited and access and parking is restricted.

OTHER OPTIONS

6. The only other option is for the school to remain on its existing

inadequate site and for the children to be educated in other local schools, where it is unlikely that there will be sufficient space or support.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. (a) Capital

The school site will be provided "free" as a condition of the NE Witney Development Agreement if this proceeds. The estimated total cost of the new school is £2.5 m, exclusive of fees. Capital receipts from the sale of the existing school site are being confirmed but are provisionally estimated at £100,000. A bid for ACG has been made for this project.

(b) Revenue

Running costs and day to day maintenance costs will be met from the school's delegated budget. Structural maintenance will be financed from the central non-delegated maintenance budget.

#### STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

8. There are no staffing implications arising from the proposed work.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The building work will be carried out in accordance with any planning permission issued by the Council, when environmental and landscape requirements will be taken into account.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

10. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to:**

(a) **authorise the serving of notice of the Council's proposals to transfer Springfield School, Witney to a new site once a site has been identified;**

(b) **instruct officers to formally consult on the Council's plans to transfer Springfield School to a new site; and**

(c) **approve the outline project submission.**

G.M. BADMAN  
Chief Education Officer

CHRIS GRAY  
County Treasurer

DAVID YOUNG  
Director of Environmental Services

Contact Officer: Keith Borien - Senior Education Officer - Tel. (01865) 815134  
November 1996

EM8(b) - page  
Division(s) affected: Hanborough

**AGENDA ITEM EM8(b)**

**OUTLINE PROJECT SUBMISSION**  
**Appraisal No: ED 441**

**Name of Scheme:** Long Hanborough CE (Controlled) Infants School and  
The Manor County Primary School Long Hanborough.  
Consolidation onto one site requiring extension and adaptation

**Committee(s):** Education

**Basis of Estimate:** Initial Budgetary Assessment

INTRODUCTION

1. At their meeting on 10 October 1995 the Education Committee authorised the publication of Statutory Notices in accordance with Section 12 of the Education Act 1980 to cease to maintain the Manor County Primary School, Long Hanborough with effect from April 1997 (Min 82/95 refers).

At the same time the Education Committee raised no objections to the publication by the Oxford Diocesan Board of Education of Statutory Notices under Section 13 of the Education Act 1980 to change the age range and character of Long Hanborough CE (Controlled) Infant School to a 5-11 CE (Controlled) Primary School from April 1997.

It was also agreed to seek a transfer order from the Secretary of State for Education and Employment, in accordance with Section 16 of the Education Act 1944, to effect the transfer to the former Manor School.

The Statutory Notices were published in December 1995 but after further consultation with the School Governors and the Diocese the Department for Education and Employment were asked to defer any decision on the proposed amalgamation of the two schools until the calculation for the pupil place capacity of the school had been determined to obtain an accurate assessment for the removal of surplus places and an appropriate bid submitted to the Department for Education & Employment as part of The Annual Capital Guideline Procedure for 1997/98.

This bid was submitted on 10 October 1996. Included within it was a

request for an allocation for the removal of 90 surplus places (30 places in the CE (Controlled) Infants School and 60 places in temporary accommodation at The Manor CP School).

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

2. The CE (Controlled) Infants School and the Manor CP School are two separate buildings managed by one Governing Body and Headteacher. The CE (Controlled) Infants School was constructed in 1879 and formerly contained two small classrooms which have been converted into one large teaching space. The Manor CP School was built in 1959 and extended in 1973. The School site includes playing fields and has five classrooms in permanent construction, one of which is used as a library and four classrooms in temporary accommodation. The hall, kitchen and administrative base are based in the permanent building.

The proposal is to construct a new reception classroom, library and administrative offices with some internal adaptations including additional and improved sanitation and cloakrooms to create a new eight class primary school with a capacity of 240 places. The extension will be permanently linked to the existing school to improve the quality of the educational provision and to achieve the most economical use of the space available.

JUSTIFICATION

3. The justification remains the same as set out in the report to Education Committee on 10 October 1995. The CE (Controlled) Infants School is not suitable for current educational requirements. This Victorian building is expensive to heat and maintain and is not a cost efficient building. It has limited facilities and a road frontage to the busy A4095 road, causing difficulties relating to noise and health and safety. The consolidation of the school onto one site will remove these problems. The school can then be managed with more efficient use of staff time and resources and by utilising a more modern and energy efficient building will enable the removal of unsuitable and costly premises.

The current capacity of the schools is 258 places (CE Infants - 30 places, Manor CP. 228 places) and the number on roll in January 1996 (Form 7) was 205 (CE Infants - 23 Manor CP 182).

The primary school forecasts, based upon the January 1996 Form 7 Returns (including rising fives), demonstrate that an 8 class school with a capacity of 240 places will continue to be required into the foreseeable future:-

	<u>1996</u> <u>2003</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	
(Actual)								
CE Infants	23	44	44	47	52	52	52	53
Manor CP	<u>182</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>181</u>
Total	205	226	224	228	232	222	230	234

The Governors and the Oxford Diocesan Board of Education have agreed to the construction of new buildings on the Manor CP School site and to the transfer of the CE Infants children onto the new site to be known as the Long Hanborough Manor (CE) Primary School. Once the new buildings are available the CE Infants School can be sold and funds used to help finance the cost of the proposals.

OTHER OPTIONS

4. (i) The schools could continue operating on two sites. In the current and long term this would be uneconomic and the difficult operational problems would remain, as would the health and safety problems.
- (ii) The Manor CP School could be provided with a single temporary prefabricated classroom to replace one of the two existing 2 class temporary units to provide eight teaching spaces. This option would not meet the integration and unity that is achievable in permanent accommodation. It is anticipated that

there would be strong local resistance to such a proposal.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

##### Capital

5. (1) The detailed brief for the proposals has not yet been prepared but the initial budgetary assessment of the cost will be in the region of £201,000 exclusive of professional fees broken down as follows:-

(i)	New Build (154m2 x £810m2)	=	£125,000
(ii)	Adaptations (63m2 x £405m2)	=	£ 26,000
(iii)	Highway Improvements		<u>£ 50,000</u>
	(Requested by Environmental Services)		£201,000 plus fees

The proposal is that this cost will be funded through the utilisation of the useable capital receipts from the disposal of the CE (Controlled) Infants school site, which is owned by Trustees, and the balance by credit approval from the Annual Capital Guideline (ACG) allocation for 1997/98. This scheme will need to be added to the Capital Programme.

##### Revenue

- (2) As a result of the consolidation of the school onto one site and the sale of the CE (Controlled) Infants School there will be a net saving to both the delegated and non-delegated budgetary provision.

#### STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

6. There are no staffing implications arising directly from this work.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The removal of some temporary accommodation from the Manor CP School site and the construction of a purpose designed permanent extension will significantly enhance the site and will be more cost efficient in energy and maintenance costs. It is anticipated that the CE Infants building will be sold for residential purposes and planning conditions are likely to ensure that the building continues to contribute towards the aesthetic aspects of the Village.

G.M. BADMAN  
Chief Education Officer

CHRIS GRAY  
County Treasurer

DAVID YOUNG  
Director of Environmental Services

**Contact Officer: David Brown - Principal Premises Development  
Officer - Tel. Oxford 01865 815107**

November 1996

Division(s) affected: All

**AGENDA ITEM EM13**

Environmental Committee

PUBLIC TRANSPORT SUB-COMMITTEE - 14 NOVEMBER 1996

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 27 NOVEMBER 1996**

**CHANGES TO CONTRACT REVIEW AREAS**

Report by the Director of Environmental Services

Introduction

1. Bus subsidy contracts are reviewed on a rolling programme, with an area (or group of areas) being reviewed every six months. School transport contracts are reviewed by the Chief Education Officer in the same areas at the same time. Subsidy contracts normally last for four years, so there are eight "review areas".
2. The review areas currently used were delineated by officers in the Education Department in the 1970s (or possibly earlier). The Public Transport Sub-Committee agreed to adopt these established areas when competitive tendering for local bus services began in 1986 (prior to that date, every bus subsidy agreement was reviewed every year!) The existing review areas and schedule are shown in Annex 1.
3. The areas, although designed originally for the Education Department alone, have generally served reasonably well. However, there are a few respects in which they have never been ideally suited to review of public transport contracts, and inevitably changes over time have made them less ideal for school contracts too. Jointly with the Chief Education Officer, I have therefore reviewed the definition of the areas, and in this report propose some changes.

Reasons For Change

4. There are two main reasons for changing contract review areas. Firstly, they are of unequal size. In particular, the inclusion of Banbury and Oxford in the same "area" causes a massive peak of workload, which in practice prevents full justice being done to services in either place. In contrast, the Abingdon and Cumnor area is, in public transport terms, very small.
5. The second reason is that some pairs of places, although at present in different review areas, have many services in common and/or serve the same hinterland. Members will recall that, in the recently completed Abingdon/Cumnor review just completed, many Faringdon area services were included because they serve both the Faringdon and Cumnor areas. Faringdon also has many services in common with Wantage. Another example is Didcot, which is presently in the same review area as Wantage, but in terms of subsidised bus services has many in common with Wallingford. It is difficult to achieve a rational pattern of services in an area if different services are reviewed at different times.
6. One argument which is advanced against retendering all services in a given geographical area at once is that local bus operators stand to lose a very high proportion of their work simultaneously, with the risk that they will be forced out of business and competition will be reduced for the next review. This is of course an argument against having geographically-based reviews at all, rather than against the changes now proposed (although rationalising areas would tend to exacerbate any problems). In my view, the potential benefits from allowing joint working of services and (if appropriate) wholesale network redesign greatly outweigh this risk, which is best addressed by encouraging operators to spread their activities over several areas.

Effecting the Change

7. In designing a revised schedule of reviews, we have had to be mindful not just of the ideal ultimate pattern, but also of transitional arrangements. During the changeover period, some contracts will inevitably not be of the normal four years duration. The Transport Act 1985 prohibits subsidy contracts of greater than five years' duration, and in practice it is wise to plan to review contracts somewhat before the five year "deadline" in case some difficulty should arise (such as a lack of acceptable tenders) which forces a contract extension.
8. Annex 2 shows for each place the changes in review dates proposed and the duration of the transitional contracts. We have aimed to keep the lengths of transitional contracts as close as possible to the normal four years. All but five places will have contracts of between 3½ and 4½ years in length, 4½ years (ie an extension of six months) being the most common. The three exceptions are Wantage, Chipping Norton and Woodstock - where contracts will have to last for the maximum five years - plus Abingdon and Kidlington, where contracts will be reviewed "prematurely" after only 1½ and 2½ years respectively. Because of commitments already made, 1997 will be a transitional year with the full proposed pattern of changes in the areas affected coming in later.
9. The proposed revised schedule of reviews is shown in Annex 3. Members will note, in particular, that Banbury and Oxford would be separated, Didcot included with Wallingford, and a new area covering Cumnor, Faringdon and Wantage created.
10. The Chief Education Officer is in agreement with the changes proposed, as a basis for future reviews of school transport contracts. Clearly it is important that both sets of contracts are reviewed in a given area simultaneously, in order to retain the facility for joint tendering for school and public transport contracts. Indeed, the proposed revised review arrangements should offer increased scope for joint tendering as a result of the more logical grouping of services under review.

Environmental Implications

11. None have been identified.

Financial and Staffing Implications

12. Extension of contracts would delay any opportunities to make savings from service revisions. On the other hand, the more rational pattern of reviews proposed should permit more effective redesign of services when the time comes.
13. The revised pattern of reviews would reduce peaks of workload, permitting more effective use of staff.

Implications for People Living in Poverty

14. None have been identified.

**RECOMMENDATION**

15. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to adopt the revised schedule of reviews of subsidised bus services shown in Annex 3, and authorise changes in the end-dates of subsidy contracts accordingly.**

DAVID YOUNG  
Director of Environmental Services

Background Papers : Nil

Contact Officer : Dick Helling, telephone : Oxford 815859

25 October 1996



**EM13 - ANNEX 1**

CURRENT BUS CONTRACT REVIEWS

Bicester, Faringdon	Apr 1997	Banbury, Oxford	Oct 1997
Burford, Witney, Eynsham	Apr 1998	Chipping Norton, Woodstock, Kidlington	Oct 1998
Thame, Watlington, Wheatley	Apr 1999	Didcot, Wantage	Oct 1999
Henley, Woodcote, Wallingford			
Bicester, Faringdon	Apr 2000	Abingdon, Cumnor	Oct 2000
	Apr 2001	Banbury, Oxford	Oct 2001

**EM13 - ANNEX 2**

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES

<b>Place</b>	<b>Current Contract Change Date</b>	<b>Proposed Contract Change Date</b>	<b>Length Transitional Contr</b>
Abingdon	Oct 2000	Apr 1998	1½ years
Banbury	Oct 1997	Oct 1997 + Apr 2001	3½
Bicester	Apr 1997	Apr 1997 + Oct 2001	4½
Burford	Apr 1998	Oct 1998	4½
Chipping Norton	Oct 1998	Oct 1999	5
Cumnor	Oct 2000	(no change)	4
Didcot	Oct 1999	Apr 2000	4½
Eynsham	Apr 1998	Oct 1998	4½
Faringdon	May 1997 + May 2001	May 1997 + Oct 2000	3½
Henley	Apr 2000	(no change)	4
Kidlington	Oct 1998	Apr 1997 + Oct 2001	2½ + 4½
Oxford	Oct 1997	Apr 1998	4½
Thame	Apr 1999	(no change)	4
Wallingford	Apr 2000	(no change)	4
Wantage	Oct 1999	Oct 2000	5
Watlington	Apr 1999	(no change)	4
Wheatley	Apr 1999	(no change)	4
Witney	Apr 1998	Oct 1998	4½
Woodcote	Apr 2000	(no change)	4
Woodstock	Oct 1998	Oct 1999	5

**EM13 - ANNEX 3**

PROPOSED REVISED BUS CONTRACT REVIEWS

Bicester, Kidlington Faringdon (part)	Apr 1997	Banbury	Oct 1997
Oxford, Abingdon	Apr 1998	Burford, Witney, Eynsham	Oct 1998
Thame, Watlington, Wheatley	Apr 1999	Chipping Norton, Woodstock	Oct 1999
Henley, Woodcote, Wallingford, Didcot	Apr 2000	Cumnor, Faringdon, Wantage	Oct 2000
Banbury	Apr 2001	Bicester, Kidlington	Oct 2001

**AGENDA ITEM EM7**

Education Committee

**EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE - 27 NOVEMBER 1996**

**CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

Report by the Chief Education Officer and County Treasurer

Introduction

1. At their meeting in October 1996, Strategy and Resources Committee agreed, that Service Committees should determine their service strategy for capital investment, and prioritise their preparation pools. This report proposes a service strategy for Education capital investment and addresses the question of priorities to be applied to the Education Committee's preparation pool. The schemes held in the preparation pool are identified in Annex 2 as is the prioritisation which officers wish to accord to them at this time. Officers will be reviewing shortly how it intends to prioritise within each priority group. A report will be brought back to the February 1997 meeting of the Sub-Committee.

Proposed Service Strategy for Education Capital Investment

2. At their July meeting the Sub-Committee approved a fully funded two year programme of capital projects. Its approval was based on the following priorities:
  - (i) Exceptional Basic Need - the urgent replacement of condemned buildings used for teaching.
  - (ii) Basic Need - the provision of school places ("roofs over heads") including temporary classroom purchase and relocation.
  - (iii) Surplus Place Removal - in line with government policy.
  - (iv) Improvement/Replacement - the upgrading of buildings to contribute to more effective teaching and learning and to enable staff to better deliver the National Curriculum.
3. This priority order replicates the government's own priority order for capital allocations, and to a large extent reflects the statutory obligations placed on Local Education Authority's.

These include:

- (i) the Education Act (1994) which places a statutory duty on the LEA to ensure that there are sufficient schools to provide for the education of children in the Authority (Basic Need Provision); In this regard the Council allows up to 15% of a schools accommodation to consist of temporary classrooms;
- (ii) the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act (1970) the Disability Discrimination Act (1995) and the Education Acts (1981 and 1993) which place obligations on the LEA to make provision in schools for access to, and use of its buildings by disabled persons, and to arrange special education provision in mainstream schools for children with special needs;
- (iii) the Education (School Premises) Regulations (1996) which lays down minimum requirements for sanitation, hard paved and playing field areas in schools;
- (iv) the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974) places a duty on the LEA to provide a healthy and safe environment for its employees;
- (v) the Education Reform Act (1988) which introduced the National Curriculum. Although there is no statutory duty on LEA's to meet a specific curriculum entitlement schools are asking for

larger spaces, particularly for Science and Technology.

4. The combination of DFEE criteria for capital allocations and statutory requirements provide the basis upon which the capital programme, consisting of major and minor works, and the Education Health and Safety Programme (revenue funded) are currently prioritised. The criteria for major and minor capital works (the annual programme) are therefore the same.
5. As it is unlikely that there will be any changes in the DFEE's prioritisation for local authority capital allocation, it is proposed that this strategy for education capital investment is confirmed by the Sub-Committee as its operating strategy, and Education and Strategy and Resources Committees be recommended accordingly. The schemes currently being held in the preparation pool (Annex 2) have been prioritised accordingly.

Environmental Implications

6. There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

Implications for People Living in Poverty

7. There are no implications for people living in poverty arising directly from this report.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

8. **The Sub-Committee are RECOMMENDED to endorse the proposed service strategy as set out in Annex 1 to the report, to approve the prioritisation of schemes in the preparation pool (Annex 2) and to RECOMMEND Education Committee and Strategy & Resources Committee accordingly.**

G.M. BADMAN

Chief Education Officer

CHRIS GRAY  
County Treasurer

Background Papers: Nil  
Contact Officer: Keith Borien - Senior Education Officer Tel. (01865)  
815134

November 1996

## EM7 - ANNEX 1

### CAPITAL PROGRAMME MAJOR AND MINOR WORKS

#### Planned Capital Spending

The aim is to provide cost effective, functional, well designed premises for schools, which meet the requirements both of the national curriculum and health and safety legislation and provide as far as possible an environment that is conducive to effective learning.

The Education capital programme reflects the spending priorities which are set out below, with the greater expenditure being on basic need, i.e. the provision of additional school places to meet demographic increases in the school population.

#### Capital Spending Priorities

##### Exceptional Basic Need (EBN)

1. To replace existing teaching premises which have reached the state where they are condemned, unsafe or structurally unsound.

##### Basic Need (BN)

2. To provide additional school places in areas of population growth where there is no more capacity in county, voluntary and grant maintained schools in the surrounding area.

##### Surplus Place Removal

3. To remove surplus places where it can be demonstrated that this is cost effective in terms of achieving recurrent revenue savings.

##### Improvement/Replacement

4. To improve school buildings by improvement or replacement which are inadequate to meet the demands of the national curriculum, to improve buildings to meet health and safety regulations, to improve school security, and to provide improved access to premises for the disabled.