

## **MELTON MOWBRAY AND VALE OF BELVOIR SCHOOL'S REVIEW**

### **MEETINGS HELD AT JOHN FERNELEY HIGH SCHOOL, MELTON**

**17<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2006**

#### **OFFICERS PRESENT – AT ALL THREE MEETINGS**

Gareth I Williams – Director of Children and Young People's Service  
Bob Dutton – Head of the Learning Environment Team  
David Atterbury – Education Officer (Business Development) Project Lead for the Melton and Vale of Belvoir Review  
Ann Morgan – Curriculum Adviser, Children and Young People's Service

#### **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE**

Ivan Ould C.C. - Lead Member for Children and Young People's Service  
Andrew Lawson – NASUWT (present at staff and governors meeting)  
Pauline Town – NUT (present for all three meetings)

Mr Graham Hart, Cabinet Support Member for Children & Young People's Service  
Mr Peter Roffey, C.C.  
(both present at the public and parents meeting only)

#### **TEACHERS' MEETING 4.00P.M.**

#### **NUMBERS PRESENT – 20 PLUS HEADTEACHER**

Gareth Williams welcomed everyone to the meeting, thanked them for attending and introduced the officers.

The presentation was then made.

Q	Is status quo an option?
A	There is a need to change and we have a unique opportunity to do so.£28.7 million could be spent many times all over Leicestershire, but has been targeted to this area.
Headteacher	Can you expand on training?
A	For most issues in schools we need to sit down and ask what is best for the kids and what is the best way to organise to minimise change. With regard to the teacher training issue, 3 Headteachers need to sit down and formulate a curriculum model.

Q	At 3 <sup>rd</sup> round will there be one option?
A	This will be a much more focussed process, to consider a preferred option, but it will be necessary to remind you of the other options on the table. We will listen to what is said before drawing a line under the process.
Q	In the Castle Rock example it is still 11-14 high school.
A	Yes but this was built for different reasons. Here the solution must be exciting and innovative, if schools do not fit this category then we will not get the funds. Different time, different reason, different criteria.
Q	What are the conditions to the funding?
A	The DfES is paying, this is a grant, we do not pay back their funding.
Q	Will the building work be completed in 2009?
A	Hopefully by 2010. Castle Rock is so important as it shows what excellent provision can be created in a relatively short space of time, and with sufficient funds.
Q	Parents don't want children to move around between schools.
A	We would not want children to be moving between schools so we need to look at blocking the curriculum to keep children within school.  Diplomas at 3 levels 3 GCSE at lower grades. Some sites at level 3. Between now and 2012 sites will develop much better.
Headteacher	Two key messages, its not school students/pupils. This is a long term project the effects of it will last 25 years. In collaboration and partnership when we get this it will be marvellous.

Meeting closed at 5.05pm

**GOVERNORS' MEETING AT 6.00P.M.**  
**NUMBERS PRESENT 11 + HEADTEACHER**

Gareth Williams welcomed everyone to the meeting, thanked them for attending and introduced the officers.

The presentation was then made.

Q	What would it be like for the Governing body to run a designer school?
A	The life span of a school is 40 years, John Ferneley was designed in the 60s'. Who knew what changes would happen then and who knows could happen in the next 50 years, there is no way of knowing. There is a finite amount of time for the consultation process. The next option choice needs to be fit for purpose.  The DfES expects an innovative and exciting solution. We know already from other schools, e.g. Bushloe that the new building is exciting and kids and teachers are motivated.
Q	I have an issue with Identity and belonging concept with Option C – the school will be so big.
A	I have no preferred view for any option.
Q	In Option B would a 6 <sup>th</sup> Form be attached?
A	Yes or no, this is still to be determined.
Q	If you have 80% agreement for one option, then why not go for that?
A	Its not a referendum, we are considering the weight of arguments in order to look at as many combinations as possible. We want full contributions from all especially the kids.  We need your comments so that we have a better understanding.
Headteacher	Governors want to be part of the future, and we want to make the best use of the funding.
A	We do not want to risk losing the funding. There is agreement through the Cabinet process for topping up from assets, but the only thing is if we can't meet timescales, then funding could be lost. We need to move forward to avoid the danger of missing out on funding.

The meeting closed at 7pm

**PARENTS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MEETING 7.30P.M.**  
**PARENTS PRESENT – 102**

Gareth Williams welcomed everyone to the meeting, thanked them for attending and introduced the officers.

The presentation was then made.

Gareth Williams	If you can give children more life chances to improve their skills through education this will be of benefit for the whole town.
Q	I don't like any of the options. Option C, a big school, wouldn't work. Option B – 3 separate schools, no it would cause problems between schools. Option A, i.e. separate post 16, 11-16 is a better option.
Q	I have a son in post 16 education in Brooksby. Myself and others, find the change at 14 disruptive  1) There is a need for a review to avoid transfer at 14 and a change to post 16 in Melton Mowbray.  2) How can it support the numbers, they would be unsustainable?  3) In Option B it will result in catchment areas impacting where a child goes to school with a 45 minute journey from one side of town to the other.
A	For four separate post 16 provisions – no, it would not work.  Post 16 must be modelled on Melton/Brooksby. Can't have everyone managing Post 16. It's a management responsibility to influence 11-16. There is a need for shared accountability – we will go into more detail at preferred option stage. We will not support an option that enables schools to abdicate responsibility for post 16. Separation would offer nothing.
Q	My two children are either side of 14. I have two questions.  1) Consideration for children either side of major change. Will it disrupt their education?  2) The choice of a 14-18/14-19 option is not there. Yes, we want provision locally and a broad breadth of curriculum – how? We need to choose a school and allow opportunity for specialisms. What will be the impact of specialist schools to catchments? We need choice vs. 11-14 and 14-19.

A	<p>The process of safeguards for children will take a lot of time and hours to develop We want to work with teachers on what to do next, and consider change management planning. Castle Rock staff could come and talk through what happened with their school if you wish.</p> <p>The final proposal will detail finance in terms of capital and revenue, catchment areas and other details. You need to tell us i.e. how long it takes to go to school, we need real people's experience at next round.</p>
Q	Option A and B decrease staffing levels. How can staffing be maintained to attract good teachers?
A	<p>One school could decrease, as the other grows, we may need to consider redeployment? We want to work with schools and make a detailed plan for children, to actually phase moving. We may keep a cohort in school and consider phased changes.</p>
Q	The parents/teachers at King Edward. Option B for 600, 800 students. How are you going to get staff across town, by moving them around?
A	<p>Deployment is a school issue. Heads can use blocking of the curriculum. This is a National issue, Kent for example, is using blocking.</p> <p>The new provision will support children better. Micro blocking is better for kids without teachers trailing around, if based on split sites. The current model can be changed. It is possible to go to Kent to see how it is done.</p>
Headteacher	<p>This consultation is all about what's best for now and the future.</p> <p>Its also about partnership and collaboration working together to meet the new curriculum requirements. So it is very very special.</p>

The meeting closed at 8.55pm.