



***Consultation – Part 1 Feedback
Schools and Academies in Haydon Bridge and
Hexham
Wednesday 24 January 2018***

(The data contained in this presentation was correct at the time of publication to the knowledge of NCC Officers)

The role, responsibility and powers of the Local Authority and other organisations

- The council must ensure that there are sufficient good school places for the population in the west of Northumberland.
- The council can hold consultations and propose changes to maintained schools
- The council cabinet is the decision maker with regard to maintained schools:- close, extend age range and enlarge.
- The SoS for education has the powers to direct the council to close schools
- The department for education can close or re-broker academies
- Academy trusts can hold consultations and apply to the regional schools commissioner to change age ranges.
- The dioceses can establish academies and also hold consultations.
- The council cannot establish academies or free schools.

Flipchart 1

Q: Can Haydon Bridge High school remain open as a financially viable and educationally good school for pupils aged 11-18 on its current site ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1: (Kielder Community First School, Greenhaugh First School, Wark First School, Bellingham First School, Bellingham Middle School)

No. So: shall we build a new school? Yes!

Children in current education must not be affected by any transition from this consultation

Table 2: (West Woodburn First School, Otterburn First School, Newbrough Primary School)

Unless factors change (injection of capital, birth – rate rises etc) it appears unsustainable

Table 3: (Greenhead School, Haltwhistle Community Campus Lower School Academy, Henshaw Primary School, Haltwhistle Upper School)

QEHS: Future buildings; deficit? Do we know enough?

Have the full range of possibilities been investigated?

William Howard – reduced PAN so children – Haltwhistle / HBHS

Can't carry on as now

Table 4: (Shaftoe Trust Primary School, Whitfield Primary School, Allendale Primary School, Haydon Bridge High School, Zoe Carr)

Replace question? Can QEHS remain open?

No school is viable in isolation – whole school system

Where will new children from houses in HB go to school?

Theme: HBHS not sustainable. How viable is QEHS?

Hexham feedback

Table 1: (Acomb First School, Beaufront First School, Chollerton C of E First School, Humshaugh C of E First School)

This question is for the Haydon Bridge partnership. However based on facts given it is not viable. The damage has been done.

Table 2: (Broomhaugh C of E First School, Whittonstall First School, Slaley First School, Whitley Chapel C of E First School)

Financially viable and educationally good – different criteria
Cannot comment on financial viability as other options ie 'all through EYFS option' is being suggested in consultation doc.
Why do these not go to 18?

Table 3: (Corbridge C of E Aided First School, Hexham First School, St Mary's RC First School, The Sele First School)

Not in it's current form

Could with a revised model it work?

Site is an ideal location for the community

Where there's a will there's a way!

Table 4: (Hexham Middle School, Queen Elizabeth High School, Corbridge Middle School, St Joseph's RC Middle School, Hexham Priory School)

Probably not with the information we have

? Data on other schools of a similar size (pupils)

Theme: Could be viable in different model

Flipchart 1 cont..

Q: If it were to close what would be the impact ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Travel times, especially from remote communities
No. of alternative places available
How to maintain the quality of education

Table 2:

Education of HBHS children +/-
Poss increase in distances travelled
Poss loss of more vocational choices
Lack of choice (parents and pupils)
Impact on local communities / sport
National Curriculum – more 2 tier steer

Table 3:

Very long journeys for children / social isolation – separate from classmates
Children would need an alternative for 9-13 education
Impact on the village – other local schools
Transport costs
Effect on less ‘capable’ children in a huge school

Table 4:

Parental choice? No choice?
Community school ‘hub of community’
Continuity is valued by many. New start needed by some.
Community impact – local employment
Student travel – long days; Staff – lack of opportunities

Theme: Travel time / distance, impact on communities, Choice (lack of)

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Taken away parental choice.
Narrows options for vocational education.
Distorts where children would naturally go in their community.

Table 2:

Travel issue – time lost
Limited options
Heart of community would go – impact on local facilities, shops etc
Travel issues – congestion in Hexham?

Table 3:

Lack of school places; Travel; Limiting choice;
Impact on community;
Jobs;
School staffing;
No established route for pupils in area
Effectively see demise of Haydon Bridge as a village and surrounding community
Where would Haltwhistle Middle pupils move to?

Table 4:

Children (364) would have to be accommodated elsewhere.
Travel / transport to another site
Effect on other schools in HB partnership
HB school is already part of a 2 tier / 3 tier system – would need to be involved.
Transitional arrangements are key to individual pupil progress

Theme: Travel / Impact of community /Limits choice, inc vocational

Flipchart 1 cont...

Q: What other options apart from closure are there ? Samuel Kings Federation - Alston ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

LA MAT

Diocese MAT

Table 2:

New sponsors

Table 3:

4-18 seems to have best outcome

HBHS & Haltwhistle (esp First and Middle and a 'vocational' 14 – 16/18 provision

(nothing much between Carlisle and Newcastle)

Table 4:

One super school or super satellites

Vocational offer

Specialisms by site

Theme: Different model of provision e.g. 4-18

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Reinvestment

Increased funding

Part of an academy – an effective academy.

Why was it failed by the authority in the first place?

William Howard - Brampton

Table 2:

See your consultation document –page 4

Table 3:

A Roman Catholic all through school

Table 4:

Another sponsor?

Convert in to a middle school; Learning village 3-18 years

SEND provision

Explore vocational options

Keystage 4 PRU

Alternative Education

Theme: Other models e.g. another sponsor, vocational, SEND

Flipchart 1 cont....

Q: If HBHS were to close, QEHS is the only other secondary school in that catchment area, however it does not have physical capacity to accept all the children – how could this be resolved?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Build a new school – maintained? Trust / Academy?

Table 2:

New build / increase capacity / staff

Table 3:

Build a bigger QEHS OR build another school – make it 4-16/18?

Table 4:

Greater sharing of primary pedagogy in Secondary settings

Investment at HBHS site may be more cost effective

In 25 years time what will education look like?

Difficult curriculum pathways alt GCSE – A Levels

Co-teaching in sixth form

Theme: New build for QEHS or invest in HBHS as 4-16/18 School

Hexham Feedback

Table 1:

A new build or extension and refurbishment of HMS, QE. This question is assuming Primary, Secondary.

Table 2:

High School Hexham

6th form H. Bridge

Questions entirely focused on underpinning suggestion / premise HBHS will / should close. More constructive questions could open other answers.

Table 3:

Don't become a Secondary and then you can accept them

2 middle schools in Hexham partnership (St Joe's and Corbridge). Close HMS and QE becomes a super high school.

Table 4:

New school building with interim plan – critical need with funding

Delay 2 tier system at QEHS for this interim period

William Howard for pupils in West of Tynedale

Theme: Not overall consensus but greater majority - new build / extension / refurbishment, William Howard School

Flipchart 2

Q: If RSC allow the Hadrian Trust to change the age range of its schools to 11-18, what impact would this have on other schools?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

First Schools forced to become Primary
Not a mixed-tier system

Table 2:

Move to 2 tier
Poss closure of some small schools
Poss retention of pupils Y5/6

Table 3:

Push first schools in Hexham – primary (Corbridge, Bellingham)
Middle schools in Hexham would then close – and they're good!
Northumberland 2 tier?
Large classes years 7 – 9? (at QEHS)

Table 4:

11 – 18 through school would make potential studio school / UTC more difficult
No school on island – diff impact by school
This consultation is reactive to what education needs to look like in 25 years time

Theme: First schools 'forced' to Primary, 2 tier, school closures 'middles in Hexham are good'

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

It depends on admission ages
This will have a massive financial implication for the Authority to upgrade facilities
Communities will suffer if schools close
Transport issues, especially for very young children.

Table 2:

Tiny primary schools?
Mixed age classes Yr 5/6
School closures / community death
Standards lowered – including standards in high school due to foundations missing
Disregarding responses to QEHS consultation
Emotional wellbeing of children from rural areas being thrust part in to huge High School

Table 3:

Finance; Training; Building – investment needed
Staff – loss of jobs; Travel – pupils travelling further
Pupils – impact on transition
Small school close impacts on community

Table 4:

Added Learning to the question for Hadrian Learning Trust
Parental confusion
Schools would fight for their own school rather than their pupils.
Could end up in a muddle like Ponteland: 2 / 3 tier
Feeder schools would have to reconsider their position / age range / offer
Affect HB and Hexham schools

Theme: Effect on community; Impact of finance on small primaries – LA upgrade facilities; reconsideration of admission / age ranges, travel and transport

Flipchart 2 cont...

Q: Has your school considered joining the Hadrian Trust ?

Hexham feedback

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

No – however schools would consider it.
Bellingham Partnership asked but were turned down at that time (early stages of H. Trust)
Would the H Trust consider inviting other schools to join them?

Table 2:

No

Table 3:

No

Table 4:

No annotation

Theme: Would consider joining H Trust, would they ask?

Table 1:

How could we join a trust which is financially deficient. This has never been aired before.
Transport issues (above in question 1) loss of specialist teaching at Years 5 and 6.
Loss of specialist facilities
Current system produces excellent results in Northumberland and nationally.
The middle system is extremely efficient for rural children in Northumberland.
It allows excellent transition from smaller to larger schools

Table 2:

V.clear from Headteacher this is not an option offered!
Set up so that church schools cannot join
Linked to above Emotional wellbeing (Q 1) – issues of recruitment and retention of staff in period of instability
Progress in year 7 & 8 ‘the lost years’
Staff tused – not always have right skills

Table 3:

Yes we were asked by the federation prior to them becoming a Trust. Catholic Schools were not asked.

Table 4:

Added Learning to the question for Hadrian Learning Trust
Yes. Not appropriate (Hexham Priory)
Yes. It didn't fit with HLT plan (Corbridge Middle)
No. Not possible (St Mary's / St Joseph's)

Theme: Church / can't join. Other schools: Yes asked to join but not appropriate / didn't fit

Flipchart 3

Q: Has your school considered changing its age range ?

- What are the positives & negatives

Haydon Bridge feedback

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Yes – Kielder, Greenhaugh, Wark *
+ Keeping school open
Variety / expertise in curriculum but possible through collaboration

Table 2:

Plans on hold due to consultation
Newbrough already a Primary
Extra staff / space / finances
More children kept for longer
KS2 data – raises accountability which should raise standards
Maintaining KS3 standards

Table 3:

Yes – 2yr olds and rising 3's.
Recently some First – Primary

Table 4:

No annotation

Theme: Yes / on hold due to consultation.
Extra staff/resources; raises accountability

Table 1:

Yes
Staying open
Lack of specialist facilities and teachers.
Small social mix for children.
Delayed PSHE and independence
School closures.
Staff morale.
Job losses

Table 2:

Yes but no – system in place suits needs of children.
Realistically to keep standards high money would not allow to pay for Y5/6 teachers. SEND v.inclusive in existing schools.
Smaller age range suits emotional needs of child – mental health / wellbeing.

Table 3:

Yes we have:
+ new build / updating; + accountability across key phases
+ one less point of transition
- Damaging something that works; - Lack of finance; - Decrease choice
Small schools would find it hard to provide a good wide range curriculum

Table 4:

Yes – see consultation document (HLT)
Yes – Govs decided it wouldn't provide correct education for our children (Corbridge Middle)
Yes – it would reduce the provision and years of Catholic Education (St Mary's / St Joseph's?)
Financial viability?

Theme: Overall yes considered changing age range. Positives - accommodation, one less transition point, small schools might struggle

Flipchart 3 cont.

Q: Has your school considered federating or forming a multi-academy trust with your neighbouring schools ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Yes *

Federation to make Q1 a possibility

Table 2:

Yes – rejected x 2

Yes – unfederated

Table 3:

Yes

Table 4:

No

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Yes

Hexham partnership is working efficiently together
There are outstanding relationships between First and Middle schools

Table 2:

QEHS model has made this model impossible even though as a partnership we have discussed and requested.

1 school is already federated and is in consultation for MAT – all deferred due to QEHS consultation / HB issues.

Table 3:

Yes

Table 4:

Yes everybody!

Done (St Mary's / St Joseph's) Federation

Yes. Inappropriate not compatible – different designation of pupils (Hex Priory School)

Yes – RSC deferred decision until after consultation.

HLT wanted to resolve age range issue before MAT expansion

Theme: Mainly yes for considering but there are further points of inappropriate / not compatible, RSC deferred decision

Theme: overall yes considered federating

Flipchart 4

Q: Is your school predicting a budget deficit in 2020 – if so how are you going to resolve it ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Most schools

Look at catchment areas and consider closing some schools

Table 2:

No annotation

Table 3:

Henshaw – X

Greenhead - Y - recruit more kids

HM - Y HF - Y

Staffing restructure – Recruitment

Table 4:

Will be managed with difficult staffing decision for maintained schools, LA needs to be more creative to address staff reductions

Theme: Reduce staff; close some schools,
LA needs to be more creative

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Humshaugh – No – data is inaccurate – sparsity. Funding granted

Table 2:

No – all solvent and very well managed

Table 3:

No

Table 4:

Many schools are predicting a deficit budget as in the past, but resolved when more accurate figures are available.

In the past the normal budgeting process has resolved a deficit

There are predicted deficits which can be resolved and other deficits which can't.

Theme: Budgeting process will resolve deficit.

Flipchart 4 cont.

Q: Have you considered sharing resources/staff with other schools ? Is a MAT the answer ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Yes – already happens between some schools

Table 2:

(question split in to 2 sections)

Yes - we do!

?

Table 3:

Yes – mixed C of E; mixed age;

Good Shepherd?

Possibly?

MAT - not necessarily LA MAT

MAT concentrated on primary

Table 4:

MAT can provide some savings partic back room staff

Theme: Overall yes / currently happens

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

We already do – resources, transport, training, moderation.

Pupil voice.

Sporting and music events.

Transition events and residentials.

Table 2:

Already have a strong partnership

School to school support, shared moderation,

partnership development plan. This is unique in Northumberland.

Table 3:

Is a MAT the answer? – Not always

Linked to sharing resources – already do

Table 4:

We already do / employ staff with other schools

(Corbridge Middle) teaching and non-teaching

Already do it in the federation (St Mary's / St

Joseph's)

HLT share resources (QEHS / HMS) back office & staff & leadership

A MAT isn't the only answer

Theme: Overall do share resources.

Flipchart 4 cont..

Q: Can your school survive with current staffing levels/pupil numbers?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

No

Table 2:

Yes x2

1 x until we have explored going Primary we have difficulties answering this question

Table 3:

Yes – H & G – yr on yr is fine.

HM & HF – currently going thro' staffing restructure & then will be yr on yr fine.

Table 4:

Needs constant attention

IT support solutions to address rural school needs

Lack of opportunities to move / happy with community leads to expensive staff

Theme: Overall, mixture of able to survive

Table 1:

Yes we are

We are thriving

Chollerton, Humshaugh, Beaufront and Acomb.

Table 2:

Yes – in its current state

Table 3:

Yes we can!

We will survive

Table 4:

Yes – Corbridge Middle / St Mary's / St Joseph's

Not without some kind of change. Cost reduction involving staffing would change the nature of the school (HLT – QEHS / Hex Middle)

Theme: Some yes will survive. Others need change

Flipchart 4 cont...

Q: How would financial problems impact on curriculum delivery ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

If there is an impact on the curriculum the school would have to close

Table 2:

No annotation

Table 3:

Won't – either na/a or can do it without impact.

Table 4:

Exhausted teachers
Heads teaching more!
Bigger classes, less support staff!

Theme: Impact on curriculum and Headteachers having to teach more

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Good financial management leads to a broad and balanced curriculum in First Schools

Table 2:

40% rise in County SLAs in one year, and we have all still managed our budgets in order to deliver Good or Outstanding Education by good forward planning and financial management. The biggest threat to this would be to have to become a Primary and employ more teachers.

Table 3:

No annotation

Table 4:

Negatively
Reduced offer to pupils

Theme: Overall, schools have good financial management / manage budget. Primary would be a threat.

Flipchart 4 cont....

Q: How close are your nearest schools – do they have similar challenges ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

KFS – too far

See map!

All have the same issues

Table 2:

4 miles OFS – WWFS

3.8 miles Shaftoe (HB) or Humshaugh (Hexham)

Table 3:

Halti – Greenhead – Gilsland 5 miles

Henshaw – 4 miles to Haltwhistle

6 miles Shaftoe Primary

Table 4:

No annotation

Theme: All have similar challenges with distance

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

You have the data

Table 2:

Crossed out challenges and replaced with successes? Yes

Table 3:

No annotation

Table 4:

*Added to questionyour nearest **similar** schools*

Yes – our nearest school has same financial challenges (HLT – QEHS / Hex Middle)

No (Corbridge Middle)

Theme: Successes not challenges

Flipchart 5

Capital Investment

Q: Should the council invest capital in school buildings – if so where – what should the investment look like ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Yes – new build

Maintain existing buildings until new build complete

Table 2:

Yes! It should be tailored to the needs of the communities. If first convert to Primary – will there be capital available?

Table 3:

Yes. H and G OK

HM & HF also OK

Generally:

Why Hexham?

Should all the money go to one catchment? Or more evenly distributed?

Table 4:

Write off the Haydon Br High School deficit and allow them to redesign their staffing numbers and allow regrowth

Why invest council funds in a trust

Write off debt of Haydon Bridge!

Haydon Bridge High School!

Why has the council earmarked money already to provide a new school in Hexham of the order of millions of pounds?

Theme: Overall yes (addition of Haydon Bridge deficit write off and redesign staffing)

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Yes

There is a need in Hexham for a state of the art High School.

Invest in a year 5 and 6 unit on the same site reducing need for investment in First School.

Table 2:

Of course, if they own the building.

Link to investment look like – schools fit for purpose for 21st C attractive, welcoming, inclusive and well resourced.

Table 3:

Yes!

Investment should be in all schools not one new build, to make the model work

Table 4:

Yes

New QEHS and bring other schools up to standard
Consistent approach

Theme: Overall yes invest

Flipchart 5 cont.

Q: Have you considered sharing a headteacher or a joint governing body ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Already do – not necessarily a saving

Table 2:

Yes to HT

No to joint GB

Table 3:

HM & HF share governing body; may share head in future

H & G already share head and Gov Body

Table 4:

Joint – GBs don't save money!

Joint SENCOs tether roles

More research needed on Exec Heads, Heads, Head of School

Theme: Overall currently do - role of GB, sharing doesn't always mean saving!

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Humshaugh – yes but it was a disaster – the impact of sharing HTs has not worked in several examples

Can work in a supportive capacity – Acomb

Table 2:

1 school already does

Others have considered but have decided that in a First School the most viable model is a teaching head.

Table 3:

Yes

Table 4:

We do (HLT) and (St Mary's / St Joseph's)

Theme: Overall yes / currently do- but risks. Sharing doesn't always work. Teaching head best model

Flipchart 5 cont..

Q: What impact will changes have on school transport ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Catchment areas would need to be redrawn

Table 2:

No annotation

Table 3:

Carbon footprint?

Lots more!!

Long journeys

Weather – snow and ice!

Infrastructure – roads / trains

In and out to the one big school

Extra – curricular limitations

Table 4:

Scarce resources spent on transport

Theme: Impact on transport, budget, long distances travelled, weather

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

What changes?

Drastic overall of present system ensuring fairness for rural communities.

Concerns over the infrastructure in Hexham.

Table 2:

If only 1, 11-18 school in area, distances will be increased massively. Impact on pupils – tired, less able to learn, spending hours on buses not at home with family – emotional impact.

What about Nursery and preschools? No transport provided for them.

Table 3:

Impact on health of pupils – less able to walk to school

More CO2 from extra transport buses and / or cars taking pupils to school further away

Additional costs

Length of journey for pupils

Longer school day for younger pupils

Table 4:

End of question added (closure of HBHS)

Less schools will put pressure on school transport and public transport

Transport plans (school and public) must be funded and provided at the same time (subsidised and public)

HB families would be eligible for school transport

Extra transport costs for LA

Theme: Distance will be increased impact on pupils learning; Increase in transport costs

Flipchart 6

Special Educational Needs

Q: Are there sufficient resources currently for children with SEND in mainstream?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Definitely not

Table 2:

No!

SENDCO training is big issue in small schools.

New SLA has made this difficult

Table 3:

Has there not just been an SEN Consultation?

Generally not: Speech and Language; ASC and all types of specialism

Table 4:

No proper provision now from the top slicing of £6000 max model - new model may have worked once – but not now.

Nothing to do with this consultation surely

Theme: Not sufficient resources for SEND mainstream

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

No

Children are being failed by the present system.

Need Hackwood Park replacement

Provision for autism and ASD

Table 2:

No – due to lack of funding. However where support can be most effectively given is in small schools, where children are well known and needs get noticed and picked up much earlier.

Table 3:

If there was more money there would be. However, changing the school format mean more money or deliver anything different?

Table 4:

No. Dozens of children are being educated outside their local community.

Not enough resources to support pupils with SEND in mainstream.

Theme: Overall, not sufficient resources.

Flipchart 6 cont.

Q: How might SEND resources be developed and shared?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

More local offer

Share expertise e.g. intervention training

Table 2:

OFS & WWFS already share a SENDCO

Table 3:

Strategically resourced

Provisions variously about the County?

Hubs?

Table 4:

Locally based provision rather than single centre of excellence

ASD / ASC / SEMH are priority

Theme: Share expertise, ideas around provision / hubs, priority SEN needs

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Continue to share good practice

Funding, more staff for specialist services e.g. LIST, Ed Psych

Table 2:

SLAs need to be broken down so that you only need to buy in to what you need. Big is not beautiful. Tailored packages have to be made available.

Table 3:

This has and is already done.

Table 4:

Working party from the partnerships to develop a proposal (Corbridge Middle)

Too big a question (Hex Priory)

Theme: Tailor SLA's to need continue to share good practice

Flipchart 7

Q: Should the council try to establish a multi-academy trust in partnership with others?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Not sure how it would solve the problems

Table 2:

How would this benefit small schools?

Table 3:

Across the whole County?

Regionally in County?

What would be different from the current LA; and being a LA maintained school; structure; Autonomy?

Table 4:

School viability issues is key not structural reorganization

Not a solution!

Why? How will it help?

Theme: Not sure solution / benefit. How will it help?

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

Yes, we should explore all options.

What are the advantages and disadvantages?

Table 2:

Is it even possible?

Table 3:

No best not

Table 4:

*Changed establish in the question and replaced with **facilitate***

Not clear this is possible

'A collection of non-viable schools does not make a good MAT'

NCC by another name?

You need pupils numbers / money to be viable – not inclusive of Catholic / C of E Schools

Vested interest?

Cross subsidising MAT by LA could be problematic

Theme: Is it possible? Advantages / Disadvantages?

Flipchart 7 cont.

Q: Would your governing body be interested in joining a MAT focussing on solving some of these problems ?

Haydon Bridge feedback

Table 1:

Interested in discussing further

Table 2:

Will there be any capital investment available for first schools converting to primaries?

How would a MAT manage / benefit small schools?

Table 3:

Undetermined

Would depend on the MAT

Table 4:

No annotation

Theme: Discuss further, Capital investment for FS –
PS, depend on MAT

Hexham feedback

Table 1:

We need to see more detail of the proposal

Table 2:

We would need a lot more information
1 school is already trying to do this.

Table 3:

No annotation

Table 4:

Underlined in the question A MAT

No!

Yes!

Possibly!

It depends!

Can't!

Theme: No more info needed

Schools Budget Positions

5 schools had outturn deficit budgets in 2016/17

7 schools have predicted deficit budgets in 2017/18.

11 schools have predicted budget deficits in 2018/19.

Costs per pupil data.

example

- 2016/17 Ranges from £2,912 to £15,461 per pupil.
- 2017/18 Ranges from £3,051 to £21,478 per pupil
- 2018/19 Ranges from £2,965 to £17,259 per pupil

Capital Investment

- The Councils medium financial plan has set a side £40M for investment in Education.
- A commitment from DfE to make a substantial contribution to any new school for Hexham, as part of the council's successful bid to the Priority School Building Programme.
- The Council's commitment to invest in education with recent approval given to new build school project in excess of £50m.

Presentation Invited from Schools - what options and models will work ?

- Schools
 - Greenhaugh First School
 - The Good Shepherd MAT

The Consultation Process

- **This is the start of a consultation process that will take seven months to complete. Schools can feedback to us at any point during that seven month period. The timeline allows schools to see when key decisions will be made and meetings held.**
- **After tonight we would hope that all schools communicate to us their initial thoughts ...but over the next seven months they will have the opportunity to tell us what they think and work on a model in partnership with others.**

The Consultation Process

- Informal consultation (in two stages).
- **11 January - 9 April**
 - Non statutory the Council decide form and length of consultation based upon custom and practice nationally and previously in county.
- **Informal Stage One with schools - 11 Jan - 2 Feb. (extended at behest of schools)**
 - Share data and information with schools
 - Seek views and gather feedback from schools
 - Develop a range options and models with schools on which to consult at 2nd stage of informal consultation, with wider public.

- **Stage 2 of Informal Consultation - with the community 19 Feb- 9 Apr.**

- Consult on a range of options developed following feedback at stage 1. Ask for other options after further thought.
- Share data and information on the impact of each of the key issues (closure, age ranges, finance, curriculum and transition arrangements, staff, Early Years, transport, catchment areas, SEND and land and buildings, etc etc.)
- **Seek views and gather feedback to inform a further consultation. All schools to hold own meetings.**
- Hold public consultation events involving all schools.
- Hold Staff, Governors and union meetings

Analysis of Informal Consultation stage 1&2

10-23 April

- All feedback from both stages of informal consultation will be analysed
- The findings will be published in a report to the Council's Cabinet.
- The Director of Education will make recommendations in the report and outline strengths and weaknesses of options.
- The Family and Children's Services Scrutiny Committee (FACS), scrutinises and can propose amendments, to cabinet.

Publication of the Outcomes of Consultation

- **Report published on 24 April**
- FACS meeting 3 May
- Cabinet meeting 8 May
 - Decision on whether or not to move to the formal consultation process, with the publication of the Statutory Proposal or
 - Request Officers to carry out further informal consultation (example Alnwick)

Statutory Consultation

10 May - 7 June

IF approved the consultation process will move into the formal stage with the publication of a Statutory Proposal.

- 4 weeks statutory period of **consultation**
- No public meetings or events will take place during this statutory process organised by council.
- Written responses either supporting or objecting to the proposal from all schools and members of community will be accepted.

8- 28 June

- Officers draft the outcomes of consultation report based upon the submissions received in this second stage of **consultation**.
- Report on the analysis of the **consultation** published on 28 June.

Decision for maintained schools only

- Report published on **28 June**
- FACS meeting **5 July** to discuss **consultation**
- Cabinet meeting **10 July**
 - After 7 months of both informal and formal consultation, cabinet will decide on whether or not to implement the proposal for maintained schools - they are **not** the decision maker for academies.

Typical Timeline

WEST

Consultation Timeline for changes to Education in the West of Northumberland

CONSULTATION TIMELINE	DATE
Report submission	6 December
Report Published	7 December
Meeting of the Council Family and Children's Services Scrutiny Committee. To consider the report setting out proposal to ask Cabinet's permission to carry out 1 st Phase consultation with Educational Professionals on the organisation of schools in the Hexham and Haydon Bridge Partnerships of Schools and delegate approval to move to 2 nd Phase wider consultation	14 December 2017
Meeting of the Council's Cabinet – Seeking permission to consult	19 December 2017
If approved Phase 1 - Informal Consultation will commence Consultation with both Partnerships begins Consultees have 3 weeks to respond	11 January 2 February
Cllr Daley and Daljit agree to 2nd Phase "Wider Consultation" Publication of Consultation Document 6 week (not including school Holidays)consultation	19 February 2018 19 February – 9 April
Outcomes of Consultation Report to FACS Scrutiny - review of Report to Cabinet on outcomes of consultation and request to publish statutory proposal	3 May 2018
Report to Cabinet – Decision whether or not to move to publication of Statutory Proposal	8 May 2018
If approved the consultation process will move to STAGE 2 - Publication Council publishes Statutory Proposal opening 4 Week Statutory Period No public meeting or events will take place during this statutory process	10 May – 7 June 2018
Drafting of the outcomes of consultation report and submission	8 June – 27 June
Report published	28 June
STAGE 4 – Decision NCC Final Report to FACS Scrutiny on outcomes of statutory period for Statutory Proposals and request for Final Decision -	5 July 2018
NCC Report to CABINET ; Outcomes of statutory period for Statutory Proposal and request for FINAL Decision by CABINET.	10 July 2018

- Note dates are indicative and can be subject to change.

EXAMPLE

Consultation Timeline - Ponteland Partnership

CONSULTATION TIMELINE	DATE
Report submission	4 March 2016
Report Published	7 March 2016
Meeting of the Council Family and Children's Services Scrutiny Committee. To consider the report setting out proposal to ask Cabinet's permission to carry out informal consultation	14 March 2016
Meeting of the Council's Cabinet – Seeking permission to consult	16 March 2016
Publication of Consultation Document 6 week (not including school Holidays)consultation	17 March 2016 17 March –11 May
Drafting of the outcomes of consultation report and submission	12-15 May
Report published	17 May
Outcomes of Consultation Report to FACS Scrutiny - review of Report to Cabinet on outcomes of consultation and request to publish statutory proposal	23 May 2016
Report to Cabinet – Decision whether or not to move to publication of Statutory Proposal	24 May 2016
If approved the consultation process will move to STAGE 2 - Publication Council publishes Statutory Proposal opening 4 Week Statutory Period No public meeting or events will take place during this statutory process	26 May - 23 June 2016
Drafting of the outcomes of consultation report and submission	24 June – 1 July 2016
Report published	4 July 2016
STAGE 4 – Decision NCC Final Report to FACS Scrutiny on outcomes of statutory period for Statutory Proposals and request for Final Decision -	12 July a.m. 2016
NCC Report to CABINET - Outcomes of statutory period for Statutory Proposal and request for FINAL Decision by CABINET.	12 July p.m. 2016

Questions ?

CONTACT:

educationconsultation@northumberland.gov.uk