



Sneyd Working Group

**Report to the Children's and
Young People Scrutiny and
Performance Panel**

5 March 2009



Walsall Council

Contents

- Executive Summary - 2 -
- Introduction and Background - 3 -
- Terms of Reference - 3 -
- Membership - 4 -
- Summary of Evidence Considered..... - 4 -
- Option A – Establish a National Challenge Trust - 5 -
- Option B - Establish an Academy on the site: 11-19 years - 6 -
- Option C - Close the school; significantly enlarge another school (Frank F Harrison); establish a 14-19 specialist Academy alongside 14-19 or 16-19 provision so that learning continues on the Sneyd site..... - 8 -
- Option D - Co-operative Trust Model - 10 -
- Conclusion - 12 -
- Recommendations - 12 -



Executive Summary

This report sets out a summary of the discussions that have taken place with the Sneyd working group regarding the options for Sneyd Community School and the continuation of education provision on the site. The options considered by the Sneyd working group were as follows:

- Option A – Establish a National Challenge Trust
- Option B – Establish an Academy on the site: 11-19 years
- Option C - Close the school; significantly enlarge another school (Frank F Harrison); establish a 14-19 specialist Academy alongside 14-19 or 16-19 provision so that learning continues on the Sneyd site.
- Option D – Co-operative Trust Model

The working group invited witnesses to support and inform their discussions on these options, including Dr Sean Sweeney - Headteacher of Sneyd Community School, Martin Cain – Headteacher of Frank F Harrison School and Ian Cleland – Chief Executive of the Ormiston Education Trust.

The Sneyd working group have drawn a series of conclusions from the options presented to them and this report presents these conclusions and the group's final recommendations to the Children's and Young People Scrutiny and Performance Panel.

The working group's recommendations on the future of Sneyd Community School are as follows:

That:

- a) Cabinet pursue a solution that ensures the continuation of education provision on the site of Sneyd Community School, supported by further investigation into viable solutions between Council Officers, representatives of Walsall Children's Services Serco, the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) and the Office of the Schools Commissioner (OSC)
- b) This solution for the continuation of education provision on the site of Sneyd Community School must:
 1. be financially viable
 2. be devised with particular attention paid to its impact on all schools within the north west area of Walsall
 3. meet the needs of the local community

Introduction and Background

On 22 October 2008, Cabinet rejected a proposal to close Sneyd Community School (Sneyd). In rejecting the closure proposal, Cabinet tasked the Children's and Young Peoples Scrutiny and Performance Panel (CYPSP) to review the future options for the school. Cabinet resolved that:

'That the matter be referred to an early meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny and Performance Panel for full consideration of all options available to the school and that the full implications of the community uses be considered in conjunction with any proposal coming forward in relation to the school.'

The CYPSP held a special meeting at Sneyd on 20 November 2008 to consider a range of possible options for the future of the school. The CYPSP heard from a range of witnesses including Dr. Sean Sweeney, Interim Headteacher and members of the School Council. The meeting was well attended by approximately 180 members of the public who were given the opportunity to speak and ask questions. At this meeting, the CYPSP made a number of requests for further information, which led to the matter being considered at a later meeting.

The CYPSP reconvened on 18 December 2008. After debating the options alongside the additional information made available to them, Members felt that this issue would benefit from the close scrutiny of a working group. Therefore, the Sneyd Working Group was established.

Terms of Reference

The working group was tasked with reviewing a series of options as potential future options for Sneyd. These were:

- The establishment of a National Challenge Trust
- The establishment of an Academy on the site for 11-19-year-olds
- Closure of the school with the significant enlargement of another school to establish a 14-19 specialist Academy alongside 14-19 or 16-19 provision so that learning continues on the Sneyd site
- a Co-operative Trust.

The full version of the working group's terms of reference as approved by the CYPSP on 18 December 2008 is attached at **Appendix 1**.

Membership

Councillors	Chris Towe (Lead Member) Barbara Cassidy Eileen Pitt
Officers	Louise Hughes – Assistant Director – Universal Services Sue Wedgwood – Assistant Managing Director, Children’s Services – Serco Susan Lupton – Head of Planning & Development Services, Children’s Services – Serco Craig Goodall – Acting Principal Scrutiny Officer Angela Walker – Scrutiny Officer

Witnesses

Dr. Sean Sweeney and Mr. Martin Cain, Headteacher of Frank F Harrison school attended all working group meetings.

At the request of Sneyd, the working group met with Ian Cleland – Chief Executive of the Ormiston Education Trust.

Summary of Evidence Considered

The Sneyd Working Group held its first meeting on Tuesday 6 January 2009, at which officers presented a discussion paper, outlining each of the options for Sneyd. Detailed discussions on each of the options for Sneyd then took place during this and a further two meetings, which took place on 15 January and 3 February 2009.

A brief summary of the information received by the Working Group on each option and the ensuing discussions that took place on each are outlined in the next section of this report.

Option A – Establish a National Challenge Trust

There are a variety of arrangements for trust status; however as Sneyd is a National Challenge School and is in an Ofsted category, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) would expect the Local Authority to apply for a National Challenge Trust as introduced in September 2008. Extracts from the DCSF guidance on arrangements for National Challenge Trusts are set out in **Appendix 2**.

There are two routes to establishing a National Challenge Trust enshrined in recent legislation:

- Closing the school and re-opening it as a trust school
- Replacing the governing body with an Interim Executive Board to steer the school towards trust status

Both routes require a statutory process to be followed and the timescale for setting up Trust arrangements for September 2009 would be tight given that partners have still to be identified and all the accompanying changes that would need to be put in place with regard to staffing.

The establishment of a National Challenge Trust would attract £750,000 funding over three years on top of the school's delegated budget. However, further investigative work would be required to identify how this funding would need to be spent.

Summary of discussion on Option A – Establish a National Challenge Trust

A strong school or powerful external partner such as a local business or university would need to be identified for this option. Members were concerned that there were no possible partners identified, due to there being no schools within the borough meeting the DCSF criteria for a strong school as follows:

- a positive contextual value added (CVA)
- 60% 5+ A*-C GCSE grades including English and Maths
- A head teacher who is a national leader of education

Another concern raised was that this was a new model and there were no current examples of it being embedded elsewhere. The advantage of a National Challenge Trust would be that it could open during 2009, whereas an Academy would open, at the earliest, in September 2010. Members felt that the £250,000 per year funding this option would attract was not sufficient to achieve the levels of improvement required at Sneyd. Although the Working Group had initial concerns regarding the suitability of this option, the criteria and provision for Trusts are

evolving which may make a National Challenge Trust a more viable option for Sneyd upon the release of new legislation.

Conclusion on Option A

The Working Group recognise that the National Challenge Trust model is relatively new, however, in light of evidence provided by officers at its 15 January and 3 February meetings, the Working Group feel that new legislation may increase the viability of this option for Sneyd Community School.

Option B - Establish an Academy on the site: 11-19 years

This option would see the closure of Sneyd and the opening of an Academy.

The Working Group received information from Ian Cleland, Chief Executive of the Ormiston Trust, whom the governing body of Sneyd had identified as a potential Academy sponsor. Although Ormiston were the preferred choice of the schools governing body, it does not necessarily mean that they would be selected as sponsor, should the option of an Academy be taken forward. Ian Cleland was able to inform parts of the debate on this option but it was made clear that the Ormiston Trust were not the only option for Sneyd as a statutory process to chose an Academy would have to be followed.

Officers informed the Working Group that the size and makeup of an Academy would be a vital consideration as part of this option due to the potential impact on surrounding schools including Pool Hayes, Willenhall and Frank F Harrison. The earliest possible date for an Academy to open at Sneyd would be January or September 2010, but this would be dependent on the complexity of the arrangements that would need to be put into place.

An Academy proposal would need the support of the DCSF. Discussions between officers and the DCSF had clarified that a small Academy (3 forms of entry, 30 pupils per form, 90 pupils per year group) would not be feasible at the Sneyd site. A small Academy would struggle to deliver the full curriculum and remain viable. However, a large, 6 form of entry Academy (180 pupils per year group) may be considered, but would need to fit within the wider context of education provision for the borough and the strategy for change. The DCSF had given guidance that a 6 form of entry Academy would be expected to deliver an 80-85% stay-on rate for sixth form, which would have implications for other sixth forms in the borough.

Summary of discussion on Option B – Establish an Academy on the site: 11-19 years

Members were concerned that the admissions policy of the school could change should it become an Academy. Members felt that it was vital for local children to be able to access a place at a local school.

Members agreed that in light of DCSF guidance, a small Academy would not be appropriate for Sneyd. In discussing the large Academy, Members identified that pupil numbers could still be an issue for Sneyd. In addition this could have a potential impact on the other schools in North West Walsall and the rest of the borough if this option was to go forward.

Members felt that an Academy could provide good opportunities for young people in the area and that the idea of sharing teaching experience across a network, as in the case of Ormiston Academies, would be valuable.

Conclusion on Option B

The Working Group concludes that a small Academy would not be appropriate for Sneyd. A large Academy may be more acceptable to the DCSF and would secure education provision on the Sneyd site. However, the financial viability and the impact of this size of Academy on neighbouring schools as well as the education provision for the borough overall would need to be carefully considered before this option could be taken forward.

Option C - Close the school; significantly enlarge another school (Frank F Harrison); establish a 14-19 specialist Academy alongside 14-19 or 16-19 provision so that learning continues on the Sneyd site.

There are a number of possible ways forward with this option depending on the range of provision on the Sneyd and Frank F Harrison sites, four examples are provided in the table below:

1	11 – 14 provision (KS3) on one site 14 – 19 provision and Academy on the other site
2	Both sites offer 11 – 16 14 – 19 Academy on one site Post 16 provision on the other site
3	11 – 16 provision on one site 14 – 19 Academy and Post 16 provision on the other site
4	11 – 19 provision on one site 14 - 19 Academy on the other site

Any of the sub-options shown above would involve the closure of Sneyd, but would ensure the continuation of education provision on the Sneyd site. All sub-options would ensure viable post 16 provision but there would be implications for both the Sneyd and Frank F Harrison sites. Frank F Harrison would enlarge significantly and would operate from both its existing site and the Sneyd site. It should be noted that the 14-19 Academy would appoint its own principal and governors; however, a working partnership with the enlarged school would be required.

The introduction of a 14-19 specialist Academy would also require a new admission round at 14 especially for new Academy entrants to be introduced in the borough. All 14 year olds in borough would be eligible to apply to the new 14-19 Academy.

Operating across two sites would attract a split site allowance in the school budget of £19,000, which would be enough to cover an extra telephone line and member of staff.

All four sub-options offer the potential to retain the sports and community facilities that have been developed on the Sneyd site.

Each of the sub-options would involve statutory processes and consultation and the establishment of the Academy would be subject to the signing of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State following the determination of associated statutory proposals by the Local Authority.

In all cases the earliest realistic implementation date would be September 2010 as these involve the bringing together of two school communities and this would need to be undertaken in a carefully planned way in order to minimise any adverse impact on standards. Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary.

Summary of discussion on Option C – Close the school; significantly enlarge another school (Frank F Harrison); establish a 14-19 specialist Academy alongside 14-19 or 16-19 provision so that learning continues on the Sneyd site

In discussing this option, Members felt that an engineering Academy fitted well with the demographic of young people in the area.

There were concerns expressed around the public perception of this option and that communications with children, parents and the wider public would have to be very clear to ensure the message of continued education provision on the Sneyd site was understood.

Members discussed the sustainability of this option and tasked officers with providing more information on the implications of each of the sub-options. As a result, a detailed report on these sub-options (**Appendix 3**) was presented to and discussed by the working group.

The Working Group were informed that Edge, an independent education foundation, had been identified as a potential sponsor for the 14-19 engineering academy. A briefing note on Edge (**Appendix 4**) was provided at the request of Members outlining the background to the organisation. Edge would need to be pursued as a sponsor should this option be taken forward.

Members requested further information on the background to the proposed engineering Academy. They were informed that the DCSF had indicated interest in the concept of a 14-19 Academy, but further investigation into the viability of this option was required before DCSF and Office of the Schools Commissioner could give a definitive answer on this option.

Conclusion on Option C

The Working Group felt that this was an interesting and potentially very exciting option but concluded that further investigation into the viability of this option would be required to enable a suitable model to be presented to the DCSF and OSC should this option be pursued.

Option D - Co-operative Trust Model

The co-operative trust model is newer still than the national challenge trust model and there is currently one school in the country operating as a co-operative trust – Reddish Vale in Stockport.

Officers had spoken to the deputy Headteacher of Reddish Vale to inform the working group's discussion on this option. The key features of this option are listed below:

- Work under the legislation of trust schools
- Originated from the Co-operative movement in Rochdale by the Rochdale Pioneers (1850's) who had a view on the values needed for children and young people
- The school operates under principles to transform learning and values as advocated by the International Co-operative Movement
- There is open and inclusive membership to the school
- Various constituencies represented -
 - Learner
 - Parent
 - Staff
 - Community
 - Community Organisation
 - Public, Private Sector including 3rd sector
- The school has 6 trustees -
 - Deal of Local University
 - Social Entrepreneur
 - Co-operative Education rep
 - Co-operative College
 - HE/FE College
 - LA
- The trustees give strategic direction and challenge
- 2 trustees are members of the Governing Body
- The school has received no funding

How does it feel different? -

“Alongside the school improvement strategies to raise attainment we have adapted a social enterprise model to support this”.

“Members of the trust work together as volunteers on specific projects for example; the young people have submitted a bid for 8 million to enhance leisure facilities”.

Summary of discussion on Option D - Co-operative Trust Model

Members felt that this appeared to be a good option, however they were concerned that the model was very new and had not been fully embedded or developed elsewhere. This option would ensure the

continuation of education at Sneyd but recruiting trustees of a suitable calibre may be problematic.

Conclusion on Option D

The Working Group conclude that further investigation into the viability of this option would be required to determine it's viability, but based on current evidence this may be the weaker option for Sneyd.

Conclusion

The Sneyd Working Group concludes that education provision should continue on the Sneyd site. There are several options that would enable this, however as non-decision making bodies, the decision on which option to pursue cannot be made by the Working Group nor the Children's and Young People Scrutiny and Performance Panel.

Further investigation into the feasibility and sustainability of each of the options is required by Cabinet, alongside consultation with all relevant national partners and government departments including the DCSF and OSC to ensure the most appropriate option for Sneyd is secured.

The Sneyd Working Group believe that it is essential that whatever option Cabinet chose to pursue, it should be financially viable, consider the wider impact on local schools, and meet the needs of local people.

Recommendations

That:

- a) **Cabinet pursue a solution that ensures the continuation of education provision on the site of Sneyd Community School, supported by further investigation into viable solutions between Council Officers, representatives of Walsall Children's Services Serco, the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) and the Office of the Schools Commissioner (OSC)**
- b) **This solution for the continuation of education provision on the site of Sneyd Community School must:**
 1. **be financially viable**
 2. **be devised with particular attention paid to its impact on all schools within the north west area of Walsall**
 3. **meet the needs of the local community**

APPENDIX 1 - Walsall Council Scrutiny and Performance Panel Work Group

Initiation Document

Work Group Name:	Sneyd Working Group
Panel:	Children's and Young People Scrutiny and Performance Panel
Municipal Year:	2008/09
Lead Member:	Councillor C Towe
Lead Officers:	Sue Wedgewood Susan Lupton
Support Officers:	Angela Walker Craig Goodall
Councillors:	Councillor C Towe Councillor B Cassidy Councillor E Pitt

1.	Context
	<p>This group has been formed in response to the recommendation of the Children's and Young People Scrutiny and Performance Panel of 18 December 2008, that:</p> <p>The Children's and Young People Scrutiny and Performance Panel recommends to Cabinet that options A and B, as set out in the options report dated 18 December 2008, are deleted as possible options for Sneyd Community School, and that options C, D and E along with the additional option of a co-operative trust are investigated further</p> <p>It was decided by the Panel that a working group would have more scope to look in detail at each of the remaining options. The group should then report back to the full Panel at a special meeting scheduled for 13 January 2009.</p>
2.	Objectives
	<p>This group has been tasked by the Children's and Young People Scrutiny and Performance Panel to consider more detailed information on each of the remaining options for Sneyd Community School and to use this information to form recommendations to the full Panel on the future of Sneyd.</p>
3.	Scope

APPENDIX 1 - Walsall Council Scrutiny and Performance Panel Work Group

Initiation Document

	<p>The group will consider each of the remaining options from the options report along with an additional option of a co-operative trust. For clarity, the options are as follows:</p> <p>C) Establish a National Challenge Trust D) Establish an Academy on the site: 11-19 years E) Close the school; significantly enlarge another school; establish a 14-19 specialist academy alongside 14-19 or 16-19 provision so that learning continues on the Sneyd site</p> <p>And the additional option of:</p> <p>A Co-operative trust</p>
4. Who else will you want to take part?	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ormiston Trust • The Headteacher of Sneyd Community School – Dr Sean Sweeney • The Headteacher of Frank F Harrison – Mr Cain • Walsall Children’s Services – Serco, Sue Wedgwood • Walsall Council Assistant Director Universal Services – Louise Hughes
5. Timescales & Reporting Schedule	
	<p>The group will meet on 6 January 2009 at 10.30am and will receive presentation on each of the remaining options as outlined in section 3. Officers have been asked to prepare briefing notes on each of the options, which will be tabled for Members on 6 January.</p> <p>After receiving all of the information, Members of the group will discuss the options and form a recommendation to the Panel. A summary of the discussion and the recommendation of the working group will be presented to the Children's and Young People Scrutiny and Performance Panel at a special meeting on 13 January 2009.</p>
6. Risk factors	
	<p>Insufficient information is provided to Members to enable them to reach a recommendation on 6 January 2009</p>

Date Agreed:	6 January 2009	Date Updated:	
--------------	----------------	---------------	--

**APPENDIX 1 - Walsall Council Scrutiny and Performance Panel Work
Group**

Initiation Document

APPENDIX 2 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

NATIONAL CHALLENGE TRUST ARRANGEMENTS

Different trust arrangements are available for schools wishing to make such changes to their governance arrangements; however, as Sneyd is a National Challenge school and is in an Ofsted category, the DCSF would expect the LA to apply for a National Challenge Trust as introduced in September 2008. The arrangements for this are set out below in extracts from the DCSF guidance.

“National Challenge Trusts (NCTs) are hard-edged solutions for schools that are unable to raise their results but where establishing an academy may not be the right solution. Becoming a trust school is a way for schools to raise standards through strengthening collaboration and drawing on the expertise and energy of their partners to support their strategic leadership”.

“NCTs will exist as foundation schools with a foundation (Trust) acquired under the provisions of the Education and Inspections Act 2006. NCTs will be local authority maintained schools supported by a trust with charitable status. The role in law of the foundation (Trust) of a National Challenge Trust school will be to appoint a majority of governors to the governing body of the school and to hold land on trust on behalf of the school. The governing body of the school will continue to be responsible for the running of the school and will receive the school’s delegated budget from the local authority. As a foundation school, the governing body of the school will employ staff and will be the admissions authority, so that the school will be a self-governing school within the local authority maintained family of schools”.

“NCTs will be different from the existing Trust school model in the following ways:

- the decision to create a NCT is triggered by local authority intervention rather than by the school – **either** by closing the school and reopening it as a trust school **or** by removing the governing body and replacing it with an Interim Executive Board (IEB) to steer the school towards trust status;
- the trust must represent a radical option for transforming the school, with a clear focus on school improvement and with the involvement of at least one strong education partner – which may be a school or a non-school education partner such as an HE or FE college;
- there must be governance arrangements which allow the strong education partner to take over the running of the weaker school through the Trust appointing a majority of the governors to the weak school;
- up to £750,000 in funding over 3 years (or up to £1 million in the case of secondary modern schools – non selective schools in selective areas) is available to support National Challenge Trust schools where NCT has been approved by the department (DCSF) as part of the local authority’s national Challenge strategy”.

The choice of trust partners is of great importance. A trust would effectively be an improvement partnership and could be led by a strong, local school to collaborate and build capacity; a powerful external partner such as a local business or university would add energy and capacity to the trust. Closure of the weak school and the opening of a new trust school would give the school and the community it serves a fresh start and a break with previous underachievement; the additional funding available would enable the school to restructure leadership, attract fresh teachers and develop ambitious plans for raising attainment. The DCSF has indicated to Walsall that a strong school would be one where:

APPENDIX 2 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

- a 60%+ students achieve 5+ GCSE grades A*-C including English and maths
- b there is a positive Contextual Value Added Score
- c the head teacher is a National Leader of Education
- d a school with a subject specialism.

No school in Walsall would meet all 4 criteria. In view of this it is proposed to explore the possibility of other partners from the HE and FE sectors should scrutiny request this course of action.

For the purpose of National Challenge governance solutions that involve closure and reopening of schools, exemption from the requirement to hold a competition for the new school will be signed off by Ministers as part of the overall approval of National Challenge plans.

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

Option B1 11 – 14 provision (KS3) on one site 14 – 19 provision and academy on the other site		
Structural change	General implications	School improvement
<p>Sneyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close Sneyd but retain education provision on site – either KS3 or 14-19 school provision and possible academy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sneyd would no longer be a separate school but education provision would be retained on the Sneyd site An Interim Executive Board would be appointed at Sneyd to oversee the school during the transitional period Support would continue to be offered to Sneyd through the Local Authority and The Black Country Challenge There would be opportunities for Sneyd staff at FFH as more staff would be required at the enlarged school. Some pupils at Sneyd would have to move to the FFH site Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a very urgent need for rapid improvement as required by the recent Ofsted inspection The Statement of Action must be the top priority for the school in order to secure the improvements set out as being necessary The capacity to address current under-performance is a key issue. Bringing school communities together presents challenges for both communities and much work would need to be done to ensure that what emerged was <u>one</u> school community (year groups, staffing, curriculum provision, options etc). Care would need to be taken to ensure that any possible impact arising from the change is kept to a minimum and that pupil progress was not adversely affected Opportunity to focus on the provision of specific key stages Support would continue to be offered to Sneyd through the Local Authority and The Black Country Challenge
<p>Frank F Harrison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly enlarge Frank F Harrison which would operate from both the existing site and the Sneyd site. Educational provision on the FFH site would be either KS3 or 14-19 school provision and possible academy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An enlarged Frank F Harrison school would operate from both the existing site and the Sneyd site. Careful consideration would need to be given to the most appropriate use of the two sites in the light of the requirements of the different key stages. Financial viability: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frank F Harrison is a National Challenge school and as such would need to ensure a continued focus on improvement for the current cohorts at all stages Increased potential for a more sustainable 6th form; viability would be increased enabling broader curriculum offer

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

	<p>operating from 2 sites would attract a modest split site allowance in the school budget to staff a second office, provide another telephone and some resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school, operating across both sites, would have one Head Teacher, one staffing structure and one set of governors. • There are a number of complex staffing issues that would need to be addressed if this model is taken forward. • Examination results for the school would exclude any KS4 and post 16 pupils on the roll of the proposed academy • Some pupils at FFH would have to move to the Sneyd site for part of their education and some pupils at Sneyd would have to attend the Frank F site for part of their education. • Any implications for the Frank F Harrison / Hatherton Primary federation would need to be considered as this model is developed • Timing of a rebuild of the school buildings would be challenging and would to take account of the timescale for the building of an academy • Accommodation at the Sneyd site and FFH would need to be reviewed and investment prioritised to facilitate the proposal. • Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer demarcation of provision (KS3, 4 and 5) enabling greater focus • Impact on learning during alterations, buildings etc • Leadership capacity to manage and lead two sites.
--	---	---

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

<p>14-19 Engineering academy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an academy would be subject to the signing of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State following the submission of an Expression of Interest and the completion of detailed feasibility work. • The proposed academy could be located on either site but account would need to be taken of school / academy size and accommodation and site requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be subject to the submission of an Expression of Interest, consultation, feasibility work and sign-off of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State • Premises and site issues would need to be resolved to enable leases etc to be put in place • A principal and staff would need to be appointed to the academy • The 14-19 Academy would not be part of the enlarged Frank F Harrison School. The 14-19 Academy would appoint governors and a principal. We would expect a working partnership with the school to be developed through the Expression of Interest when written • An admissions process for the proposed academy would need to be managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils have wider choice and opportunity to pursue academic and/or vocational paths in the area • 14-19 provision needs to complement and enhance borough wide provision and be part of the 14-19 strategy • Details of curriculum offer to be decided
---	---	--

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

Option B2 Both sites offer 11 – 16 14 – 19 academy on one site Post 16 provision on the other site		
Structural change	General implications	School improvement
<p>Sneyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close Sneyd but retain education provision on site – 11-16 and either 14-19 academy or post 16 school provision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sneyd would no longer be a separate school but education provision would be retained on the Sneyd site An Interim Executive Board would be appointed at Sneyd to oversee the school during the transitional period Support would continue to be offered to Sneyd through the Local Authority and The Black Country Challenge There would be opportunities for Sneyd staff at FFH as more staff would be required at the enlarged school. Some pupils at Sneyd may have to move to the FFH site. Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a very urgent need for rapid improvement as required by the recent Ofsted inspection The Statement of Action must be the top priority for the school in order to secure the improvements set out as being necessary The capacity to address current under-performance is a key issue. Bringing school communities together in this option presents <u>even greater</u> challenges for both communities and much work would need to be done to ensure that what emerged was <u>one</u> school community (year groups, staffing, curriculum provision, options etc). Care would need to be taken to ensure that any possible impact arising from the change is kept to a minimum and that pupil progress was not adversely affected Opportunity to focus on specific key stages is lost as KS3 and KS4 pupils would be taught on both sites Support would continue to be offered to Sneyd through the Local Authority and The Black Country Challenge Minimal opportunity for collaborative provision through planning, team teaching etc as pupils taught across both sites
<p>Frank F Harrison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly enlarge Frank F Harrison which would operate from both 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An enlarged Frank F Harrison school would operate from both the existing site and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frank F Harrison is a National Challenge school and as such would need to ensure a

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

<p>the existing site and the Sneyd site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational provision on the FFH site would be 11-16 and either 14-19 academy or post 16 school provision 	<p>Sneyd site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Careful consideration would need to be given to the most appropriate use of the two sites. • Financial viability: operating from 2 sites would attract a modest split site allowance in the school budget to staff a second office, provide another telephone and some resources. • The school, operating across both sites, would have one Head Teacher, one staffing structure and one set of governors. • There are a number of complex staffing issues that would need to be addressed if this model is taken forward. • Examination results for the school would exclude any KS4 and post 16 pupils on the roll of the proposed academy • Some pupils at FFH might have to move to the Sneyd site for part of their education and some pupils at Sneyd might have to attend the Frank F site for part of their education. • Any implications for the Frank F Harrison / Hatherton Primary federation would need to be considered as this model is developed • Timing of a rebuild of the school buildings would be challenging and would take account of the timescale for the building of an academy • Accommodation at the Sneyd site and FFH would need to be reviewed and investment prioritised to facilitate the proposal. • Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital 	<p>continued focus on improvement for the current cohorts at all stages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased potential for a more sustainable 6th form; viability would be increased enabling broader curriculum offer. • Impact on learning during alterations, buildings etc • Leadership capacity to manage and lead two sites. • The securing of 'good' provision on both sites, Capacity of both internal and external support for two systems offering 11-16.
--	--	--

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

	<p>schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary.</p>	
<p>14-19 Engineering academy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an academy would be subject to the signing of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State following the submission of an Expression of Interest and the completion of detailed feasibility work. • The proposed academy could be located on either site but account would need to be taken of school / academy size and accommodation and site requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be subject to the submission of an Expression of Interest, consultation, feasibility work and sign-off of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State • Premises and site issues would need to be resolved to enable leases etc to be put in place • A principal and staff would need to be appointed to the academy • The 14-19 Academy would not be part of the enlarged Frank F Harrison School. The 14-19 Academy would appoint governors and a principal. We would expect a working partnership with the school to be developed through the Expression of Interest when written • An admissions process for the proposed academy would need to be managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils have wider choice and opportunity to pursue academic and/or vocational paths in the area • 14-19 provision needs to complement and enhance borough wide provision and be part of the 14-19 strategy • Details of curriculum offer to be decided.

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

Option B3 11 – 16 provision on one site 14 – 19 academy and Post 16 provision on the other site		
Structural change	General implications	School improvement
<p>Sneyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close Sneyd but retain education provision on site – either 11-16 or 14-19 academy and post 16 school provision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sneyd would no longer be a separate school but education provision would be retained on the Sneyd site An Interim Executive Board would be appointed at Sneyd to oversee the school during the transitional period Support would continue to be offered to Sneyd through the Local Authority and The Black Country Challenge There would be opportunities for Sneyd staff at FFH as more staff would be required at the enlarged school. Pupils at Sneyd may have to move to the FFH site depending upon which site is identified for 11-16 and for the proposed 14-19 academy and post 16 provision. Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a very urgent need for rapid improvement as required by the recent Ofsted inspection The Statement of Action must be the top priority for the school in order to secure the improvements set out as being necessary The capacity to address current under-performance is a key issue. Bringing school communities together presents challenges for both communities and much work would need to be done to ensure that what emerged was <u>one</u> school community (year groups, staffing, curriculum provision, options etc). 11-16 continuous provision on one site would in the long term support school improvement issues. Impact on learning during alterations, buildings etc Support would continue to be offered to Sneyd through the Local Authority and The Black Country Challenge
<p>Frank F Harrison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly enlarge Frank F Harrison which would operate from both the existing site and the Sneyd site. Educational provision on the FFH site would be either 11-16 or 14-19 academy and post 16 school provision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An enlarged Frank F Harrison school would operate from both the existing site and the Sneyd site. Careful consideration would need to be given to the most appropriate use of the two sites. Financial viability: operating from 2 sites would attract a modest split site allowance in the school budget to staff a second office, provide another telephone and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bringing school communities together presents challenges for both communities and much work would need to be done to ensure that what emerged was <u>one</u> school community (year groups, staffing, curriculum provision, options etc). 11-16 continuous provision on one site would in the long term support school improvement issues.

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

	<p>some resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school, operating across both sites, would have one Head Teacher, one staffing structure and one set of governors. • There are a number of complex staffing issues that would need to be addressed if this model is taken forward. • Examination results for the school would exclude any KS4 and post 16 pupils on the roll of the proposed academy • Pupils at FFH may have to move to the Sneyd site depending upon which site is identified for 11-16 provision and for the post 16 provision and the proposed 14-19 academy • Any implications for the Frank F Harrison / Hatherton Primary federation would need to be considered as this model is developed • Timing of a rebuild of the school buildings would be challenging and would to take account of the timescale for the building of an academy • Accommodation at the Sneyd site and FFH would need to be reviewed and investment prioritised to facilitate the proposal. • Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frank F is a National Challenge school and as such would need to ensure a continued focus on improvement for the current cohorts at all stages. • Increased potential for a more sustainable 6th form; viability would be increased enabling broader curriculum offer. • Impact on learning during alterations, buildings etc • Leadership capacity to manage and lead two sites.
<p>14-19 Engineering academy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an academy would be subject to the signing of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State following the submission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be subject to the submission of an Expression of Interest, consultation, feasibility work and sign-off of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils have wider choice and opportunity to pursue academic and/or vocational paths in the area • 14-19 provision needs to

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

<p>of an Expression of Interest and the completion of detailed feasibility work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed academy could be located on either site but account would need to be taken of school / academy size and accommodation and site requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Premises and site issues would need to be resolved to enable leases etc to be put in place • A principal and staff would need to be appointed to the academy • The 14-19 Academy would not be part of the enlarged Frank F Harrison School. The 14-19 Academy would appoint governors and a principal. We would expect a working partnership with the school to be developed through the Expression of Interest when written • An admissions process for the proposed academy would need to be managed 	<p>complement and enhance borough wide provision and be part of the 14-19 strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of curriculum offer to be decided
---	---	--

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

Option B4 11 – 19 provision on one site 14 - 19 academy on the other site		
Structural change	General implications	School improvement
<p>Sneyd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close Sneyd but retain education provision on site – either 11-19 school or 14-19 academy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sneyd would no longer be a separate school but education provision would be retained on the Sneyd site • An Interim Executive Board would be appointed at Sneyd to oversee the school during the transitional period • Support would continue to be offered to Sneyd through the Local Authority and The Black Country Challenge • There would be opportunities for Sneyd staff at FFH as more staff would be required at the enlarged school. • Pupils at Sneyd may have to move to the FFH site depending on which is identified as the school site. • Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a very urgent need for rapid improvement as required by the recent Ofsted inspection • The Statement of Action must be the top priority for the school in order to secure the improvements set out as being necessary • The capacity to address current under-performance is a key issue. • Bringing school communities together presents challenges for both communities and much work would need to be done to ensure that what emerged was <u>one</u> school community (year groups, staffing, curriculum provision, options etc). • 11-19 continuous provision on one site would in the long term support school improvement issues. • Impact on learning during alterations, buildings etc • Support would continue to be offered to Sneyd through the Local Authority and The Black Country Challenge. • Increased potential for a more sustainable 6th form; viability would be increased enabling broader curriculum offer. • Direct progression on same site for post 16
<p>Frank F Harrison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly enlarge Frank F Harrison which would operate from either the existing site or the Sneyd site. • Educational provision on the FFH site would be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An enlarged Frank F Harrison school would operate from either the existing site or the Sneyd site. • Careful consideration would need to be given to the most appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing school communities together presents challenges for both communities and much work would need to be done to ensure that what emerged was <u>one</u> school community (year

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

<p>either 11-19 school or 14-19 academy.</p>	<p>use of the two sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school would have one Head Teacher, one staffing structure and one set of governors. • There are a number of complex staffing issues that would need to be addressed if this model is taken forward. • Examination results for the school would exclude any KS4 and post 16 pupils on the roll of the proposed academy • Pupils at FFH may have to move to the Sneyd site depending on which is identified as the school site • Any implications for the Frank F Harrison / Hatherton Primary federation would need to be considered as this model is developed • Timing of a rebuild of the school buildings would be challenging and would to take account of the timescale for the building of an academy • Accommodation at the Sneyd site and FFH would need to be reviewed and investment prioritised to facilitate the proposal. • Interim arrangements would be needed for the period until the completion of any associated capital schemes; an interim stage using the existing accommodation on the two sites would be necessary. 	<p>groups, staffing, curriculum provision, options etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11-19 continuous provision on one site would in the long term support school improvement issues. • Frank F is a National Challenge school and as such would need to ensure a continued focus on improvement for the current cohorts at all stages. • Increased potential for a more sustainable 6th form; viability would be increased enabling broader curriculum offer. • Impact on learning during alterations, buildings etc • Leadership capacity to manage and lead two sites.
<p>14-19 Engineering academy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an academy would be subject to the signing of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State following the submission of an Expression of Interest and the completion of detailed feasibility work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be subject to the submission of an Expression of Interest, consultation, feasibility work and sign-off of a Funding Agreement by the Secretary of State • Premises and site issues would need to be resolved to enable leases etc to be put in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils have wider choice and opportunity to pursue academic and/or vocational paths in the area • 14-19 provision needs to complement and enhance borough wide provision and be part of the 14-19 strategy • Details of curriculum

APPENDIX 3 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed academy could be located on either site but account would need to be taken of school / academy size and accommodation and site requirements 	<p style="text-align: center;">place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A principal and staff would need to be appointed to the academy • The 14-19 Academy would not be part of the enlarged Frank F Harrison School. The 14-19 Academy would appoint governors and a principal. We would expect a working partnership with the school to be developed through the Expression of Interest when written • An admissions process for the proposed academy would need to be managed 	<p style="text-align: center;">offer to be decided</p>
--	--	--

APPENDIX 4 – SNEYD WORKING GROUP REPORT

About Edge

What is Edge?

Edge is an independent education foundation, dedicated to raising the status of practical and vocational learning. We are working to ensure that all young people can achieve their potential through practical and vocational learning as well as academic qualifications. This will help young people fulfill their potential and equip the UK's future workforce with the skills to be successful.

What does Edge stand for?

We stand for the creation of an education system where practical and vocational learning have equivalent value to academic routes. We believe that there are many paths to success.

What are Edge Academies?

New kinds of schools that put equal focus on academic and practical learning. They will offer high-quality work experience and mentoring in real businesses. We believe that they can become models for the schools of the future.

Why do we need them?

The academies are an opportunity to put theory into practice. Decades of research, in the UK and abroad, has shown that young people thrive when practical learning is a serious part of the curriculum. The two Edge academies will allow students to benefit from different kinds of learning and demonstrate the value of learning by doing

How is Edge involved?

With Edge's financial backing and advice, the River Leen and Henry Mellish Schools in Nottingham and Sir Frank Markham School in Milton Keynes are being transformed into thriving academies, responsible for the education of thousands of students. They will focus on achievement for all students through real-world learning, particularly in business and performing arts.

How is Edge funded?

In May 2003 the examinations organisation, Edexcel, was sold to Pearson plc. The money went to a holding charity, the Edexcel Foundation. The trustees decided it should promote practical and vocational learning and in May 2004 it was officially renamed the Edge Foundation.

Edge's MK Academy in Milton Keynes was shortlisted for the first ever Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Excellence Awards. The MK Academy was up for the Best Academy award, but was pipped to the post by the South Maidstone Federation Academies at an awards ceremony held in London on 28 November 2008.

With so many new academies in development, we were pleased that the MK Academy was singled out for praise and recognition. Edge's consultations with students and parents in Milton Keynes and our efforts to create a learning-friendly environment fit in perfectly with BSF's aims.