

Project + No		REORGRANISATION CONSULTATION MEETINGS	
Date, Time + Place		Thursday 29 November 2007 at Haywood High School, 16:00pm	
	Topic	Item	Action
PERSONS PRESENT FROM THE AUTHORITY			
	Ged Rowney	Director of Children & Young People's Services	GR
1.0	INTRODUCTION/PRESENTATION		
	<p>Ged Rowney introduced a presentation on the City's proposals for reorganisation.</p> <p>Transformation on schools has caused concerns; potential £200 million for the City to improve schools and education. Building, funding, staff – different towns have argued – birth rate, in and out of city immigration, etc. The prediction is that there will be 3000 fewer pupils in 2015.</p> <p>People have been talking about change for years, but main issue for people is Serco and they believe that we are now making the changes when proposals were already drawn up before we came to Stoke.</p> <p>We are in partnership with communities/staff and want to involve everyone. We plan to minimise disruption and offer staff opportunities. With falling numbers, staffing numbers tend to go down anyway.</p> <p>Many people asked: why are we involved? Why these changes to our school?</p> <p>We still want to give staff support and need to manage a change together. We will undertake a recruitment review. Shadow Governing Bodies will be made up in 2008 and they will appoint the Headteacher in 2009.</p> <p>We are offering opportunity for discussion and to generate very clear proposals.</p> <p>Refencing arrangements will cover all staff, including learning mentors, contracted staff – they will all have to be appointed by the new Governing Body. Teaching staff in faith and trust schools are also appointed by the Governing Body.</p> <p>The timescale – consultation interviews will take place in November – January 2011. All feedback will be considered. It will then be moved to full Council for discussion in March 2008. 2010 will be the change-over date.</p> <p>GR thanked the staff for attending and for the hospitality. He then went on to run through issues and answer any questions.</p>		

	QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION	
	<p>David Dickinson wanted to ask the LA some questions.</p> <p>He referred to English and Maths results and value added. This was not in line with the LA's statement.</p> <p>DD - Have you read the OfSTED report? Because this shows an improvement in English and Maths.</p> <p>GR – This was based on the GCSE results for 2006. At 138th, the City is still in the bottom 12. This has been an improvement, but not in the last 12 years, and it is in real need of improvement.</p> <p>We are working with KS1 and KS2 to improve performance. There is need for development now and for the future. On School Improvement, Jane Gaffney and her team are working for secondary schools and are driving the areas forward.</p> <p>DD – Yet there are still options keep St Joseph's on their own or keep other faith schools open. This school is the largest in the LA and the most subscribed.</p> <p>You are talking about the future, but you can't give guarantees on jobs or people. You don't know the facts or the figures. A lot of good staff will leave rather than staying and having interviews. You can't give any guarantees.</p> <p>GR - No school or Chair can give 100% guarantees that there will be posts. It will raise opportunities in existing roles. Schools are losing staff on a regular basis.</p> <p>DD – Looking at the OfSTED and SIPs reports, what are the main issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KS4 – 3/4 • GCSE English and Maths <p>Value added 2-3. OfSTED reports say good progress. Are we underperforming? Can you find something that is saying that we are underperforming? OfSTED say we are making progress.</p> <p>GR – There is still room for improvement.</p> <p>Staff member – You are not building a school for strength. The staff are dedicated to the school and if you take it away, you won't get anything more from us because the staff will leave.</p> <p>GR – We circulated the initial draft document in July and developed the discussion, talking with other groups. We can move on even further for change. A discussion paper was put to the headteachers earlier this term and generally, they wanted to keep schools open on their side.</p> <p>DD – Unclear when present case, on what grounds will the LA be closing the school?</p> <p>GR – 1998 Education Act Standards Framework Act / 2006 Inspection Act. Power to close schools.</p> <p>DD – Why reorganisation – talked about falling school rolls?</p> <p>GR – We are reorganising special schools and secondary schools. We are recommending our preferred outcome to close schools.</p> <p>DD – We have already changed the character – why change it again?</p> <p>GR – It is recognised that if we are make the necessary changes to the City overall, we must support changes to schools. Issues in the consultation statement are part of the wider process of regeneration.</p> <p>DD – Why change it then?</p> <p>GR – This is about development, transition, clear ambition and visions.</p> <p>DD – Why is there a need for a new building? There is high quality in the old building and it will be low quality in the new buildings. Staff/community are horrified at the interior [of some recent new builds], it looked like cell blocks.</p> <p>GR – That was just examples from Birches Head. When people saw what it was like inside, they loved it. Sandon High is due to open and has its own designs; young people of the school are proud of it.</p> <p>Staff – I am concerned about the next year 7 intake number, because you have said that you want to have 180 pupils each year – we can easily have 220, so why do you want to lower it?</p>	

Doc ref	<p>GR – I can see that you would want more pupils. However these are the published admin numbers.</p> <p>Q – The decisions – Admin, LA Forum has acknowledged this, but ours could be 210. Doesn't that show that this school is in demand?</p> <p>DD – Up to LA to come out with proposals, have had between 4 and 8 Academies. Unproven no guarantee, have sponsors. I would like to see evidence for Academies – is this a Serco proposal?</p> <p>GR – There was some demand for us to have 8 academies, but, we talked with OfSTED and all have said academies within a mix of schools would be a better fit in the City. Expectations in Headteacher proposal with MPs wish to go for Academy.</p> <p>Q – Immigration: what happens if it goes up by 3000 in a few years?</p> <p>Q – Who makes allowance for parents who want to bring their child to this school, and that have moved from places to bring pupils just to this school and stay in the area?</p> <p>A – All figures have been checked and all the pupil figures have been sent to Joan Walley.</p> <p>GR – The projected population figures do take into account the plans to regenerate the City.</p> <p>DD – But clarify: you want to close Longton High. Have all the population figures been taken into account? The figures over 10% still got 13% slack in the system.</p> <p>Q – Concern generally about the deal with the Government £200 million: is there a catch? That may have been what it was worth 4 years ago – not worth that now?</p> <p>GR – Originally £160 million given nature and need in City. An increase to £220 million instead is needed now. First we have to come up with a detailed local plan. Our plan is for 7 brand new schools – and we've got positive feedback from Government in support of this.</p> <p>DD Closed the meeting.</p> <p>GR - If you have any questions, we are more than happy to view them and you can send them by either e-mail or letter.</p> <p>Meeting ends.</p>	
---------	---	--