

**TO: EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE & LEARNING**  
**DATE: 24 NOVEMBER 2017**

---

**OUTCOME OF THE CONSULTATION ON THE AMALGAMATION OF COLLEGE TOWN INFANT  
& NURSERY AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS**  
**Interim Chief Officer, Strategy, Resources and Early Help**

**1 PURPOSE OF DECISION**

- 1.1 To receive the outcomes of the consultation of the possible amalgamation of College Town Infant & Nursery and Junior Schools and agree the way forward.

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 **That the outcomes of the consultation are noted.**
- 2.2 **That the possible amalgamation of College Town Infant & Nursery and Junior Schools should move to the next stage of representation (formal consultation).**
- 2.3 **That the Representation stage should be based on an amalgamation progressing, with the route to amalgamation being to extend the age range of the Infant & Nursery School and to close the Junior School.**
- 2.4 **That the Proposal, attached as Annex 2, is agreed.**

**3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 74% of respondees to the consultation supported an amalgamation.
- 3.2 The most popular option was to close the Junior School and extend the age range of the Infant and Nursery School. Specific benefits of this approach were recognised by respondees in their comments.

**4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 Not to progress with amalgamation proposals, meaning that both current schools continue as separate organisations and the possible benefits are not realised.

**5. SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Background

- 5.1 The College Town schools were created as separate Infant (ages 4-7 years) and Junior (ages 7-11 years) schools, and they share the same site in Sandhurst.
- 5.2 There are however positive educational benefits for children to be educated in all-though primary schools (ages 5-11 years). The majority of schools in the Borough are primary schools, and any new school would be a primary school.
- 5.3 The Executive Member agreed on 25 August to consult on the possible amalgamation of the schools. The consultation period ran from 8 September to 22 October 2017. There was consultation on four options:

Option 1: Close both schools and open a College Town Primary School as a local authority maintained school.

Option 2: Close College Town Infant and Nursery School and extend the age range at College Town Junior School to become a Primary School.

Option 3: Close College Town Junior School and extend the age range at College Town Infant and Nursery School to become a Primary School.

Option 4: Retain both schools as separate Infant and Junior Schools.

- 5.4 The consultation involved a discussion paper and questionnaire, staff meetings (2, one at each school) and open meetings (2, one at each school). Responses were requested through the web-based questionnaire. 205 responses were received.
- 5.5 At the first Open meeting 8 parents representing 5 families attended. At the second meeting 12 people, including 5 parents, staff and governors attended.
- 5.6 74% of respondees were in favour of amalgamation in some way. The most popular option was to close the Junior and extend age range of Infant to become a primary (Option 3) with 42% of all responses.
- 5.7 In responses made to the questionnaire and at meetings:
- The benefits of amalgamation were recognised including being better for children, education, consistency of learning, continuity/ transition, monitoring, and parents. The sharing of resources would be more effective and efficient. No one school would be seen as being 'better' or 'in control'. Inset days are not currently aligned which affects families; this issue would be overcome.
  - the strengths of the Infant School were stressed by respondees in terms of its pupils' achievements, leadership, management and reputation. The personal qualities of the current Infant School headteacher were also described by some respondees.
- 5.8 It was also recognised that:
- Finances are a concern should the schools amalgamate. There would be less funding available which would affect standards. The situation is complicated by the introduction of the National Funding Formula (NFF) over the same period as the amalgamation, 2018-2020, which will alter the way that schools are funded. The details of the NFF are not currently finalised, but it is known that schools amalgamating will benefit from a transition period. A meeting was held between the Council, school bursars and finance governors to explain the situation and model different scenarios including a potential funding loss of around £0.16m. An amalgamation would also present opportunities for substantial cost savings, depending on how a new primary school is organised by the governors.
  - Work on the site and buildings would be needed, and the Council should pay for this. The Council has commissioned a feasibility survey of the options which will now be costed. The draft capital programme for 2018/19 recognises that work would be required and an indicative allocation has been made that will be subject to Executive approval in February 2018 for works to commence in the 2018/19 financial year. Various options will be considered.
  - Staff are uncertain about the future. It would be for the governing body to establish a staffing structure that was affordable, but it was made clear during the consultation that teaching and teaching support staff would most likely be largely unaffected. Administrative staff are more likely to be affected; any proposed changes would need to

follow the Council's reorganisation protocols. Site staff are already shared between the schools. Maintaining staff morale could be an issue.

- Separation of smaller and larger children is still required, the benefits of the Infant School for the younger children are not necessarily best for older children and that the 'village feel' of the Infant School would be lost.
- Change disrupts children, parents and staff and the period of disruption could be up to 18 months. The time taken to become an effective primary school could be several years.
- Alternative ways of achieving improvement include keeping the schools completely separate and working with them, or keeping them separate but with one headteacher to improve transition, communication, co-operation and goodwill.

5.9 The Infant School governing body expressed a preference for Option 3 making a case that the leadership of the Infants can be used to improve the Junior School, the option is the least disruptive and financially beneficial. The Junior School Governing Body recognise the advantages of amalgamation for improving the quality of education but are concerned about the impact of funding, in particular given their teaching support for children with special educational needs and the challenges of small class sizes.

5.10 A full report of the consultation is attached as Annex 1.

#### Next steps

5.11 The approach to amalgamations is described in statutory guidance. Both processes are similar but the decision maker is different:

- 'Opening and closing maintained schools: Statutory guidance for proposers and decision-makers' (DfE, April 2016) in relation to option 1. An amalgamation by closing both infant and junior schools and replacing them with a primary school could be considered under 'Section 11' proposals and the Schools Adjudicator would be the final decision maker;
- 'Making prescribed alterations to maintained schools' (DfE April 2016) in relation to options 2 and 3. An amalgamation by closing one school and extending the age range of the other is a 'prescribed alteration' which the local authority can decide.

5.12 In both cases, if there is agreement following consultation that a proposal should progress, the next stages are for a notice to be published followed by a period of 'representation' – formal consultation - during which views can be submitted. If there is agreement to proceed the notice would be published on 27 November and the period of representation be completed by 31 December 2017.

5.13 An amalgamated primary school would be among the larger primary schools in the Borough, with 3 forms of entry and a number on roll of around 500 (up to 630). It should be noted that 5 other primary schools are currently of this size in the Borough, and 2 more are growing to become a similar size.

5.14 Taking into account the views expressed, that the option to close the Junior School and extend the age range of the Infant & Nursery School was the most popular, and that the Council can determine the proposal, it is recommended that this option, Option 3, be progressed through the 'prescribed alterations' process.

5.15 If the amalgamation is agreed, the Proposal on which formal consultation will be held is attached as Annex 2.

5.16 The Executive Member will then consider responses and decide the proposal. It is hoped that this stage can be completed by the end of February 2018.

If it is agreed to proceed in February 2018

- 5.17 The Council will support the schools with amalgamation into a primary school, which would likely open on 1 September 2018.
- 5.18 With Option 3, after the Executive Member had decided to proceed, it would be good practice for the governing body of the Infant School to be enlarged to ensure it was representative of all the stakeholders of both schools, for example by electing or appointing additional governors. The existing governing body of the Junior School would continue until the school ceased to be maintained.
- 5.19 An updated timeline is attached as Annex 3.

**6. ADVICE RECEIVED FROM STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICERS**

Borough Solicitor

- 6.1 The relevant legal issues have been addressed within the report.

Borough Treasurer

- 6.2 The anticipated financial implications are set out in the supporting information. School governors will need to manage the reduction in revenue budget arising from an amalgamation, most significantly through the saving arising from employing one less head teacher. Any capital works will need to be approved by the Executive and these can be properly considered when options have been identified and costed.

Human Resources

- 6.3 Human Resources have been involved in discussions with both governing bodies through the process to date. For the avoidance of any ongoing doubt, the proposal to extend the infant school will mean the existing substantive headteacher continues in post for the extended primary school. The HR Team will support the governing body in the new staffing structures required.

Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.4 Issues were addressed in the Consultation Plan of the consultation, reported as part of the paper agreed by the Executive Member on 25 August.

Strategic Risk Management Issues

- 6.5 Issues are addressed below.

ISSUE		RISK	COMMENT
1	School standards	Standards will fall when schools amalgamate into a primary school	The evidence is that better continuity for pupils, opportunities for enhanced delivery of the National Curriculum and better use of resources are more likely to lead to higher standards.

			LA support will be provided to the primary school to maintain and improve standards. The period of disruption and uncertainty will be minimised as much as possible.
2	Recruitment and retention	Staff retention may be a concern on amalgamation	Opportunities will be presented to increase the range, expertise and experience of teaching and support staff, provide opportunities and development for staff, and enhanced opportunities in the deployment of staff. In the long term these should aid recruitment and retention.  Effective communication can mitigate this risk.
3	Financial	Running costs following an amalgamation may exceed the reduced funding allocation due from the Schools National Funding Formula.	Governors will need to carefully consider the required staffing structure and other budgets and satisfy themselves that the financial consequences of amalgamation can be managed.

## 7. CONSULTATION

### Principal Groups Consulted

- 7.1 Parents, children, staff, governors, trade unions and the wider community were consulted.

### Method of Consultation

- 7.2 Through consultation materials on the Council's website, feedback from meetings and individual's comments.
- 7.3 The consultation period was 6 weeks from 8 September to 22 October 2017.

### Representations Received

- 7.4 See Annex 1.

### Background papers

'Making 'prescribed alterations' to maintained schools: Statutory guidance for proposers and decision-makers' – DfE - April 2006

### Contacts for Further Information

Graham Symonds  
Head of School Sufficiency and Services  
01344 354067  
[Graham.symonds@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:Graham.symonds@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

Chris Taylor  
Interim Chief Officer, Strategy, Resources and Early Help  
01344 354062  
[Chris.taylor@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:Chris.taylor@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

Approved by Cllr Dr Gareth Barnard  
Executive Member, Children, Young People  
& Learning

Signature.....

Date: 24 November 2017

Approved by Nikki Edwards  
Director, Children, Young People  
& Learning

Signature.....

Date: 24 November 2017

## Annex 1

### Report on the consultation regarding the possible amalgamation of College Town Infant & Nursery and College Town Junior Schools

#### *Consultation held 8 September to 22 October*

The consultation involved discussion paper and questionnaire, staff meetings (2, one at each school) and open meetings (2, one at each school). Responses were requested through the web-based questionnaire.

Open meeting 1 attended by 8 parents representing 5 families

Open meeting 2 attended by 12 people, including 5 parents, staff and governors

#### **Responses – summary**

	Number	%
Option 1 – close both schools and open a primary	55	27
Option 2 – Close Infant and extend age range of Juniors to become a primary	10	5
Option 3 – Close Junior and extend age range of Infant to become a primary	86	42
Option 4 - Retain separate Infant and Junior schools	54	26
	205	

74% in favour of amalgamation in some way.

Most popular option - close Junior and extend age range of Infant to become a primary

68% respondees (34) made comments

70.5% respondees (117) had children attending College Town Infant and/or Junior schools.

69% respondees (114) had children attending who will attend College Town Infant and/or Junior schools in the future.

#### **Responses by parent (of a child currently, past or future at the schools), teacher, non-teaching, governor (note that some respondees had more than one role)**

Number	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Total
Parent	42	7	66	42	157
Teacher - CTI	1		6	3	10
Teacher - CTJ	8	1	1	3	13
Non-teaching staff - CTI	3		8	4	15
Non-teaching Staff - CTJ	4	1		8	13
Governor - CTI			1		1
Governor - CTJ	2			1	3
<b>% of role</b>					
Parent	26.8%	4.5%	42.0%	26.8%	100.0%
Teacher - CTI	10.0%		60.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Teacher - CTJ	61.5%	7.7%	7.7%	23.1%	100.0%
Non-teaching staff - CTI	20.0%		53.3%	26.7%	100.0%
Non-teaching Staff - CTJ	30.8%	7.7%		61.5%	100.0%
Governor - CTI			100.0%		100.0%
Governor - CTJ	66.7%			33.3%	100.0%

16 respondees were 'other' – not parent, staff or governor

50 respondees indicated a community interest – pre-school, grandparent, previous teacher, previous governor, supply teacher, living close, secondary school teacher, related to staff, attended school, volunteer, other relation, childminder, future parent, live locally and involved in education, Sandhurst School governor.

**Responses – comments**

Amalgamation better of children, education, consistency of learning, continuity/ transition, monitoring, and parents. Sharing of resources more effective and efficient. No one school would be seen as being 'better' or 'in control'. Inset days not aligned	15
Outstanding features of CTI can be rolled out to all year groups; leadership, management and reputation of Infants would lead to a strong primary school. Pupils achieve. Staff dedicated and motivated	14
Strong Head of Infants would make a good head of amalgamated primary school	12
Attitude of Infants headteacher - unhelpful	2
Strong Infants governing body – ethos, vision and values	1
Juniors poor: unstructured, low standards; poor leadership; unwelcoming; few improvements; poor communication;	5
Amalgamation and change would bring disruption to children and staff	3
Community benefits	2
If amalgamation happens, classes should be no bigger than at current time	2
Agree with amalgamation but would need a new headteacher	3
Method doesn't matter – need to amalgamate	1
Need to handle amalgamation carefully, with regular input from everyone	2
Junior school needs improving but amalgamation is not the way to do it	3
Could keep separate schools and have one headteacher, improve communication, co-operation and goodwill. Larger organisations not necessarily better	3
Don't see how amalgamated school would bring benefit; doesn't necessarily help transition; got excellent staff in both schools that it would be a shame to lose; doesn't ensure a well-rounded education	5
Benefits of Infants not necessarily best for older children	1
'Village feel' of Infants would be lost	1
A primary would be too big and overwhelming; not good for the individual. Still need separation – big & little children	6
In a large primary it would be difficult to create a 'whole school' ethos	1
Why change? – OK as it is; not worth the cost of change	2
Building challenges – staff room, classrooms	6
Funding challenges; could primary cope with less funding; would lead to overworked resources; lower standards; implication for children with difficulties	11
It's an exercise of cost saving over quality of education provision and driven by the council seeking to bridge its funding gap	1
Funding benefits in long term; successful primary will ensure a healthy future budget	2
Staffing issues: staff are specialists in infant or junior, Maintaining staff morale important, High level of staff training needed, staffing organisation a concern across a large site	4



## ***Governing Body preferred option and comments***

### ***Infant & Nursery School***

Option 3 - The leadership of College Town Infant and Nursery School is outstanding, with an experienced Governing Body, and it is important this is retained and used to improve the outcomes for KS2 pupils and staff. This option is considered least disruptive to staff, children and parents. This option is considered financially beneficial and would ensure greater stability for children and staff in both schools.

There were concerns raised about transition funding and a question about who would fund this if amalgamation were to take place.

If all other options were chosen the Infant School would lose its National Support School status, something the school has worked hard to achieve.

### ***Junior School***

The Junior School GB from the outset saw the advantages of amalgamation and continues to see it, not least in improving the quality of education of the Infants from KS1 to KS2 where there continues to exist a significant gap. However if, from the outset, we had been aware of the impact of funding of the amalgamation we would not have supported amalgamation and the consultation process.

College Town Junior School prides itself on the support it gives to all the children but not least to service children and children with Special Education Needs. In addition we are not a full 3 form entry school and face considerable challenges in class sizes. Our future strategy in reducing class sizes and improving teacher/pupil ratios and improving the quality of education in-line with our development plan would have been to move to a 3 form entry and/or increased teaching staff and support staff.

Any significant impact on funding by its nature will prove challenging both to the range of teaching support we currently provide but also to SEN support and in reducing class sizes.

The challenge moving ahead is ensuring the Council continues to support budgets and to offset the funding gap in amalgamation; the very nature of the site and the fact that we already share facilities means we do not see where significant cost savings will come from to offset the funding gap without impacting teaching and support staff.

### ***Children's views***

At the Infant School the following question was asked at an assembly - "What would be better if we joined up as one school". The responses stated were:

1. Use of the field
2. Having siblings in same school – 'I would get to play with my sister/brother'

### ***Other points from meetings***

Future funding a concern

A disruption period of 18 months will affect families

The time it will take to become an effective primary school

## Annex 2: Formal consultation Proposal

### Proposal to close College Town Junior School and extend the age range of College Town Infant School to become a Primary School



Your views are invited on this proposal

#### This proposal directly concerns the following schools:

College Town Infant and Nursery School  
Branksome Hill Road  
College Town  
Sandhurst  
GU47 0QF

College Town Junior School  
Branksome Hill Road  
College Town  
Sandhurst  
GU47 0QE

Currently provides a Nursery, Reception and Years 1 and 2

Currently provides Years 3 to 6

#### Proposer

Bracknell Forest Council  
Time Square  
Market Street  
Bracknell  
RG12 1JD

#### The Proposal

The Council's proposal is to close College Town Junior School and extend the age range of College Town Infant and Nursery School by adding Years 3 to 6 to the existing school, so creating a school that will provide education for nursery and all primary-phase years from Reception to Year 6 (ages 4 to 11).

It is proposed that the Primary School will come into effect on 1 September 2018.

**Comments on this Proposal are invited by 31 December 2017**

**Please read this Proposal and complete the online response form available at:**

<http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/public/sch/ct-consult>

#### Background

College Town Infant and Nursery and Junior Schools were created as separate infant (ages 5-7 years) and junior (ages 7-11 years) schools. There are positive educational benefits for children to be educated in all-though primary schools (ages 5-11 years). The majority of schools in the Borough are primary schools, and all new schools would be a primary school.

Over the years a number of separate infant and junior schools in Bracknell Forest have joined together to form a single primary school: Sandy Lane (in 2002), Great Hollands (in 2004) and The Pines (in 2005) Primary schools are the most recent of these. Amalgamated schools have been successful and have achieved many benefits similar to those envisaged with this proposal.

The Council is proposing this change because it believes it is in the best interests of the children, families and wider community in College Town.

If agreed, it will support College Town Infant School governors with planning and organisation of the new school.

No changes are being considered to the designated area or the size of year groups, currently up to 90 pupils in each year. Nursery provision would continue largely unchanged.

The Council is proposing to progress using the statutory 'prescribed alteration' of schools legislation.

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/514548/16-04-06\\_FINAL\\_SO\\_Guidance\\_PA\\_Regs.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/514548/16-04-06_FINAL_SO_Guidance_PA_Regs.pdf)

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2013/3110/contents/made>

## **The Consultation**

Between 8 September and 22 October a consultation was undertaken to gain views on the feasibility of amalgamating the schools. A range of responses were made which, on balance, demonstrated that an amalgamation achieved through closing the Junior School and extending the age range of the Infant School was the preferred way forward.

Different options to amalgamate the schools, or not, were presented for consultation. 74% of respondents were in favour of amalgamation in some way. The most popular option was to close the Junior and extend age range of Infant to become a primary (Option 3) with 42% of all responses.

A full report on the consultation and a copy of the Executive Member report agreeing to proceed to this stage, the Proposal, are available here: <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/public/sch/ct-consult>

## **Why an amalgamation is desirable**

The Council's view, supported by the outcomes of the consultation, is that a primary school would:

- Enable better continuity of education and progression for all pupils and parents, in particular from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2.
- Enable more stability for children and parents by avoiding the need for a change of school at a young age. Among those who would benefit would be children of parents in the armed forces.
- Enhance the safeguarding needs of all pupils, for example by being aware of the needs of children of all ages in the same family.
- Provide scope to achieve higher educational outcomes.
- Provide opportunities to develop the curriculum and enhance the delivery of the National Curriculum.
- Allow better use of educational resources, including both teaching and non-teaching staff.

- Provide opportunities to increase the range, expertise and experience of teaching and support staff, provide opportunities and development for staff, and opportunities in the deployment of staff.
- Allow improvement and greater flexibility in management and organisation, for example in specialist teaching.
- Better enable the recruitment and retention of a headteacher to support the vision of a new combined primary school.
- Better promote and support the recruitment and retention of all staff
- Provide scope to achieve better value for money, for example by a rationalisation of some administrative and leadership posts in the school.
- Provide a higher profile in the local community.

### **How the Proposal will affect pupils**

Pupils would continue through the new primary school without a change of school at 7 years of age. This would bring better continuity for pupils and parents. It is for governors to agree but it is anticipated that the class organisation of the new primary school would be very similar to that in the current infant and junior schools.

### **How the Proposal will affect staff**

The Council's 'Organisational Change staffing protocol' and the requirements of the School Staffing Regulations would guide the deployment of all staff from the current schools to the new primary school. When appointed, the headteacher would work with the governing body and staff to draw up a development plan for the new Primary school. Appropriate leadership and staffing structures for the school would follow. In practice, it is envisaged that many roles would continue largely unchanged. There would probably be some changes to the structure of senior leadership and administrative posts in the school. Where any salary reductions are identified then salary safeguarding arrangements will apply for 3 years.

### **How the Proposal will affect governors**

If the Proposal is agreed, the governing body of the Infants School will take on additional responsibilities to oversee the establishment of the Primary School. The Junior School Governing Body would continue until the school closed on 31 August 2018.

### **How the Proposal will affect buildings**

There are areas that would require capital investment to support amalgamation and the scope and scale of this has yet to be determined. With the publication of this Proposal, options can now be evaluated by the Council to determine the precise scope and estimated cost of possible capital works. The financial cost of any agreed capital building works would be funded by the Council.

### **How the Proposal will affect other schools in the local area**

The effect on other local primary schools and the secondary school, Sandhurst School, would be minimal. Children from the local College Town community will continue to be able to express a preference for any school in Sandhurst or elsewhere in the Borough. The planned admission number (PAN, the number that is used to decide how many children can be admitted into a year group) of the primary school would be the same as the PAN of the current Infant school. No changes in year group sizes are proposed so intake to Sandhurst Secondary School should be unaffected.

## Project costs

Infant School governors will need to consider the implications of work arising from the implementation and prioritise school budgets accordingly. Council support for governors and school leadership will be provided from within existing resources. In terms of capital building works, the Council will develop and fund an acceptable scheme.

The Governing Body will need to consider financial issues and determine a sustainable budget plan for the Primary school for the remaining period of the 2018/19 financial year, and subsequent financial years.

## Issues to be addressed during the implementation phase

The issues to be addressed by governors will include:

- Admission matters
- School Name
- Recruitment of Headteacher using the organisational change staffing protocol.
- Consideration of financial issues
- Agree staffing structure - by 31 May 2018 - and implement organisational change staffing protocol.
- If necessary, agree Instrument of Governance of substantive Governing Body
- Consider options for building works. The Capital budget for works in 2018/19 is scheduled to be agreed by the Council's Executive in February 2018
- Establish / review school policies
- Practical issues e.g. uniform.

## Timetable

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Relevant dates</b>
Publication of Proposal and Formal Notice	27 November
Period of formal consultation ('Representation')	27 November – 31 December
Consider representation outcomes and final determination of proposal by Executive Member.	By 16 February 2018 (Start of half term)
Stand-still period for appeals	By 16 March 2018
If the Proposal is agreed:	
Implementation period	19 March to 31 August 2018
Junior School closes	31 August 2018
Primary School opens	1 September 2018

If you wish to respond to this Proposal through support, objections, comments or otherwise making representations go to the Consultation website: <http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/public/sch/ct-consult>

The consultation closes on 31 December 2017

If you have any queries please email: [consultation.education@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:consultation.education@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

### Annex 3: College Town schools – Possible amalgamation – consultation and approval process

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Any guidance?</i>	<i>Period; End date</i>
<b>Initial written agreement from both Governing Bodies to consider amalgamation</b>		By 21 July COMPLETE
<b>Preparation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning</li> <li>• Decision on approach – or consult on both methods?</li> <li>• Initial approval by Executive Member on 25 Aug</li> <li>• Preparation of materials</li> </ul>		By 1 September COMPLETE
<b>Consultation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaflets/Posters</li> <li>• Website</li> <li>• Meetings</li> <li>• etc</li> </ul>	'A minimum of 6 weeks; school holidays should be avoided.' 'Consult individuals, groups and organisations'	1 September – 22 October COMPLETE
Consider consultation outcomes and report to Executive Member on 24 Nov.		By 24 November
<b>Prepare and publication of Formal Notice</b>	See guidance below*	27 November
<b>Formal consultation / Representation</b>	'Must be 4 weeks, or more.' 'Must cover the specific proposal'	27 November – 31 December
Proposal be to extend the age range of the Infant School, close the Junior school and progress through the 'Prescribed alterations' route	See guidance below*	
Infant School to review governance during the transition phase.	It would be good practice to extend the range and skills of governors to include experience of the junior years. GB of school to close to continue to meet until school closes.	
Consider representation outcomes and final determination of proposal by Executive Member on 16 Feb.	'Must be within 2 months' (else proposal is referred to Schools Adjudicator)	By 16 February (Start of half term)
Stand-still period for appeals	'4 weeks'	By 16 March

<b>Implementation</b>		By 31 August 2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admission issues</li> <li>• School Name</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GB confirms/ recruits (depending on option) a Headteacher</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address financial issues</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree staffing structure</li> </ul>	Organisational change protocol to be used	By 31 May 2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If necessary, agree Instrument of Governance of substantive GB</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider options for building works e.g. to establish a common entrance, one staffroom and one office.</li> </ul>	Various options will be possible of different scales. Funding of these works to be determined.	Capital budget to be agreed by Executive February 2018 for works in 2018/19.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish / review school policies</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practical issues e.g. uniform</li> </ul>		
<b>Primary school opens</b>		1 September 2018

\* Guidance on 'prescribed alteration' of schools

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/514548/16-04-06\\_FINAL\\_SO\\_Guidance\\_PA\\_Regs.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/514548/16-04-06_FINAL_SO_Guidance_PA_Regs.pdf)

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2013/3110/contents/made>