

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF THE FORMAL CONSULTATION – 23 JUNE 2008 TO 10 OCTOBER 2008

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The formal consultation has generated a considerable response representing the views of over 1,600 stakeholders. Those stakeholders include governing bodies, school staff, parents, pupils, pre school providers, town & parish councils, the Rural Community Council, the Learning & Skills Council, the Isle of Wight College, the National Association of Small Schools, local action groups and associations, local businesses and the wider Island community.
- 1.2 Throughout the consultation process the Authority has been working in close cooperation with the Catholic Diocese of Portsmouth and the Anglican Dioceses of Winchester & Portsmouth, and has been in discussion with the relevant unions & professional associations (ASCL, ATL, GMB, NAHT, NASUWT, NUT, Unison, VOICE) and the local MP.
- 1.3 33 governing bodies of the 64 schools affected by the current proposals made a written representation. 55% of these representations supporting proposals as published with a further 15% supporting proposals with some conditions such as the change of the proposed site location. 8 governing bodies opposed the proposal to close their school either outright or by amalgamation; no other governing bodies opposed the proposals.
- 1.4 Of the 8 written representations received from parish or town councils, 2 support proposals with a vision for local, community focused, extended school provision and 5 oppose the proposed closure, either outright or by amalgamation, of a local primary school.

2.0 Key themes raised include:

- Pupil disruption and the impact on standards.
- Transition management.
- No guarantee that standards will improve.
- Capital programme - timescale and funding.
- Morale of school staff.
- Transport – especially in rural areas.
- Impact on community where closure is proposed.
- Adequacy of consultation and consultation process.
- Reorganisation could be halted by a new administration – need to end uncertainty.

3.0 Consultation Representation

Process

- 3.1 A small number of respondents have challenged the Council's process in respect of the consultation and their understanding of the decisions taken as part of the process.
- 3.2 Throughout the process the Council has followed the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) guidance on the process of school organisation. The basis for the consultation both at the informal stage from January to March 2008 and the formal process from the 23 June to 10 October 2008 has been the published consultation booklet 'which way forward for Island education?'. This booklet clearly set out three viable options for the future

school provision, including an option which provided primary, middle and high schools and options which provided primary and secondary schools. The booklet also provided potential outcomes for all individual schools in respect to each option.

3.3 At this stage no final decisions have been made on policy or the future of individual schools, this is the purpose of the Cabinet meeting of 24 November 2008. However, in the Full Council meeting of 19 March 2008 recommendation, which was then endorsed by the Cabinet, in its role as the policy body for the Local Education Authority under the then Isle of Wight Council Constitution, was made to consult upon the impact for individual schools of a policy to:

- change from a primary (4-9 age range), middle (9-13 age range) and high (13-19 age range) system of school organisation to a primary (4-11 age range) and secondary (11-19 age range) system of school organisation.

Subsequently in the Cabinet meeting of the 3 June 2008 it was agreed to:

- establish the primary sector by enlargement and/or amalgamation of schools and at establishment to have no schools below one form entry (30 pupils maximum in a year group) and no school larger than two form entry (60 pupils maximum in a year group);
- establish all secondary schools as new schools and for them to be let by competition under the Education and Inspections Act 2006.

and officers were authorised to formally consult upon the above policy and its implications for individual schools. This consultation took place from the 23 June to the 10 October 2008.

3.4 At all stages in the process, so far, the recommendations of either the Full Council or Cabinet have taken account of the findings from consultation. For example in setting the policy principles the consultation of January to March 2008 demonstrated:

- Overwhelming support for a move to a primary and secondary school organisation;
- Significant concern at the proposed establishment of three form entry primary schools;
- A view to maintain as many rural schools as possible and to use amalgamation and federation to sustain provision.

All of these consultation findings are reflected in the decisions of the 19 March Full Council and the subsequent school by school proposals approved by Cabinet at its 3 June 2008 meeting and formally consulted upon.

3.5 Respondents also raise concern that the Council has not consulted with all appropriate groups. All groups as defined in the DCSF guidance have been consulted with.

3.6 A small number of respondents raise concern that the Council's process did not allow question to be raised in respect of the proposal to move to a primary and secondary school organisation from that of a primary, middle and high school organisation or that the process did not invite responses supporting the current system of school organisation. Consultation meetings whilst concentrating upon the impact of the proposals for individual schools also allowed response in respect of the policy of school organisation and support of the current system. This is clearly borne out in the response received by the Council, where although there is again overwhelming support for a move to a primary and secondary school organisation there has been some clear support for the primary, middle and high school organisation and the sustaining of the current system.

- 3.7 It is the Council's submission that the process has appropriately followed the DCSF guidance and has been open and truly consultative. There is clear demonstration, in the revised proposals, that the Council has listened and amended its position in response to views of young people, the public and school professional community.

Policy

Primary and Secondary School Organisation / Primary, Middle and High School Organisation

- 3.8 The significant majority of respondents supported the proposal to move to a primary and secondary school organisation as outlined in the Full Council proposal, and endorsed by the Cabinet, of 19 March 2008. Of the governing bodies, which responded, 70% supported the move to a primary and secondary organisation. The professional community particularly primary and high school staff but also some middle school staff supported the proposal. Again the majority of parent responses were in favour of the proposal with many supporting the concept of retaining the key stages discretely within a school sector and the impact this would have on their children's progress. Some parents who had moved to the Island expressed a strong preference for the primary and secondary organisation. The Church of England and Roman Catholic Diocesan Authorities and the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Learning and Skills Council supported the proposal for a primary and secondary school organisation. Young people identified that the change would improve the standard of teaching by providing the Island with a school organisation which is consistent with that of most Authorities in England and Wales. This was seen, by them, as positive in the recruitment and retention of high quality staff. They also identified that moving to a primary and secondary organisation would make transfer for young people to and from the Island much easier. The young people also welcomed a system which would reduce the points of transition and retain the key stages fully in individual schools. They saw this as helpful to their progress.
- 3.9 Most respondents who objected to the proposal had current direct interest in individual middle schools. For example the most significant objection to the proposal came from Solent Middle School with 38 individual responses from staff, governors and parents. No respondents supported the modified primary, middle and high school organisation, with the retention of Year 9 in middle schools, outlined in the consultation booklet 'which way forward for Island education?' Where respondents objected to the proposal they wished the Authority to retain the current primary, middle and high school provision. They often expressed the view that more support should be put into achieving higher standards within the current middle and high schools. Whilst this may be possible it does not address the wider constraints apparent in the current school organisation such as:
- Changing national requirements – changes at a national level indicate that the school organisation as it currently stands would not meet the expectations set out by central government, particularly in respect of inclusion, the 14-19 curriculum, the proposed increase in the school leaving age to 18 and the development of personalised learning;
 - Declining pupil numbers – there are fewer pupils within the primary and middle schools, which lead to inequalities in the amount of money spent per pupil across the Island and unequal access to opportunities for the Island's young people;
 - Economic regeneration is the key to the Island's future and will require the development of schools and learning to reflect the different community requirements and pace of regeneration across the Island, the skill base needed by potential employers and the

provision of high quality learning and opportunity, which will enable young people to secure employment and their future prospects on the Island;

- Government guidance – alongside comments made about performance and raising standards within the OFSTED Area Review of 2003, the OFSTED Joint Area Review of 2006 and OFSTED Annual Performance Assessment of 2005, has led officials from the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) to ask the council to address the level of underperformance and low aspirations, the effectiveness of support and challenge to schools, the strengthening of school leadership and teaching quality, efficiency of the system of school organisation and the unfilled places and to end the uncertainty over the form of school organisation for the Island.

Some parents, professional staff and young people also raise the role played by middle schools in acting as a stepping stone between the needs of younger and older children. Young people were also concerned that some teachers might lose their jobs and that there might be more bullying in the secondary schools or that the schools might be too big. They also expressed concern that some communities would lose the local school and that they might have to travel further to school. Overall young people felt that change could be confusing and that there were no guarantees that it would improve learning or results.

- 3.10 The Council's proposal to establish the new secondary provision with an 11-14 lower and a 14-19 upper structure will support the sustaining of the development of younger children towards the personalised and more independent learning model of the 14-19 curriculum. This will also support the development of children's personal and social skills and mitigate against the bullying concern of the young people. The retention of young people in the primary school until the end of Key Stage 2 will also support their development and provide opportunities of leadership and mentoring for them with their younger peers. The new school organisation will have a similar number of children to the current; therefore, the overall risk to jobs is limited. Children will remain for longer, up to age eleven, at primary schools within or nearer to their communities than the current system, where many travel some significant distance to middle school at age nine. Overall travel in the proposed system is unlikely to be greater than in the current system.
- 3.11 Whilst the concerns raised by some respondents and particularly those of the young people are important and will need to be fully addressed in any implementation of change they do not negate the fact that in both the January to March consultation and in the formal consultation from 23 June 2008 to 10 October 2008 the overwhelming view of respondents has been to support the Council's policy proposal to move to a primary (4-11 age range) and secondary (11-19 age range) form of school organisation.

One and Two form entry Primary Schools

- 3.12 Some respondents have raised the issue of the proposal to set the minimum entry for a primary school at one form (maximum thirty pupils). In determining the principles for the establishment of a system of school organisation the Council has a duty to ensure that finite resources are spent in such a way as to ensure the highest quality of provision and best value for money.
- 3.13 Whilst some Authorities, for example Northumberland, have set a minimum of a half form entry, in their re-organisation of schools; they are also Authorities with a much greater population sparsity and distance between schools than the Isle of Wight. In the proposal the Authority has effectively and appropriately used the provisions of amalgamation and

federation to provide primary schools which can offer the full range of curriculum and which are sustainable into the future. Where provision is closed new school provision is always within 3 miles.

- 3.14 Where primary schools are currently proposed for closure with no new provision from amalgamation they all have a five year reception year intake average of less than a half form. For many of those schools amalgamating the combined five year reception intake average will provide for one or two form entry sustainability.
- 3.15 Currently most primary pupils (89%) are educated in one form entry schools the position will be almost identical after the proposed change in organisation.
- 3.16 Many respondents saw the one form entry minimum and two form entry maximum establishment for the primary schools as positive. Often those responding from the professional community supported the sustainability and curriculum viability of the one form entry schools as having the potential to enhance standards at Key Stages 1 and 2. Many parents welcomed the fact that no schools would be established at greater than two form entry.
- 3.17 The Island's limited population sparsity and limited distance between schools does not support the establishment of primary schools below one form entry. Where primary schools are proposed for closure with no further provision, through amalgamation or federation, they do not support a half form entry. The proposal to limit the size of the primary schools to a maximum two form entry is welcomed. Further detail to this proposal is given in Appendix K.

Competition

- 3.18 A small number of respondents, from the high school sector, have questioned the rationale for declaring the proposed secondary schools as new and using the Education and Inspections Act 2006, competition regulations, to establish them. This issue is responded to in detail in Appendix L.
- 3.19 The Education and Inspections Act 2006 is specific in its provision for the granting of a waiver to competition. Two conditions apply:
- that the new school being established is of a religious ethos;
 - that the new school is being established from existing schools which already achieve high standards for their pupils and are seen to be successful.

Only the second condition can apply to the five community secondary schools. However, none of the current high schools either collectively or individually have consistently achieved national standards at GCSE. They are unlikely to be seen as successful schools in the terms of the 2006 Act and it is unlikely that a waiver would be granted for any high school to be enlarged to meet the proposed new 11-19 secondary provision.

- 3.20 Representation has been made by Weston Primary School and members of the Totland community that the proposal to go to competition for the new Freshwater primary school should be reviewed and consideration given to the enlargement of Weston and its move to the new Freshwater site. To enlarge this school, even though it has an improving record of standards and quality, could deny the Freshwater community a direct input into the new school's establishment and accountability. There is also some indication that the community

would wish to be a 'proposer' for any new school. The detail in respect of these comments is set out in Appendix L and this option for Weston Primary School is given within Appendix Q.

- 3.21 Some objection has been received in respect of the proposal to apply for a waiver to competition in the following schools in the East Cowes Primary amalgamation with Whippingham Primary to be on the Osborne Middle site. This representation argues that the performance record of East Cowes Primary, it is seen as a good school, against the performance record of Whippingham Primary, it is seen as a satisfactory school, warrants the enlargement of East Cowes Primary. This is seen as providing quality to the community without the possible risk of loss of community control, which could be brought by competition. The detail in respect of these comments and this option for East Cowes Primary School is given within Appendix Q.
- 3.22 Some further objection has been received from the Ventnor community in respect to the proposed Diocesan amalgamation of St. Boniface CE VC Primary, St. Margaret's CE VC Primary and St. Wilfrid's RC VA Primary. This objection is mainly on the grounds that the proposed new school will not provide a diversity of school choice to the Ventnor community or provide a school in upper and lower Ventnor. However, responses supporting the proposal significantly outweigh the objections received. In respect of diversity of school choice the Ventnor community has not had a community primary school for a significant number of years and there is no history of admission requests, by parents, for out of priority area places. The detail in respect of these comments and the options for the Ventnor community are given within Appendix Q.

Standards

- 3.23 A significant number of respondents have raised the question as to whether a change to a new system of school organisation will guarantee a rise in the standards achieved by young people. A guarantee that standards will rise can not be given as the direct performance of any school is the responsibility of the governing body and headteacher. However, the Authority can guarantee that the proposals will remove significant constraints within the current school organisation to the achievement of high standards. The Authority's proposals also offer the opportunity for a much higher degree of community involvement in the school's accountability and community challenge to its performance.
- 3.24 The detailed responses to the questions over standards are given in Appendix J. However, it must be recognised that where other Authorities have undertaken a change from a primary, middle and high school organisation to one of primary and secondary that standards, particularly at the two key points at the end of Key Stage 2 (eleven year olds) and the end of Key Stage 4 (GCSE), have risen. Whilst there has been improvement these two key points still provide significant underperformance in the current system. At Key Stage 2 overall performance over a five year average has not seen the Authority above 80th out of 150 in the ranking of all Local Authorities in England. Similarly at Key Stage 4, GCSE performance, the Authority has not been ranked, over the same period, outside of the bottom quartile. During this same period Key Stage 1 (seven year olds) performance has not been ranked below 10th out of the 150 Local Authorities. The young people of the Island are capable of much more.
- 3.25 Young people, in their response, recognise the constraints a system which is not matched to the key stages and which has two transitions has upon their progress and achievement. The proposals remove both of these significant disadvantages.

- 3.26 The funding inequality evident within the current system provides a significant constraint upon the achievement of high standards and the support which can be made available to more vulnerable pupils across the Island. The Authority's own tracking of pupil performance demonstrates that by the end of Key Stage 2 the performance of children who have spent Key Stage 1 in the smallest or largest primary school shows no significant difference. Given that those in the smallest schools receive additional funding of, on average, at least £4,000 per pupil there is a question as to whether the Authority is meeting its duty of achieving the best outcomes for its finite resources and offering value for money in the current system of school organisation. The proposals would offer a more even funding distribution with better support for the most vulnerable pupils and, therefore, the potential for better value for money.
- 3.27 A small number of responses raise the increased upper age range of the primary schools and the increased lower age range of the secondary schools, in the proposals, as a risk in respect to pupils' behaviour and its impact upon standards. Young people themselves state that they feel comfortable and happy within their schools. Overall, Island schools have good standards of behaviour and OFSTED reports consistently identify pupil attitudes, behaviour and pupils personal and social skills as strengths. Whilst this concern is recognised the professional community, see the risk as minimal and effectively controlled by good school leadership and internal organisation. The secondary proposal also supports behaviour management with its reference to an internal 11-14 and 14-19 organisation.

Transition

- 3.28 One of the areas with the most significant response was that of transition, both for pupils and staff during the change from one system to another. Many respondents cited the following as key questions:
- Impact on children's progress, the process must not be disruptive;
 - Parent and child need to know which school they will be at and for how long;
 - Will my child have teachers they know?
 - Maintaining staff morale;
 - Will staff have the knowledge for the new schools;
 - How long will transition take?
 - How many changes of school might my child have?
- 3.29 The Appendices O and P together with aspects of Appendix H provide the detailed response to these questions. Appendices O and P are proposals in respect of both pupil and staff transition and provide a clear and definitive timeline which, if approved by the Cabinet in respect of the recommendation in paragraph 66 of the Cabinet report, will allow effective communication to take place with pupils, parents and all staff after the 24 November 2008.
- 3.30 Appendix O sets out the following principles in respect of pupil transition:
- Once a pupil has transferred to a middle school there will be no move back to a primary school as part of any transitional arrangement;
 - No pupil will have more school movements (two) during the transitional period than in the current primary, middle and high school organisation.

In respect of pupils' movement parents will still retain their right under the 2006 Admissions Code to express a preference for a new school for their child at any time. However, pupil

movement determined by the Local Authority's implementation of a new school organisation will not sit outside of the principles above. For staff the key principles to be applied are:

- All staff transfers will take place within the requirements of relevant employment law;
- Processes of redeployment will be applied in accordance with policies agreed with appropriate professional associations and unions specifically for the process of school organisation;
- An appropriate training programme will be offered as part of the implementation process;
- Some degree of ring fencing in the appointment process will apply subject to final agreement with the professional associations and unions and the need to ensure a high quality service in the future;
- Appropriate guidance and career counselling support will be made available to all staff.

These principles and the timeline given in Appendices O and P support a smooth transition for both pupils and staff. They meet the concerns raised by respondents.

- 3.31 The Authority is maintaining a close monitoring of the movement of staff and the morale of staff. In the academic year 2007/2008 those staff leaving Island schools was slightly lower in number than in the previous two years. Whilst this situation is still being monitored the loss of staff is not currently a significant factor. The risk to staff morale is recognised and again the Authority would emphasise that the risks, in change, to jobs is limited.

Uncertainty

- 3.32 Many responses saw the current and past uncertainty about school organisation to be a significant factor in underperformance. For many respondents, who were highly supportive of the proposals, there was a key question of will the change be delivered. The school community, both governors, staff and many parents expressed the strong view that a clear and final decision must be made. This group also identified uncertainty as a key factor in staff morale.

Rural Schools

- 3.33 Many responses, though often from those with a direct interest in a rural school, object to the closure of rural schools. A concern is raised that the Authority has not considered the requirements of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 in respect of rural schools or recognised the quality of their work and importance to their communities.
- 3.34 In respect of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 there is a presumption against the closure of rural schools. However, where an Authority has considered the impact of closure on the rural community, it has appropriately allowed for mitigation of the impact of closure on the community and can demonstrate that the community has reasonable access to alternative provision then the Authority's power to close a rural school is not removed by the Act.
- 3.35 In determining the proposals for all primary schools the Authority applied a weighted matrix. The matrix included key areas such as standards achieved, per pupil head funding, OFSTED

report grade, site conditions, special educational needs, deprivation indices, rural designation, entry demographics, unfilled places and area demographics. The outcome of this matrix and the potential for the school to achieve one form entry sustainability was then applied in determining a proposal for enlargement, amalgamation, federation or closure. Currently the Isle of Wight has twenty one primary schools which are designated as rural by the DCSF criteria. No Island middle, high or special school currently has a rural designation. In the table below the rural schools are listed with the proposal for their future.

School	Proposal	Comment
All Saints CE VC Primary	Enlarge on the current site.	Proposal supported by the school and Diocese. No objection.
Arreton CE VC Primary	Federation with Oakfield CE VA Primary.	Proposal supported by the Diocese and governors.
Bembridge CE VA Primary	Enlarge possibly use the Foreland Middle site.	Proposal supported by the school and Diocese. Some question over eventual site provision.
Brading CE VC Primary	Enlarge on the current site.	Proposal supported by the school and Diocese. No objection.
Brightstone CE VC Primary	Enlarge on the current site.	Proposal supported by the school and Diocese.
Chale CE VC Primary	Closure.	Proposal supported by the Diocese. Strong community and Parish Council objection.
Chillerton & Rookley Primary	Amalgamation.	New rural provision now supported by the school.
Godshill Primary	Amalgamation.	New rural provision now supported by the school.
Nettlestone Primary	Enlarge on the current site.	Proposal supported by the school.
Newchurch Primary	Enlarge on the current site.	Proposal supported by the school.
Niton Primary	Enlarge on the current site.	Proposal supported by the school.
Shalfleet CE VC Primary	Amalgamation.	Proposal supported by the school and Diocese. Question over the final site to be used.
St. Boniface CE VC Primary	Amalgamation.	New joint faith provision supported by both CE and RC Dioceses. Some community objection.
St. Helen's Primary	Closure.	Very significant community and Parish Council objection.
St. Margaret's CE VC Primary	Amalgamation.	New joint faith provision supported by both CE and RC Dioceses. Some community and school objection.
St. Saviour's RC VA	Enlarge on the current site	Proposal supported by the school and Diocese.
St. Wilfrid's RC VA Primary	Amalgamation.	New joint faith provision supported by both CE and RC Dioceses. Some community objection.
Whippingham Primary	Amalgamation.	Proposal supported by the community. Some school objection.
School	Proposal	Comment
Wootton Primary	Enlarge on the current site.	Proposal supported by the school.

Wroxall Primary	Amalgamation.	New rural provision now supported by the school.
Yarmouth CE VA Primary	Amalgamation.	Proposal supported by the Diocese. School and community will support amalgamation but do not see the reason for not using the Yarmouth site.

- 3.36 The proposals in the table above do not indicate significant reduction in the rural schools. Of twenty one schools nine will remain open, under the proposal, either on their current sites or by moving to an adjacent middle school site and enlarging to a 4-11 age range. A further nine schools will be amalgamated to provide four new and more long term sustainable schools of mostly one form entry. Again they will initially use their current sites until new schools are built, which in most cases will be within a three and a half mile travelling distance of any of the existing schools. One school will federate and continue to use its current site. Two schools, both of which have a five year intake average of below a half form entry, are proposed to close. However, there are, within three miles, viable alternative rural schools. In some of the schools which are amalgamating or proposed to close there are a significant number of unfilled places, with pupils often attending from outside the school's priority area. A significant number of the rural schools are of a religious ethos and the Authority's proposals are fully supported by the Church of England Diocese of Portsmouth and Winchester and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Portsmouth.
- 3.37 The Council recognises the quality of work within its rural and small schools. However, within a strategic change of its school organisation it must address the significant number of unfilled places within the primary sector and ensure that it uses its finite resources to achieve the best outcomes for young people and provide the best value for money to the community. The proposals have effectively sought to use amalgamation and federation as alternatives to closure. Similarly the amalgamation of a number of schools will lead to the building of brand new 21st Century provision which will significantly enhance the community, adult learning and other facilities available to the wider rural community. Overall the places available for young people in rural schools, post a change in organisation, will not be dissimilar to that within the current school organisation.
- 3.38 Concern was also raised that the proposals for the rural schools would see the removal of small schools. The current proposals do not see any school outside of a federation, with a single leadership and governance, existing below a one form entry. In the current system 89% of pupils go to one form entry primary schools and this percentage will be similar in the proposed new organisation. It is also important to recognise that a one form entry primary school of 4-11 age range, which would have a maximum of 210 pupils is well below the most common position nationally for similar schools, at around 400 pupils.
- 3.39 The Council recognises the importance of the rural schools to their community. The success of the Island's Extended School programme has often enhanced the role played by the school in the community. All of this is recognised and where there will loss of a rural school the Authority, as outlined in Appendix N will ensure that facilities such as pre-school provision, adult learning youth club and/or youth service provision are maintained alongside the wider community activities. The Authority will have in place an Asset Transfer Strategy in accordance with the Local Government Act 2000. Providing the community can meet the criteria and requirements of this strategy in any request for transfer, the Authority will work with the

community and/or other groups such as the Diocesan Authorities to achieve an asset transfer and the sustaining of provision.

- 3.40 The proposals do not provide for significant reduction of rural provision and when related to the limited sparsity of population and closeness of viable alternative provision, are not unreasonable. With the potential development of some new school provision, within the rural community, and the Authority's position in being willing, subject to appropriate criteria being met by the rural community, to apply its Asset Transfer Strategy the proposals offer new opportunity to the rural community.

Transport

- 3.41 A significant number of respondents raised the provision of the school lift and safe routes to school as an area of concern. In particular responses wanted clarity and reassurance in the proposals that:

- the movement of children and the number of daily journeys would not increase as a result of any change in the school system;
- transport for primary children would be escorted;
- the school lift would be a dedicated provision and of a better quality than the current school lift.

- 3.42 The detailed proposals and the Authority's duties for the school lift are set out in Appendix H. A detailed paper covering the transport needs will be brought to the March 2009 meeting of the Cabinet. This paper will make appropriate recommendations for Cabinet decision. The outcome of Cabinet decisions in March 2009 will then be incorporated in the publication of the statutory notices for each school in September 2009 as set out in Appendix P.

- 3.43 In meeting its transport duties the Authority will:

- ensure that all routes to the schools of a primary and secondary school organisation are surveyed and declared safe or that action is taken to make them safe or that sustainable transport in line with the 2006 Admissions Code is provided;
- ensure that any school lift for primary age children (4-11 year olds) is escorted at a ratio of not greater than 15 children to one adult;
- ensure that all buses used on the school lift will be dedicated to the lift and not service buses;
- ensure that all staff involved in the school lift are fully Criminal records Bureau (CRB) checked.

- 3.44 A number of respondents in the consultation have indicated that they feel the proposed system of school organisation will increase the need for transport and movement of children across the Island. The Authority is challenged that this will increase cost and negates the Council's own Eco-Island objectives and desire to reduce carbon emissions. The need for some new and sustainable primary school lift does not increase the overall need to transport children from the current provision. A key advantage of the proposed move to a primary and secondary school organisation is that children can remain much closer to their immediate communities for another two years of their education. In the proposed new school organisation most primary age children will be within reasonable walking distance of their schools. The secondary lift although very much as now will be required to meet the test of sustainability in line with government guidance and the Council's objectives for EcoIsland. The change to the proposed primary and secondary school organisation will also remove the

high level of unfilled places within the current provision. This will mean that most children will in the future attend schools within the priority area of where they live. This change in itself will significantly reduce the current levels of cross Island travel.

Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (Special Educational Needs) (LDD)

- 3.45 Provision for children with LDD was raised by a number of respondents. The detail to this response is given in Appendix M. However, it is important to recognise that the Authority's two complex learning difficulty schools, Medina House (primary age range) and St. George's (secondary age range) will sit outside of the changes to the mainstream school system.
- 3.46 In meeting the needs of young people that have specific LDD needs in respect of speech and language and communication and interaction the Authority currently has three specialist units, with one unit in each of the primary, middle and high school sectors of the current system. Within the proposed primary and secondary school organisation the Authority will have three specialist units as of now, but with one unit in the primary sector and two units in the secondary sector. The detail in respect of the schools which will host these units is given in Appendix M.
- 3.47 Provision of support to pupils with LDD is and will remain a key function of each school's leadership and governance. Where a school is let by competition its approach to providing an inclusive ethos and relevant curriculum for all young people, regardless of background or capability will be a key element in determining the success of the proposal.
- 3.48 The proposed move from a system of primary, middle and high school organisation to one of primary and secondary will enhance the overall provision for pupils with LDD. In particular the following areas will see improved provision as a result of the proposed change in school organisation:
- Progression and continuity of learning;
 - Curriculum breadth and opportunity;
 - Specialist staffing and support;
 - Accommodation compliance;
 - Equality of funding.

Funding and Capacity

- 3.49 Some response raised concern over the funding of any change and whether the Authority had the capacity to be able to deliver the proposed changes.
- 3.50 The revenue cost in respect of the school organisation project can largely be contained with existing revenue funding of the Authority, the Direct Schools Grant (DSG) and specific grant funding which the Authority receives. The main cost areas are as set out below:
- | | | |
|-------------------|----------|--|
| • Project Team - | £409,000 | within current resources.
from 2011 this cost will be met from BSF funding. |
| • Project funding | £250,000 | to cover initiation and implementation costs. |
| • Staff Training | £300,000 | within current resources from the DSG and grant funding. |

- School Lift £2.029M current lift costs – new lift within this allocation.

3.51 The capital funds are provided through DCSF ring fenced grants which can only be spent upon the development of the school estate. These grants provide three sources of funding as follows:

- Basic capital allocation £3M – 2008/2009 allocation – annual varying amount allocation
- Primary Capital Programme (PCP) £14M plus – over 2009-2014
- Building Schools for the Future (BSF) £120 – 150M in two tranches from 2011 at the earliest - £36M secure for the Cowes One School Pathfinder (OSP)

3.52 To ensure the appropriate officer capacity and expertise the Authority is establishing a project team under a Project Director for School Organisation. Initially the project team will consist of a Project Director, Project Manager, Procurement Officer, Communications Officer and School Improvement Officer. The key areas of asset management, human resources and legal support are already in place. This commitment to a project team is also a readiness requirement of the BSF capital submission. It is the Council's view that it has in place the resources capacity and expertise to ensure the delivery of a new school organisation for the Island.

The Diocesan Authorities

3.53 Both the Church of England Diocese of Portsmouth and Winchester and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Portsmouth have expressed their full support for the proposals.

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Learning and Skills Council

3.54 The Hampshire and Isle of Wight Learning and Skills Council have given their full support to the proposal for a primary and secondary school organisation and the proposals in respect of establishing the secondary schools as new schools and letting them by competition. They raise some concern that there is over capacity in the proposed post 16 provision. The proposed post 16 provision allows for the raising of the school leaving age to eighteen and the staying on of all young people in education, training and/or employment and related training. Providing the post 16 providers collaborate and co-operate to the benefit of the young people the issue of over capacity will not arise. From April 2010 the Authority will be able to use its new post 16 commissioning role to manage the market.

St. Helen's and Yarmouth responses

3.55 The response from the St. Helen's and Yarmouth communities in respect of the proposals for St. Helen's Primary School and Yarmouth CE VA Primary School have been extensive, accounting for almost 70% of all responses, and cogently argued. In the response from both communities and schools new options and specific information has been put forward which requires further consideration before a final decision.

3.56 To resolve the matter for both these schools in a manner which is seen to be open and fair the Authority, subject to cabinet approval, will appoint an Independent Panel to review the

proposals for both schools and provide officers with a report, which will be made public, to take to Cabinet for decision.

- 3.57 The remit for the independent panel is provided in Appendix R. In respect of Yarmouth CE VA Primary School this proposal is supported by the Church of England Diocese of Portsmouth and Winchester.

4.0 School by School Representation

COWES AREA

4.1 Cowes Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body support the proposal as published and caution against any unnecessary delay in implementation.

September 2010 is the earliest implementation date.

A parent supports the proposal for a 2FE primary but with a relocation to the Solent Middle site with Gurnard Primary remaining on its existing site.

It is recommended that Gurnard primary relocates to the Solent Middle site, the site would therefore not be available.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Pupil disruption and impact on standards;**
- **Transition management a key concern;**
- **Is Government funding for capital build guaranteed?**
- **Car parking / traffic congestion a concern;**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Can current year 4 be retained at primaries as year 5 in September 2009?

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

- Concern over OSP delivery timescale;

The One School Pathfinder building (OSP) is scheduled to be available for September 2011; this occupation date has been factored into the current proposals. In the event of unforeseen slippage in the delivery of the OSP, alternative allocation of middle and primary sites in Cowes will provide a workable, though less desirable, accommodation of pupils.

- Concern over potential increase in class sizes.

Class size is under the direct influence of autonomous decisions by individual governing bodies. Larger schools do not necessarily result in larger class sizes.

4.2 Gurnard Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body supports the proposal to relocate to the Solent Middle site but consider a 2FE primary would make best use of existing facilities.

It is recommended that the initial establishment on the Solent site be 2FE with a review after 3 years.

Four other letters (1 from staff body, 3 from parents) support the relocation to the Solent Middle site. Three of these (including staff body) consider a 2FE primary would make best use of existing facilities.

It is recommended that the initial establishment on the Solent site be 2FE with a review after 3 years.

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Loss of on site swimming pool if school relocated to Solent site;

Provision of swimming pools is not required by DCSF guidance (BB 98/99). The school currently uses alternative off site provision for year 4, this could be extended to other year groups.

- Will the priority area change if school relocated?

There is no requirement for the priority area for Gurnard to change as part of the proposals, though it is recognised that the Solent Middle site falls just outside the existing priority area.

- 1FE proposal represents poor use of Solent site;

It is recommended that the initial establishment on the Solent site be 2FE with a review after 3 years.

- Could Solent site be sold to fund a rebuild at Gurnard site?

The sale of the Solent site might fund a rebuild at the Gurnard site but would require two relocations of pupils, prior to commencement and on completion of build. This is considered unnecessarily disruptive.

- What happens if OSP build at Cowes High is delayed?

The One School Pathfinder building (OSP) is scheduled to be available for September 2011; this occupation date has been factored into the current proposals. In the event of unforeseen slippage in the delivery of the OSP, alternative allocation of middle and primary sites in Cowes will provide a workable, though less desirable, accommodation of pupils.

4.3 Love Lane Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Pupil disruption and impact on standards;**
- **Transition management a key concern;**
- **Is Government funding for capital build guaranteed?**
- **Car parking / traffic congestion a concern;**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Can current year 4 be retained at primaries as year 5 in September 2009?

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

- Concern over OSP delivery timescale;

The One School Pathfinder building (OSP) is scheduled to be available for September 2011; this occupation date has been factored into the current proposals. In the event of unforeseen slippage in the delivery of the OSP, alternative allocation of middle and primary sites in Cowes will provide a workable, though less desirable, accommodation of pupils.

- Concern over potential increase in class sizes.

Class size is under the direct influence of autonomous decisions by individual governing bodies. Larger schools do not necessarily result in larger class sizes.

4.4 Northwood Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Pupil disruption and impact on standards;**
- **Transition management a key concern;**
- **Is Government funding for capital build guaranteed?**
- **Car parking / traffic congestion a concern;**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Can current year 4 be retained at primaries as year 5 in September 2009?

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

- Concern over OSP delivery timescale;

The One School Pathfinder building (OSP) is scheduled to be available for September 2011; this occupation date has been factored into the current proposals. In the event of unforeseen slippage in the delivery of the OSP, alternative allocation of middle and primary sites in Cowes will provide a workable, though less desirable, accommodation of pupils.

- Concern over potential increase in class sizes.

Class size is under the direct influence of autonomous decisions by individual governing bodies. Larger schools do not necessarily result in larger class sizes.

4.5 Solent Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body object to the proposal to close Solent Middle, citing high standards of attainment at the school and that the school is very popular and oversubscribed. If, however, the decision is made to close the school, the Governing Body would strongly support the relocation of Gurnard Primary to the site as a 2FE primary school.

It is recommended that the initial establishment of Gurnard Primary on the Solent site be 2FE with a review after 3 years.

The staff body at Solent Middle object to the proposed closure of the school & do not consider the proposed structure will raise standards at GCSE.

Thirty five other letters (3 identified as parents, 30 duplicate 'form' letters, 2 others) oppose the closure of Solent Middle and consider it should remain as a middle school.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Pupil disruption and impact on standards;**
- **Management of transition a key concern;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **What happens if Government funding for capital build is cut?**
- **Build management / timescale and cost concerns;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local elections?**
- **Effect on morale of Middle School staff – impact on quality of teaching;**
- **Different treatment of Middle School staff.**

4.6 Somerton Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Pupil disruption and impact on standards;**
- **Management of transition a key concern;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **What happens if Government funding for capital build is cut?**
- **Build management / timescale and cost concerns;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local elections?**
- **Effect on morale of Middle School staff – impact on quality of teaching;**
- **Different treatment of Middle School staff.**

4.7 Cowes High School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Pupil disruption and impact on standards;**
- **Management of transition a key concern;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **What happens if Government funding for capital build is cut?**
- **Build management / timescale and cost concerns;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local elections?**
- **Effect on morale of Middle School staff – impact on quality of teaching;**
- **Different treatment of Middle School staff.**

4.8 Cowes Secondary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **How will competition improve standards?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- What is the catchment / priority area for the new secondary school?
- What will be the admission policy to the new secondary school?

With the exception of possible Voluntary Controlled (VC) status, the governing body of the new school will be responsible for admissions arrangements, including priority areas. The governing body will have to meet the requirements of the Schools Admissions Code of Practice including consultation with the Council regarding admission arrangements.

- Which middle schools will be designated to the school?

It is recommended that Solent Middle, Somerton Middle and Osborne Middle are designated to the proposed new secondary school.

EAST COWES AREA

4.9 East Cowes / Whippingham

Written responses to consultation:

East Cowes Schools Working Group (representing the Governing Bodies of East Cowes Primary, Whippingham Primary and Osborne Middle Schools, East Cowes Town Council, local IWC members and Chimneys and Seashells Pre schools) support the amalgamation but with a 3 form entry 0-11 provision on the Osborne Middle site with extensive extended school & community facilities.

32 duplicate form letters (23 parents – all East Cowes Primary, 9 others) support the Working Group vision.

6 letters expressed a preference, ranging from concern surrounding competition and waiver to absolute preference for enlargement, for the enlargement of East Cowes Primary and relocation to the Osborne Middle site as an alternative to the proposed amalgamation. Included in these letters was a joint submission from the head teachers of both East Cowes Primary and Osborne Middle.

A letter was also received supporting a 0-14 provision on the Osborne Middle site via a primary and junior high school.

One letter from parents of a Whippingham pupil objected to the amalgamation, supporting the retention of Whippingham Primary as a discrete 1FE primary school.

There is a high risk that the close location of two 1FE community primaries would generate adverse competition, potentially resulting in viability concerns for the less popular school.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Pupil disruption – impact on standards;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Whippingham & East Cowes should both be maintained as separate 1FE primaries;

There is a high risk that the close location of two 1FE community primaries would generate adverse competition, potentially resulting in viability concerns for the less popular school.

- 2FE primary provision at Osborne Middle site will be insufficient to meet local demand for places;

The combined number of places offered to children for both schools for September 2008 was 44. If future pupil numbers rose and the proposed school became over subscribed, there is sufficient site to accommodate a governing body request to increase the admission number beyond 60.

4.10 Holy Cross RC VA Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for KS2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

- Can additional building be accommodated on the current site?

The Catholic Diocese is in discussion with the Sisters of Christ over various site issues. The long term location of the proposed provision is dependant on their outcome. If the site issues cannot be resolved, the school will need to relocate.

- Could the school acquire the convent site and become a 2FE primary?

The Catholic Diocese has indicated that this is not an option.

4.11 Wootton Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Pupil disruption – impact on standards;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve.**

4.12 Osborne Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

See under East Cowes / Whippingham, otherwise no representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings

- **Pupil disruption – impact on standards;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Motivation of staff during reorganisation is a concern;**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Which secondary school will Osborne pupils be attached to, Cowes or Medina?

It is recommended that Osborne Middle be designated to the proposed Cowes/Medina secondary schools.

RYDE AREA

4.13 Binstead Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Quality of leadership at good schools like Bishop Lovett will be lost;**
- **Concern that uncertainty of middle school staff will impact on teaching;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local election?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Retain current year 4 pupils as year 5 at their primary schools in September 2009;

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

- Will parents need to buy new school uniforms?

School uniform is a matter for individual governing bodies to determine; the Council will encourage governing bodies to take a pragmatic approach to uniforms during any transition period.

4.14 Dover Park Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Quality of leadership at good schools like Bishop Lovett will be lost;**
- **Concern that uncertainty of middle school staff will impact on teaching;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local election?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Retain current year 4 pupils as year 5 at their primary schools in September 2009;

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

- Will parents need to buy new school uniforms?

School uniform is a matter for individual governing bodies to determine; the Council will encourage governing bodies to take a pragmatic approach to uniforms during any transition period.

4.15 Greenmount Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Quality of leadership at good schools like Bishop Lovett will be lost;**
- **Concern that uncertainty of middle school staff will impact on teaching;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local election?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Retain current year 4 pupils as year 5 at their primary schools in September 2009;

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

- Will parents need to buy new school uniforms?

School uniform is a matter for individual governing bodies to determine; the Council will encourage governing bodies to take a pragmatic approach to uniforms during any transition period.

4.16 Haylands Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Quality of leadership at good schools like Bishop Lovett will be lost;**
- **Concern that uncertainty of middle school staff will impact on teaching;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local election?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Retain current year 4 pupils as year 5 at their primary schools in September 2009;

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

- Will parents need to buy new school uniforms?

School uniform is a matter for individual governing bodies to determine; the Council will encourage governing bodies to take a pragmatic approach to uniforms during any transition period.

4.17 Oakfield CE VA Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

A letter stated that the Bishop Lovett site should be used as a 2 form entry rather than the 1 form entry provision proposed in order to increase parental choice in the Ryde East area and make best use of the existing facilities.

Two existing classroom blocks at the Bishop Lovett site are unsuitable and are earmarked for demolition, thereby removing surplus capacity at the site.

A letter from a parent of a pupil at St. Mary's stated that the Bishop Lovett site could be used for both the enlarged St. Mary's & Oakfield primaries with the St. Mary's site being used as a nursery school.

Both the Anglican and Catholic Dioceses have stated their intention to continue discrete provision on both existing sites.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for KS2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.18 St. Mary's RC VA Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body supports the proposals and would consider the same provision on an adjacent site if this should provide more feasible.

Both the Anglican and Catholic Dioceses have stated their intention to continue discrete provision on both existing sites.

A letter from a parent stated that the Bishop Lovett site could be used for both the enlarged St. Mary's & Oakfield primaries with the St. Mary's site being used as a nursery school.

Both the Anglican and Catholic Dioceses have stated their intention to continue discrete provision on both existing sites.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for KS2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.19 Bishop Lovett CE VC Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Disruption of pupils – impact on standards;**
- **Continuity of staff to be maintained where possible;**
- **Concern over build management;**
- **Is the capital funding guaranteed?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Potential for Bishop Lovett site to accommodate a 2FE primary, this would be a better use of existing facilities.

Two existing classroom blocks at the Bishop Lovett site are unsuitable and are earmarked for demolition, thereby removing surplus capacity at the site.

4.20 Mayfield CE VC Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Disruption of pupils – impact on standards;**
- **Continuity of staff to be maintained where possible;**
- **Concern over build management;**
- **Is the capital funding guaranteed?**

4.21 Swanmore Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Disruption of pupils – impact on standards;**
- **Continuity of staff to be maintained where possible;**
- **Concern over build management;**
- **Is the capital funding guaranteed?**

4.22 Ryde High School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of Ryde High School welcomes the proposal for secondary education on the Ryde High site.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Disruption of pupils – impact on standards;**
- **Continuity of staff to be maintained where possible;**
- **Concern over build management;**
- **Is the capital funding guaranteed?**
- **Why not enlarge Ryde High School?**

4.23 Ryde Secondary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of Ryde High School supports the proposal in terms of site and proposed pupil numbers. The Governing Body consider that the specification for the new school should require:

- The new school to be a community school;
- Standards achieved to be above national averages;
- Vigorous sustainability of delivery;
- Broad based curriculum with a mix of academic & vocational studies embracing new specialised Diplomas;
- Aspiration for all pupils including SEN & G&T;
- Retention of at least one, preferably both, of the existing specialisms;
- Strong liaison with local community;
- Strong liaison with commerce, industry & voluntary sector;
- Collaboration with cluster schools;
- Development of off-Island partnerships;
- Active involvement in Extended Schools agenda.

The Governing Bodies recommendations will be considered, as appropriate, when drafting any specifications for the proposed new school

Ryde Town Council are concerned that the proposed changes could have a negative impact on the new schools ability to attract staff, on pupil behaviour and on exam results. They also recognise that the establishment of a new school could provide an opportunity to build on recent improvements. The deficit of secondary pupils choosing the Ryde area needs to be addressed.

There is an ongoing parental preference against higher secondary provision in Ryde. The Council recognises this as an area of concern.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Will competition improve performance?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- What will the priority areas for the new secondary schools be?

With the exception of possible Voluntary Controlled (VC) status, the governing body of the new school will be responsible for admissions arrangements, including priority areas. The governing body will have to meet the requirements of the Schools Admissions Code of Practice including consultation with the Council regarding admission arrangements.

EAST WIGHT AREA

4.24 Bembridge CE Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for KS2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.25 Nettlestone Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body support the move to a 2 tier structure and the proposals to expand Nettlestone Primary.

A safe travel plan from St. Helens, including a school friendly bus service, good drop off points for private vehicles and walking / cycling routes is required.

A letter from the parents of 25 current year 4 pupils at Nettlestone proposes that this cohort should remain at Nettlestone as Year 5's in September 2009.

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Quality of leadership at good schools like Bishop Lovett will be lost;**
- **Concern that uncertainty of middle school staff will impact on teaching;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local election?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Retain current year 4 pupils as year 5 at their primary schools in September 2009;

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

- Will parents need to buy new school uniforms?

School uniform is a matter for individual governing bodies to determine; the Council will encourage governing bodies to take a pragmatic approach to uniforms during any transition period.

4.26 St. Helens Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of St. Helens opposes the proposal to close the school for the following reasons:

- **No evidence to support the view that small schools are not educationally viable;**
- **Emotional affect on children that closure would entail; pupils feel safe and secure at St. Helens;**
- **Savings on high per pupil cost would be offset by increased transport costs;**
- **Capital savings accrued by removal of need to extend other schools;**
- **Informal consultation process flawed;**
- **Closure would reduce parental choice;**
- **Failure to consult all stakeholders during statutory consultation;**
- **School transport to alternative provision not costed;**
- **Increase in car travel to school;**
- **Failure to explore alternatives to discontinuance;**
- **Presumption against closure of designated rural schools;**
- **Forecast increase in local demographics;**

Forecast pupil numbers only indicate the potential for a 101 pupil 4-11 primary school by 2018, based on projected cohorts and existing parental preference for the school.

- Future need for childcare provision in St. Helens;

Childcare provision could form a valid part of any community bid under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.

The Governing Body submit that the Authority should consider retention of St. Helens Primary as a 4-9 first school or a 4-7 infant school.

The Governing Body carried out a parent survey asking for their choice of priority school should St. Helens close. 25 parents (40 children) chose Bembridge CE Primary and 1 parent (1 child) chose Nettlestone but with some reservations.

The staff of St. Helens Primary believes that the IWC is incorrect in its proposal to close the school and wish the following points to be considered in order to retain educational provision within the village:

- **Evidence to show small schools perform well;**
- **Consistently high standards attained at St. Helens;**
- **Loss of parental engagement if school closes;**
- **Potential for federation or amalgamation with another small school, for example Brading Primary;**
- **Impact on community if closed;**
- **Saving on high per pupil cost offset by travel cost to alternative provision;**
- **Capital saving if school retained;**
- **Joint highest percentage of children who walk or cycle to school;**
- **Reluctance of parents to use school lift leading to an increase in car usage;**
- **St. Helens pupils feel safe and enjoy coming to school;**
- **Loss of family learning / adult education if closed;**

Family learning / adult education provision could form a valid part of any community bid under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.

Should the proposed closure be implemented the staff are concerned that the following points are considered:

- **Provision of safe and affordable transport;**
- **Access to after school clubs is not affected by travel considerations;**
- **Pastoral care is provided to pupils during the move to a new school;**
- **Educational support is given to the current year 3 pupils to ensure Key Stage 2 Test attainment is maintained;**
- **Close liaison between staff to ensure a smooth transition;**
- **St. Helens staff to be redeployed to priority school, wherever possible, to ensure continuity for pupils;**
- **Cohorts of pupils are not split to different schools;**
- **Siblings are not separated;**

Pupils displaced following a proposed closure will be given the option of a place at a designated school. Cohorts of pupils will not be split up unless this results from parental preference for an alternative school to that which is designated.

St. Helens Parish Council and St. Helens Parents, Children and Community Association (PCCA) jointly submit that they oppose the proposed closure of St. Helens Primary School for the following reasons:

- **The consultation process is legally flawed;**
- **No statutory consultation on policy;**
- **Failure to consult adequately with interested parties;**
- **Inadequacy of meetings with IWC representatives;**
- **Inadequate provision of information;**
- **Presumption against the closure of a designated rural school;**
- **No valid educational reason for closing St. Helens Primary;**
- **St. Helens has a good Ofsted report;**
- **St. Helens pupils attain high standards;**
- **Educational benefit of school location;**
- **Parental engagement at current site;**
- **Within walking distance for many pupils;**
- **No evidence to support the view that ½ form entry schools are not educationally viable;**
- **Evidence to support the educational benefit of small schools;**
- **Failure to consider alternatives to closure;**
- **Failure to consider the impact on community of closure;**
- **Cost of transport to alternative provision not identified;**
- **Increased traffic if school closed;**
- **Environmental impact of increase in transport;**
- **Safety of children on school buses;**
- **No bus service between St. Helens & Nettlestone for parental use;**
- **St. Helens can be cost effectively extended to accommodate 4-11 provision.**

The St Helens site extends to 10,350m²; this is sufficient for a 1FE 4-11 school, extensive extension would be required, a complete rebuild would be considered a more cost effective option.

- **Demographic need for school / new housing developments in area;**

Forecast pupil numbers only indicate the potential for a 101 pupil 4-11 primary school by 2018, based on projected cohorts and existing parental preference for the school.

The Parish Council & PCCA submit that all primary schools in the East Wight Area should remain open but if one is to be closed it should not be St. Helens.

125 letters (15 from parents, 110 others) were received opposing the proposed closure of St. Helens Primary School.

A petition with 47 signatures also opposed the proposed closure. The reasons given for objecting were:

- **Flawed consultation (High Court R(Parents for legal action) v Northumberland CC [2006] EWHC1081);**
- **Inadequate consultation;**
- **Inadequate information;**
- **Decision predetermined, views will be disregarded;**

- **No evidence to support Council policy over form entry;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Alternatives to closure not considered;**
- **Federation with other schools not considered;**
- **Presumption against closure of designated rural schools;**
- **Rurality of community not considered;**
- **Impact on community of school closure;**
- **School a pivotal part of community focus;**
- **No justification to close school;**
- **Closure would reduce diversity and parental choice;**
- **Pre school parents not consulted;**
- **Closure motivated against local member;**
- **Proposals not costed;**
- **Impact on local businesses if school closes;**
- **Concern over young children in school buses;**
- **Cost of Transport to alternative provision;**
- **Increase in traffic if school closed;**
- **Environmental impact of increased transport;**
- **No buses between Nettlestone & St. Helens for parent transport;**
- **Loss of Home / School relationship;**
- **Loss of accessibility of school staff;**
- **Young families won't live in St. Helens if school closes;**
- **Disruption to pupils;**
- **Impact on school staff;**
- **Psychological impact on St. Helens pupils – will be at increased risk of bullying;**
- **Exclusion of St. Helens children from after school activities due to transport issues / bus times;**
- **Parental preference for small schools;**
- **Small schools achieve better standards;**
- **St. Helens has a good Ofsted with some outstanding features;**
- **Pupils feel safe and secure in small schools;**
- **Quality of existing provision / standards achieved;**
- **Quality of St. Helens staff;**
- **St. Helens site accessible by walking;**
- **St. Helens provides local school for local pupils;**
- **Loss of parental / community involvement in current school;**
- **Bembridge CE VA Primary should be the designated school if closure is implemented.**
- **Concern that existing cohorts may be separated;**

Pupils displaced following a proposed closure will be given the option of a place at a designated school. Cohorts of pupils will not be split up unless this results from parental preference for an alternative school to that which is designated.

- **Loss of childcare provision – breakfast and after school clubs;**
- **Loss of Family learning at St. Helens;**

Family learning / childcare provision could form a valid part of any community bid under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.

- St. Helens can be extended cost effectively;

The St Helens site extends to 10,350m²; this is sufficient for a 1FE 4-11 school, extensive extension would be required, a complete rebuild would be considered a more cost effective option.

- St. Helens provides good value for money;

For the financial year 2008/09, St Helens Primary School received DSG funding of £4,111 per pupil. This is £774 per pupil (23%) above the Island primary average of £3,337.

- Forecast increase in local demographics / New housing developments in St. Helens area;

Forecast pupil numbers only indicate the potential for a 101 pupil 4-11 primary school by 2018, based on projected cohorts and existing parental preference for the school.

- Parking / access concern over Nettlestone site;

The council recognises that the main vehicular access to the Nettlestone site may need to be improved.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Cost issues.**
- **Transport issues.**
- **Support for children with special needs.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Parental offer to rebuild / expand St. Helens.

4.26 Forelands Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of Forelands Middle expressed concerns surrounding:

- **Differentiation of treatment of staff in terms of employment rights;**
- **Retention of staff leading up to re-organisation;**
- **Lack of transition plan;**
- **Training for staff;**
- **Management of split sites during transition.**

The Governors propose that Forelands runs as a satellite site of a secondary school in its current form during transition.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Loss of existing quality of provision / standards achieved at Forelands Middle;**
- **Loss of excellent staff team at Forelands Middle;**
- **No guarantee that re-organisation would improve standards;**
- **SEN provision weaker at smaller schools;**
- **Different treatment of primary / middle staff;**
- **Disruption to pupils;**
- **Forelands Middle should expand downwards to become Forelands Primary;**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Will Forelands Middle be linked to Sandown Secondary?

It is recommended that Forelands Middle be designated to the proposed Sandown secondary school.

SOUTH EAST WIGHT AREA

4.27 Brading CE Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

A joint submission from the Governing Body & Brading Town Council supports the proposal and further proposes integrated facilities to include Doctors Surgery, Youth Club, Town Council, Library and Community Sports facilities on the school site.

218 duplicate 'form' letters were received from residents strongly supporting the joint proposal for integrated services.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for Key Stage 2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.28 Broadlea Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Continuity of staff needs to be addressed;**
- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Impact on standards – pupil disruption;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve.**

4.29 Gatten and Lake Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Continuity of staff needs to be addressed;**
- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Impact on standards – pupil disruption;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve.**

4.30 Newchurch Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body propose that current year 4 pupils remain at the school as Year 5's in September 2009 as no alterations would be necessary to accommodate these pupils.

At September 2009 a 3 tier structure will still be in place on the Isle of Wight as no proposed reorganisation can be implemented by this time. Year 5 pupils (current year 4) will therefore transfer to middle schools as they do now. There is no statutory mechanism by which this earlier retention can be accommodated.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Continuity of staff needs to be addressed;**
- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Impact on standards – pupil disruption;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve.**

4.31 Shanklin CE VC Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Chair of Governors reported the views expressed at a school stakeholders meeting. The stakeholders concerns were:

- **The apparent change in the treatment of middle schools;**
- **Lack of evidence to support need for change;**
- **No need for wholesale re-organisation;**
- **Difference in method to establish primary / secondary sectors;**
- **Disruption to pupils;**
- **Capacity of local authority to manage process;**
- **Need for consultation with stakeholders surrounding build management;**
- **Impact of 1 form entry on admissions – denial of parental choice;**
- **Logistical pressures as existing larger cohorts progress through the school;**
- **Insufficient resources to support transition.**

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for Key Stage 2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.32 Sandown CE VC / St. Johns CE VC Primary Schools Amalgamation

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body & staff of Sandown CE Primary support the proposal but consider that the Sandown CE site is insufficient for a 2FE primary school. They propose that both existing sites remain open until a suitable alternative site is available.

The Council recognises that the proposed provision on the Sandown CE site would be a constrained site provision. The use of both existing sites until this issue can be satisfactorily resolved would be beneficial.

The Governing Body and staff of St. John's CE Primary support the proposal but consider that both existing sites should remain open until a suitable alternative site is available.

The Council recognises that the proposed provision on the Sandown CE site would be a constrained site provision. The use of both existing sites until this issue can be satisfactorily resolved would be beneficial.

(The Headteacher of St. John's CE Primary reports that despite their formal support for the proposal, none of the staff at St. John's want the amalgamation and instead consider that St. John's CE should continue as a 1FE primary school)

The headteacher's comments are noted but contradict the formal support for the amended proposal given by the Governing Body and staff at the school.

8 duplicate 'form' letters from parents at Sandown CE Primary support the proposal

8 letters opposed the proposal (Sandown Town Council, 4 from parents at St. John's CE, 3 from parents at Sandown CE). Reasons given for objecting were:

- **Loss of good SEN provision at St. Johns CE VC primary;**
- **Quality of provision / standards achieved at existing schools;**
- **Disruption to pupils;**

- Forecast increase in local demographics;
- Proposal would reduce admission number from 90 to 60 this would be insufficient & reduce parental choice;

The combined number of places offered to children for both schools for September 2008 was 50. There is sufficient proposed capacity to meet a future increase in local demographics.

- St. John's CE VC is being treated less favourably than other schools;
- St. John's CE VC should be re-built in a new site;
- Additional adjacent land available at St. John's CE VC site;
- Both schools should be retained;

There is a high risk that the close location of two CE primaries would generate adverse competition, potentially resulting in viability concerns for the less popular school.

- Loss of school name / identity.

The name of a school is a matter for individual governing bodies to determine. A well managed amalgamation will preserve the best of the identity and ethos of both schools.

- Distance to proposed or alternative site;

The distance between the two sites by road is 0.4 miles. Any proposal for an alternative site should ideally be within 2 miles of the existing sites.

- Sandown CE VC site too small;

The Council recognises that the proposed provision on the Sandown CE site would be a constrained site provision. The use of both existing sites until this issue can be satisfactorily resolved would be beneficial.

One of the letters also opposed the proposed change to a 2 tier system.

A petition with 65 signatures was received calling for the retention of St. John's CE as a discrete primary school.

8 duplicate form letters from parents at Sandown CE VC were received opposing the proposed amalgamation. Reasons specified were:

- **Amalgamated school would be too large;**
- **Lack of concrete information;**
- **Pupil disruption;**
- **Existing quality of provision at Sandown CE VC.**

Two letters raised concerns surrounding the proposed amalgamation. The concerns expressed related to the adequacy of the school site, particularly in relation to play / P.E, the maintenance of quality teaching staff, provision of adequate resources and pastoral care of pupils.

The Council recognises that the proposed provision on the Sandown CE site would be a constrained site provision. The use of both existing sites until this issue can be satisfactorily resolved would be beneficial.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Standards both for existing and new numbers;**
- **Changes are unfair;**
- **Size of school is a concern;**
- **3 tier system is better;**
- **No need for change;**
- **Address failing areas rather than upsetting younger children;**
- **Capital provision;**
- **Familiarity with existing schools and staff.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Site ownership issues;

The Council has no concerns regarding site ownership .

- Sufficiently of 2FE;

The combined number of places offered to children for both schools for September 2008 was 50. There is sufficient proposed capacity to meet a future increase in local demographics.

- Governing Body arrangements;

The shadow governing body of the proposed new school will have representatives from both existing governing bodies.

- Split site issues;

The distance between the two sites by road is 0.4 miles; this close proximity will further reduce any split site issues that should in any event be overcome by the effective leadership and management of the proposed new school.

4.33 Lake Middle School

Written responses from consultation:

Nine letters were received (7 from parents, 2 others). Concerns surrounding the proposal included:

- **Loss of existing quality of provision / standards achieved at Lake Middle;**
- **Loss of excellent staff team at Lake Middle;**
- **No guarantee that re-organisation would improve standards;**
- **SEN provision weaker at smaller schools;**
- **Different treatment of primary / middle staff;**
- **'Gagging' of staff during consultation;**
- **Lake Middle should expand downwards to become Lake Primary;**
- **Disruption to pupils.**

One letter opposed the change from the current 3 tier system and another proposed an infant / junior model for primary provision.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Disruption to pupils and impact on standards;**
- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Continuity of teaching staff needs to be addressed;**
- **Why change the system?**
- **Will the SEN policy change?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Extended school provision at enlarged primaries must at least match that which is available at middle schools.

By 2010, the Government expects all schools to be delivering a 'core offer' of extended services. The proposals for enlarged primaries with a minimum 1FE will provide the capacity to enable this delivery.

4.34 Sandham Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Disruption to pupils and impact on standards;**
- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Continuity of teaching staff needs to be addressed;**
- **Why change the system?**
- **Will the SEN policy change?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Extended school provision at enlarged primaries must at least match that which is available at middle schools.

By 2010, the Government expects all schools to be delivering a 'core offer' of extended services. The proposals for enlarged primaries with a minimum 1FE will provide the capacity to enable this delivery.

4.35 Sandown High School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body support the proposed move to a two tier structure but oppose the proposed closure of Sandown High. They consider that the school should be excluded from the competition process for the following reasons:

- **Foundation status of school with aim to establish a Trust;**
- **Training school status;**
- **Successful Graduate Teacher Programme;**
- **Results at KS4 & KS5 improving steadily;**
- **Youth Sports Trust Partnership school;**
- **Oversubscribed & popular school.**

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Disruption to pupils and impact on standards;**
- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Continuity of teaching staff needs to be addressed;**
- **Why change the system?**
- **Will the SEN policy change?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Extended school provision at enlarged primaries must at least match that which is available at middle schools.

By 2010, the Government expects all schools to be delivering a 'core offer' of extended services. The proposals for enlarged primaries with a minimum 1FE will provide the capacity to enable this delivery.

.

4.36 Sandown Secondary School

Written responses to consultation:

Sandown High Governing Body oppose the proposal for a new school and propose the expansion of the existing High School.

4 letters from parents expressed concerns or opposed the proposal to locate the new school on a split site.

1 letter from a parent considered the proposed school was too large and the Sandown High site may not be sufficient.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Concern over split site provision;**
- **Concern over competition process;**
- **Specialist status for new schools – will existing benefits be lost?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern that the proposed admission number is lower than the current High School admission number of 436;

If the admission number were to remain at 436 the school, with the addition of years 7 & 8 would be too large.

- Will Ventnor Middle be designated to Sandown Secondary or Medina Secondary

It is recommended that Ventnor Middle School be designated to the proposed new Medina secondary school.

SOUTH WIGHT AREA

4.37 Niton Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Continuity of staff needs to be addressed;**
- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Impact on standards – pupil disruption;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve.**

4.38 St. Boniface CE VC, St. Margaret's CE and St. Wilfrid's RC VA Primary Schools Amalgamation

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of St. Margaret's CE Primary supports the proposed amalgamation and VA status.

The Chair of Governors of St. Wilfrid's Catholic Primary supports the proposed amalgamation and VA status.

5 Governors of St. Boniface CE Primary support the proposed amalgamation and VA status.

27 letters supporting the proposal with 25 supporting VA status (11 staff, 2 parents, 14 other) cited stability and sustainability of provision, maintenance of existing schools values and variable local demographics as the reasons for support. One of the letters raised the concern that non faith parents should be fairly represented on the Governing Body of the new school. **Another letter raised the issue of transport between lower and upper Ventnor and to Newport on transfer to secondary school/**

The Council will, through dialogue with both Dioceses, ensure that there is an appropriate secular community representation on the shadow governing body of the proposed new school

6 letters opposed the proposal (2 from Town Councillors, 3 from parents, 1 other). The reasons for objecting to the proposals given were:

- **Inadequate time to respond to consultation;**
- **Lack of consultation;**
- **Flawed consultation;**
- **Insufficient information / misinformation;**
- **Equality / Environmental Impact Assessment not carried out;**
- **No evidence that standards will improve post reorganisation;**
- **Parental preference for small schools;**
- **Closure of small schools not justified;**
- **Poorer children do not perform as well in larger schools;**
- **Lack of parental choice if only one faith school in Ventnor;**
- **Travel to Niton / Wroxall concerns over cost / logistics / environment;**
- **Concern over appropriate use of LA resources / land;**
- **Opposition to joint faith status;**
- **Opposition to VA status because of Governing Body implications and curriculum control;**
- **10% capital contribution of VA status a burden to deprived community;**
- **State & Church should be kept separate;**

- **Ventnor CE primaries seen as local not faith schools;**
- **Discrimination against non-faith staff;**
- **Preferred proposal for upper and lower Ventnor primaries and 11-16 provision on the Ventnor middle site.**
- Potential for selective admissions;

As a Voluntary Aided school, the governing body of the new school will be responsible for admissions arrangements. The governing body will have to meet the requirements of the Schools Admissions Code of Practice including consultation with the Council regarding admission arrangements.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transport to Ventnor Middle site needs to be addressed;**
- **Will there be funding for transitional arrangements?**
- **Who will own the new site?**
- **Transition a key issue;**
- **Will the new school be ready for 2010?**
- **What happens to existing sites?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- New school gives positive message to community;
- Two schools are already sharing one Headteacher so amalgamation is a good answer;
- Existing opportunities for children and wider community of Ventnor in the new school.
- Will extended services be provided?
- Pre school provision needs clarification;

By 2010, the Government expects all schools to be delivering a 'core offer' of extended services. The proposals for the joint faith amalgamation at 2FE will provide the capacity to enable this delivery.

Early years provision will continue for all primary schools where a sustainable need exists. Pre-school provision and childcare could form a valid part of any community bid under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.

4.39 Ventnor Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

A letter was received from one member of staff reported as on behalf of the whole staff but not signed by the staff. This letter raised concern over:

- **The need to change system;**
- **Disruption to staff and pupils;**
- **Staff uncertainty in the proposed change loss of staff to the school;**
- **Loss of quality of current provision to the community.**

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Could a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local elections?**
- **Transition arrangements – management of middle school sites is a concern;**
- **Transport of pupils to Newport an issue;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Ventnor Middle Ofsted is good, therefore closure is not justified;**
- **Concern that middle school staff will leave;**
- **Morale of school staff – impact on teaching.**

WEST WIGHT AREA

4.40 All Saints CE Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body do not consider the close proximity of two primary schools in Freshwater to be in the best interests of West Wight children. They consider that the existing facilities on the All Saints site can be easily modified to accommodate a 1 form entry 4-11 primary school.

The All Saints CE site extends to 20,760m², this is sufficient for the proposed school.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for KS2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Concern over lack of parents attending meeting**

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.41 Brighstone CE Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received by close of consultation.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for KS2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.42 Chale CE Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body object strongly to the proposal for closure for the following reasons:

- **Cost of Transport will negate savings from closure;**
- **Area of rural deprivation;**
- **Impact on community;**
- **Successful small school;**
- No further expenditure required to become 4-11 primary.

The Governors propose that Chale should remain open as a 4-11 primary school for up to 60 pupils.

The Chale CE site extends to 5,300m²; this is insufficient for a 1FE 4-11 school.

Chale Parish Council considers that IWC has failed to properly address the possibility of federating Chale CE Primary with another school. It requests that the site be considered under the Community Asset Transfer Strategy should the school close. It reiterates the points made in its submission to the informal consultation.

If the Council owned part of the Chale CE site is declared surplus to the Council's requirements, it will be subject to the provisions contained within the Council's Community Asset Transfer Strategy.

Forty One letters were received (6 from parents, 4 others, 31 duplicate 'form' letters – save Chale School Action Group) objecting to the proposed closure of Chale CE Primary. The reasons for objection given are:

- **Parental choice of small school;**
- **Good Ofsted / standards;**
- **Good Headteacher and staff;**
- **Good SEN provision;**

- **Cost of Transport if closed;**
- **Transport logistics if closed;**
- **Environmental impact of transport if closed;**
- **Impact on community if closed;**
- **Presumption against closure of rural schools;**
- **Lack of information / misinformation;**
- **Flawed consultation;**
- **Lack of consultation;**
- **'Gagging' of professionals during consultation;**
- Good pre-school which would be lost if school closes;
- Forecasted inc rural demographics.

Pre-school provision and childcare could form a valid part of any community bid under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.

Forecast pupil numbers only indicate the potential for a 45 pupil 4-11 primary school by 2018, based on projected cohorts and existing parental preference for the school.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Future provision for Chale pupils particularly SEN;**
- **Standards not considered in proposal to close school;**
- **Transport safety an issue;**
- **Concern over future for school staff;**
- **Prejudice against small schools.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Priority of admission to nearest alternative schools

Pupils displaced following a proposed closure will be given the option of a place at a designated school. Cohorts of pupils will not be split up unless this results from parental preference for an alternative school to that which is designated.

- Use of site if school closes

If the Council owned part of the Chale CE site is declared surplus to the Council's requirements, it will be subject to the provisions contained within the Council's Community Asset Transfer Strategy.

4.43 St. Saviours Catholic Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body consider that the proposals represent an unsustainable over provision for the primary sector in the West Wight. The Governors consider that parents should have a choice of provision and propose that St. Saviours Catholic, Shalfleet CE & Yarmouth CE amalgamation, Brighstone CE and a community primary on the West Wight Middle site would provide this choice and meet demographic need.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for KS2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.44 Shalfleet CE & Yarmouth CE Primary School Amalgamation

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of Shalfleet CE Primary supports the amalgamation & the proposal to use the Shalfleet site but consider additional land would be crucial for future provision. 67% of families returned a school questionnaire, the results of which were:

- 68% supported move to 2 tier
- 86% supported the proposed amalgamation
- 89% agreed that the new school should be on the Shalfleet site
- 80% disagreed that the new school should be on the Yarmouth site

The Shalfleet CE site extends to 8,046m², this is just sufficient for a 1FE 4-11 school with the provision of an all weather playing surface as an alternative to the acquisition of additional land.

The Governing Body of Yarmouth CE Primary support the move to 2 tier provision and reluctantly accept the principle of amalgamation with Shalfleet CE Primary but only on the basis that the Yarmouth site would be better for the new school. The Governors consider that the site is not at risk of flooding having commissioned an independent flood risk assessment, and that acquisition of adjacent council owned land would increase the available site area to a sufficient size. The Governors do not consider the larger intake at Shalfleet as evidence of parental preference in favour of Shalfleet and against Yarmouth. **The Governors support the educational & social advantages of one site within the town of Yarmouth, which is easily available by all means of transport, including safe working routes. The Governing Body consider the proposal as tantamount to closure and believe that the Local Authority & Diocese have not been open, thorough, objective or reasonable in arriving at the proposal.**

The Yarmouth CE site extends to 6,543m². With the inclusion of land used by the school within living memory (283m²) and adjacent council owned land (2,486 m²) the site would be sufficient for a 1FE 4-11 school with the provision of an all weather playing surface.

The 7 year average intake at Shalfleet CE Primary is 17 pupils. The 7 year average intake at Yarmouth CE Primary is 10 pupils. Intake numbers must by definition, in the absence of over subscription as in both these cases, give an indication of parental preference over a period of time.

Yarmouth Town Council is opposed to the proposal and believes that the Yarmouth site should continue either as a discrete provision or as the site for the amalgamated school for the following reasons:

- **Integration of school with community;**
- **No argument for ceasing provision at the Yarmouth site has been provided;**
- **The proposal is tantamount to closure and does not comply with DCSF guidance;**
- **The impact on Yarmouth Towns economy;**
- **The advantage of an historic Town site.**

28 letters (15 from parents, 13 others) were received supporting the proposed amalgamation with provision on the Shalfleet site.

6 letters were received (2 from parents, 4 others) supporting the proposed amalgamation but on the Yarmouth site.

5 letters were received (3 from parents, 2 others) supporting the amalgamation but proposing either on alternative, new site or that further investigation be carried out and the new school should be located on the site judged most educationally beneficial.

2 letters (1 parent, 1 other) objected to the closure of Yarmouth CE Primary.

5 letters (2 parents, 3 others) opposed the amalgamation and proposed that provision should continue on both sites.

There is a high risk that the close location, in rural terms, of two 1FE CE primaries would generate adverse competition for a limited pupil cohort, potentially resulting in viability concerns for the less popular school.

438 duplicate form letters were received opposing the closure of the Yarmouth CE site and proposing that it should continue either as a discrete provision or as the site for the amalgamated school.

In light of the response received and new proposals regarding the Yarmouth site, further investigation surrounding the final location of the proposed amalgamated school would be beneficial.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings

- **Yarmouth School in the heart of the community;**
- **Transport an issue;**
- **Few pupils walk to Shalfleet site;**
- **Access road to Shalfleet site is dangerous;**
- **Diocese should have a pastoral concern for Yarmouth children;**
- **Future nursery provision needs to be addressed.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Use of adjacent land to increase Yarmouth site as a possibility;
- Flooding risk at Yarmouth overstated;
- Bias against Yarmouth site.

The Yarmouth CE site extends to 6,543m². With the inclusion of land used by the school within living memory (283m²) and adjacent council owned land (2,486 m²) the site would be sufficient for a 1FE 4-11 school with the provision of an all weather playing surface.

In light of the response received and new proposals regarding the Yarmouth site, it is recommended that the final location of the proposed amalgamated school merits further investigation

- Future nursery provision needs to be addressed.

Early years provision will continue for all primary schools where a sustainable need exists. Pre-school provision and childcare could form a valid part of any community bid under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.

4.45 Weston Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body propose that Weston Primary should be extended to YR – Y6 and relocated to the West Wight Middle site. The Governing Body consider that this will overcome the uncertainty of competition, preserve the good standards achieved at the school and provide diversity of provision in the West Wight area.

Totland Parish Council propose that Weston Primary be relocated to the West Wight Middle site as a 4-11 primary.

75 duplicate 'form' letters were received from Parents proposing that Weston Primary relocate to the West Wight Middle site as a 4-11 primary.

Two letters (1 parent, 1 pupil) were received opposing the closure of Weston because of the quality of provision and standards achieved.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings

- **Standards at school are good;**
- **Disruption to pupils – impact on standards;**
- **Maintenance of staff continuity;**
- **The parent meeting is not considered as consultation.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- West Wight Middle building unsuitable for primary provision

The Council recognises that the West Wight Middle buildings are not suitable for permanent primary provision and have identified the site for a new build school under PCP funding.

- Non faith provision needed in West Wight.

The Council recognises the need for a diversity of provision in the West Wight area, hence the proposal to establish a new primary school on the West Wight Middle site.

- Future use of site.

If the Weston site is declared surplus to the Council's requirements, it will be subject to the provisions contained within the Council's Community Asset Transfer Strategy. DDA implications will have to be carefully considered with any change of use.

4.46 West Wight Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Disruption of pupils – impact on standards;**
- **No guarantee that capital funding will be available from Central Government;**
- **Transition management a key concern;**
- **Morale of middle school staff, impact on quality of teaching;**
- **Concern over build management / timescale;**
- **Could a new administration (IWC) halt the plans after the local elections?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over small number at meeting

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.47 West Wight Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

All Saints CE Primary Governing Body consider that the establishment of a new school in close proximity to their school would be undesirable.

St. Saviours Catholic Primary Governing Body consider that the proposed 5 forms of entry in the West Wight area would represent an unsustainable over provision in the primary sector. They also consider that Freshwater should have a non-faith provision.

Weston Primary Governing Body do not support the creation of a new school by competition. They propose that Weston Primary be extended and relocated to the West Wight Middle site. Their proposal is supported by Totland Parish Council and 75 parents of Weston pupils.

The Governors of West Wight Middle School consider that 5 forms of entry in the West Wight area would represent an over provision in the primary sector. They propose either one joint faith Catholic / C of E school and one community school in the Freshwater / Totland area or the closure of All Saints and a community school on the West Wight Middle site.

A letter raised concerns that the proposal represents over provision in the primary sector for the West Wight and that a non faith primary provision should remain within the area.

A letter from a parent stated that the new school must be non-faith (i.e. community) to ensure diversity of choice for parents in the West Wight.

The Council recognises the need for a diversity of provision in the West Wight area, hence the proposal to establish a new primary school on the West Wight Middle site.

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Non-faith primary provision needed in West Wight Area

The Council recognises the need for a diversity of provision in the West Wight area, hence the proposal to establish a new primary school on the West Wight Middle site.

- Current buildings not suitable for primary provision

The Council recognises that the West Wight Middle buildings are not suitable for permanent primary provision and have identified the site for a new build school under PCP funding.

RURAL AREA

4.48 Arreton St. George's CE Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body support the proposal to retain provision at Arreton St. George's.

An 'in principal' suggestion that federation with Oakfield CE Primary is indicated. The Governors seek the extension of the schools priority area to include all neighbouring villages.

There is no requirement for the priority area for Arreton St. Georges to change as part of the proposal. The defining of priority areas forms part of the annual admissions consultation carried out in conjunction with the Admissions Forum.

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Federation will enable both schools to strengthen their continued existence;
- Parental consultation in March / April 2009 leading to Instrument of federation in June 2009;
- Implications of VA status discussed.

4.49 Chillerton & Rookley / Godshill / Wroxall 'Rural' Amalgamation

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of Chillerton & Rookley report that the school community would prefer the retention of the school as a discrete provision. However, they accept that this is unlikely and propose that the following points are given consideration with regard to the proposed amalgamation.

- All 3 sites to remain open until the new school is built.

The retention of all 3 sites until the new school is built would resolve capacity issues at the Godshill site, allow existing cohorts to be kept together and minimise disruption to pupils. As such this amendment to the proposal is considered beneficial.

- A waiver from competition be applied for and the new school to have foundation status.

The Council has applied for a waiver from competition.

- Headteachers from the existing schools to be considered first for the post of Headteacher at the amalgamated school.

This is a matter for the shadow governing body of the proposed new school to determine, giving due regard to the employment rights of the existing headteachers.

- Shadow Governing Body for the new school to have equal representation from the three existing schools.

The Council will ensure that there is appropriate representation from the existing governing bodies on the shadow governing body of the proposed new school.

- Parents able to express site preference for admission during the split site phase of the amalgamated school.

It is the intention that parents will be able to express a preference for individual sites during the split site phase, though this is ultimately a decision requiring consultation with the proposed new schools Governing Body.

The Governing Body of Wroxall primary support the proposal and consider that it recognises the specific needs of the Wroxall community with specific reference to deprivation, location of pupils and the importance of the school within the community.

With regard to the proposed amalgamation the Governors consider that:

- A waiver should be applied for

The Council has applied for a waiver from competition.

- The 3 existing sites continue until the new build is available for use.

The retention of all 3 sites until the new school is built would resolve capacity issues at the Godshill site, allow existing cohorts to be kept together and minimise disruption to pupils. As such this amendment to the proposal is considered beneficial.

- That Governors be involved in the planning process for the amalgamation as early as possible

Consultation with the governing bodies of the three existing schools will continue throughout the process.

- That the shadow Governing Body of the amalgamated school have equal representation from the 3 schools.

The Council will ensure that there is appropriate representation from the existing governing bodies on the shadow governing body of the proposed new school.

- That parents are able to state a preference for the Wroxall site when applying for a place at the amalgamated school.

It is the intention that parents will be able to express a preference for individual sites during the split site phase, though this is ultimately a decision requiring consultation with the proposed new schools Governing Body.

43 duplicate 'form' letters were received from Godshill parents asking for children to remain at their current sites, until transfer to secondary school; thereby minimising any disruption.

The retention of all 3 sites until the new school is built would resolve capacity issues at the Godshill site, allow existing cohorts to be kept together and minimise disruption to pupils. As such this amendment to the proposal is considered beneficial.

16 letters from Chillerton & Rookley community (13 from parents, 3 others) called for the Chillerton & Rookley site to remain open until the new build at Godshill is ready. A petition signed by 25 parents and 4 others also called for this.

The retention of all 3 sites until the new school is built would resolve capacity issues at the Godshill site, allow existing cohorts to be kept together and minimise disruption to pupils. As such this amendment to the proposal is considered beneficial.

9 letters opposed the proposed amalgamation, mostly preferring the school to continue as discrete provision (Chillerton & Rookley 4 from parents, 1 other: Wroxall one from parents, 2 others: Godshill one from parents). The reasons for opposition were:

- **Preference for small schools;**
- **Quality of provision / standards achieved at existing schools;**

- **Pupil disruption;**
- **Staff uncertainty / morale;**
- **Increase in travel;**
- **Environmental impact of travel;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- Difficulty of split site management.

Any split site issues should be overcome by the effective leadership and management of the proposed new school.

- Community identity lost;
- History of schools lost;
- Hostility between the communities.

A well managed amalgamation will preserve the best of the identity and ethos of all schools, celebrate their individual histories and bring the communities together to provide future benefit for their children & young people.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process after the local election?**
- **Concern over build management / timescale;**
- **Transport impact on school / parent partnership;**
- **4 year olds on buses is not appropriate.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over capacity at Godshill site;
- Closing Chillerton & Rookley site unfair.

The retention of all 3 sites until the new school is built would resolve capacity issues at the Godshill site, allow existing cohorts to be kept together and minimise disruption to pupils. As such this amendment to the proposal is considered beneficial.

- Choice of preferred site at amalgamated school.

It is the intention that parents will be able to express a preference for individual sites during the split site phase, though this is ultimately a decision requiring consultation with the proposed new schools Governing Body.

- Will the make up of the Governing Body of new school have representation from the 3 existing schools?

The Council will ensure that there is appropriate representation from the existing governing bodies on the shadow governing body of the proposed new school.

- Concern over management of split site.

Any split site issues should be overcome by the effective leadership and management of the proposed new school.

- Pre School provision an issue.

Early years provision will continue for all primary schools where a sustainable need exists. Pre-school provision and childcare could form a valid part of any community bid under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.

- Location of site for new school.

The new site will be in the Godshill area. Due to commercial sensitivity a more precise location cannot be given at this time.

NEWPORT AREA

4.50 Barton Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Pupil disruption – impact on standards.**

4.51 Carisbrooke CE Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

Governing Body support the proposal but wish to highlight the need to maintain pre-school accommodation.

Early years provision will continue for all primary schools where a sustainable need exists.

A letter from parents of a pupil at Carisbrooke CE also supports the proposal

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for Key Stage 2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.52 Hunnyhill Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Pupil disruption – impact on standards.**

4.53 Newport CE Primary School

Written responses to consultation:

A letter expressing concerns over funding, in light of the current economic climate, sufficiency of the existing site, lack of detailed site analysis and doubt that the Island will ever achieve results in line with the mainland, was received.

The Newport CE site extends to 13,400m², this is sufficient for the proposed school. Some temporary accommodation may be required prior to the completion of necessary capital works. Detailed, site based surveys have not been carried out as this could be perceived as prejudging decisions by Cabinet.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for Key Stage 2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.54 **Nine Acres Primary School**

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Pupil disruption – impact on standards.**

4.55 **St. Thomas of Canterbury Catholic Primary School**

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body supports the proposals and would consider the same provision on an adjacent site if this should provide more feasible.

Both the Anglican and Catholic Dioceses have stated their intention to continue discrete provision on both existing sites.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition a key concern;**
- **Accountability for Key Stage 2 results during transition;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern that consultation not properly conducted;**
- **Concern over timetable / possible slippage;**
- **Can a new administration (IWC) halt the process?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Concern over lack of parents attending meeting;

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Dioceses and the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.56 **Summerfields Primary School**

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Transition management a concern;**
- **Pupil disruption – impact on standards.**

4.57 Downside Middle School (including Kitbridge)

Written responses to consultation:

No representation received

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Concern over treatment of middle school staff;**
- **Concern that there could be an exodus of middle school teachers.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Typographical error in consultation documentation pointed out.

The documentation was corrected at the earliest opportunity. The consultation documentation is version controlled and an accompanying errata and amendments document, listing all changes between versions has also been published.

- Concern over low number attending meeting.

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.57 Nodehill Middle School

Written responses to consultation:

The staff & Governing Body are disappointed with the proposal to close all middle schools & saddened by the cessation of the site being used as a school. They consider that in any event the school should stay open for years 6, 7 & 8 in the academic year 2010/11 with any closure not effective until September 2011.

A letter supporting the current 3 tier system and objecting to the proposed closure of Nodehill was also received.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Disruption of pupils – impact on standards;**
- **No guarantee that capital funding will be available from Central Government;**
- **Transition management a key concern;**
- **Morale of middle school staff, impact on quality of teaching;**
- **Concern over build management / timescale;**
- **Could a new administration (IWC) halt the plans after the local elections?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Future of Nodehill site.

If the Nodehill site is declared surplus to the Council's requirements, it will be subject to the provisions contained within the Council's Community Asset Transfer Strategy. The site contains listed buildings.

- Which secondary will Nodehill link to? Medina or Carisbrooke?

It is recommended that Nodehill is designated to the proposed new Carisbrooke secondary school.

- Concern over small number at meeting

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.58 Carisbrooke High School

Written responses to consultation:

The staff & Governing Body of Carisbrooke High School welcomes the proposal to open a new 11-19 school on the current site but urges that a decision made by Summer 2009, that delay will effect the wellbeing of students & staff & that the Authority has sufficient capacity to support the transition process.

The staff & Governors accept the fundamental premise that re-organisation is necessary to raise standards.

September 2010 is the earliest implementation date.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Disruption of pupils – impact on standards;**
- **Are Carisbrooke High's results good enough to apply for a waiver?**
- **No guarantee that capital funding will be available from Central Government;**
- **Transition management a key concern;**
- **What happens to high school staff? Continuity concerns;**
- **Concern over build management / timescale;**
- **Could a new administration (IWC) halt the plans after the local elections?**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Can Christ the King pupils apply for places at Carisbrooke High?

Parents have the right to apply for places at any age appropriate school at any time. If there are no places available their application is placed on a waiting list.

- Concern over small number at meeting

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

4.59 Medina High School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of Medina High School supports the move to 11-18 provision for secondary schools but considers that the new Medina Secondary school should be on a single site.

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **No guarantee that standards will improve;**
- **Will Medina High staff have to reapply for their jobs? Concern over staffing continuity.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Typographical error in consultation documentation pointed out.

The documentation was corrected at the earliest opportunity. The consultation documentation is version controlled and an accompanying errata and amendments document, listing all changes between versions has also been published.

- Concern over low number attending meeting.

Schools circulated a letter informing parents of the meeting on behalf of the Council; the meeting was held in the evening to facilitate attendance.

- Pupils commuting to mainland to attend 6th form college.

The proposed reorganisation of secondary provision will ensure the broadest possible curriculum offer on the Island, minimising the need for pupils to commute to the Mainland to access their learning.

4.60 Carisbrooke Secondary School

Written responses to consultation:

The staff & Governors of Carisbrooke High School request that the specification for the new school should address:

- Bidders to demonstrate how they will raise standards;
- 8-10 form entry;
- Verticality of progression / experience;
- Not divided into upper / lower sections;
- Build on existing partnerships / collaboration;
- Fully comprehensive, fully inclusive community status;

- Non selective regardless of any specialism;
- At least two specialisms one of which being sport;
- Other specialism(s) to map to current building & staff capacities;
- Diploma lines to flow from specialisms;
- Full strategic plan of building / site development;
- Management by new school of all facilities;
- Quality transport service to meet all needs of collaboration/ school day.

The staff and Governing Bodies recommendations will be considered, as appropriate, when drafting any specifications for the proposed new school

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **What type of organisations will be bidding to run the new schools?**
- **Will bidders be funding the new schools?**
- **Is competition compulsory?**
- **How will Headteachers be appointed to the new school?**

4.61 Medina Secondary School

Written responses to consultation:

The Governing Body of Medina High School consider that the new Medina Secondary school should be on a single site.

The Governing Bodies recommendations will be considered, as appropriate, when drafting any specifications for the proposed new school

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

No matters arising

5.0 Islandwide/Area representation

Written responses to consultation:

The Rural Community Council is fully supportive of the need for change to the local educational system. The RCC welcomes the current proposals in so far as a significant improvement on those outlined in the informal consultation. The RCC expresses concern over the impact the proposals involving school closure will have on:

- Access to community learning at local schools;
- **Transport provision and its impact on:**
 - **Access to pre and after school clubs;**
 - **Parental engagement with schools;**
 - **Low income families disadvantaged without private transport.**
- Loss of local pre school provision;
- **Impact on village businesses;**
- **Reduction in number of families choosing to live in a village;**
- Impact on community events / sports teams;

The RCC consider that to say the closure of a primary school would cause a village to 'die' is an exaggeration but have concerns that villages may change considerably as a result and be more likely to end up with significant number of second homes.

Pre-school provision, childcare, community learning and leisure need could all form a valid part of any community bid under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.

The LSC & Isle of Wight College support the move to a two-tier system but expresses concern that there will be an over provision post 16, which could lead to damaging levels of competition. The college expresses a strong interest in participating in the future development and delivery of secondary education on the Isle of Wight.

Ryde Town Council expresses concerns over the impact that the proposed reorganisation may have on school results. The council seeks clarification on proposed transition management and fears that the retention and development of teaching staff may be adversely affected. The timetable of the capital build programme and its impact on pupils is also a concern. The council recognises that educational attainment across the Island is a key concern but is not convinced that wholesale change recognises the varied needs of Island communities.

Standards not Tiers has responded to the formal consultation and considers that:

- **There is no need to move to an exclusively 2 tier system;**
- **No school closures are required;**
- **The consultation process is flawed;**
- **Good Ofsted judgements exist at schools proposed for closure;**
- **The information that was provided was misleading and biased;**
- **Headteachers have been 'gagged' during consultation;**
- **Not all stakeholders were consulted;**
- **There was inadequate consultation with pupils;**
- **There was poor consultation with parish councils;**
- **The views of the Primary Headteacher forum are not valid professional opinion.**

Standards not Tiers recommends that as an alternative proposal, education on the Island should be:

- **Locally based;**
- **Evolved from the existing system;**
- **Based around small schools with a reduction in size of the largest high schools;**
- **Embrace stage not age;**
- **A variety of provision to suit individual communities;**
- **Changed gradually to minimise disruption;**
- **A mix of 0-7, 0-11 and twelve 4-19 through schools with GCSE year groups of between 60 and 210 pupils (2-7FE)**

The National Association for Small Schools has expressed concern that:

- **Governors & staff feel forbidden to talk about closure proposals;**
- **Evidence on the virtue of small schools was not included in the consultation information;**
- **The informal consultation questionnaire was flawed;**

- **Proposals do not provide diversity, choice and a system shaped by parents;**
- **Formal consultation restricted to parents and Governors only;**
- **Claims about larger schools being more effective are unsubstantiated;**
- **Singular model of education is ineffective;**
- **Pre school parents not considered by IWC as statutory consultees;**
- **Flawed consultation;**
- **IWC in breach of statutory principles.**

11 letters of support for the move to a two tier structure were received, points raised were:

- **Concern over availability of funding;**
- **Preserve as many 1FE primaries as possible;**
- **Separate transport for primary pupils needed;**
- **Current high cost of small schools is unfair;**
- **Transition management to minimise pupil disruption is crucial;**
- **No further delay.**

September 2010 is the earliest implementation date.

- **Secondary schools should have geographic catchment areas**

With the exception of possible Voluntary Controlled (VC) status, the governing body of the new school will be responsible for admissions arrangements, including priority areas. The governing body will have to meet the requirements of the Schools Admissions Code of Practice including consultation with the Council regarding admission arrangements

30 letters opposed the proposals to move to a two tier structure for the following reasons:

- **Existing high standards in current schools;**
- **Good KS3 results in middle schools;**
- **Specialist staff / curriculum benefit of middle schools;**
- **Children acquire more responsibility at middle schools;**
- **Current problems are caused by high schools being too large;**
- **Closure of small primaries unwarranted;**
- **Presumption against closure of designated rural schools;**
- **No justification for change;**
- **Reduces diversity and choice for parents;**
- **Pupil disruption especially during transition;**
- **Impact on middle school staff;**
- **Problems with school leadership and governance not addressed;**
- **Impact on community;**
- **No evidence that standards will improve;**
- **Key stage structure / testing may be abandoned therefore no need to change structure;**
- **No guarantee of capital funding;**
- **Cost of additional transport;**
- **Environmental impact of additional transport;**
- **Forecast increase in demographics will reduce surplus places without the need for change;**
- **Size of proposed secondary schools;**

- **Decision pre determined;**
- **Teachers ‘gagged’ during consultation;**
- **Flawed consultation;**
- **Insufficient information;**
- **Inadequate risk management;**
- **Alternatives not considered;**
- **Create local area by area solutions instead i.e. ‘through’ schools.**

9 letters raised concerns surrounding the impact of proposals on middle school staff. These included:

- **Concern over redeployment process;**
- **Not a level playing field;**
- **Morale of staff;**
- **Stress caused by proposals;**
- **Uncertainty faced by middle school staff;**
- **Loss / waste of skills;**
- **No use made of experience / expertise of middle school Heads and Deputy Heads.**

3 letters were received with specific regard to school transport, the issues raised were:

- **Shortcomings of existing arrangements;**
- **Provision of free transport for pupils;**
- **Provision of USA style, escorted dedicated school buses.**

Frequent concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- **Disruption to pupils – impact on standards;**
- **Transition arrangements a concern;**
- **Inequality of resources in primary sector – middle site vs existing primary site;**
- **Increase in traffic congestion;**
- **No need to change current system;**
- **Good collaboration required;**
- **Proposed secondaries too large;**
- **Insufficient information provided;**
- **Concern surrounding build timetable;**
- **Concern over sufficiency of capital funding;**
- **Impact on school staff – potential loss of middle school teachers due to uncertainty;**
- **No guarantee that standards will improve.**

School specific concerns arising from Parent and Public meetings:

- Which secondary schools will middle school sites be designated to?

The following designation of middle school sites is recommended:

*Cowes Secondary – Solent Middle, Somerton Middle, Osborne Middle
Ryde Secondary – Bishop Lovett Middle, Mayfield Middle, Swanmore Middle*

*Sandown Secondary – Forelands Middle, Lake Middle, Sandham Middle
Carisbrooke Secondary – Nodehill Middle, West Wight Middle
Medina Secondary – Downside Middle, Osborne Middle, Ventnor Middle*

- Admission arrangements for proposed secondaries;
- Priority areas for proposed secondaries.

With the exception of possible Voluntary Controlled (VC) status, the governing body of the new school will be responsible for admissions arrangements, including priority areas. The governing body will have to meet the requirements of the Schools Admissions Code of Practice including consultation with the Council regarding admission arrangements.

- Specialisms for proposed secondaries

The Council's preferred specialism for the proposed new secondary schools will be included in the competition notice (specification) for the new school

- Location of public meetings inconvenient

The public meetings were held in Cowes which is accessible by public transport.

- Public meetings not well publicised

The public meetings were advertised on the Council's website and in the Isle of Wight County Press. There was a high awareness of the meetings both in the local media and in local interest action groups.