

## Appendix B

### Relevant Extract from the Statutory Guidance – Factors to be Considered by Decision Makers

4.15 Regulation 8 of The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools)(England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) provides that both the LA and schools adjudicator **are required** to have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State when they take a decision on proposals. Paragraphs 4.16 to 4.64 below contain the statutory guidance.

4.16 The following factors should not be taken to be exhaustive. Their importance will vary, depending on the type and circumstances of the proposals. All proposals should be considered on their individual merits.

#### EFFECT ON STANDARDS AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

##### A System Shaped by Parents

4.17 The Government's aim, as set out in the Five Year Strategy for Education and Learners and the Schools White Paper *Higher Standards, Better Schools For All*, is to create a schools system shaped by parents which delivers excellence and equity. In particular, the Government wishes to see a dynamic system in which:

weak schools that need to be closed are closed quickly and replaced by new ones where necessary;

the best schools are able to expand and spread their ethos and success; and

new providers have the opportunity to share their energy and talents by establishing new schools – whether as voluntary schools, Trust schools or Academies – and forming Trusts for existing schools.

4.18 The EIA 2006 amends the Education Act 1996 to place new duties on LAs to secure diversity in the provision of schools and to increase opportunities for parental choice when planning the provision of schools in their areas. In addition, LAs are under a specific duty to respond to representations from parents about the provision of schools, including requests to establish new schools or make changes to existing schools. The Government's aim is to secure a more diverse and dynamic schools system which is shaped by parents. The Decision Maker should take into account the extent to which the proposals are consistent with the new duties on LAs.

##### Standards

4.19 The Government wishes to encourage changes to local school provision where it will boost standards and opportunities for young people, whilst matching school place supply as closely as possible to pupils' and parents' needs and wishes.

4.20 Decision Makers should be satisfied that proposals for a school expansion will contribute to raising local standards of provision, and will lead to improved attainment for children and young people. They should pay particular attention to the effects on groups that tend to under-perform including children from certain ethnic groups, children from deprived backgrounds and children in care, with the aim of narrowing attainment gaps.

4.21 Decision Makers should be satisfied that when proposals lead to children being displaced, any alternative provision will meet the statutory SEN improvement test (see paragraphs 4.57-4.63).

### **Diversity**

4.22 The Government's aim is to transform our school system so that every child receives an excellent education – whatever their background and wherever they live. A vital part of the Government's vision is to create a more diverse school system offering excellence and choice, where each school has a strong ethos and sense of mission and acts as a centre of excellence or specialist provision.

4.23 Decision Makers should consider how proposals will contribute to local diversity. They should consider the range of schools in the relevant area of the LA and whether the expansion of the school will meet the aspirations of parents, help raise local standards and narrow attainment gaps.

### **Every Child Matters**

4.24. The Decision Maker should consider how proposals will help every child and young person achieve their potential in accordance with Every Child Matters' principles which are: to be healthy; stay safe; enjoy and achieve; make a positive contribution to the community and society; and achieve economic well-being. This should include considering how the school will provide a wide range of extended services, opportunities for personal development, access to academic and vocational training, measures to address barriers to participation and support for children and young people with particular needs, e.g. looked after children or children with special educational needs (SEN) and disabilities.

## **SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS**

### **Equal Opportunity Issues**

4.27 The Decision Maker should consider whether there are any sex, race or disability discrimination issues that arise from the changes being proposed, for example that there is equal access to single sex provision for the other sex to meet parental demand. Similarly there needs to be a commitment to provide access to a range of opportunities which reflect the ethnic and cultural mix of the area, while ensuring that such opportunities are open to all.

## **NEED FOR PLACES**

### **Creating Additional Places**

4.28 In considering proposals, the Decision Maker should consider the supporting evidence presented for the increase, and take into account the existence of spare capacity in neighbouring schools, but also the quality and popularity with parents of the schools in which spare capacity exists and evidence of parents' aspirations for places in the school proposed for expansion. The existence of surplus capacity in neighbouring less popular or successful schools should not in itself prevent the addition of new places.

4.29 Where the school has a religious character, or follows a particular philosophy, the Decision Maker should be satisfied that there is satisfactory evidence of sufficient demand for places for the school to be sustainable.

4.30 Where proposals will add to surplus capacity but there is a strong case for approval on parental preference and standards grounds, the presumption should be for approval. The LA in these cases will need to consider parallel action to remove the surplus capacity thereby created.

### **Expansion of Successful and Popular Schools**

4.31 The Government is committed to ensuring that every parent can choose an excellent school for their child. We have made clear that the wishes of parents should be taken into account in planning and managing school estates. Places should be allocated where parents want them, and as such, it should be easier for successful and popular primary and secondary schools to grow to meet parental demand. For the purposes of this guidance, the Secretary of State is not proposing any single definition of a successful and popular school. It is for the Decision Maker to decide whether a school is successful and popular, however, the following indicators should all be taken into account:

a. the school's performance;

- i) in terms of absolute results in key stage assessments and public examinations;
- ii) by comparison with other schools in similar circumstances (both in the same LA and other LAs);

iii) in terms of value added;

iv) in terms of improvement over time in key stage results and public examinations.

b. the numbers of applications for places;

i) the Decision Maker should also take account of any other relevant evidence put forward by schools.

4.32 The strong presumption is that proposals to expand successful and popular schools should be approved. In line with the Government's long standing policy that there should be no increase in selection by academic ability, this presumption does not apply to grammar schools or to proposals for the expansion of selective places at partially selective schools.

4.33 The existence of surplus capacity in neighbouring less popular schools should not in itself be sufficient to prevent this expansion, but if appropriate, in the light of local concerns, the Decision Maker should ask the LA how they plan to tackle any consequences for other schools. The Decision Maker should only turn down proposals for successful and popular schools to expand if there is compelling objective evidence that expansion would have a damaging effect on standards overall in an area, which cannot be avoided by LA action.

4.34 Before approving proposals the Decision Maker should confirm that the admission arrangements of schools proposed for expansion fully meet the provisions of the Schools Admissions Code. Although the Decision Maker may not modify proposed admission arrangements, the proposer should be informed that proposals with unsatisfactory admission arrangements are unlikely to be approved, and given the opportunity to revise them in line with the Code of Practice. Where the LA, rather than the governing body, is the admissions authority, we will expect the authority to take action to bring the admission arrangements into line with the School Admissions Code.

### **Travel and Accessibility for All**

4.35 In considering proposals for the reorganisation of schools, Decision Makers should satisfy themselves that accessibility planning has been properly taken into account. Facilities are to be accessible by those concerned, by being located close to those who will use them, and the proposed changes should not adversely impact on disadvantaged groups.

4.36 In deciding statutory proposals, the Decision Maker should bear in mind that proposals should not have the effect of unreasonably extending journey times or increasing transport costs, or result in too many children being prevented from travelling sustainably due to unsuitable routes e.g. for walking,

cycling etc. The EIA 2006 provides extended free transport rights for low income groups – see Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance ref 00373 – 2007BKT-EN at [www.teachernet.gov.uk/publications](http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/publications) . Proposals should also be considered on the basis of how they will support and contribute to the LA's duty to promote the use of sustainable travel and transport to school.

## **FUNDING AND LAND**

### **Capital**

4.49 The Decision Maker should be satisfied that any capital required to implement the proposals will be available. Normally, this will be some form of written confirmation from the source of funding on which the promoters rely (e.g. the LA, DCSF, or LSC). In the case of an LA, this should be from an authorised person within the LA, and provide detailed information on the funding, provision of land and premises etc.

4.50 There can be no assumption that the approval of proposals will trigger the release of capital funds from the Department, unless the Department has previously confirmed in writing that such resources will be available; nor can any allocation 'in principle' be increased. In such circumstances the proposals should be rejected, or consideration of them deferred until it is clear that the capital necessary to implement the proposals will be provided.

4.51 Proposals should not be approved conditionally upon funding being made available, subject to the following specific exceptions. For proposals being funded under the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) or through the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme, the Decision Maker should be satisfied that funding has been agreed 'in principle', but the proposals should be approved conditionally on the entering into of the necessary agreements and the release of funding. A conditional approval will protect proposers so that they are not under a statutory duty to implement the proposals until the relevant contracts have been signed and/or funding is finally released

## **OTHER ISSUES**

### **Views of Interested Parties**

4.64 The Decision Maker should consider the views of all those affected by the proposals or who have an interest in them including: pupils; families of pupils; staff; other schools and colleges; local residents; diocesan bodies and other providers; LAs; the LSC (where proposals affect 14-19 provision) and the Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership if one exists, or any local partnership or group that exists in place of an EYDCP (where proposals affect early years and/or childcare provision). This includes statutory objections and comments submitted during the representation period. The Decision Maker should not simply take account of the numbers of people expressing a particular

view when considering representations made on proposals. Instead the Decision Maker should give the greatest weight to representations from those stakeholders likely to be most directly affected by the proposals.