



Report of the Director of Children's Services

Report to Executive Board

Date: 9 January 2012

Subject: The Development of All-Through Schools at Carr Manor and Roundhay – Lessons Learned

Are specific electoral Wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Moortown and Roundhay		
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:		
Appendix number:		

Summary of main issues

1. The purpose of this report is to inform Executive Board of the lessons learned by Children's Services following the report taken to Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) on 27 September 2012 in respect of the all-through school developments at Carr Manor and Roundhay. This report is presented as a joint document with outcomes of Scrutiny Board detailed in full within section 3.2; and specifically in 3.2.4.
2. In October 2011, Design and Cost Reports (DCRs) for the Carr Manor and Roundhay Basic Need projects were submitted to Executive Board for £2.57m and £4.43m respectively. Due to additional costs being subsequently identified in respect of both projects, a further report was taken to the Executive Board on 7th March 2012, seeking approval to an additional £655k in respect of Carr Manor and £2.77m in respect of Roundhay; a total of £3.43m extra spend.
3. In addition to the approval of these additional costs, Executive Board resolved that the processes relating to this specific case be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Board for review; and that a further report be submitted to a future meeting of Executive Board in order provide details of the lessons which have been learned as a result of this issue and any changes to procedure which have been implemented.
4. Following the review undertaken Scrutiny Board is reassured that lessons have been learned from the Roundhay and Carr Manor projects and that extensive work has been undertaken to ensure operational systems are in place to reduce risk. The Board notes that the revised

approaches are currently in practice and have been utilised for a number of major basic need expansion schemes including Little London.

Recommendations

5. Executive Board is requested to note:

- 5.1. the recommendations made by Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) following presentation to this board in September 2012; and
- 5.2. the lessons learned from the Carr Manor and Roundhay projects and the changes in procedure which have been implemented.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Executive Board of the lessons learned by Children's Services following the report taken to Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) on 27 September 2012 in respect of the all-through school developments at Carr Manor and Roundhay.
- 1.2 This report will seek to provide some background contextual information in addition to these lessons learned in order to explain the benefit of the revised procedures subsequently implemented by Children's Services
- 1.3 This report will summarise the recommendations made by Scrutiny Board at its meeting of 27 September. Section 3.2 contains specific information provided by Scrutiny Board. The conclusions of Scrutiny Board are detailed in Section 3.2.4.

2 Background information

- 2.1 In July 2011 the Council's Executive Board approved proposals to change the age range of Carr Manor High School from 11-18 to 4-18, with a reception admission limit of 30 (1FE) using land adjacent to the existing High School site. In September 2011 the same change in age range was approved in respect of Roundhay School, with the 2FE primary-age provision to be delivered on the site of the former Braim Wood School on Elmete Lane. Both schemes were in response to the need for additional pupil places caused by the increasing birth rate across Leeds.
- 2.2 In October 2011, Design and Cost Reports (DCRs) for the Carr Manor and Roundhay Basic Need projects were submitted to Executive Board for £2.57m and £4.43m respectively. Due to additional costs being subsequently identified in respect of both projects, a further report was taken to the Executive Board on 7th March 2012, seeking approval to an additional £655k in respect of Carr Manor and £2.77m in respect of Roundhay; a total of £3.43m extra spend.
- 2.3 In approving these additional costs, Executive Board also resolved that the processes relating to this specific case be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Board for review; and that a further report be submitted to a future meeting of Executive Board in order provide details of the lessons which have been learned as a result of this issue and any changes to procedure which have been implemented.
- 2.4 Children's Services presented a paper to Scrutiny Board on 27 September 2012. This paper sought to:
 - i. Explain how the scheme cost estimates were developed for the DCRs of October 2011
 - ii. Explain the reasons for the additional funding required in respect of both projects
 - iii. Detail the lessons learned from the Carr Manor and Roundhay projects in terms of cost estimation and cost management and detail the revised approach adopted by Children's Services to the management of major capital projects.
- 2.5 Scrutiny Board noted the recommendations presented by Children's Services, which were:
 - a. The reasons for the two original DCRs being submitted to Executive Board in October 2011, which were found to have inaccurate cost estimation based on only limited site specific survey information
 - b. The reasons for the additional capacity funding in respect of the all-through school projects at Carr Manor and Roundhay, totalling £3.43m

- c. The lessons learned from the Carr Manor and Roundhay projects and a revised approach being adopted by Children's Services in the management of major capital projects

2.6 This report seeks to expand on point c) above. Detailed information provided by Scrutiny Board following their September 2012 meeting is included within section 3.2.

3.0 Main issues

3.1 Lessons Learned

3.1.1 Lesson – Project timescales were both insufficient and insufficiently flexible at the outset

Explanation – It was the culture of Education Leeds to attempt to achieve very ambitious project deadlines in order to meet the Council's statutory duty in respect of school place provision. By promoting a culture of inflexibility Education Leeds was able to successfully deliver a large number of projects on time, however this was offset by an increased exposure to cost risk.

Outcomes – Children's Services has developed its project and programme methodologies to include more detailed consideration of whether temporary solutions are required in advance of permanent building solutions being delivered; with the additional cost of these temporary solutions are considered within budgets at the outset. All project managers have been trained to develop programmes based on the constraints of the statutory processes required to increase school admission numbers. The Built Environment team are represented within early discussions with schools and statutory consultation events in order to shape expectations in respect of timescales.

3.1.2 Lesson – Project and programme budgets were established based on inappropriate information and not sufficiently validated by private partners.

Explanation – The budgets for both the Roundhay and Carr Manor projects were established using the actual costs of previous school extension projects delivered via the modular framework contract. These were validated by a consultant-led exercise based on conceptual rather than 'real' sites, i.e. this exercise was desktop only. An allowance for risk was added, however contingency levels were reduced in response to lack of funding available from central government and the need to demonstrate that multiple projects could be resourced simultaneously. It was not explicit within the contract cost rates that they did not apply to whole new school projects; which exposed LCC to increased risk of 'abnormal' costs being identified. These abnormal costs were incurred for both projects. Detailed validation from the Strategic Design Alliance (SDA) was not sought nor offered and therefore the risk of each budget being insufficient was not identified until after the DCRs were submitted.

Outcome – Methodologies for estimating budgets for programme planning purposes are adjusted in accordance with actual previous project costs and detailed consultant cost advice is sought prior to proposals to increase the capacity of a school being presented to Executive Board. Contingency levels for each project are in line with national best practice. There is a clear expectation of all project delivery staff that project risks are priced and included in overall cost projections to ensure these represent a 'worst case' position.

3.1.3 Lesson – DCRs were submitted prior to cost certainty being achieved in order to compress project timescales.

Explanation – The process of submitting DCRs based on early cost estimates was established by Education Leeds and embedded into project management methodologies implemented by the Estate Management (now Built Environment) team. This process was designed to allow project programmes to be compressed in order to speed up delivery timescales and proved successful for the delivery of smaller school extension projects.

Outcome – This process has now ceased. Children's Services has implemented a robust methodology of ensuring that cost certainty, barring any unforeseen events that could not reasonably be expected, has been achieved prior to the submission of each project DCR. It is acknowledged that adopting the process of submitting DCRs at an early stage for whole new school projects increased LCC exposure to the risk of budgets being insufficient at the point of contract award. This risk was not fully understood at the time the DCRs were submitted for Carr Manor and Roundhay.

- 3.1.4 Lesson – The project management team were insufficiently experienced in delivering whole school modular buildings and the contract form and/or building type was inappropriate for this type of project.

Explanation – The projects at Carr Manor and Roundhay were delivered using a modular framework contract procured in 2009 by Education Leeds in partnership with the Council's strategic partner at that time, the SDA. The Education Leeds staff responsible for the establishment of the contract had left the organisation by August 2011 and handover arrangements were subsequently proved to be inadequate. In the absence of guidance from the SDA to the contrary, it was assumed that the modular framework contract was appropriate to deliver projects such as Carr Manor and Roundhay.

Outcome – The project managers for both the Carr Manor and Roundhay projects had no experience of delivering whole new schools using modular buildings and the assumption that the modular approach was suitable for this type of project proved erroneous. Strong client – designer relations are being developed between Children's Services and the Council's JVC partner, Norfolk Property Services (NPS) to ensure a mature partnering approach is taken during project inception stages. This will ensure quality procurement advice is received at the outset. All project managers are to be offered training on different contract types to develop professional expertise; and this is being supported by the Council's Public Private Partnership Unit (PPPU) department. Thorough handover processes are now in place and embedded into practices within the Built Environment team and overseen by senior management. No whole school modular buildings have since been procured.

- 3.1.5 Lesson – The design and build contract form does not have sufficient synergy with Council financial approval processes.

Explanation – Within design and build contracts such as the modular framework contract used at Roundhay and Carr Manor the point at which cost certainty is achieved is later than within traditionally procured contracts. This necessitates the submission of a DCR at a later stage and therefore increases the length of the overall project programme. Design and Build contracts have been used very successfully by LCC across multiple programmes such as Building Schools for the Future and have a number of advantages, however the modular framework contract did not have a traditional client 'design freeze' built into the project stages and therefore exposed the Council to increased cost risk. It would not have been possible to submit the DCRs for Carr Manor and Roundhay at contractor design freeze and to deliver the school places by September 2012.

Outcome – As detailed within 3.1.4 above, relationships between client departments such as Built Environment and the Council's JVC partner NPS are enabling informed decisions on contract types to be made at an early stage. Detailed project planning workshops are established for each project to ensure that all financial approvals are built into construction programmes from the outset and the clear expectation that cost certainty must be achieved before authority to spend is sought is embedded in Built Environment project management processes. All staff have received additional training and written guidance materials have been produced to reinforce these messages.

- 3.1.6 Lesson – Insufficient screening of DCRs occurred within Children's Services at the time these were submitted for both the Carr Manor and Roundhay projects.

Explanation – The restructure of senior leadership posts in Children's Services was not completed until January 2012. During August and September 2011 when the DCR reports were submitted there was reduced management capacity and lack of clarity for project managers in respect of the appropriate report screening processes.

Outcome – A robust screening methodology is now in place and has proved successful since its implementation. All DCRs are cleared by senior management within the Built Environment team and the senior finance officer to ensure accuracy, detail and quality before final approval is requested from the Chief Officer for Strategy Performance and Commissioning. All Built Environment staff have received training to embed this approach. It is now a clear expectation of project managers that they are accountable for ensuring clearance is achieved in a timely manner.

- 3.1.7 Lesson – Communication strategies generally, and specifically with elected Ward members, were not well defined or managed.

Explanation – Education Leeds processes for communication in respect of Basic Need projects were largely managed at a programme level and therefore were insufficiently detailed. Whilst communications plans were developed at the outset of each project they were not regularly updated and good practice of regular communication with elected Ward Councillors; which was established within previous transformational building programmes and projects; was not followed for Basic Need projects.

Outcome – All Children's Services project managers are required to produce and regularly update a formal communications plan for each project, irrespective of the project size or complexity. The need for regular written or verbal communication with elected Ward Councillors is included as a standard requirement for all Basic Need projects. Communications plans are approved at Programme Manager level within Built Environment.

- 3.1.8 Lesson – The programme management of Basic Need within Estate Management (now Built Environment) team promoted a lack of accountability amongst project managers within the team.

Background – During 2010 and 2011, operational management of the Basic Need programme was undertaken by one senior officer with programme management and technical building expertise. As part of this role the officer took on additional responsibilities in respect of cost management and the development of project programmes. This created an inconsistent approach amongst project managers, many of whom were not accustomed to the responsibility of managing Basic Need projects in a holistic way. When this member of staff left the organisation in August 2011 there was a clear skills gap that was not filled until the Children's Services leadership recruitment process was concluded in January 2012. Handover processes at that time were inadequate.

Outcome – Clear responsibilities are now in place for all project managers. These have been reinforced via standardised appraisal targets, team meetings and service training events. The Built Environment team now has full management capacity and therefore appropriate escalation routes are available for all project management staff. In addition, Children's Services has commissioned PPPU to support with project management and governance on the next phase of major Basic Need projects. PPPU have extensive experience of project delivery; and whilst this adds additional costs to projects, this partnership has been valuable in identifying areas of good practice that will be applied to future project.

- 3.1.9 Lesson - Insufficiently detailed communication with Planning and Highways prior to the submission of a planning application increases cost risk.

Explanation - In the cases of Roundhay and Carr Manor there was insufficient time built into project programmes at the outset to facilitate comprehensive advice from colleagues in Planning and Highways that could have been used to inform the anticipated project costs. The process of informal consultation had been established during previous years' Basic Need programme delivery and the risks had not been fully re-assessed prior to the development of project programmes that targeted a September 2012 completion date for these two projects.

Outcome – Consultation with both planning and highways commences prior to project inception in order that any risks can be identified at the earliest possible stage. Children's Services have developed a robust service delivery standard with colleagues in Highways that includes regular meetings at senior and officer level and the provision of formal written advice. Where increased risk is identified for particular projects, a draft planning application is submitted to Plans Panel prior to design freeze in order that any feedback and costs can be included in the project scope. Additionally, a cross Council Basic Need Programme Board has been established with Chief Officer representation from Planning and Highways to contribute to Basic Need proposals.

- 3.1.10 Lesson – Inaccurate assumptions were made at the outset that the sites for the new school buildings at Carr Manor and Roundhay would be appropriate.

Explanation – The sites selected for both projects were agreed in partnership with relevant Council departments as both had previously been declared surplus by Education Leeds. There was an assumption that, as both sites had previously been schools, the level of risk at each would be relatively low. This proved to be inaccurate.

Outcome – Children's Services has implemented an improved rigorous approach to site selection in partnership with Corporate Asset Management and City Development. The governance structures in place for projects also include representatives from key departments in order that risks are identified and mitigated. Children's Services has also commenced the commissioning of NPS prior to the statutory consultation stage to assess the 'viability' of particular sites or proposals. Whilst this requires financial commitment and therefore increases the risk of abortive fee charges it does facilitate robust risk management and better strategic decision making.

3.2 Scrutiny Board outcomes and recommendations

The following information has been approved by the Chair of Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

3.2.1 Introduction

On 7th of March 2012 Executive Board considered the report of the Director of Children's Services, 'Basic Needs 2012: Carr Manor and Roundhay all through schools revised costs'. The purpose of the report was to request a transfer of secured grant funding and the authorisation of expenditure amounting to £3.43m in respect of the Carr Manor and Roundhay all through school projects. The figure of £3.43m represented an increase in costs since the original design and cost reports¹ were submitted to the Executive Board by the Director of Children's Services in October 2011.

In response the Executive Board raised a number of concerns. Whilst it was acknowledged that this matter was not subject to Call In, due to the need to ensure that the

¹ CARR MANOR HIGH SCHOOL: PRIMARY ACCOMMODATION Capital Scheme Number: 15822/CAM/000, ROUNDHAY HIGH SCHOOL TECHNOLOGY AND LANGUAGE COLLEGE : PRIMARY ACCOMMODATION Capital Scheme Number: 15822/ROU/000

accommodation was in place for September 2012, it was requested by the Executive Board that the matter be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Board, so that the related processes could be reviewed.

The Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) resolved to consider this matter at its meeting on the 27th of September 2012. The objective of the Scrutiny Board was to consider the lessons which had been learned and identify if sufficient changes to procedure have been made to minimise the risk of a significant overspend arising in the future.

3.2.2 Comments and Considerations

The Director of Children's Services submitted a report to the Scrutiny Board in preparation for the meeting on the 27th of September 2012 entitled 'The Development of All-Through Schools at Carr Manor and Roundhay'.

The following Executive Member and officers attended the Scrutiny Board meeting:

- Councillor Blake, Executive Member (Children and Families)
- Nigel Richardson, Director of Children's Services
- Sarah Sinclair, Chief Officer (Strategy, Commissioning and Performance)
- James Saunders, Built Environment Programme Manager.

The Scrutiny Board were presented with an explanation of how the original costs provided in the design and cost report of October 2011 were assessed.

In introducing the report the Chief Officer (Strategy, Commissioning and Performance) advised the Scrutiny Board that the preliminary design and cost project work spanned a period of time during which Education Leeds were undergoing a major transitional phase back into the management of Local Authority.

It was explained to the Scrutiny Board that operational practice around approvals and projects in Education Leeds was different to the practice within Leeds City Council. There was a desire to progress schemes as quickly as possible in order to meet demand for school places. It was therefore normal practice to submit design and cost reports based on estimated costs to Executive Board as early as possible. The Scrutiny Board was advised that historically this process had worked well for most schemes. On reflection the Scrutiny Board perceived that this was a high risk strategy employed by Education Leeds but were reassured to note that this was not a practice followed by Leeds City Council generally.

The Scrutiny Board was informed that the Carr Manor and Roundhay schemes were costed on a modular framework contract and that this type of framework had never been used before for costing a whole school solution. The Board asked if any member of the project team had relevant experience to oversee a development of this type and were advised that no officer working on the projects had the relevant experience to deliver whole new modular build schools at that time.

The Board wished to understand if the developments would have gone ahead in the same way if initial costs had been estimated correctly. In response the Board was advised that there was a lack of maturity in the Estate Management project team at that time and therefore insufficient experience to challenge if a whole new modular build was the best method to utilise. The additional costs have brought the schemes in line with more traditional build projects, which are generally more expensive. The Board also identified that further expenditure of £155,223.76 has been incurred to pay for temporary accommodation at the Roundhay site due to the delay in project completion.

Evidence clarified that discussions had taken place with both Highways and Planning officers based within the City Development Department from July 2011, in advance of the

design and cost report being submitted to the Executive Board. The Scrutiny Board was informed that advice had been provided regarding planning and highways requirements relating to site conditions and traffic management which were not incorporated into the original costings. The Board was also told that much of the advice provided in the initial stages was informal and this again was attributed to a lack of experience and maturity in the project team. It was acknowledged that formal and structured questions at an earlier time with colleagues in the City Development Department should have been undertaken. Further questioning also identified that there was a lack of integration in operations between Education Leeds and Leeds City Council which resulted in information not being shared relating to the sites.

The Scrutiny Board asked if the project team had taken into account the contribution made by Elected Members regarding the Roundhay site during the consultation period as it highlighted some of the issues with the site. The Board was advised that project managers were aware of the views during that time, however managers did not attend all the public meetings at the start of the project when consultation was being undertaken.

Clarification was sought on the strategic approach to plan for the provision of sufficient school accommodation based on projected birth rate, as the problems encountered to provide primary accommodation will eventually manifest at secondary stage. It was clarified that there has never been a proper clear asset strategy which accounted for demographic changes and that a reactive situation had developed to meet demand. Reassuringly the Scrutiny Board were advised that work is currently being done to formulate a whole council approach to asset management which considers population and demand.

3.2.3 Identified Improvements

The Scrutiny Board was made aware of a number of improvements that have been put into place to reduce risk and improve operational procedures the following were considered in greater detail at the meeting:

- Design and cost reports are no longer taken forward to Executive Board until the design freeze stage when costs can be accurately predicted.
- Children's Services are more realistic about timescales, which may result in the requirement for temporary solutions, however this should ensure that projects are delivered successfully and within anticipated cost.
- Significant work has been undertaken to build and formalise relationships between Children's Services and the City Development Department to ensure advice is sought and considered for planning and highways matters at an early stage. Further consideration is also being undertaken jointly about the use of land and buildings in Council ownership.
- Where expert advice is required Children's Services is utilising the commissioned services of Norfolk Property Solutions Leeds who provide a multi-disciplinary architectural and property service.
- Children's Services are now supported by the Public Private Partnership Unit who have considerable experience in project delivery and governance.
- Project managers now attend public consultation meetings.

3.2.4 Conclusions of the Scrutiny Board (Children and Families)

The Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) :

- is reassured that lessons have been learnt from the Roundhay and Carr Manor projects and that extensive work has been undertaken to ensure operational systems are in place to reduce risk. The Board are also satisfied that expert support is in place which can be utilised to ensure projects are designed and costed appropriately, particularly where experience is not available in Children's Services.

- notes that the revised approaches are currently in practice and have been utilised for a number of major basic need expansion schemes including Little London.
- considers that the progression of a proactive strategy for the provision and management of assets based on population growth and demand should continue.
- recommends that the views of ward councillors are sought early in consultation processes due to their knowledge of the locality and strong links with the community.

4.0 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 The proposals in respect of changing the age range of both secondary schools and the provision of 90 additional pupil places for 2012 have been subject to extensive consultation including public consultation and legal requirements in accordance with statutory process since December 2010. The Executive Board reports are listed in section 7.
- 4.1.2 All capital building works have been the subject of consultation between Children's Services Officers, the school and governing body and the public via the statutory planning processes.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 The recommendations within this report do not have any direct or specific impact on any of the groups falling under equality legislation and the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality.
- 4.2.2 Equality Impact Assessment screening documents were prepared for each individual project at the outset by the Children's Services Capacity Planning and Sufficiency team. These documents are available at Appendix 1.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 The projects at Carr Manor and Roundhay met the Local Authority's statutory duty to provide sufficient school places. These projects also make a positive contribution towards the modernisation of the school estate across the city and should help raise standards and educational attainment amongst school pupils.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 On 7 March 2012 Executive Board approved additional costs of £2.77m and £655k for the projects at Roundhay and Carr Manor respectively. This represents a total additional expenditure of £3.43m. The additional funding has been allocated from two secured grant funded schemes, £3.177m from Scheme 14185/000/000 Devolved Schools Capital Grant and £0.253m from Scheme 16404/000/000 (2011/2012) Basic Need Grant.
- 4.4.2 The additional expenditure has not necessitated the cancellation or abortion of any other planned capital project.
- 4.4.3 It was confirmed during the request for Authority to Spend in March that the overall project cost for each school was assessed as value for money by the Council's former strategic partner and cost consultants for the projects. This assessment was based on the range of challenges faced given the complexities of both sites, plus a delay in achieving planning permission and contractor Administration in respect of the Roundhay project.
- 4.4.4 Despite the increased costs, the overall cost per square metre for each school is comparable with other new school projects delivered since 2011.

- 4.4.5 As detailed within the report to Scrutiny Board in September 2012, the key areas and reasons for the variance and the need for additional capital funding were:
- (i) The production and timing of the DCR submission
 - (ii) The nature of the modular framework contract
 - (iii) Planning considerations
 - (iv) Ground conditions

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.1 This report contains information provided by Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) and the finalised version has been shared with Scrutiny Board prior to circulation to Executive Board; however it remains eligible for call-in.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 Prior to March 2012 the project management of these two projects was undertaken using the model developed and used within Education Leeds. This is based on Prince 2 methodology. All project managers are now using the Council's Delivering Successful Change methodology.

5.0 Conclusions

- 5.1 There are a complex range of contributory factors that have resulted in the need to request Authority to Spend additional funds to deliver the Basic Need projects at both Roundhay and Carr Manor.
- 5.2 The opportunity for a fundamental review of the working practices adopted by Education Leeds has highlighted a series of required procedural and structural changes that have now been implemented by Children's Services across all projects. Children's Services welcomes the role of Scrutiny Board in this process.
- 5.3 Following the review undertaken Scrutiny Board is reassured that lessons have been learned from the Roundhay and Carr Manor projects and that extensive work has been undertaken to ensure operational systems are in place to reduce risk. The Board notes that the revised approaches are currently in practice and have been utilised for a number of major basic need expansion schemes including Little London.

6.0 Recommendations

- 6.1 Executive Board is requested to note:
- (i) the recommendations made by Scrutiny Board (Children and Families) following presentation to this board in September 2012; and
 - (ii) the lessons learned from the Carr Manor and Roundhay projects and the changes in procedure which have been implemented.

7.0 Background documents²

None

² The background documents listed in this section are available for download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

Screening will help to determine the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration and whether an **impact assessment** will be required.

Directorate: Planning & Learning Environments	Service area: School Access Service
Lead person: Darren Crawley	Contact number: 0113 2243867

1. Title: Roundhay through school
Is this a:

☒ **Strategy**
☐ **Policy**
☐ **Service**
☐ **Function**
☐ **Other**

Is this:

☒ New/proposed
 ☐ Already exists and is being reviewed
 ☐ Is changing

(Please tick one of the above)

2. Please provide a brief description of the policy/strategy/ service/function being screened:

- Main aim**
 To establish a through school as part of the current Roundhay school which will provide provision for 4 to 19 year olds. It is intended that Key stage 1 and 2 will be established on the site of the former Braim Wood school with Key stage 3 and 4 continuing to operate from the existing Roundhay school.
- Purpose**
 To create an additional 2 forms of entry (60 places) primary provision within the Roundhay area to help manage the shortage of school places within this area.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration
please tick the appropriate boxes

Question	Your answer
Does your strategy, policy, service or function affect service users, employees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

or the wider community?	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does your proposals relate to areas where there are known inequalities? (for example disabled peoples access to public transport, the gender pay gap, racist or homophobic bullying in schools, educational attainment of Gypsies and Travellers)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If you have answered yes to either of the above go to question 4 If you have answered no to either of the above go to decision 3 in question 5	

4. Considering equality, diversity, cohesion and integration	
Are you including equality, diversity, cohesion and integration as part of considerations within your future planning. (you need to consider age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If yes please provide details	

5. Screening decision	
Decision 1 – need to complete an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment... ...if you have answered yes to either or both questions in 3 and no to question 4 you will need to complete an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment.	
When will you complete the impact assessment?	Date:
Who will lead the impact assessment?	Name and job title:

Decision 2 – do not need to complete an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment...

...if you have answered **yes** either or both questions in 3 and **yes** to question 4 you do not need to complete an impact assessment.

Decision 3 – do not need to complete an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment...

...if you have answered **no** to either or both questions in 3

Please provide details

Date screening completed	27 th October 2010
---------------------------------	-------------------------------

ROUNDHAY THROUGH SCHOOL

Service Area: School Access Service	Team: School Organisation
Assessment prepared by: Darren Crawley	Contact number: 0113 2243867
Date of assessment: 27 th October 2010	

1. Summary of project that was assessed:

To create a through school providing community school provision for 4-18 year olds operating from 2 sites. The current Roundhay school will house key stage 3 and 4 pupils with key stage 1 and 2 pupils being located on the site of the old Braim Wood school, which will offer 60 places to reception class.

2. Summary of people/services involved with assessment:

An operational group has been setup to develop and work through proposals to expand school provision across the city as part of the School Places Strategy – Planning Learning Places in Leeds 2010-2013. This group consists of officers from various services within Education Leeds. These include: *School Organisation – Lesley Savage and Darren Crawley, PMIT – Heather Ross and Nev Smith, Estates Management – Steve Hoggart and Alex Macleod, Inclusion – Liz Lowes, School Improvement – Helen Kirwin, Extended Services – Dave Foxton, Early Years – Julia Manning.*

3. Research:

As part of the process to develop options, various research work is undertaken including:

- Analysis of birth data, looking at past trends
- Projections based on births and take-up, to determine whether there are enough school places within a particular area.
- Parental preference patterns.
- The types of schools within the area, does this offer choice and diversity?
- Research around BME to ensure these groups are not adversely affected.
- Ensure that we adhere to our legal duty of promoting choice and diversity.
- Communicating with schools and local members to gain a better understanding of the wider community
- Communicating with the community at a later stage of the process to obtain views.

7. Who may be affected by this project?

Equality characteristics

☒

Age

☒

Carers

☒

Disability

☐

Gender reassignment

☒

Race

☐

Religion
or Belief

☐

Sex (male or female)

☐

Sexual orientation

☐

Other

Stakeholders

☒

Services users

☒

Employees

☒

Trade Unions

☒

Partners

☒

Members

☐

Suppliers

☒

Other please specify: *Diocese, Neighbouring authorities*

Potential barriers.

☒

Built environment

☐

Location of premises and services

☒

Information
and communication

☐

Customer care

☐

Timing

☐

Stereotypes and assumptions

☐

Cost

☒

Consultation and involvement

☐

Other, please specify

8a. Summary of Impacts:				
Equality Characteristic	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Neutral Impact	Description
AGE	X			Parents with children in the school at key stage 2, will not have to apply for a place into key stage 3 as their place will be automatic.
AGE	X			An additional 60 places will be made available for children aged between 4-11 within the Roundhay area.
AGE	X			Younger children will have access to a wide range of additional educational facilities by being able to access the site of the secondary provision.
AGE			X	Younger children's safety & wellbeing will be protected by locating primary provision on a satellite site.
DISABILITY			X	School will be built to DDA guidelines to ensure accessibility in and around the building for all.
RACE		X		Due to 60 places in year 7 being allocated to children already in the school at year 6, certain communities within Harehills who may have previously got a place at the school in year 7 may now find it difficult to get a place.

8b. Summary of stakeholders involvement:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initial briefing sessions with Headteacher, governing body and ward members. - Members of the assessment team who represent various services and partners are part of discussions and meetings throughout the process. - School employees and trade unions will be met during the consultation stage. - Parents and members of the community will be consulted via a public meeting.

8c. Summary of Potential barriers:		
Type of barrier/Issue	Action needed	Impact

Built environment	DDA guidelines adhered to.	Ensure accessibility for all
Information and Communication	A consultation document and public meeting will be used to convey the aims of the proposal to the wider community.	All relevant parties are able to express their views verbally and in written format.
Consultation and Involvement	Consultation documents available on request in other languages	All communities are consulted and are able to express their views on the proposal.

9. Does this activity bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)?	
<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Please provide detail: Creation of a 2fe primary in this area will mean that children's nearest school polygons will change potentially bringing different communities in contact with each other.	
Action required: None	

10. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another?	
<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Please provide detail: The nearest school boundaries would mean that children who are nearest to the primary school site would automatically get a place into secondary if they attended the primary school. The make up of the area around the primary school site is 50% white British and 50% BME. There is an area between Hovingham and Bankside where some of the children have been able to get a place at Roundhay High school in the past. However, the new primary site will not be their nearest primary school and therefore will find it difficult to get a place at Roundhay for secondary provision due to 60 places automatically allocated. The makeup of this area is 85% BME, 15% white British.	
Action required:	

11. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

Screening will help to determine the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration and whether an **impact assessment** will be required.

Directorate: Planning & Learning Environments	Service area: School Access Service
Lead person: Darren Crawley	Contact number: 0113 2243867

1. Title: Carr Manor through school
Is this a:

☐ **Strategy**
☐ **Policy**
☐ **Service**
☐ **Function**
☒ **Other**

Is this:

☒ New/proposed
 ☐ Already exists and is being reviewed
 ☐ Is changing

(Please tick one of the above)

2. Please provide a brief description of the policy/strategy/ service/function being screened:

- Main aim**
 To establish a through school as part of the current Carr Manor High school which will provide provision for 4 to 19 year olds. It is intended that Key stage 1 and 2 will be established in a new modular building on land near to Carr Manor High school.
- Purpose**
 To create an additional 2 forms of entry (60 places) primary provision within the Meanwood area to help manage the shortage of primary school places within this area and surrounding areas.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration
please tick the appropriate boxes

Question	Your answer
----------	-------------

Does your strategy, policy, service or function affect service users, employees or the wider community?	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Does your proposals relate to areas where there are known inequalities? (for example disabled peoples access to public transport, the gender pay gap, racist or homophobic bullying in schools, educational attainment of Gypsies and Travellers)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> No
If you have answered yes to either of the above go to question 4 If you have answered no to either of the above go to decision 3 in question 5	

4. Considering equality, diversity, cohesion and integration	
Are you including equality, diversity, cohesion and integration as part of considerations within your future planning. (you need to consider age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> No
If yes please provide details	

5. Screening decision	
Decision 1 – need to complete an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment... ...if you have answered yes to either or both questions in 3 and no to question 4 you will need to complete an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment.	
When will you complete the impact assessment?	Date:

Who will lead the impact assessment?	Name and job title:
--------------------------------------	---------------------

<p>Decision 2 – do not need to complete an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment...</p> <p>...if you have answered yes either or both questions in 3 and yes to question 4 you do not need to complete an impact assessment.</p>

<p>Decision 3 – do not need to complete an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment...</p> <p>...if you have answered no to either or both questions in 3</p>
Please provide details

Date screening completed	27 th October 2010
---------------------------------	-------------------------------

CARR MANOR THROUGH SCHOOL

Service Area: School Access Service	Team: School Organisation
Assessment prepared by: Darren Crawley	Contact number: 0113 2243867
Date of assessment: 8 th November 2010	

1. Summary of project that was assessed:

To create a through school providing community school provision for 4-18 year olds operating from 2 sites. The current Carr Manor High school will house key stage 3 and 4 pupils with key stage 1 and 2 pupils being located in a new modular building on land next to Carr Manor High school. The modular building will offer primary provision for 60 children in reception class, this will be in addition to the 60 places currently be offered at Carr Manor Primary. This school will not be linked to this proposal.

2. Summary of people/services involved with assessment:

An operational group has been setup to develop and work through proposals to expand school provision across the city as part of the School Places Strategy – Planning Learning Places in Leeds 2010-2013. This group consists of officers from various services within Education Leeds. These include: *School Organisation – Lesley Savage and Darren Crawley, PMIT – Heather Ross and Nev Smith, Estates Management – Steve Hoggart and Alex Macleod, Inclusion – Liz Lowes, School Improvement – Helen Kirwin, Extended Services – Dave Foxton, Early Years – Julia Manning.*

3. Research:

As part of the process to develop options, various research work is undertaken including:

- Analysis of birth data, looking at past trends
- Projections based on births and take-up, to determine whether there are enough school places within a particular area.
- Parental preference patterns.
- The types of schools within the area, does this offer choice and diversity?
- Research around BME to ensure these groups are not adversely affected.
- Ensure that we adhere to our legal duty of promoting choice and diversity.
- Communicating with schools and local members to gain a better understanding of the wider community
- Communicating with the community at a later stage of the process to obtain views.

7. Who may be affected by this project?

Equality characteristics

☒

Age

☒

Carers

☒

Disability

☐

Gender reassignment

☒

Race

☐

Religion
or Belief

☐

Sex (male or female)

☐

Sexual orientation

☐

Other

Stakeholders

☒

Services users

☒

Employees

☒

Trade Unions

☒

Partners

☒

Members

☐

Suppliers

☒

Other please specify: *Diocese, Neighbouring authorities*

Potential barriers.

☒

Built environment

☐

Location of premises and services

☒

Information
and communication

☐

Customer care

☐

Timing

☐

Stereotypes and assumptions

☐

Cost

☒

Consultation and involvement

☐

Other, please specify

8a. Summary of Impacts:				
Equality Characteristic	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Neutral Impact	Description
AGE	X			Parents with children in the school at key stage 2, will not have to apply for a place into key stage 3 as their place will be automatic.
AGE	X			An additional 60 places will be made available for children aged between 4-11 within the Meanwood area.
AGE	X			Younger children will have access to a wide range of additional educational facilities by being able to access the site of the secondary provision.
AGE			X	Younger children's safety & wellbeing will be protected by locating primary provision on a satellite site.
DISABILITY			X	School will be built to DDA guidelines to ensure accessibility in and around the building for all.

8b. Summary of stakeholders involvement:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initial briefing sessions with Headteacher, governing body and ward members. - Members of the assessment team who represent various services and partners are part of discussions and meetings throughout the process. - School employees and trade unions will be met during the consultation stage. - Parents and members of the community will be consulted via a public meeting.

8c. Summary of Potential barriers:		
Type of barrier/Issue	Action needed	Impact
Built environment	DDA guidelines adhered to.	Ensure accessibility for all
Information and Communication	A consultation document and public meeting will be used to convey the aims of the proposal to the wider community.	All relevant parties are able to express their views verbally and in written format.

Consultation and Involvement	Consultation documents available on request in other languages	All communities are consulted and are able to express their views on the proposal.
------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

9. Does this activity bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)?	
<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Please provide detail: Creation of a 2fe primary in this area will mean that children's nearest school polygons will change potentially bringing different communities in contact with each other.</p>	
<p>Action required: None</p>	

10. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Please provide detail:</p>	
<p>Action required:</p>	

12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person

12. Governance, ownership and approval State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment		
Name	Job Title	Date

13. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions (please tick)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	As part of Service Planning performance monitoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	As part of Project monitoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board Please specify which board
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify)

14. Publishing	
Date sent to Equality Team	
Date published	