

Scrutiny committee

Date: Thursday, 24 November 2016

Time: 16:30

Venue: Mancroft room

City Hall, St Peters Street, Norwich, NR2 1NH

All group pre-meeting briefing – 16:00 Mancroft Room

This is for members only and is not part of the formal scrutiny meeting which will follow at 16:30.

The pre-meeting is an opportunity for the committee to make final preparations before the start of the scrutiny committee meeting. The public will not be given access to the Mancroft room before 16:30.

For further information please contact:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Councillors:

Wright (chair)

Maguire (vice chair)

Bogelein

Bradford

Coleshill

Davis

Fullman

Grahame

Haynes

Malik

Manning

Packer

Peek

Committee officer: Lucy Palmer

t: (01603) 212416

e: lucypalmer@norwich.gov.uk

Democratic services

City Hall

Norwich

NR2 1NH

www.norwich.gov.uk

Information for members of the public

Members of the public and the media have the right to attend meetings of full council, the cabinet and committees except where confidential information or exempt information is likely to be disclosed, and the meeting is therefore held in private.

For information about attending or speaking at meetings, please contact the committee officer above or refer to the council's website.



If you would like this agenda in an alternative format, such as a larger or smaller font, audio or Braille, or in a different language, please contact the committee officer above.

Agenda

1 Apologies

To receive apologies for absence

2 Public questions/petitions

To receive questions / petitions from the public (notice to be given to committee officer in advance of the meeting in accordance with appendix 1 of the council's constitution)

3 Declarations of interest

(Please note that it is the responsibility of individual members to declare an interest prior to the item if they arrive late for the meeting)

4 Minutes

7 - 10

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2016

5 Work Programme 2016-17

11 - 32

Purpose - To agree items and how these will be scoped and prepared for the remaining meetings of 2016-17 and to agree timings and process for 2017-18

6 Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB) and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) update

33 - 42

Purpose - That members note the details outlined in this briefing report

7 Education and Social Mobility

43 - 88

Purpose - To consider the evidence gathered by this committee with the view to make recommendations.

Date of publication: **Wednesday, 16 November 2016**

- T** is this, the right **TIME** to review the issue and is there sufficient officer time and resource available?
- O** what would be the **OBJECTIVE** of the scrutiny?
- P** can **PERFORMANCE** in this area be improved by scrutiny input?
- I** what would be the public **INTEREST** in placing this topic onto the work programme?
- C** will any scrutiny activity on this matter contribute to the council's activities as agreed to in the **CORPORATE PLAN**?

Once the TOPIC analysis has been undertaken, a joint decision should then be reached as to whether a report to the scrutiny committee is required. If it is decided that a report is not required, the issue will not be pursued any further. However, if there are outstanding issues, these could be picked up by agreeing that a briefing email to members be sent, or other appropriate action by the relevant officer.

If it is agreed that the scrutiny request topic should be explored further by the scrutiny committee a short report should be written for a future meeting of the scrutiny committee, to be taken under the standing work programme item, so that members are able to consider if they should place the item on to the work programme. This report should outline a suggested approach if the committee was minded to take on the topic and outline the purpose using the outcome of the consideration of the topic via the TOPIC analysis. Also the report should provide an overview of the current position with regard to the topic under consideration.

By using the flowchart, it is hoped that members and officers will be aided when giving consideration to whether or not the item should be added to the scrutiny committee work programme. This should help to ensure that the scope and purpose will be covered by any future report. The outcome of this should further assist the committee and the officers working with the committee to be able to produce informed outcomes that are credible, influential with SMART recommendations.

Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound

Scrutiny committee and a protocol for those attending scrutiny

- All scrutiny committee meetings will be carried out in a spirit of mutual trust and respect
- Members of the scrutiny committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups
- Scrutiny committee members will work together and will attempt to achieve evidence based consensus and recommendations
- Members of the committee will take the lead in the selection of topics for scrutiny
- The scrutiny committee operates as a critical friend and offers constructive challenge to decision makers to support improved outcomes
- Invited attendees will be advised of the time, date and location of the meeting to which they are invited to give evidence
- The invited attendee will be made aware of the reasons for the invitation and of any documents and information that the committee wish them to provide
- Reasonable notice will be given to the invited attendee of **all** of the committees requirements so that these can be provided for in full at the earliest opportunity (there should be no nasty surprises at committee)
- Whenever possible it is expected that members of the scrutiny committee will share and plan questioning with the rest of the committee in advance of the meeting
- The invited attendee will be provided with copies of **all relevant** reports, papers and background information
- Practical arrangements, such as facilities for presentations will be in place. The layout of the meeting room will be appropriate
- The chair of the committee will introduce themselves to the invited attendee before evidence is given and; all those attending will be treated with courtesy and respect. The chair of the committee will make sure that all questions put to the witness are made in a clear and orderly manner

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**16:30 to 18:20****20 October 2016**

Present: Councillors Wright (chair), Maguire (vice chair) Bogelein, Bradford, Davis, Fullman, Grahame, Malik, Manning, Packer and Peek

Apologies: Councillors Coleshill and Haynes

Also present: Paul Dunning (Diocese of Norwich Education and Academies Trust) and Chris Hey (Norfolk County Council)

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Wright declared an 'other' interest in item 6 below as he was a governor at a Church of England school which was connected with Diocese of Norwich Education and Academies Trust (DNEAT).

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2016

3. Scrutiny committee work programme 2015 -2016

Members discussed the TOPIC process for putting an item onto the scrutiny committee work programme and the strategy manager confirmed that officers would do an initial check for an item against the TOPIC analysis and bring the item back to the next meeting.

Confirmation of the scope around the upcoming item on the neighbourhood model was requested from the committee. Members suggested that the report could include:

- How the public would be engaged in this - including what was being asked of residents, and what support would be available to them.
- How would the sustainability of initiatives that rely on volunteers be secured, for example ensuring resilience in the event of key individual residents disengaging/moving on
- How would councillors be involved?

- How would the resource allocated to the model reflect different patterns of deprivation in the city. For example, areas with more engaged citizens may have an excess of capacity whereas other areas may be less well-served

RESOLVED to:-

- 1) note the scrutiny committee work programme 2015 – 16; and
- 2) ask officers to consider the scope provided by members for the neighbourhood model item.

4. Consultation methods

The director of customers and culture presented the report and invited questions from members.

She said that the council was looking at ways of working digitally with the public and this included adding more self-service options to the website as well as researching automated processes for collecting email addresses of members of the public. Once this work had been completed, it could be used to email results of consultations to those who had responded to aid with transparency and accessibility for the public. By encouraging those who are able to access services online, it would leave more resources to help those who were not comfortable using online services.

In response to a member's question, the director of customers and culture said that having a panel of people scrutinising consultations could lead to small consultations becoming a very long process. This was used however for previous budget consultations and could be used again in the future.

Members discussed consultations around transportation and planning applications and that many applications were too far along in the planning process before the consultations began. The director of customers and culture said that transport issues were very complicated and Norfolk County Council had more responsibility for these than Norwich City Council.

RESOLVED to note the report on consultation methods.

5. Update of the representative on NHOSC

The representative gave a verbal update. He said that NHOSC had looked at a review of stroke services and that generally, there had been an improvement. In response to a member's question, he confirmed that the patient journey had been reviewed from the ambulance call through to rehabilitation.

Ambulance services had also been discussed and it was highlighted that there had been around a fifty percent increase in the number of calls to the ambulance service. Training for paramedics was under review with plans to phase the placements of trainees so that they were not all taken out of the service at one time and had to be covered by other staff.

RESOLVED to note the update from the NHOSC representative.

6. Educational outcomes for the young people of Norwich

The chair introduced the item and said it would be the next step of information gathering by the committee ahead of making recommendations at a future meeting.

Chris Hey, head of place, planning and organisation at Norfolk County Council introduced himself. He explained that his role was very much focused on forward planning, primarily around the provision of pupil places due to population growth. He said that the role of the local authority was to ensure there were sufficient school places, appropriate support for vulnerable learners and to facilitate a good education for every Norfolk learner. The academy system gathered accountability into the academy trust which was a key accountable body to the Secretary of State and not locally elected members which was a big shift. A new key role of regional schools commissioner had been set up which discharged the functions of the Secretary of State at a local level and would challenge underperformance for all schools in the area.

Paul Dunning introduced himself and explained his role as the CEO of the multi academy trust, DNEAT. He said that the Diocese of Norwich formed its own trust in response to the number of schools that were becoming academies. The trust had a number of schools choosing to join it and had some schools which had to become academies.

He said that all academy trusts were different and the Diocese of Norwich acted in a collaborative way. The board of trustees were responsible to the Secretary of State but devolved power throughout the local schools. The schools within the trust were grouped geographically with improvement officers working in each area. Driving up performance in primary schools was a large part of their focus. The groups met annually to report on performance.

DNEAT worked with the local community and had parent governors on their boards. There was a clear career development path for staff and they recognised the importance of empowering staff.

Chris Hey said that if a school were to fall into special measures, this would trigger a discussion with the local authority about finding an appropriate sponsor for the school and it transitioning into an academy. The system was designed to inject new governance at an underperforming school to drive improvements for a positive outcome.

In response to a member's question, Paul Dunning said that all schools needed high quality teachers. Academies did have more freedom around staffing than local authority schools with pay scales in place for unqualified teachers (usually those teaching vocational subjects). He said that recruiting teachers was a challenge across the country. DNEAT had recognised that many teaching assistants were talented graduates who could train on the job as long as the intention was to move them onto formal training.

(Councillor Peek left the meeting at this point)

Discussion ensued on exclusions and oversubscribed short stay schools. Paul Dunning said that there was just as much competition for main schools to produce good GCSE results. All schools wanted the best for their pupils and this had to be a collective responsibility. Free schools could add capacity for places and it would be helpful if more came forward.

Members discussed how academies would be financially held to account as they were also funded by tax payers. Paul Dunning said that any business dealings had to be declared in the academies' accounts (for example, if a person in a position of power in the academy were to sell its services from their own business) and a mechanism was in place to identify such incidents. The CEO of an academy trust was also the accounting officer and a report must be written and submitted on the academy's accounts. Chris Hey said that the public had to be satisfied with the checks and balances in place, however, the accounts were also subject to parliamentary scrutiny.

(Councillor Manning left the meeting at this point)

In response to a member's question, Chris Hey said that if a local authority school on county council owned land were to become an academy, the land must be transferred to the academy on a lease of 125 years. Any controls on this would have to be permitted by the Secretary of State.

(Councillor Malik left the meeting at this point)

Discussion ensued around the accountability of academy trusts to the local community. Chris Hey said that financial accountability was tracked through laws for charities and business finances and education outcomes were judged by Ofsted. Paul Dunning added that the role of the regional schools commissioner was created in response to the growth of academies and provided some local intelligence. Chris Hey said that local authorities had a legal right to commission new schools and suitable sponsors were appointed by the regional schools commissioner once an open competition for sponsors had concluded.

(Councillor Bogelein left the meeting at this point)

The chair thanked Chris Hey and Paul Dunning for attending and said that members would take the evidence gathered so far and form some recommendations at the next meeting of the scrutiny committee.

RESOLVED to note the evidence gathered on academies and educational outcomes

CHAIR

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 5

REPORT for meeting to be held on 24 November 2016

Work Programme for 2016-17

- Summary:** The purpose of this report is to provide an update to members on the items and gaps on the scrutiny work programme for the remainder of 2016-17 to support them in deciding what items to include and agree scopes for these. Also to agree a process for setting the work programme in 2017-18.
- Conclusions:** The draft work programme (appendix A) is accompanied by an assessment of previously suggested topics against the TOPIC criteria. It is proposed that any discussion is a whole committee discussion based on this documentation, to assist members in providing a clear scope for the items on future agendas to facilitate robust scrutiny.
- A timeline for setting the work programme is also proposed to ensure that there is a strong basis for the next year.
- Recommendation:** To agree items and how these will be scoped and prepared for the remaining meetings of 2016-17 and to agree timings and process for 2017-18.
- Contact Officer:** Adam Clark, Interim strategy manager,
01603 212273
adamclark@norwich.gov.uk
- Beth Clark, Scrutiny liaison officer
01603 212153
BethanyClark@norwich.gov.uk

Items for 2016-17

1. The attached Appendix A shows the work programme as it currently stands, with items that have been assigned to future meetings. Members are encouraged to discuss the scope for the following items based on the TOPIC assessments in Appendix B so that officers can undertake appropriate background work:

City Accessibility. This is currently scheduled for 23 February and the TOPIC assessment outlines what the scope of the item would be. Members are invited to comment on this and establish what background information they require, and which officers they would like to attend for the item.

Flooding. This is currently unallocated as more detail is required as per the TOPIC assessment. It is potentially too broad a subject to allow effective scrutiny. Members are therefore invited to provide clarification on their area of interest.

2. In addition the following item requires discussion to clarify the scope of the item and the process through which the committee members would like this issue to be considered. This discussion could cover the type of evidence needed by members and which stakeholders should be engaged:

Food poverty. This is currently allocated over two meetings on 23 February and 23 March

Process for developing work programme 2017-18

3. It is anticipated that the work programme for 2017-18 will be developed over several months from early 2017 as per the appended suggested timetable.
4. By evolving the work programme over several months, we hope to be able to support a more effective scrutiny process and ensure that members are provided with appropriate support material in a timely fashion.
5. Comment is invited on whether this timetable is the appropriate one for members.

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER, CABINET, PORTFOLIO HOLDER, COUNCILLOR, or ORGNISATION	SCOPE – REASON FOR TOPIC REQUEST and OUTCOME SOUGHT
30 June 2016	Market Consultation	Adrian Akester (Head of Citywide Services)	To update members on the outcomes of the consultation on Norwich Market.
30 June 2016	Grounds Maintenance Contract	Adrian Akester (Head of Citywide Services)	To gain clarification on whether efficiencies can be found in the budget regarding the Grounds Maintenance Contract.
30 June 2016	Publication of Traffic Regulation Orders	Phil Shreeve (Strategy manager)	To understand how the council will publicise information about Traffic Regulation Orders
30 June 2016	Quarter 4 Performance Review	Phil Shreeve (Strategy manager)	Identification of any causes for concern and note successes arising from this 6 monthly review of performance monitoring data
14 July 2016 MEETING CANCELLED	Communications and Consultation	Nikki Rotsos and portfolio holder (Cllr Waters)	The strategy manager circulated a briefing paper and the committee will look at this document at the meeting on 20 October.
14 July 2016 MEETING CANCELLED	Devolution	Phil Shreeve and Cllr Wright	To discuss the council's position on the proposed East Anglian devolution plan.
14 July 2016 Evidence gathering meeting	City Accessibility Tour	Andy Watt and Cllr Wright	This scrutiny committee meeting was cancelled and instead some members took part in a tour of the city looking at accessibility around the city. Access groups were also invited to attend, including RNIB and NNAB.

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER, CABINET, PORTFOLIO HOLDER, COUNCILLOR, or ORGNISATION	SCOPE – REASON FOR TOPIC REQUEST and OUTCOME SOUGHT
22 September 2016	Update from 21st July meeting of the Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Maguire, NHOSC councillor rep	For the committee to note the work of NHOSC and comment on any implications for Norwich residents for the rep to take back to the next NHOSC meeting.
22 September 2016	Update from 8th September meeting of the Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Maguire, NHOSC councillor rep	For the committee to note the work of NHOSC and comment on any implications for Norwich residents for the rep to take back to the next NHOSC meeting.
22 September 2016	Academies and education attainment	Cllr Wright, chair of scrutiny	To consider the current state of educational outcomes in Norwich with reference to changing school structures such as academies and free schools.
20 October 2016	Update from 13th October meeting of the Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Maguire, NHOSC councillor rep	For the committee to note the work of NHOSC and comment on any implications for Norwich residents for the rep to take back to the next NHOSC meeting.
20 October 2016	Educational outcomes for the young people of Norwich	Cllr Wright, chair of scrutiny	To consider the current state of educational outcomes in Norwich with reference to changing school structures such as academies and free schools.
20 October 2016	Consultation method	Nikki Rotsos (Director of customers and culture)	That the scrutiny committee notes the consultation process of the council and considers specific ways of enhancing this.

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER, CABINET, PORTFOLIO HOLDER, COUNCILLOR, or ORGNISATION	SCOPE – REASON FOR TOPIC REQUEST and OUTCOME SOUGHT
24 November 2016	Greater Norwich Growth Board and Local Enterprise Partnership	Dave Moorcroft (Director of regeneration and development)	A briefing paper about the 'current state of play' in regard to GNGB and LEP.
24 November 2016	Education and Social Mobility	James Wright	To provide members the opportunity to form recommendations following the evidence gathering meetings around academies at the September and October scrutiny committee meetings.
15 December 2016	Update from 8th December meeting of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Maguire, NHOSC councillor rep	For the committee to note the work of NHOSC and comment on any implications for Norwich residents for the rep to take back to the next NHOSC meeting.
15 December 2016	Corporate Plan Review	Adam Clark (Strategy manager)	To consider amendments to corporate performance KPIs
15 December 2016	Equality Information Report	Adam Clark (Strategy manager)	Pre scrutiny of the report before it goes to cabinet.
15 December 2016	Neighbourhood Model and ward councillors	Bob Cronk (Director of neighbourhoods)	Scrutinise the Neighbourhood Model to see how effective it is at delivering services to the communities.

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER, CABINET, PORTFOLIO HOLDER, COUNCILLOR, or ORGNISATION	SCOPE – REASON FOR TOPIC REQUEST and OUTCOME SOUGHT
26 January 2017	Pre scrutiny of the proposed budget	Justine Hartley (Chief finance officer)	To make suggestions to cabinet regarding the proposed budget's ability to deliver the council's overarching policy.
26 January 2017	Environmental Strategy – Yearly update on the progress statement	Richard Willson (Environmental strategy manager)	Identification of any issues to consider and note successes and progress reported in the progress statement.
26 January 2017	Update from 12th January meeting of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Maguire, NHOSC councillor rep	For the committee to note the work of NHOSC and comment on any implications for Norwich residents for the rep to take back to the next NHOSC meeting.
23 February 2017	Food Poverty	Boyd Taylor (Financial inclusion manager)	For the committee to identify and address the problem around food poverty in Norwich – evidence meeting.
23 February 2017	City Accessibility	Andy Watt	TBA
23 March 2017	Summary of Food Poverty meeting	Boyd Taylor (Financial inclusion manager)	Following the first food poverty meeting, this committee meeting will aim to identify solutions and resolutions to recommend to cabinet for consideration

DATE OF MEETING	TOPIC FOR SCRUTINY	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER, CABINET, PORTFOLIO HOLDER, COUNCILLOR, or ORGNISATION	SCOPE – REASON FOR TOPIC REQUEST and OUTCOME SOUGHT
23 March 2017	Annual Review of the Scrutiny Committee	Beth Clark and Cllr Wright	To agree the annual review of the scrutiny committee's work 2016 to 2017 and recommend it for adoption of the council

Unallocated items

Date TBC	Council's Flood Prevention Policy	Graham Nelson	TBA
----------	--	---------------	-----

Norwich City Council

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

City Accessibility

The topic of city accessibility has been put through the TOPIC process below:

Time

In light of recent changes to road layouts throughout the city, this would be a timely piece of work as development of the pedalways project continues and changes to crossings/traffic lights etc. are being rolled out.

There are numerous other road layouts throughout the city which have been altered recently

Objective

To make appropriate recommendations on how the council could ensure that people with visual impairments/disabilities can access the city safely and with confidence.

To explore the processes in place for engaging people with disabilities/visual impairments around changes to street scenes/crossings

Performance

It may be possible to improve both process and outcome in future transport/city development projects with scrutiny input

Following the Accessibility Tour which took place in July, ideas, ways to improve, and suggestions have already been put forward from members of the public via councillors

Interest

Public interest has already been proven regarding this piece of work – stakeholders and members of the public attended the city tour.

Stakeholders have requested more involvement in the consultation process.

Corporate plan

Safe, clean, low carbon city.

Fair city.

Value for money services.

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Flooding

The topic of flooding has been put through the TOPIC process below:

Time

Looking at Norwich City Council's role in flood prevention policy is timely owing to changes in county services which could exacerbate flooding throughout Norfolk. The scrutiny committee could therefore look at this how this could impact on Norwich and the role of services provided by the council

Objective

The objective is not currently clear. There are a range of activities undertaken by the city council which could impact on flood risk, either solely or in partnership with the Highways Agency. These include:

- Overall planning policy
- Addressing surface water arising from new development
- Dealing with surface water flooding on the highway
- Street maintenance (such as gully cleaning)

Some of these are primarily about prevention, and others are about responding to issues as they arise. Clarification is needed as to which of these areas are of interest to committee members.

Performance

In order to impact on council performance in any of the areas highlighted above, there would need to be a clear steer on the scope of this item. There would also need to be an understanding of the limits of the city council's role, given the significant roles played by other key stakeholders, such as the county council and Environment Agency.

Interest

Flooding would clearly have public interest in the event that it occurred, but we are not aware of any current evidence of a groundswell of interest in the issue locally.

Corporate plan

Safe, clean, low carbon city.

Healthy city with good housing

Work Programming for Scrutiny Committee 2017/2018

Stage 1 –February/March

- Initial discussion with members of scrutiny committee based on corporate plan and the forward agenda of the authority to identify potential topics
- Start writing the scrutiny annual report, using it an opportunity to evaluate previous performance and identity any follow-up work on previous reviews

Stage 2 – Late March

- On the basis of feedback, gather a long list of potential topics
- Consult appropriate officers on the long list
- Identify where some suggestions are duplicates/feed into each other
- Identify potential methodologies for suggested work, make assessment of likely resource implication
- Sign off the annual report at the March scrutiny committee meeting

Stage 3 – Early April

- Produce a shortlist
- Undertake TOPIC assessments of shortlisted pieces of working
- Draft schedule of items and projects

Stage 4 – May

- Sign-off of work programme at the scrutiny meeting
- Detailed work begins

Stage 5 – Mid-year

- Six month review (October/November) by the committee to gauge progress and suggest amendments
- Note the committee can review/amend Work Programme at every meeting as it is a standing item on every agenda

FORWARD AGENDA: CABINET and COUNCIL MEETINGS 2016 – 2017

ALLOCATED ITEMS						
Meeting	Report	Purpose	Portfolio holder + Senior Officer + Report author	Date report signed off by	Management clearance	Exempt?
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Revenue budget monitoring 2016/17 period 6	To update cabinet on the provisional financial position as at 30 September 2016, the forecast outturn for the year 2016-17, and the consequent forecast of the general fund and housing revenue account balances.	Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley	2 NOV	Justine Hartley	NO
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Capital budget monitoring 2016/17 quarter 2	To update cabinet on the financial position of the capital programmes as at 30 September 2016 and capital budget virements and seek approval for an adjustment to the 2016-17 capital programme.	Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley	2 NOV	Justine Hartley	NO
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Statement of Community Involvement - adoption	To seek approval for the adoption of a revised Statement of Community Involvement.	Cllr Bremner Graham Nelson Lara Emerson	2 NOV	Dave Moorcroft	NO
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Procurement of the housing gas heating servicing and repairs contract KEY DECISION	To inform cabinet of the procurement process for the re-provision of the housing gas servicing and repairs contract; and to seek approval to award the contract.	Cllr Harris Bob Cronk	2 NOV	Bob Cronk	NO
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Procurement of structural consultancy services for housing repairs KEY	To inform cabinet of the procurement process for structural consultancy services and to approve the placing of orders	Cllr Gail Harris Bob Cronk	2 NOV	Bob Cronk	NO

ALLOCATED ITEMS						
Meeting	Report	Purpose	Portfolio holder + Senior Officer + Report author	Date report signed off by	Management clearance	Exempt?
	DECISION					
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Development sites – KEY DECISION	To approve inclusion of site in the business plan of Norwich Regeneration Ltd	Cllr Stonard Gwyn Jones	2 NOV	Dave Moorcroft	NO
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Managing Assets	To approve the disposal of the land and property assets mentioned in this report.		2 NOV		YES (Para 3)
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Contract settlement – NEWS – KEY DECISION	To agree costs of excess contamination delivered to NEWS vis the recycling collections	Cllr Stonard Adrian Akester	2 NOV	Bob Cronk	YES (Para 3)
CABINET 16 NOV 2016	Appointment of external auditors	To propose arrangements for the appointment of the council's external auditors for 2018-19 and beyond.	Cllr Stonard Justin Hartley	2 NOV	Laura McGillivray	NO
COUNCIL 29 NOV 2016	Appointment of external auditors	To approve arrangements for the appointment of the council's external auditors for 2018-19 and beyond	Cllr Stonard Justin Hartley		Laura McGillivray	NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	Quarter 2 2016-17 Performance report	To report progress against the delivery of the corporate plan priorities and key performance measures for quarter 2 of 2016-17	Cllr Alan Waters	30 NOV	Laura McGillivray	NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	City Hall clock tower	To inform cabinet of the procurement process for the repairs to City Hall clock tower and to ask for delegated approval to place the orders	Carol Marney	30 NOV		NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	Revenue budget monitoring 2016/17 period 7		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley	30 NOV	Justine Hartley	NO
CABINET	Treasury management		Cllr Mike Stonard	30	Justine	NO

ALLOCATED ITEMS						
Meeting	Report	Purpose	Portfolio holder + Senior Officer + Report author	Date report signed off by	Management clearance	Exempt?
14 DEC 2016	mid-year review 2016/17		Justine Hartley	NOV	Hartley	
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	Municipal Bonds Agency borrowing framework		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley	30 NOV	Justine Hartley	NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	Anti-fraud, whistleblowing and anti-money laundering policies		Cllr Stonard Justine Hartley	30 NOV	Justine Hartley	NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	Procurement of repairs to City Hall clock tower KEY DECISION	To inform Cabinet of the procurement process for the repairs to City Hall clock tower and to ask for delegated approval to place the orders	Cllr Stonard Andy Watt	30 NOV	Andy Watt	NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	CIL Neighbourhood funding	To approve CIL neighbourhood funded projects for 2017-18	Cllr Stonard Gwyn Jones	30 NOV	Dave Moorcroft	NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	Greater Norwich Investment Plan KEY DECISION	To agree on the inclusion of projects in the 2017-18 Greater Norwich Investment Plan	Cllr Waters Dave Moorcroft	30 NOV	Dave Moorcroft	NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	Procurement of support services for the annual programme of events delivered by Norwich City Council – KEY DECISION	To award the event support services to a framework of suppliers	Cllr Roger Ryan Helen Selleck Lewis Cook	30 NOV	Nikki Rotsos	NO
CABINET 14 DEC 2016	Appropriation of Land for Planning Purposes	To seek approval for the appropriation of housing land for planning purposes, which will enable this site to be developed for affordable housing.	Cllr Bremner Andy Watt Andrew Turnbull	30 NOV	Dave Moorcroft	YES (Para 3)

ALLOCATED ITEMS						
Meeting	Report	Purpose	Portfolio holder + Senior Officer + Report author	Date report signed off by	Management clearance	Exempt?
CABINET 18 JAN 2017	Revenue budget monitoring 2016/17 period 8	To provide an update on the provisional financial position, the forecast outturn for the year and the consequent forecast of the general fund and housing revenue account balances.	Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley	4 JAN	Justine Hartley	NO
CABINET 18 JAN 2017	Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2017/18 (post consultation)	To follow	Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley	4 JAN	Justine Hartley	NO
CABINET 18 JAN 2017	Risk management report	To follow	Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley	4 JAN	Justine Hartley	NO
CABINET 18 JAN 2017	Corporate plan and performance	To consider amendments to corporate performance KPIs	Cllr Waters Adam Clark	4 JAN	Laura McGillivray	NO
CABINET 18 JAN 2017	Procurement of the installation of thermodynamic hot water systems to social housing properties - KEY DECISION	To award the contract of the installation of thermodynamic hot water systems to social housing properties	Cllr Gail Harris Jay Warnes Steve Cleveland	4 JAN	Anton Bull	NO
CABINET 18 JAN 2017	Mutual exchange incentive – way forward	To consider a change to the current mutual exchange incentive scheme that Norwich City Council currently offers in order to make it more cost-effective and to help the most vulnerable.	Cllr Gail Harris Phyllida Molloy Grant Lockett	4 JAN	Bob Cronk	NO
COUNCIL 24 JAN 2017	Member's allowances	To receive recommendations on member's allowances from the independent panel.	Cllr Stonard Anton Bull Andy Emms	20 JAN	Anton Bull	NO
COUNCIL	Council Tax Reduction		Cllr Mike Stonard	20	Justine	

ALLOCATED ITEMS						
Meeting	Report	Purpose	Portfolio holder + Senior Officer + Report author	Date report signed off by	Management clearance	Exempt?
24 JAN 2017	Scheme 2017/18		Justine Hartley	JAN	Hartley	
COUNCIL 24 JAN 2017	Municipal Bonds Agency borrowing framework		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley	20 JAN	Justine Hartley	
CABINET 8 FEB 2017	Revenue budget monitoring 2016/17 period 9		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
CABINET 8 FEB 2017	Capital budget monitoring 2016/17 quarter 3		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
CABINET 8 FEB 2017	General fund revenue budget 2017/18 and capital programme 2017/18 to 2021/22		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
CABINET 8 FEB 2017	Housing rents and budgets 2017/18		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
CABINET 8 FEB 2017	Treasury management strategy 2017/18		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
COUNCIL 21 FEB 2017	General fund revenue budget 2017/18 and capital programme 2017/18 to 2021/ 22		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
COUNCIL 21 FEB 2017	Housing rents and budget 2017/18		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	

ALLOCATED ITEMS						
Meeting	Report	Purpose	Portfolio holder + Senior Officer + Report author	Date report signed off by	Management clearance	Exempt?
COUNCIL 21 FEB 2017	Treasury management strategy 2017/18		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
COUNCIL 21 FEB 2017	Corporate plan and performance	To consider amendments to corporate performance KPIs and corporate plan documentation	Cllr Waters Adam Clark		Laura McGillivray	NO
CABINET 15 MAR 2017	Revenue budget monitoring 2016/17 period 10		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
CABINET 15 MAR 2017	Proposed right off of bad debt		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	
CABINET 15 MAR 2017	Grant of right to buy one for one receipts		Cllr Mike Stonard Justine Hartley		Justine Hartley	

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Scrutiny Request	Outcomes or current position
11 June 2015	The council's consultation process	Nikki Rotsos	For a briefing paper to be circulated, for scrutiny members to gain an overview and understanding of the council's current work in this area.	This item is provisionally allocated to be reviewed by the committee on 14 July 2016
15 October 2015	Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015 – 2016	James Wright	Discussion of income generation led to the suggestion of involving cooperatives in this work. Idea to hold a half-day seminar for senior staff and officers to provide clarification around the way in which they work	The cooperatives item is being progressed by the strategy manager and Cllr Herries for a future scrutiny committee meeting – date tbc. It was also agreed that workshops would be held to update members.
12 November 2015	Community Space Review	Bob Cronk	It was agreed a website containing a centralised tool for room bookings across all community centres would worthwhile	A central online booking system is something that has previously been explored with the volunteer management committees/community associations that operate the council's community centres. A centralised tool would provide some positive benefits but not all of the centres use IT regularly. The new community centres website could be used as a basis for this and further development work with the centres has been proposed linking this proposal with the council's digital inclusion activity. The majority of the centres still work with a paper booking system and taking forward a web based system would require endorsement from the centres but something the council can encourage and will continue to do so, building on those centres that do use web tools.
17 December 2015	*Transformation Update	Bob Cronk	Discuss with the communications team about publishing the changes to the Housing and Planning Bill	Members can find an update on the Housing and Planning Act on the Local Government Information Unit website: http://www.lgiu.org.uk/briefing/housing-and-planning-bill-update/

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Scrutiny Request	Outcomes or current position
17 December 2015	Quarter 2 performance monitoring 2015 – 2016	Andy Watt	The homelessness strategy shows that Norwich is way below the average with regards to preventing homelessness by keeping people in their own homes. How does this relate to the target of preventing homelessness? Would it be worth having a new target to help increase the number of people staying in their own home?	Members can find an update on e-councillor
28 January 2016	Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015 – 2016	James Wright	Ask the chair to provide members with an update on the cooperatives briefing	The cooperatives item is being progressed by the strategy manager and Cllr Herries for a future scrutiny committee meeting – date tbc. It was also agreed that workshops would be held to update members.
25 February 2016	Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee	Phil Shreeve	Ask the strategy manager to contact the chair of the CCG to see which consultations on planned changes to commissioning intentions may be able to be made available via e-councillor	A discussion has been held and further options looked at once the CCG have looked again at their consultation and engagement processes
	Council policies for the control of verge parking and A boards	Andy Watt	Contact all schools in the Norwich City Council area for a copy of their travel plan to collect data on how children travel to school	Members can find information here: <u>\\Sfil2\Shared Folders\Transport and infrastructure\Transport planning\School Travel\School Travel Plans\School Travel Plans (2016)</u>
		Andy Watt	Liaise with the communications team and place an article in Citizen magazine to promote best practise around verge parking	The communications team have confirmed that the article has been written, signed off and filed ready for the summer issue (which is circulated from June 6 th)

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Scrutiny Request	Outcomes or current position
17 March 2016	Push the Pedalways	Jo Deverick	Percentage of roads that are 20mph on the pink pedalway	<p>West area (around The Avenues), including North Park Avenue. 10763 metres (10.8 kilometres)</p> <p>- Britannia Road (includes part of Gurney Road and Vincent Road). 1284 metres (1.3 kilometres)</p> <p>- East area (Heartsease). 12401 metres (12.4 kilometres)</p> <p>Areas that have been approved and designed as part of the CCAG1 but will be installed as part of the CCAG2</p> <p>- City centre - the new areas of 20mph. This includes all new areas within the old city walls and a small area north of Barrack Street. 23738 metres (23.8 kilometres)</p> <p>More information about the benefits of 20 mph areas please look on Norwich City Council website under the Cabinet Committee papers section from March 9th meeting.</p>
		Jo Deverick	Members asked for verification of the width of the contraflow cycle path of Essex Street	Ongoing
		Phil Shreeve	Understand the health benefits of the pedalway scheme and benefits for 20mph zones	<p>Benefits of 20mph zones -</p> <p>http://www.britac.ac.uk/policy/health_inequalities.cfm</p>

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Scrutiny Request	Outcomes or current position
17 March 2016	Push the Pedalways	Phil Shreeve		Benefits of physical activity - http://www.ukactive.com/turningthetide/ https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/everybody-active-every-day-a-framework-to-embed-physical-activity-into-daily-life
26 May 2016	Setting of the Scrutiny Committee Work Programme	Phil Shreeve	Members asked for information about the publication of Traffic Regulation Orders	The service is looking at getting TROs online as soon as resource enables it to happen.
30 June 2016	Quarterly performance report	Phil Shreeve	With reference to measure PVC4 (number of new business start-ups) members requested further information, in particular what would happen if a new business were to close?	The Economic development officer – ‘The figure was gross, it measures new businesses which have started with support from local business support agencies. It is not a measure of active businesses which is a net figure i.e .new businesses + existing businesses – business closures. This measure is available from official statistics but is subject to a 2 year time lag which is why it is not used as a performance measure, it is not timely enough. The measure does not include business closures’
30 June 2016	Update on the Norwich Market Consultation	Adrian Akester	The scrutiny committee to explore the possibility of 1. for a bus route to take in the market place via Saint Peters Street; and, 2. to improve sign posting from existing bus stops to the market (particularly on Castle Meadow)	The head of city development responded, ‘1) is a matter for the county council as they are the passenger transport authority. From the knowledge I do have it is very unlikely to be viable and also a single bus route is only going to be of use for a small proportion of the population. As Scrutiny Committee notes the nearest main bus stops are at Castle Meadow. The market is already signed from Castle Meadow (at the junction with Davey Place). To

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Scrutiny Request	Outcomes or current position
				provide more signs as requested under 2) would be costly, however there is no budget for this, nor for future maintenance. Such provision could only therefore be justified based on well researched marketing advice of which I am unaware. Additional signs would also add to street clutter.
22 September 2016	Switch and Save		For members to better understand the Switch and Save process	It was agreed that the best way to implement this would for the scrutiny committee to attend an all member briefing on this topic

Norwich City Council

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

ITEM 6

REPORT for meeting to be held on 24 November 2016

Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB) and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) update

Summary:

This report provides an update on the current activities of the Greater Norwich Growth Board and the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP). The main items covered in the report include:-

- Greater Norwich Growth Board
- GNGB Governance
- Community Infrastructure Levy
- Funding agreement for the Northern Distributor Road
- Key achievements
- Current progress on the Greater Norwich Local plan
- New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership

Conclusions:

The report summarises the background to this topic and work currently being progressed to provide committee with a briefing on the current workstreams and activities of the Greater Norwich Growth Board and the New Anglia Local enterprise partnership as they relate to Norwich

Recommendation: Members note the details outlined in this briefing report

Contact Officer David Moorcroft- Director of regeneration and development 01603 212225

Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB)

Background

1. In November 2013, cabinet approved the dissolution of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) and the establishment of a growth board for the Greater Norwich area.
2. Cabinet agreed the Greater Norwich Growth Board governance and to recommend to council to pool Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in March 2014.
3. The joint working through the Greater Norwich Development Partnership provided the policy framework (the Joint core strategy) which sets out the commitment to deliver 37,000 new homes and 27,000 new jobs over the period 2008 - 2026 and this is now in place. Alongside this the Norwich Area Transportation (NATS) strategy (now Transport for Norwich) provides a coordinated approach to transportation across the whole area. The work across Greater Norwich is now in delivery phase, for which the Greater Norwich Growth Board is responsible. The growth board enables continued collaborative working across greater Norwich in the context of the approved City Deal arrangements.

Governance

4. Principles of constitution are that meetings are in public and a consensus is required to make decisions which are approved by individual local authorities.
5. The governance of the growth board is based on the following principles:
 - (a) The board will be led by local authority and LEP representatives and will have the scope to include other key partners (either as voting or non-voting members).
 - (b) The board membership (with substitutes) will be the leaders/cabinet members (or equivalent) of each of the four councils together with business representative from the New Anglia LEP Board.
 - (c) Meetings of the board will be held in public and administrative arrangements for meetings will be the same as those of the local authority undertaking this task.
 - (d) The work of the growth board will be the subject of scrutiny by the individual authorities.
 - (e) Decision making will be by a consensus of all voting members of the board.
 - (f) An annual business plan, to be agreed by the constituent local authorities, will provide the framework for the work of the board.
 - (g) On financial matters, the scope of decision making will be determined by the business plan.
6. The board will have the following broad remit. It will:

- (a) provide a co-ordinated approach to the delivery of jobs, homes and infrastructure across the area
- (b) provide a link to the LEP wide work on skills and business support through representation on LEP wide boards responsible for skills and business support
- (c) Provide a delivery body for the LEP at a local level
- (d) be responsible for the delivery of the business plan (the annual programme of delivery)
- (e) have primary responsibility for coordinating the delivery of strategic infrastructure (greater Norwich Growth Board Investment Fund) and oversee the management of the local infrastructure fund
- (f) Provide project management of investment programmes and monitor progress of delivery and spend including reviewing the programme risks and risk mitigation measures
- (g) Secure the co-operation of the parties
- (h) Identify, lobby for, secure and coordinate funds.
- (i) In future this may also include the formulation of future planning documents and the discharge for the duty to co-operate on planning matters

Local infrastructure fund

- 7. £20M borrowing was approved through the City Deal at reduced public works loan board rates. This is to establish a local infrastructure fund to be made available to developers of sites which have infrastructure constraints. The intention is to bring forward sites for development more quickly.

Greater Norwich Growth Board Investment Fund

- 8. The purpose of the Infrastructure Investment Fund is to deliver the capital programme of projects identified in the Joint core strategy (JCS) and the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP). These include but are not restricted to:
 - (a) Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS), including the Northern Distributer Road (NDR)
 - (b) Long Stratton Bypass
 - (c) Schools
 - (d) Green Infrastructure
 - (e) Community Space

(f) Libraries

(g) Sports Provision

9. Broadland, Norwich City, South Norfolk and Norfolk County Councils, and New Anglia LEP will produce a joint business plan that will include the infrastructure requirements across the three districts and will prioritise the projects to be delivered. The business plan will require prior approval by the council and will be revisited on an annual basis.
10. The GNGB has previously identified funding from a variety of sources including planning obligations under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, Government departments and agencies and the CIL. Apart from CIL the other sources of funding can be aligned with specific projects. The funding will remain fluid as new sources will undoubtedly come on stream in future.
11. Current forecasts indicate that for the period to 2025/26 a total of £25.213M CIL income will be generated from development in Norwich.

CIL Business Planning

12. CIL business plans are approved by cabinet/council on an annual basis.
13. In July 2015 cabinet and council considered the draft Norwich Business plan for 2016-7 (setting out infrastructure projects for Norwich to be funded from the pooled Infrastructure Investment Fund) and recommended that it be presented to GNGB for inclusion in the greater Norwich growth programme.

2016-7 Annual Growth Programme

14. The proposed Annual Growth Programme is formed from project information provided in the three Annual Business Plans. The draft Growth Programme has been developed so that projects put forward for inclusion:
 - (a) benefit the growing community and/or the wider economy of the Greater Norwich area;
 - (b) have investigated and secured appropriate match funding (where available);
 - (c) are deliverable (either in whole or in part) during 2016/17; and
 - (d) have been identified as strategic priorities by the relevant working groups and governance structures.
15. Tables 2 and 3 list the projects promoted in the Annual Business Plans and detail those recommended to be endorsed for inclusion in the proposed 2016/17 Growth Programme and those recommended to be endorsed in-principle for subsequent years. Table 4 shows projects recommended to be endorsed for inclusion in the 2016/17 Growth Programme, however these projects do not require funding from the Infrastructure Investment Fund in 2016/17.

Table 2: Projects proposed for inclusion/funding in 2016/17	
<i>Scheme</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
Diamond Centre – £1m loan funding	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme – subject to exploration and finalisation of borrowing terms etc.
St Faiths to Airport Industrial Estate link road - £500k (16/17) and £500k (17/18)	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 and 17/18 Growth Programme – subject to outcome of current feasibility work.
Chartwell Road/Denton Road to School Lane Toucan Crossing £120k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Programme
Golden Ball St – (up to) £500k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme – subject to detailed costings work and exploration of private sector funding opportunities.
Heathgate Pink Pedalway- £150k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme.
Carrow Bridge to Deal Ground cycle path - £100k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme.
Colney River Crossing - £150k	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme.

Table 3: Endorsed in-principle, subject to further work	
<i>Scheme</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
Long Stratton Sports Hub - £500k	Endorse in-principle for inclusion in 17/18 Growth Programme – subject to additional funding

	becoming available and further site planning
Castle Gardens - £150k	Endorse in-principle for inclusion in 17/18 Growth Programme – subject to securing additional funding
Wensum Strategy Phase 1 - £200k	Endorse in-principle for inclusion in 17/18 and 18/19 – subject to further scheme development via the Wensum Strategy.
Marriott's Way Phase 3 - £365k	Endorse in-principle for inclusion in 17/18 and 18/19 – subject to further scheme development via the Marriott's Way Strategy

Table 4: Strategic projects supported by borrowing	
<i>Scheme</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
Northern Distributor Road - £40m	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme. First call on pooled CIL Infrastructure Investment Fund anticipated 2017/18.
Long Stratton Bypass - £10m	Endorse for inclusion in 16/17 Growth Programme. Reaffirm commitment to use borrowing powers to ensure timely delivery. Further work on phasing and timing to be undertaken
The GNGB has access to a further £10m of borrowing via the City Deal. These funds may be used for a range of infrastructure projects, including transportation infrastructure in the city centre.	

Northern Distributor Road Funding Agreement (NDR)

16. The Northern Distributor Road funding agreement was approved by council on 29 September 2015. This gave authorisation to use future CIL revenues to fund costs associated with the delivery of the Norwich (NDR).
17. The NDR will improve connectivity and accessibility across both the northern part of the Norwich urban area and areas of the county in an arc from the northwest to the east of this main urban area. Such improvement will ease the relative disadvantage of the peripheral location of these areas and provide the basis of the transport infrastructure required to address existing and future problems, and to achieve the growth objectives which have been identified for Norwich and its surrounding area.
18. The NDR is an essential piece of transport infrastructure that releases an estimated £1bn of economic benefits for Norwich and Norfolk by reducing congestion and offering new access to key strategic employment and growth locations.

Achievements

19. In 2014/15 and 2015/16 the council has received a total of £410,203.59 of funding from pooled CIL for projects in Norwich. Projects include- Danby Wood, Marston Marsh, Riverside Walk (Oasis), Marriott's Way, Earlham Millennium Green. In addition the LEP are providing £11.076M of Local Growth Fund towards Transport for Norwich for the 4 years 15/16 to 18/19. It is being used on a wide variety of projects including the Golden Ball Street project, part of the blue pedalway and the Sweetbriar Roundabout improvement.

Greater Norwich Local Plan

20. Norwich City Council, Broadland District Council, and South Norfolk Council, working with Norfolk County Council, have agreed to work together to prepare the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP). The GNLP will build on the long-established joint working arrangements for Greater Norwich, which have delivered the current Joint Core Strategy for the area.
21. A number of factors will play an important role in developing the GNLP. The GNLP will need to plan positively for jobs, homes, prosperity and environmental improvements. The existing pattern of development and planned growth in existing local plans will have a major influence. Nationally, there is a much stronger emphasis on ensuring delivery, and in particular the need to increase housing development. Locally, since preparation of the JCS, significant investment in transport infrastructure has been delivered or committed, including 'Norwich in 90', the NDR, A11 and A47 improvements, and cycling and public transport infrastructure. Monitoring suggests that jobs have grown strongly since a low point in 2011 and a number of initiatives are being pursued to grow the local economy.
22. The JCS plans for the housing and jobs needs of the area to 2026 and the GNLP will ensure these needs continue to be met to 2036. The Central Norfolk Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which was published in January 2016, concludes that approximately 12,000 new houses, over and above existing planned growth, will need to be delivered in the Greater Norwich area over the period to 2036. The GNLP is a new plan which will eventually replace the JCS and the districts' site specific documents; as part of this process a new set of plan objectives need to be established. These objectives will assist in developing the vision for the plan in due course, and will also contribute to policy making and form the basis for monitoring the plan.
23. A Call for Sites was undertaken between 16 May and 8 July 2016. Approximately 500 sites have been submitted. Whilst the call was for sites across the full range of uses, including 'Local Green Spaces', the submissions have predominantly been for additional housing or housing-led development. Additional employment land has been put forward in key locations, including further land at Norwich Research Park, and the majority of larger-scale proposals have suggested mixed uses (i.e. housing and employment with supporting infrastructure and open space).

24. Whilst the submitted sites are widely distributed across the Greater Norwich area, very few new sites have come forward within the Norwich City Council area itself, reflecting the fact that a large number of brownfield sites within the city are already permitted or allocated for redevelopment and very limited greenfield opportunities remain. Unsurprisingly the Norwich sites are being promoted for a range of housing, employment and commercial uses. However it is noticeable that the few significant housing proposals in Norwich are already committed sites, some of which are being proposed higher densities.

GNLP Governance

25. To oversee the preparation of the new Local Plan the authorities involved have re-established their joint working arrangements under the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP). The chair of the GNDP board is Councillor Shaun Vincent, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Broadland District Council and the vice chair is Cllr Alan Waters, Leader of Norwich City Council.
26. The GNDP will exercise political leadership for the planning activities carried out jointly by the Greater Norwich Local Planning Authorities. This group is made up of three members from Broadland district council, Norwich city council, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County council and a member from the Broads authority. The group is supported in its role by the Director level representation from each Local authority and a series of advisors who will be seconded into the group when necessary. Meetings of the GNDP will be held in public.

New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP)

Background and Governance

27. New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership was established by Government in 2010 as a business-led collaboration between the private, public and education sectors across Norfolk and Suffolk to deliver economic growth. The New Anglia LEP area covers a population of around 1.6 million people and 55,000 businesses.
28. Established as a company limited by guarantee in 2011, the New Anglia LEP's published Articles of Association explain its purpose, duties and responsibilities. Governed by a board of directors and supported by an executive team, the LEP publishes information about governance, finances and decisions on its website including minutes from board meetings, year-end accounts and a register of directors' interests to aid transparency.
29. The LEP is also required by government to develop an annual Assurance Framework; this sets out governance and arrangements for the delivery of programmes and projects as well as relationships with partners, other LEPs and all local authorities.
30. New Anglia Board (Norwich members highlighted in bold text)

Chair: Mark Pendlington, a Group Director at Anglian Water.
Doug Field, Joint Chief Executive, East of England Co-op
Mark Goodall, Area Manager, Aker Solutions (energy sector)

Jeanette Wheeler, Partner, Birketts LLP

Steve Oliver, Chairman, MLM Group

Lindsey Rix, Managing Director, Personal Lines, Aviva

Davina Tanner, Chief Executive and Founder of Britannia Enterprises

Dr Tim Whitley, Managing Director, Research and Innovation, BT

Cllr David Ellesmere, Leader, Ipswich Borough Council

Cllr Andrew Proctor, Leader, Broadland District Council

Cllr John Griffiths, Leader, St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Cllr Cliff Jordan, Leader, Norfolk County Council

Cllr Colin Noble, Leader, Suffolk County Council

Cllr Alan Waters, Leader, Norwich City Council

Dr Nikos Savvas, Principal, West Suffolk College

Professor David Richardson, Vice-Chancellor, University of East Anglia

Key priorities for the LEP

31. The LEP publishes a Strategic Economic Plan which sets out how its target of creating 95,000 more jobs, 10,000 new businesses and 117,000 more homes by 2026 will be achieved. Key areas of activity are:
32. Transport - major projects delivered through the New Anglia Local Transport Body, made up of transport stakeholders across the region including the Department for Transport, Abellio Greater Anglia, Port of Felixstowe and Norwich International Airport as well as the counties, local authorities and Chambers of Commerce.
33. Probably the most notable successes in terms of transport are the Great Eastern Rail Campaign for investment on the Norwich to London main line, funding to support the Norwich Distributor Road and the dualling of the A11 at Elveden.
34. Skills - creating jobs is a priority for LEPs and central to this is the need to have a highly skilled workforce. Through the New Anglia Skills Board, brings together business, education, sector specialists and policymakers to help steer the skills agenda in Norfolk and Suffolk and build on the good work being undertaken by all partners. A Skills Manifesto was launched in 2013 (revised 2016) to detail how skills support will be delivered.
35. Business Support - New Anglia offers funding, advice and support across a range of funding programmes to support business growth from SMEs to start-ups. Funding also supports major infrastructure projects from flood defences to digital incubation hubs.
36. The LEP's flagship Growth Hub delivers free business advice and a range of grant schemes designed to support expansion and jobs growth. Grants are available between £1,000 and £500,000.
37. New Anglia LEP business support activity in Norwich includes:
 - (a) 533 Norwich businesses supported by the New Anglia Growth Hub

- (b) £405,467 Small Grants Scheme funding delivered to Norwich businesses, creating 98.5 jobs and £1.8m private sector leverage.
- (c) £1.22million Growing Business Fund monies allocated to Norwich businesses, creating 175 jobs and £7.2million in private sector leverage.
- (d) Norwich Area Transportation Strategy package of £7million improvements to roads in the city centre.
- (e) Norwich Aviation Academy £3m investment with the building on schedule to open in late 2016/17.
- (f) £1.6m loan to Pasta Foods to support expansion.
- (g) £80k loan to Norwich Airport for an in-depth feasibility study into further development opportunities.
- (h) £150k grant to Norwich Writers' Centre to support the development of Dragon Hall.
- (i) £250k grant to support UEA Enterprise Centre – 257 new jobs and 50 jobs by 2019
- (j) £200k grant to NUA to support 108 new businesses and 195 jobs by 2020
- (k) New Anglia Capital - £500k of the £1.26m invested to date has been invested in Norwich businesses:
- (l) £200k Ablatus Therapeutics is the first commercial spin-out from the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, which has a stake in the company, and builds on research which identified a more efficient way to treat growths and tumours in patients.
- (m) £250k EnLight (Signplay Ltd) provides a future-proof communications platform that is scalable and flexible enough to be used for a multitude of other intelligent city and Internet-of-Things applications.
- (n) £18k Rainbird
- (o) £25k Supapass

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 7

REPORT for meeting to be held on 24 November 2016

Education and social mobility

Summary:

This purpose of this item is to provide members the opportunity to form recommendations following the evidence gathering meetings around academies at the September and October scrutiny committee meetings.

Conclusions:

The committee has been provided with evidence from a variety of witnesses and should use this information to formulate recommendations on how the educational landscape may impact residents of Norwich.

Recommendation:

To consider the evidence gathered by this committee with the view to make recommendations.

Contact Officer:

Adam Clark – Interim strategy manager
Telephone (01603) 212273
Email adamclark@norwich.gov.uk

Bethany Clark – Scrutiny liaison officer
Telephone (01603) 212153
Email bethanyclark@norwich.gov.uk

Background

1. At the scrutiny committee meeting on 22 September 2016, a representative from the National Union of Teachers was invited to give evidence regarding academies and free schools and how the city of Norwich was affected.
2. On 20 October 2016, the committee invited two more witnesses to provide further evidence on the subject of academies and free schools. Representatives from DNEAT (the Diocese of Norwich Education and Academies Trust) and Norfolk County Council attended the meeting, and answered the committee's questions.
3. Following these meetings, members should use the information they have received to consider any recommendations.
4. Included in this report are the minutes of the meetings held on 22 September 2016 and 20 October 2016 and the CSN Policy Briefing: Schools that work for everyone.



SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16:30 to 18:04

22 September 2016

Present: Councillors Wright (chair), Maguire (vice chair), Bogelein, Bradford, Coleshill, Davis, Fullman, Grahame, Haynes, Malik, Packer and Peek.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Manning.

2. Public questions / petitions

There were no public questions or petitions.

3. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest

4. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2016

5. Scrutiny committee work programme 2016 - 2017

General discussion ensued around the work programme, where the following points were made:

- Members agreed that when any new subjects were brought forward for possible inclusion on the work programme, the TOPIC process must be properly applied every time.
- It was also agreed that the TOPIC process should also be applied retrospectively to all items on the work programme due before the scrutiny committee prior to Christmas.

- A future item was suggested for the January meeting: Flood prevention plan improvements. It was noted that this particular subject was very planning-oriented but applying the TOPIC process would see if any areas of this work were suitable for scrutiny. It was agreed that this could be fleshed-out and bought back to a future meeting.
- It was also agreed that a member briefing would be the best way for councillors to fully understand the Switch and Save process.
- A process was suggested for members to raise specific areas of interest by suggesting subjects to the scrutiny liaison officer for triage and suitable topics could then be moved on to officers to provide reports etc.

RESOLVED to:

1. review items currently on the work programme to ensure they meet the requirements set out in the TOPIC process;
2. flesh-out the subject of flood prevention plan improvements to be bought back to a future meeting; and,
3. draft a subject submission process involving the scrutiny liaison officer as a method of triaging potential new work programme items.

6. Evidence gathering – educational attainment and academies

The chair explained that part of the task of the scrutiny committee was to examine whether or not school structures influence later life achievements.

Scott Lyons, Joint Division Secretary for Norfolk NUT, introduced himself, explaining that he does work at an academy and spends four days in his NUT role. He also said that he had both at school and Academy experience.

The chair explained that the general secretary of the NUT had given an example of a free school in London where the spend per pupil was disproportionately large due to low pupil numbers.

Members expressed concerns regarding three schools; including those that had had previous debts wiped, thus allowing them to start with an advantage. One member questioned why funds used for wiping school debt could not be put into enabling a school to remain open instead of forcing it to become an academy.

Scott also echoed such concerns regarding accountability of free schools, although he did say that he hadn't dealt with many in his current role.

A member of the committee said that marketing of free schools have not lived up to expectations with many failing. He questioned whether such problems had a knock-on effect to higher schools and whether any safeguarding was in place should a free school file.

The chair pointed out the U-turn from the secretary of state regarding parent-governors, raising concerns that a local parent link had been lost when it comes to school governance and accountability.

Discussion ensued during which members made the following points:

- There was a lack of understanding as to how academies would be held accountable as it was felt that children's prospects and future livelihoods were at risk in the name of profit.
- It was considered that negotiation with national chains of academies would prove very difficult and it was not easy to understand where serious concerns could be raised.
- A greater understanding of what the city council could do to affect positive changes in this scenario was required - including a full understanding of what the current state of play with schools and academies meant for the future of Norwich as a whole.
- Greater insight would be required into the ways in which questions and concerns could be put in front of those people who made important school and academy-based decisions.
- Scott said that the media had been very helpful insofar as raising awareness that parents need to be challenging schools and academies directly.
- The idea of junior schools becoming primaries was also raised and it was felt that this had worked for a number of schools in Yarmouth particularly.
- Concerns were expressed regarding teachers fearing that if they spoke out or went on strike they would face the sack. Scott said that the NUT were aware of this scenario and had actually intervened in a number of such cases.
- Discussion took place regarding whether or not the county council could form a cooperative school as the co-op model seemed to have been successful elsewhere.

Scott said that he would be happy to answer for the questions in the future and welcome to the work of the scrutiny committee in examining schools and academies in the Norwich area.

RESOLVED to continue receive evidence at the October scrutiny committee meeting from further stakeholders.

7. Update of the representative for the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (verbal update)

The representative for the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee reported a growth in the number of unexpected deaths under the aegis of the mental health trust. He explained that the majority of these were suicides and that this trend had

been noticed by the trust. He said that the resulting investigation examined data and carried out interviews with people but it was felt that the report was inadequate.

He went on to say that families and service users had not been directly invited to take part in producing the report and had had to demand an input.

Members agreed that a formal request to the chair of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be submitted via the scrutiny officer. This should explain that the scrutiny committee believes that families and service users should be invited to participate in such important work.

RESOLVED for officers to provide instructions to scrutiny committee members to sign up for direct county council committee paper notifications.

CHAIR



SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16:30 to 18:20

20 October 2016

Present: Councillors Wright (chair), Maguire (vice chair) Bogelein, Bradford, Davis, Fullman, Grahame, Malik, Manning, Packer and Peek

Apologies: Councillors Coleshill and Haynes

Also present: Paul Dunning (Diocese of Norwich Education and Academies Trust) and Chris Hey (Norfolk County Council)

1. Declarations of interest

Councillor Wright declared an 'other' interest in item 6 below as he was a governor at a Church of England school which was connected with Diocese of Norwich Education and Academies Trust (DNEAT).

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2016

3. Scrutiny committee work programme 2015 -2016

Members discussed the TOPIC process for putting an item onto the scrutiny committee work programme and the strategy manager confirmed that officers would do an initial check for an item against the TOPIC analysis and bring the item back to the next meeting.

Confirmation of the scope around the upcoming item on the neighbourhood model was requested from the committee. Members suggested that the report could include:

- How the public would be engaged in this - including what was being asked of residents, and what support would be available to them.
- How would the sustainability of initiatives that rely on volunteers be secured, for example ensuring resilience in the event of key individual residents disengaging/moving on
- How would councillors be involved?

- How would the resource allocated to the model reflect different patterns of deprivation in the city. For example, areas with more engaged citizens may have an excess of capacity whereas other areas may be less well-served

RESOLVED to:-

- 1) note the scrutiny committee work programme 2015 – 16; and
- 2) ask officers to consider the scope provided by members for the neighbourhood model item.

4. Consultation methods

The director of customers and culture presented the report and invited questions from members.

She said that the council was looking at ways of working digitally with the public and this included adding more self-service options to the website as well as researching automated processes for collecting email addresses of members of the public. Once this work had been completed, it could be used to email results of consultations to those who had responded to aid with transparency and accessibility for the public. By encouraging those who are able to access services online, it would leave more resources to help those who were not comfortable using online services.

In response to a member's question, the director of customers and culture said that having a panel of people scrutinising consultations could lead to small consultations becoming a very long process. This was used however for previous budget consultations and could be used again in the future.

Members discussed consultations around transportation and planning applications and that many applications were too far along in the planning process before the consultations began. The director of customers and culture said that transport issues were very complicated and Norfolk County Council had more responsibility for these than Norwich City Council.

RESOLVED to note the report on consultation methods.

5. Update of the representative on NHOSC

The representative gave a verbal update. He said that NHOSC had looked at a review of stroke services and that generally, there had been an improvement. In response to a member's question, he confirmed that the patient journey had been reviewed from the ambulance call through to rehabilitation.

Ambulance services had also been discussed and it was highlighted that there had been around a fifty percent increase in the number of calls to the ambulance service. Training for paramedics was under review with plans to phase the placements of trainees so that they were not all taken out of the service at one time and had to be covered by other staff.

RESOLVED to note the update from the NHOSC representative.

6. Educational outcomes for the young people of Norwich

The chair introduced the item and said it would be the next step of information gathering by the committee ahead of making recommendations at a future meeting.

Chris Hey, head of place, planning and organisation at Norfolk County Council introduced himself. He explained that his role was very much focused on forward planning, primarily around the provision of pupil places due to population growth. He said that the role of the local authority was to ensure there were sufficient school places, appropriate support for vulnerable learners and to facilitate a good education for every Norfolk learner. The academy system gathered accountability into the academy trust which was a key accountable body to the Secretary of State and not locally elected members which was a big shift. A new key role of regional schools commissioner had been set up which discharged the functions of the Secretary of State at a local level and would challenge underperformance for all schools in the area.

Paul Dunning introduced himself and explained his role as the CEO of the multi academy trust, DNEAT. He said that the Diocese of Norwich formed its own trust in response to the number of schools that were becoming academies. The trust had a number of schools choosing to join it and had some schools which had to become academies.

He said that all academy trusts were different and the Diocese of Norwich acted in a collaborative way. The board of trustees were responsible to the Secretary of State but devolved power throughout the local schools. The schools within the trust were grouped geographically with improvement officers working in each area. Driving up performance in primary schools was a large part of their focus. The groups met annually to report on performance.

DNEAT worked with the local community and had parent governors on their boards. There was a clear career development path for staff and they recognised the importance of empowering staff.

Chris Hey said that if a school were to fall into special measures, this would trigger a discussion with the local authority about finding an appropriate sponsor for the school and it transitioning into an academy. The system was designed to inject new governance at an underperforming school to drive improvements for a positive outcome.

In response to a member's question, Paul Dunning said that all schools needed high quality teachers. Academies did have more freedom around staffing than local authority schools with pay scales in place for unqualified teachers (usually those teaching vocational subjects). He said that recruiting teachers was a challenge across the country. DNEAT had recognised that many teaching assistants were talented graduates who could train on the job as long as the intention was to move them onto formal training.

(Councillor Peek left the meeting at this point)

Discussion ensued on exclusions and oversubscribed short stay schools. Paul Dunning said that there was just as much competition for main schools to produce good GCSE results. All schools wanted the best for their pupils and this had to be a collective responsibility. Free schools could add capacity for places and it would be helpful if more came forward.

Members discussed how academies would be financially held to account as they were also funded by tax payers. Paul Dunning said that any business dealings had to be declared in the academies' accounts (for example, if a person in a position of power in the academy were to sell its services from their own business) and a mechanism was in place to identify such incidents. The CEO of an academy trust was also the accounting officer and a report must be written and submitted on the academy's accounts. Chris Hey said that the public had to be satisfied with the checks and balances in place, however, the accounts were also subject to parliamentary scrutiny.

(Councillor Manning left the meeting at this point)

In response to a member's question, Chris Hey said that if a local authority school on county council owned land were to become an academy, the land must be transferred to the academy on a lease of 125 years. Any controls on this would have to be permitted by the Secretary of State.

(Councillor Malik left the meeting at this point)

Discussion ensued around the accountability of academy trusts to the local community. Chris Hey said that financial accountability was tracked through laws for charities and business finances and education outcomes were judged by Ofsted. Paul Dunning added that the role of the regional schools commissioner was created in response to the growth of academies and provided some local intelligence. Chris Hey said that local authorities had a legal right to commission new schools and suitable sponsors were appointed by the regional schools commissioner once an open competition for sponsors had concluded.

(Councillor Bogelein left the meeting at this point)

The chair thanked Chris Hey and Paul Dunning for attending and said that members would take the evidence gathered so far and form some recommendations at the next meeting of the scrutiny committee.

RESOLVED to note the evidence gathered on academies and educational outcomes

CHAIR



Department
for Education

Schools that work for everyone

Government consultation

Launch date 12 September 2016

Respond by 12 December 2016

Contents

About this consultation	3
Who this is for	3
Issue date	3
Enquiries	3
Additional copies	4
The response	4
Respond online	4
Other ways to respond	4
Deadline	4
Introduction	5
The need for more good school places	9
Families who are just about managing	10
Independent schools	12
Case for change	12
Evidence	13
Proposals for reform	14
Universities	17
Case for change	17
Evidence	18
Proposals for reform	18
Selective schools	21
Case for change	21
Evidence	22
Proposals for reform	24
Faith schools	30
Case for change	30
Evidence	31
Proposals for reform	32

About this consultation

This consultation sets out the Government's ambition to create an education system that extends opportunity to everyone, not just the privileged few. It proposes to expand radically the number of good school places available to all families, by: providing the right incentives for all schools with a strong track record and valuable expertise to expand their offer to even more pupils; leveraging the expertise of high performing institutions to set up new good places in the state sector as well as turn around existing schools; and delivering a diverse school system that provides all children, whatever their background, with schooling that will help them achieve their potential.

The consultation covers proposals in four key areas:

- Independent schools directly assisting the state-funded sector, through creating more good places, and giving more choice and control for parents.
- Universities playing a direct role in improving school quality and pupil attainment.
- Selective schools providing more school places, and ensuring that they are open to children from all backgrounds.
- Faith schools delivering more good school places, while meeting strengthened safeguards on inclusivity.

We would like to hear your views on these proposals.

Who this is for

- Schools and representative bodies
- Higher Education Institutions and representative bodies
- Local authorities and faith bodies
- Children, young people and parents

Issue date

The consultation was issued on 12 September 2016.

Enquiries

If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact the team on:

- schoolsystem.consultation@education.gsi.gov.uk

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the DfE Ministerial and Public Communications Division by

email: Coordinator.CONULTATIONS@education.gsi.gov.uk or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the [DfE Contact us page](#).

Additional copies

Additional copies are available electronically and can be downloaded from [GOV.UK DfE consultations](#).

The response

The results of the consultation and the Department's response will be [published on GOV.UK](#) in Spring 2017.

Respond online

To help us analyse the responses please use the online system wherever possible. Visit www.education.gov.uk/consultations to submit your response.

Other ways to respond

If for exceptional reasons, you are unable to use the online system, for example because you use specialist accessibility software that is not compatible with the system, you may download a word document version of the form and email it or post it.

By email

- schoolsystem.consultation@education.gsi.gov.uk

By post

Rebecca Sandford
Department for Education
Third floor
Sanctuary Buildings
Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BT

Deadline

The consultation closes on 12 December 2016.

Introduction

1. This Government is dedicated to making Britain a country that works for everyone, not just the privileged few. This mission is arguably more important in education than anywhere else. Parents rightly expect the ability to send their child to a good school in their local area. A child's schooling is crucial in determining their chances in life and every child should be able to go as far as their talents will take them.
2. Over the last six years, our education reforms have delivered many more good school places for parents and their children. This year, over 1.4 million more children now attend schools rated good or outstanding than in 2010. Our free schools and academies programmes have ensured that strong schools and school leaders have been able to extend their success more widely across the school system to open up a greater diversity of provision. And our new curriculum and qualifications reforms are driving school standards to match the best international comparisons.
3. But for too many children in England, a good school remains out of reach. There are still 1.25 million children attending primary and secondary schools in England which are rated either requiring improvement or inadequate. At the same time, the demographic pressure for good school places is increasing: primary pupil numbers grew by over 11% between 2010 and 2016 and are projected to increase by a further 4% between 2016 and 2020. Secondary pupil numbers are projected to increase by around 10% between 2016 and 2020.¹
4. To tackle this problem, we need to do three things. Firstly, we need radically to expand the number of good school places available to all families, not just those who can afford to move into the catchment area, go private, pay for tuition to pass selective tests or belong to certain faiths. Secondly, we need to give all schools with a strong track record, experience and valuable expertise the right incentives to expand their offer to even more pupils, driving up standards and giving parents greater control. And thirdly, we need to deliver a diverse school system that gives all children, whatever their background, the opportunity to help them achieve their potential.

¹ Source: Schools, Pupils and their Characteristics: January 2016 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/schools-pupils-and-their-characteristics-january-2016>) and National pupil projections – future trends in pupil numbers: July 2016 SFR <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-pupil-projections-july-2016>

5. This consultation sets out proposals to help achieve all three. In the past, we have successfully leveraged the expertise of experienced education institutions - those with a proven track record for delivering a higher quality of education and better life chances for children. That is why we have encouraged the development of multi-academy trusts, supported good school leaders to take over failing schools, while also helping groups of parents, teachers and others set up free schools themselves.

6. However, there are a number of institutions for whom creating new school places or improving existing schools is either not incentivised or is actively prohibited by current regulations:

7. **Independent schools.** Currently independent schools educate an estimated 425,000 pupils aged 5-15 outside the state system², paid for privately. Many of the best independent schools have good results in GCSE and A level exams translating into better achievement for their pupils in gaining places within higher education, for example at Russell Group universities, than their state school counterparts. The best of the independent schools all benefit from the state from the benefits offered by charitable status. We should expect these schools to assist the state-funded sector more directly, without necessarily spending more money, by building capacity in the sector through more good places and choice and control for parents.

8. **Universities.** Britain has some of the best higher education institutions in the world with considerable academic expertise, and teaching resource, and they have a vested interest in improving attainment among school leavers. Universities are often criticised for charging higher tuition fees without widening access to lower income students, but they have little direct control over the main driver of better access: students' school-level attainment. We believe universities have a greater and more direct role to play in improving school quality and pupil attainment.

9. **Selective schools.** There is good evidence to suggest that grammar schools deliver high-quality education to their pupils and that their pupils outperform their counterparts at non-selective schools, including when the effects of selection are taken into account. However, despite demand from parents, no new grammar schools have

² Source: Schools, Pupils and their Characteristics January 2016.

been allowed since the 1998 School Standards and Frameworks Act, which prohibited new grammars. We want more good schools, including selective schools, but we want selective schools to make sure they help children from all backgrounds.

10. **Faith schools.** Faith schools make up a third of all schools in England. The government currently applies a 50% cap on the number of children admitted by faith for oversubscribed new free schools, in order to foster inclusivity. However, the evidence suggests that this rule does not achieve inclusivity and in fact prevents some high-performing faith schools from expanding or establishing new schools. We want to deliver real inclusivity in schools, while increasing the number of good school places, including at new faith schools.

11. This consultation sets out a series of reforms to encourage these high-performing institutions - independent schools, higher education institutions, selective and faith schools - to help improve the quality of school places in the mainstream state sector. We intend to do so by making the benefits these schools enjoy, of which other schools cannot take advantage, conditional on them doing much more to drive up the quality of schools locally or increasing the number of good school places in the system. That means we will ask them to partner with existing schools or set up new state schools.

12. In some cases, these requirements will be built into existing agreements, so that, for example, the ability to charge higher tuition fees for university, or to maintain the key benefits associated with independent schools' charitable status, is explicitly linked to doing more. In others, we will extend new freedoms with conditions attached allowing selective schools to open on new sites or for new selective schools to be established, or by relaxing the 50% rule on faith admissions in new free schools. In all cases, the overriding objective is to create an education system that will allow anyone in this country, no matter what their background or where they are from, to go as far as their talents will take them.

13. These proposals complement our wider approach to school improvement and our drive to build capacity in the system through multi-academy trusts. It remains the Government's ambition that all schools ultimately benefit from the autonomy and freedom to innovate and to meet the needs of their community that academy status brings, and we will be supporting schools to make this transition. Alongside this, there is a need to build capacity in the system and continue to improve the quality of existing

schools, both through our work to support academies and spread best practice, and through the proposals outlined in this consultation document. In doing so, we will create an education system that will allow anyone in this country, no matter what their background or where they are from, to go as far as their talents will take them.

14. As education policy is devolved, these proposals apply to England only.

The need for more good school places

1. There were significant improvements in the number of pupils able to access a good school over the last Parliament. At the end of March 2016, 86% of schools were rated good or outstanding by OFSTED, an increase of 17 percentage points since 2010. This allowed an additional 1.4 million pupils to access the best schools. However, significant challenges remain and we need to continue to build capacity in the system and ensure that existing schools that are struggling are turned around.

2. Firstly, the pressure for good school places is increasing: primary pupil numbers grew by 11% between 2010 and 2016, and more secondary places will be needed throughout this Parliament as this demographic bulge moves through the system.³ The most recent national pupil projections report that the primary school population is estimated to increase by 174,000 (3.9%) between 2016 and 2020, and the secondary school population by 284,000 (10.3%).⁴

3. The co-ordinated admissions process run by local authorities is coping well with recent increases in demand. Applications for secondary school places have been increasing since 2013, and numbered 548,000 in 2016, when 95% of applicants received an offer of one of their top three preferred schools. Primary application data has only been collected since 2014, and has also shown increases to reach 642,000 in 2016. At this level 96.3% of applicants received one of their top three preferences.⁵

4. In March this year the Department for Education published data identifying 65 local authority districts where fewer than 50% of secondary school applicants have a good or outstanding school place available to them within 5km. This means that in 20% of districts fewer than half of secondary school pupils have access to a good school within a reasonable distance of their home, and these are not necessarily rural or sparsely populated areas, as Braintree, Daventry and Hartlepool all have poor levels of access. Furthermore poor access is to be found almost everywhere in the country: the

³ Schools, Pupils and their Characteristics SFR 2016.

⁴ Source: National pupil projections – future trends in pupil numbers: July 2016 SFR

⁵ Source: Secondary and primary school applications and offers: March and April 2016 SFR.

bottom ten districts in England – which all provide fewer than 25% of secondary school pupils with access to a good or outstanding place – are to be found in eight out of ten regions, with London and the North West being the exceptions.

5. All parts of the education system need to collaborate more to widen opportunity and raise standards in existing schools, in order to contribute to meeting these challenges. Four areas stand out where more could be done: independent schools, universities, selective schools and faith schools. This consultation outlines proposals for change in each of these areas.

Families who are just about managing

6. These policies will increase the number of good and outstanding school places in the system, and therefore should benefit all students.

7. At the moment, the primary method for judging how schools support families of modest means is the measure of those in receipt of free school meals (FSM) in the past six years. However, this captures a relatively small number of pupils whose parents have been in receipt of income related benefits, linked to the local labour market in the past six years. This includes receipt of Income Support, income-based Jobseekers Allowance, income-based Employment and Support Allowance, Child Tax Credit, Working Tax Credit and Universal Credit. This effectively means that if you earn more than £16,190, you will not qualify for Free School Meals. In January this year, 14.3% of pupils were eligible for Free School Meals.

8. This Government believes it is important to support pupils on free school meals through the Pupil Premium and this will continue. But we also believe that schools should take greater account of those children of people on modest incomes, who do not qualify for such benefits but who are nevertheless just about managing. These are ordinary families, who have a job but do not always have job security; have their own home, but worry about paying the mortgage. They can just about manage but are concerned at the cost of living and getting their children into a good school. Children from these families are not necessarily well-served by the education system.

9. We lack a similar way to record the experiences or outcomes of those not in this group. The majority of ordinary families, even those struggling to get by, are not caught

by the FSM measure. This means that there is no reliable national picture of the impact of policy on families above the FSM eligibility threshold. There is no way to differentiate between the school experience of a child from a family which is struggling to get by, and that of a child from the wealthiest 10% of families. This distorts policy to focus at a cliff edge whereas the reality is that there are children from ordinary, working families with otherwise similar educational prospects not getting the support they need.

10. The Government wants to develop a way to identify the group of people who are 'just about managing' in order to understand the impact of policy on those falling just above the eligibility threshold for free school meals. We want to work with experts and specialists to identify the best and most robust way to identify this group and measure their attainment and progress in the school system.

Q: How can we better understand the impact of policy on a wider cohort of pupils whose life chances are profoundly affected by school but who may not qualify or apply for free school meals?

Q: How can we identify them?

Independent schools

Case for change

1. The UK's independent schools have a long history and the best have a world-wide reputation for excellence. They produce excellent exam results and well-rounded citizens who go on to excel in a variety of fields.
2. However, despite the fact that many of the top public schools began life as foundations for poor, bright pupils, these same schools are now increasingly out of reach. Average fees have increased by more than 20% over the last 5 years. At the same time, there has been a 33% increase since 2008 of non-British students with overseas parents attending these schools.⁶
3. Recognising this, many public schools offer scholarships and bursaries to enable pupils from ordinary backgrounds to attend. But there is much more they should be doing so that children from a much wider variety of backgrounds truly benefit from the excellent education they can deliver.
4. Many of these schools enjoy charitable status, and the associated advantages including relief from business rates. We believe independent schools could and should do more as a condition of these benefits and their privileged position. We want to see them doing more to increase the number of good and outstanding school places in the state system and to give more ordinary students access to the education they deliver.
5. Our proposals will ensure that independent schools are doing more to benefit ordinary families, particularly those who are just about managing. These families cannot afford independent school fees but are also often earning enough not to be eligible for direct state support. The quality of their local school is important to them. We are asking independent schools to spread their expertise through the state system to benefit families like these, by setting an expectation that the best independent schools sponsor state schools and offer funded places.

⁶ Source: <http://www.lloydsbankinggroup.com/globalassets/documents/media/press-releases/lloyds-bank/2015/150911-cost-of-private-schooling-final.pdf>

Evidence

6. There are approximately 2,300 independent schools in England, ranging in size from the very small (single digit numbers of pupils) to the very large (nearly 4,000 pupils). Many of them are very small: almost 50% are smaller than 150 pupils, with a median size of 154. The fees range from £20k per year in a prestigious day school (and approaching double that in a boarding school) to far smaller amounts in small religious schools.⁷ Similarly, quality varies from world-leading education to some small, poorly-resourced schools which may have difficulty meeting the Independent Schools Standards.

7. About half of the schools in the sector (c.1,300) are registered as charities. Schools with charitable status, like other charities, must demonstrate that they meet Charity Commission 'public benefit' rules – that is to say they benefit a reasonably wide section of the public rather than a narrow group of individuals. The most common way in which this is done is through the use of funds to give bursaries and fee discounts.

8. Lots of schools already have partnership arrangements with state schools (1,112 of the 1,157 Independent Schools Council schools). These vary enormously in scope - from substantive facilities sharing and teaching to 'buddying' programmes. Examples of the best include:

- The Aspirations project run by Kings College Wimbledon for seven state schools to raise the academic and vocational aspirations of students of less privileged backgrounds. The programme includes masterclasses, science lectures, practical learning of debating skills, a university visit, an annual course of GCSE sessions and a university applications day; and
- The York Independent State School Partnership between eight state funded schools and 3 independent schools, runs a programme of masterclasses for the most able students across the city, providing academic challenge through opportunities which state schools cannot provide alone, and provides Latin GCSE to students from maintained schools and twilight training sessions for teachers.

⁷ Source: DfE School Census 2015

9. Many fewer schools have chosen the more resource and time-intensive option of sponsoring or co-sponsoring an academy or setting up a free school: 8 independent schools already sponsor 11 academies. Examples of excellent free schools established by independent schools include:

- Westminster School is the key partner in sponsoring Harris Westminster Sixth Form with Harris Academy Trust. Students at the free school share the facilities and the teaching expertise of Westminster School;
- Eton College's successful establishment of Holyport Free School, a state boarding school; and
- The establishment by Brighton College, with support from 5 other independent schools, of the highly successful London Academy of Excellence, a new sixth form academy for bright children from under-privileged backgrounds in Tower Hamlets and Newham.

Proposals for reform

10. Our objective is to harness the capacity of independent schools to offer greater benefit to ordinary families. This would be both by adding extra capacity to the state sector – where we need good sponsors to help turn around under-performing schools – and by opening up their education to a wider range of pupils. We are clear that the biggest and most successful independent schools should face exacting requirements, while recognising that not all have the capacity and capability to act in the same way.

11. We propose that independent schools with the capacity and capability should meet one of two expectations in recognition of the benefits of their charitable status:

- To sponsor academies or set up a new free school in the state sector. The capital and revenue costs of this would be met by the government, but the independent school would have responsibility for ensuring its success. We would expect this school to be good or outstanding within a certain number of years, **or**;
- To offer a certain proportion of places as fully funded bursaries to those who are insufficiently wealthy to pay fees. We expect this figure to be considerably higher than that offered currently at most independent schools.

12. We would not necessarily expect independent schools to put any additional

funding into these schools. The revenue and capital funding would come from central government, although independent schools would be able to support these schools financially if they chose to. Instead, we expect these schools to bring their considerable expertise and impressive ethos to bear on the state sector to ensure more children can be taught at good schools.

Q: What contribution could the biggest and most successful independent schools make to the state school system?

Q: Are there other ways in which independent schools can support more good school places and help children of all backgrounds to succeed?

13. We know that there are a large number of smaller independent schools that do not have the capacity and capability to take on full sponsorship. However, we believe that they still have a role to play in improving schools in the state sector. We will ask these schools to fulfil one or more of the following:

- Provide direct school-to-school support with state schools. This could include providing staff to assist state schools with teacher development and personal support between heads of department in independent and state schools to share best practice. Joining Teaching School Alliances is the best way to make those contributions to teacher development or school improvement really count;
- Support teaching in minority subjects which state schools struggle to make viable, such as further maths, coding, languages such as Mandarin and Russian, and classics;
- Ensure their senior leaders become directors of multi-academy trusts, to give strategic steer and leadership and provide experienced staff to be governors;
- Provide greater expertise and access to facilities, for example access to science labs and music, drama and sporting facilities; and
- Provide sixth-form scholarships to a proportion of pupils in each year 11 at a local school; assisting with their teaching; or helping them with university applications.

Q: Are these the right expectations to apply to all independent schools to ensure they do more to improve state education locally?

Q: What threshold should we apply to capture those independent schools who have the capacity to sponsor or set up a new school or offer funded places, and to exempt those that do not?

14. We propose to set new benchmarks that independent schools are expected to meet, in line with their size and capacity. We think it is essential that independent schools deliver these new benchmarks. If they do not, we will consider legislation to ensure that those independent schools that do not observe these new benchmarks cannot enjoy the benefits associated with charitable status, and to result in the Charity Commission revising its formal guidance to independent schools on how to meet the public benefit test, putting the new benchmarks on to a statutory footing.

Q: Is setting benchmarks the right way to implement these requirements?

Q: Should we consider legislation to allow the Charity Commission to revise its guidance, and to remove the benefits associated with charitable status from those independent schools which do not comply?

Q: Are any other changes necessary to secure the Government's objectives?

Universities

Case for change

1. The UK's universities are world class, with four of the top ten in the world. Many have extensive partnership and outreach programmes designed to encourage successful applications from students from all backgrounds.
2. Their success means universities have a depth of expertise and resources to draw on – in governance, teaching and finance – which are badly needed in the schools system.
3. Universities now have the freedom to charge a higher rate of fees. Those institutions charging fees over £6,000 have dedicated considerable amounts of resource to widen access: expenditure through Access Agreements (which universities must agree with the Director of Fair Access in order to charge above £6,000) is expected to reach £745 million in 2016/17.
4. However, in charging higher rates, universities have been criticised for failing to widen access to children of more modest incomes and backgrounds. We believe this is unfair, on the grounds that universities currently have little involvement or direct control over the factor that has the greatest impact on access - namely, school-level attainment.
5. We believe that universities' activity should focus more on where they can make the most difference: raising standards and attainment in the schools system. Spreading their expertise and experience through the schools system has the potential to create many new good school places - offering new opportunities to ordinary families, especially those just about managing – and improving the quality and diversity of sixth form students who go on to study at higher education institutions.
6. Many universities in the UK have partnership arrangements with academies or free schools already. A much smaller number have set up new free schools or sponsored existing academies. The Government would like to see all universities match those examples, and sponsor existing schools or set up new schools in exchange for the ability to charge higher fees.

Evidence

7. It is strongly in universities' interests to improve attainment at schools. Research shows that prior attainment of pupils is the overriding factor in predicting access to university. Research conducted by the Institute for Fiscal Studies⁸, on behalf of Government, shows that for students who took their GCSEs in 2008, pupils from the most advantaged background were 33 percentage points more likely to progress to higher education than pupils from the most disadvantaged background. Once background characteristics and prior attainment are taken into account the gap reduces to 4 percentage points. A key factor holding back prospective students is the quality of education they receive at school. We believe that there is a compelling argument that universities should focus on raising attainment at school.

8. Some universities already run excellent schools:

- King's College London took advantage of the free schools programme to open a specialist sixth form college - King's College London Mathematics School (KCLMS) - to encourage young people across London with a facility in maths to pursue these highly academic options. The results have been outstanding. In August 2016 100% of KCLMS students received an A* or A grade in Mathematics, including 83% gaining an A*.

Proposals for reform

9. Despite some excellent examples of universities sponsoring schools, this level of direct involvement is far from the rule. We believe all universities could and should play a direct role in raising attainment in schools to widen access, and for this to be made a condition of their fair access requirements.

10. We want higher education institutions to meet the following requirements as a condition of charging higher fees:

- Establish a new school in the state system, of which the capital and revenue costs will be met by the government, **or**;
- Sponsor an academy in the state system.

⁸ Socio-economic, ethnic and gender differences in HE participation, BIS, November 2015

11. In both cases, we would expect this school to be good or outstanding within a certain number of years, and over time we would expect universities to extend this partnership with the schools sector, to charge the higher rate of fees. For example, we would ask universities to extend their support to further schools after a certain number of years, which in turn would be required to be Good or Outstanding over time.

Q: How can the academic expertise of universities be brought to bear on our schools system, to improve school-level attainment and in doing so widen access?

Q: Are there other ways in which universities could be asked to contribute to raising school-level attainment?

12. We want to see universities begin to sponsor schools as soon as possible. In the immediate term, the Government intends to set out new guidance to the independent Director for Fair Access (DfA), with a clear expectation that universities would contribute to school-level attainment as a condition of charging higher fees, and that we want them to do so by sponsoring academies or establishing new free schools.

13. This will inform the DfA's own guidance to higher education institutions on their access agreements, which are conditions of charging the higher rate of fees. This would build on the guidance already issued to the DfA in February 2016, which placed a strong emphasis on working with schools.

14. The letter of guidance would be issued in early 2017, in time for inclusion in the DfA's own guidance to universities for access agreements that come into force for 2018/19.

15. In terms of accountability and enforceability, the DFA already possesses the ability to refuse to renew an Access Agreement, meaning an institution will not be able to charge higher fees if it fails to deliver against its own Access Agreement.

Q: Is the DFA guidance the most effective way of delivering these new requirements?

16. Beyond this guidance, we will consider what further measures, including potential legislation in a future Parliamentary session, are necessary to require sponsorship of a school as the specific means by which universities contribute to raising attainment and

widening participation, where the DFA does not currently have the power to do so.

Q: What is the best way to ensure that all universities sponsor schools as a condition of higher fees?

17. In addition to, but not instead of, the above requirements, universities could consider:

- supporting schools through being a member of the governing body or academy trust board;
- assisting with curriculum design, mentoring of school pupils, and other educational support; and
- provision of human resources, teaching capacity (for example in A-level STEM subjects), and finance support.

18. In addition to driving attainment, we could ask universities to consider taking into account geography, the number of good school places or higher education participation rates when deciding where to focus their energies.

Q: Should we encourage universities to take specific factors into account when deciding how and where to support school attainment?

Selective schools

Case for change

1. There are currently 163 existing grammar schools in England, educating around 166,000 students (around 5% of state secondary pupils). Ten local authorities (LAs) have wholly selective education systems and a further 26 LAs have one or more grammar schools in their area. The 5% of secondary school pupils attending grammar schools nationally rises to more than 25% in fully selective local authority areas. Other elements of our education system are often based on selection – at age 16 in the state-funded sector and at all ages in independent schools.
2. Legislation currently prohibits any new selective schools and prevents existing non-selective schools from becoming selective. This means that schools cannot introduce selective admission arrangements where they do not already exist. Existing selective schools can lawfully expand, and that includes expansion in annexes or on sites separate from the main body of the school provided that the offer to pupils on the separate sites is fully integrated with the teaching and learning in the rest of the school. Approval was given to the Weald of Kent Grammar School to expand in Sevenoaks because the school clearly demonstrated that its proposed annex was fully integrated. However, the funding necessary for expansion has not been consistently available to grammar schools.
3. Grammar schools are popular with parents and good for the pupils who attend them. The vast majority of the existing 163 grammar schools have demonstrated that they provide an excellent education for the pupils, of all income groups, who attend them. They provide a stretching education for our most able pupils, regardless of their background, which recognises, and enables them to meet, their potential. Those who do well at grammar schools are more successful at getting into university.
4. Many selective schools are employing much smarter tests that seek to see past coaching and assess the true potential of every child. However under the current model of grammar schools – while those children that attend selective schools enjoy a far greater chance of academic success – there is some evidence that children who attend non-selective schools in selective areas may not fare as well academically – both compared to local selective schools and comprehensives in non-selective areas.

5. We believe that there is a case for relaxing restrictions on selective education, in order to provide more good school places within the system – whether through the expansion of existing grammars, the creation of new selective schools or through allowing non-selective schools to become selective – in the interests of improving education standards and increasing choice for parents. And we believe that this can and should be to the betterment of, not at the expense of, other local schools – by supporting the creation of new good school places in non-selective schools locally at the same time.

6. This chapter sets out our proposals to increase the number of good school places by lifting the restrictions on selection, but at the same time requiring selective schools to play a greater role in raising standards at other schools. In doing so, we do not propose a re-introduction of the binary or tripartite system of the past or a simple expansion of existing selective institutions. We propose that selective schools should be asked to contribute to non-selective schooling in certain ways, ensuring the expansion of good selective education alongside the creation of new good school places in non-selective schools. We believe that these proposals will make grammar schools engines of academic and social achievement for all pupils, whatever their background, wherever they are from and whatever their ability.

Evidence

7. The evidence on grammar schools is based on the selective system as it currently operates. It exemplifies why selective schools should be a key part of a diverse schools system that offers parents and children a range of options for their education.

8. At the moment, it is not an option that is available to thousands of children who do not live in a selective area or whose parents do not earn enough to afford to move to one. Yet there is considerable evidence to show that existing wholly-selective schools produce good exam results for pupils. 99% of selective schools are good or outstanding. 80% are rated outstanding, compared to 20% of non-selective schools. In 2015, almost all pupils in selective schools (96.7%) gained five or more A*-C passes at GCSE including English and mathematics, compared to 56.7% at comprehensives. This does not merely reflect the higher ability intakes of selective schools: when prior attainment is taken into account the advantage still lies with selective schools. In 2015,

98% of pupils at selective schools - who had achieved above level 4 at Key Stage 2 - gained 5+ GCSEs or equivalent (including English and maths) compared to 91% at comprehensive schools and 88% at non-selective schools in selective areas. Estimates of how much of the educational gains are due purely to attending a selective school vary, once other factors are taken into account, from zero up to around three quarters of a GCSE grade per subject.⁹

9. Some studies have found that selective schools can be particularly beneficial for pupils on lower incomes who attend them. For example, one study¹⁰ reported that the educational gain from attending a grammar school is around twice as high for pupils eligible for free schools meals, compared to the overall impact across all pupils. As discussed in Chapter 1: The Case for Change, we intend to develop a wider measure to capture the experience of children from ordinary working households, whose parents may not be eligible for income-related benefits or tax credits but nevertheless earn moderate incomes and just about manage to get by.

10. Other studies suggest that there may be an association with poorer educational consequences for those pupils not attending selective schools in areas where selection is allowed. For example, one study found that pupils in non-selective local schools in selective areas performed worse – by around one GCSE grade point – than pupils with the same prior attainment educated in comprehensive schools in non-selective areas. In contrast, research for the Sutton Trust found no adverse effects of existing grammar schools on GCSE results for pupils in other schools.¹¹

11. Some studies have noted the relatively small group of FSM pupils in selective education. In January 2016, 2.5% of pupils in selective schools were eligible for free school meals, compared to 13.2% for all state-funded schools. However, as discussed in Chapter 1, there is no clear understanding of the number of children of ordinary, working families in selective education or the relative incomes of parents. We believe there is a case for looking at the wider impact of selective education of those on low

⁹ See for example <http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/10/SuttonTrustFullReportFinal.pdf>

¹⁰ Atkinson, A., Gregg, P. and McConnell, B. (2004) The results of 11 Plus selection: an investigation into equity and efficiency of outcomes for pupils in selective LEAs, cited in Coe et al (2008) Evidence on the effects of selective educational systems, CEM Centre, Durham University for the Sutton Trust

¹¹ Sutton Trust (2008) 'Evidence on the effects of selective educational systems' by the Centre for Evaluation and Monitoring, Durham University'

incomes or who just about manage.

Proposals for reform

12. We want to retain and increase the academic success of selective education, while at the same time improving the educational outcomes for those that do not attend selective schools. To do so, we propose to allow the expansion of selective education in England on the explicit condition that action to expand existing selective schools or establish new selective schools is accompanied at the same time by support to ensure good quality non-selective places locally. In practice that means:

13. Support for existing grammar schools to expand. We will allow good and outstanding selective schools to expand, subject to certain conditions as set out below. To support them to do so, we will make available dedicated funding of up to £50m a year and we will fund expansion of places upfront on the basis of estimates, not retrospectively, thus removing a financial disincentive to expansion. We know that some existing selective schools have expressed an interest in expanding onto a satellite site while maintaining a single integrated school across the sites. Supporting this expansion will provide additional good quality selective places in the system and would help to meet existing unmet demand (although it would not increase the number of selective schools overall).

14. Permitting the establishment of new selective schools. We will enable new wholly-selective or partially-selective schools to be established by removing the existing restrictions on selection, subject to meeting certain conditions as set out below. These would be established as free schools set up in response to local demand and they would have the flexibility to select 100% of their intake on the basis of ability. Partially-selective schools take a proportion of their places by ability or aptitude and a proportion without reference to aptitude or ability.¹² There are currently only a small number of these schools, with levels of partial selection varying (most being between 10% and 35%), but we will support proposals to establish new partially selective schools.

15. Permitting existing non-selective schools to become selective. We will allow

¹² The Office of the Schools Adjudicator defines 'aptitude' as the potential to attain and 'ability' as actual attainment.

existing non-selective schools to become selective by removing existing restrictions on selection, subject to meeting certain conditions as set out below. These schools would become selective in response to local demand and would have flexibility to select 100% of their intake on the basis of ability. We will consider measures to preserve school diversity in areas where schools choose to convert in this way.

Q: How should we best support existing grammars to expand?

Q: What can we do to support the creation of either wholly or partially new selective schools?

Q: How can we support existing non-selective schools to become selective?

16. These measures will increase the number of state school places provided by good and outstanding providers – albeit the places will be selective. To ensure that we also increase the number of good and outstanding places in non-selective schools, we intend to apply conditions on new or expanding selective schools. These conditions may vary from school to school but we propose to use the following menu of options to ensure that new or expanding selective schools contribute in a meaningful way to improving outcomes for all pupils:

- Take a proportion of pupils from lower income households. This would ensure that selective education is not reserved for those with the means to move into the catchment area or pay for tuition to pass the test;
- Establish a new non-selective secondary school, with the capital and revenue costs paid by government;
- Establish a primary feeder in an area with higher density of lower income households to widen access, with the capital and revenue costs paid by government;
- Partner with an existing non-selective school within a multi-academy trust or sponsor a currently underperforming and non-selective academy. Under these arrangements, we would expect selective schools to share resources, assist with teaching, provide curriculum support, assist with university applications and contribute to governance expertise.
- Ensure that there are opportunities to join the selective school at different ages, such as 14 and 16, as well as 11. This might be facilitated through the

partnership or sponsor arrangements with other schools.

17. In all cases, we would expect non-selective schools established or in partnership with selective schools to be rated good or outstanding within a certain number of years of establishment or of the selective school taking over.

Q: Are these the right conditions to ensure that selective schools improve the quality of non-selective places?

Q: Are there other conditions that we should consider as requirements for new or expanding selective schools, and existing non-selective schools becoming selective?

Q: What is the right proportion of children from lower income households for new selective schools to admit?

18. It will be important to hold selective schools to account for these conditions. We propose to require selective schools to provide information on their websites about their partnership with other schools and on their success in recruiting a fair proportion of below-average income pupils. We expect that all selective schools will want to provide greater opportunity for all children, at both selective and non-selective school. We will monitor this through the work of the Regional Schools Commissioners and Education Funding Agency and existing data collections.

19. Where schools are not meeting expectations or selective schools do not deliver good or outstanding non-selective education alongside new selective places, we will consider a series of sanctions. These would entail:

- Removing access to any additional funding streams. We will consider removing additional funding for new pupils or programmes;
- Removing the right to select by ability (either temporarily or permanently) for the offending school. We will prevent selective schools from using their freedoms;
- Restricting access to future growth. We will bar selective schools from further expansion.

Q: Are these sanctions the right ones to apply to schools that fail to meet the requirements?

Q: If not, what other sanctions might be effective in ensuring selective schools contribute to the number of good non-selective places locally?

20. We would expect the proposers of a new school to work with the relevant local authorities, regional school commissioner or central government as appropriate in considering where best to locate a new selective school. For those new schools established through the free schools route, the application process will identify how the school will meet local demand; how it will secure applications, including for encouraging these at different ages, such as 14 and 16, as well as 11; and how it will meet the conditions. In this process, and when existing schools are converting to become selective, we believe that geography and the level of pre-existing selection are important factors. While not limiting the number of good school places, we will look at ways to particularly encourage the location of new schools where there is local demand and a need for additional good school places. Research for the Sutton Trust found that around a fifth of grammar school pupils come from outside the 36 LAs in which grammars are located¹³, so there is evidence of wider demand outside the immediate areas of existing selective schools.

Q: How can we best ensure that new and expanding selective schools and existing non-selective schools becoming selective are located in the areas that need good school places the most?

Existing schools

21. These proposals currently apply to new and expanding selective schools and existing non-selective schools becoming selective. We believe there is a case for existing selective schools to do more to support children at non-selective schools. We therefore propose to do the following:

- Encourage multi-academy trusts to select within their trust. We will make clear that multi-academy trusts and/or other good or outstanding academies can already establish a single centre in which to educate their "most able" pupils. This centre could be 'virtual' or have a physical location. This would enable the

¹³ Source: Sutton Trust 2008 report <http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/10/SuttonTrustFullReportFinal11.pdf>

schools to provide a more challenging and targeted curriculum, and to create an ethos within the centre of excellence which supports all children to achieve their potential. As pupils are identified as 'most able' pupils after they had been admitted to their individual school through a non-selective admissions process, this is currently permissible.

- Require existing selective schools to engage in outreach activity. The best selective schools already work closely with local primary schools to raise aspirations, improve educational practice, and promote wider access. In order to ensure that disadvantaged pupils are encouraged to apply, we will expect existing selective schools to work closely in partnership with local primary schools to identify individual pupils who may benefit most from targeted activity. This may include identifying and helping children from disadvantaged backgrounds, teacher and pupil exchanges, shared resources, or financial support for transport and uniforms, which can be barriers to poorer households considering selective education.
- Fair admissions and access. Selective schools also need to ensure that the pupils they admit are representative of their local communities. All schools have been able to start the process of prioritising the admission of pupils entitled to the Pupil Premium since the current School Admissions Code came into force in December 2014. We need to increase the pace at which selective schools are ensuring fair access. We therefore propose to require all selective schools to have in place strategies to ensure fair access. Legislation would require selective schools to prioritise the admission of, or set aside a number of specific places for, pupils of lower household income in their oversubscription criteria.

Q: How can we best ensure that the benefits of existing selective schools are brought to bear on local non-selective schools?

Q: Are there other things we should ask of existing selective schools to ensure they support non-selective education in their areas?

Q: Should the conditions we intend to apply to new or expanding selective schools also apply to existing selective schools?

22. The schools funding formula should recognise that there are additional costs

associated with meeting the needs of pupils from families that are just about managing and pupils with low prior attainment. We are committed to the introduction of a National Funding Formula which will bring in fair funding for all schools – selective or non-selective. In our consultation earlier this year we proposed that the key factors to be included in the formula might include measures on the number of poorer pupils and the number of pupils with low prior attainment. We will ensure that the formula rewards those schools that support schools with a higher proportion of lower attaining pupils and those from less wealthy households. We will be consulting shortly on the value and weighting to be attached to these factors.

Faith schools

Case for change

1. Schools of a religious character, or faith schools, make up around a third of all mainstream schools in England – almost 7,000 out of just over 20,000 state funded schools. The large majority of faith schools are either Church of England schools (67%) or Catholic schools (29%).
2. The vast majority of these are high-performing schools whose performance compares well with mainstream schools. They are more likely to be rated good or outstanding by Ofsted and consistently achieve higher performance in exam results. It is also the case that pupils from poorer backgrounds perform better at faith schools than at other schools.
3. Faith designated schools and academies are allowed to prioritise children of their faith when they are over-subscribed. Voluntary-aided faith schools (including those which have converted to become academies) are able to select up to 100% of pupils on the basis of faith. Many faith schools choose to open up a proportion of places to children of other faiths or none, and some do not apply any faith criteria at all.
4. For new academies and faith schools that have been opened under the free schools programme, a 'cap' was introduced on faith-based admissions in order to support inclusivity and tolerance, meaning that when the free school is over-subscribed it can only apply faith-based oversubscription criteria to the first 50% of places.
5. The effectiveness that capping faith admissions to these schools has had in promoting inclusion and community cohesion is, however, questionable. In open free schools designated for minority faiths in the English school system (Islam, Judaism, Sikhism and Hinduism) the intake has been predominantly of pupils from similar ethnic backgrounds. This means we need to consider other ways in which we can ensure that these schools promote inclusivity and community cohesion. In addition, the cap is also not working to promote parental choice and access to high-performing faith schools. Some faiths have felt unable to open new schools through the free schools route because they say it contravenes religious rules. This has meant, for example, that in areas where there has been significant growth in the Catholic population, the Catholic Church has not set up sufficient school places to meet demand.

6. This consultation therefore proposes that we replace the ‘cap’ for faith free schools – including for existing schools – with a series of strengthened safeguards to promote inclusivity, thereby allowing free schools with up to 100% faith-based admissions.

Evidence

7. The vast majority of faith schools provide a high standard of education and their performance in Ofsted inspections and test and examination results compares favourably with non-faith schools. In all cases, faith schools are more likely to be good or outstanding as compared to non-faith schools (89% as compared to 86% at primary; 81% as compared to 75% at secondary).¹⁴

8. Key Stage 2 tests and GCSE examination results show that in overall terms faith schools are more likely to achieve the expected standard as compared to non-faith schools. At primary level the differences are relatively small, though there are more significant differences for secondary schools where the proportion of pupils in faith schools that are achieving 5 GCSE A*-C including English and Maths is four percentage points higher than for non-faith schools.

9. As can be seen in the table below, whilst free schools are currently limited to admitting a maximum of 50% of their pupils on the basis of faith when oversubscribed, this has not resulted in a mixed ethnic intake. In minority faith schools (Islam, Judaism, Sikhism and Hinduism) the ethnic make-up is formed of pupils from predominantly similar ethnic (and very likely religious) backgrounds.¹⁵

10. By contrast, Catholic schools have a far better record on diversity, in spite of the fact that no new Catholic school has been established since the 50% rule was imposed because they say it contravenes religious rules. As set out below, “Other Christian” schools have nearly a fifth of pupils of Asian origin and nearly a tenth from black ethnic families, with just 55% of White ethnic origin. While ethnicity data is not a perfect match to religious affiliation, it does demonstrate a high degree of diversity not apparent in

¹⁴ Source: Ofsted official statistics: Maintained schools and academies inspections and outcomes as at 31 March 2016

¹⁵ School Census January 2016.

other faith settings that apply the 50% rule.

Ethnicity data for faith designated free schools

	Number of schools	Proportion of pupils classified as white ethnic origin	Proportion of pupils classified as mixed ethnic origin	Proportion of pupils classified as Asian ethnic origin	Proportion of pupils classified as black ethnic origin	Proportion of pupils classified as any other (including Chinese) ethnic origin	Proportion of pupils unclassified	Total pupil count (including those with unclassified ethnicity)
Church of England	10	63%	8%	15%	8%	5%	1%	1,538
Other Christian	36	55%	7%	19%	9%	3%	7%	6,818
Hindu	2	2%	5%	91%	0%	1%	1%	887
Jewish	6	84%	5%	2%	2%	3%	4%	456
Muslim	11	1%	4%	80%	9%	5%	1%	2,630
Sikh	11	2%	3%	89%	1%	4%	0%	1,887
Total	76	36%	6%	43%	7%	4%	4%	14,216

Proposals for reform

11. The existing limitations on the proportion of pupils that may be admitted in oversubscribed free schools are determined by the Department for Education and enforced through the funding agreement.

12. Given the evidence that the 50% rule does not promote diversity, we will remove these limits and replace them with a series of strengthened safeguards to promote inclusivity to: ensure that faith free schools promote inclusivity, enhance understanding of other faiths and those with no faith; promote community cohesion and properly prepare children and young people for life in modern Britain. These would build on existing requirements currently included in the funding agreements and inspected by Ofsted, of all faith free schools, which require them to: act inclusively by enabling pupils of all faiths and none to play a full part in the life of the school and not disadvantage pupils or parents of any faith (or none); and actively promote the fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs.

13. In place of the 50% rule, we propose the following requirements for new faith free schools:

- Prove that there is demand for school places from parents of other faiths. We propose that faith schools should be required to prove, through local consultation and signatures, that parents of other faiths would be happy to send their children there;
- Establish twinning arrangements with other schools not of their faith. This would be required under the funding agreement and could be achieved by creating links between young people in different schools in structured programmes, including sharing teachers and resources and conducting joint lessons and assemblies. A number of existing faith free schools engage in twinning with schools of different faiths, which has included exchange trips and joint lessons to help develop closer ties and understanding. For example, the Tauheedul Education Trust, an academy trust with Muslim and non-faith schools, has twinned its Muslim schools in Hackney and Blackburn with a Jewish and Church of England School respectively;
- Consider setting up mixed-faith multi-academy trusts, including becoming a sponsor for underperforming non-faith schools. This would help ensure that the high standards and effective practice demonstrated by many faith schools is used to help improve others. It could also help to bring together schools with pupils from different backgrounds. Such arrangements could be used to promote greater cohesion through shared teaching arrangements, learning activities and partnering on extra-curricular activities;
- Consider placing an independent member or director who is of a different faith or no faith at all on the governing body of new faith free schools. This will help ensure that there is independent input into the governance of the school and will help ensure that they have a wider perspective beyond their own faith.

Q: Are these the right alternative requirements to replace the 50% rule?

Q: How else might we ensure that faith schools espouse and deliver a diverse, multi-faith offer to parents within a faith school environment?

14. We would ensure that new faith schools had clear plans to meet these requirements by strengthening the guidance to free school applicants and ensuring that clear consideration of their multi-faith arrangements is part of the written and interview elements of the application process.

15. We would monitor the compliance with provisions in the funding agreement, by checking how well these schools meet the requirements relating to inclusivity and fundamental British values and how well they promote community cohesion. Closer monitoring here would include an increased focus on how these schools are meeting the requirements as part of the regular visits from DfE education advisers in the first two years of the school's operation in the run up to their first Ofsted inspection. We would also look to strengthen our intervention powers where schools do not meet our expectations, including in relation to uniform policy, food policy and curriculum.

16. Schools that do not meet these requirements would lose the right to admit on the basis of faith and become a non-faith school.

Q: Are there other ways in which we can effectively monitor faith schools for integration and hold them to account for performance?

Q: Are there other sanctions we could apply to faith schools that do not meet this requirement?



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2016

This document/publication (not included logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/consultations



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk