

## RECORD OF EXECUTIVE DECISION

Monday, 26 September 2011

Decision No: (CAB 11/12 7047)

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
PORTFOLIO AREA:	CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND LEARNING
SUBJECT:	SECONDARY SCHOOL ESTATE PROGRAMME 2011/12
AUTHOR:	Karl Limbert

### THE DECISION

In accordance with the Education Acts and having had regard to s2 Local Government Act 2000 and the provisions of the Community Strategy:

- (i) To vire, in accordance with the Financial Procedure Rules, a sum of £4,500,000 from the Secondary School Estate Capital budget to the following schemes:
  - £650,000 Bitterne Park Capital Investment
  - £670,000 Chamberlayne College Capital Investment
  - £650,000 Regents Park Capital Investment
  - £575,000 Sholing Tech. Capital Investment
  - £600,000 St. Anne's Capital Investment
  - £520,000 St. George Capital Investment
  - £485,000 Upper Shirley High Capital Investment
  - £350,000 Secondary Investment Programme Contingency
- (ii) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital expenditure of £4,500,000 from the Children's Services & Learning Capital Programme, for investment in the secondary school estate.

### REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1. The secondary school estate has a significant profile of backlog maintenance issues. This is due, in part, to the fact that investment in ongoing maintenance had been reduced when it had been thought that the secondary estate would be largely rebuilt under Building Schools for the Future. In the absence of this investment, it is now critical that a programme be formulated to address key maintenance and suitability issues across the estate.

2. The proposals contained within this report were developed by CSL's Strategy and Capital Programme Team, on the basis of a reasoned assessment of schools' condition surveys and discussions with Heads regarding suitability items. The proposals have been agreed by all of the secondary schools concerned as comprising a solution that addresses the most pressing issues, whilst ensuring an equitable distribution of resources across the estate. As these proposals provide a platform for commonly agreeable solution, it is proposed that they be approved and actioned.

## **DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

1. In addition to the proposals that form the subject of this report, two other options for the allocation of the secondary investment pot were put to schools for their consideration. The first was a condition-driven set of proposals, meaning that the capital pot was allocated to schools solely on the basis of the items identified within their condition surveys. As condition items are given a priority score, the secondary estate was taken as a whole and the "top" £4.5m worth of issues identified to be addressed. This option had the advantage of being entirely transparent and objectively-determined. However, the option also had a number of key drawbacks, which the schools felt outweighed the advantages:
  - An inequitable distribution of investment, with, at the extremes, some schools receiving up to a 390% greater investment profile than others; and
  - An inability for schools to have input into the issues that they would like to see addressed, owing to the fact that the identification of priority items was based solely on the content of the condition surveys. This meant that "suitability" items (such as the need for additional toilets) could not be factored-in and, since a number of schools deemed these latter items to be more pressing than the condition issues, they found this option to be unpalatable.
2. The second discarded option was a mix of the other two (i.e. the judgement-based and the condition driven options). Again, this was rejected, due to the perceived lack of flexibility that this provided schools with in determining the focus of the investment.

## **OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS CONCERNING THE DECISION**

None

## **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

None

**CONFIRMED AS A TRUE RECORD**

We certify that the decision this document records was made in accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 and is a true and accurate record of that decision.

Date:  
26<sup>th</sup> September 2011

Decision Maker:  
The Cabinet

Proper Officer:  
Judy Cordell

**SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come in to force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of publication subject to any review under the Council's Scrutiny "Call-In" provisions.

Call-In Period expires on

Date of Call-in *(if applicable) (this suspends implementation)*

Call-in Procedure completed *(if applicable)*

Call-in heard by *(if applicable)*

Results of Call-in *(if applicable)*