AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - In terms of Section 5 of the Code of Conduct, members of the Committee are asked to declare any interest in particular items on the agenda and the nature of the interest(s) at this stage.

3. MINUTE - Minute of Meeting of Education & Children's Services Committee held on 17 September 2019.

ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION

4. STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSAL TO CLOSE GATESIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

5. BUILDING FIFE’S FUTURE - WOODMILL AND ST COLUMBA’S RC HIGH SCHOOLS UPDATE - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

6. BUILDING FIFE’S FUTURE – INVERKEITHING HIGH SCHOOL SITE SELECTION UPDATE - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

7. SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

8. OUR MINDS MATTER: EXTENDING FIFE SCHOOLS’ COUNSELLING SERVICE - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

9. EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIRECTORATE PLAN - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

10. SOUTH EAST IMPROVEMENT COLLABORATIVE - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY/MONITORING

11. ATTAINMENT AND EDUCATION OUTCOMES - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

12./
12. EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIRECTORATE - REVENUE BUDGET 2019-20 PROJECTED OUTTURN - Joint Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services and the Executive Director - Finance & Corporate Services

13. EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIRECTORATE - CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN 2019-20: PROGRESS REPORT - Joint Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services and the Executive Director - Finance & Corporate Services

ITEM FOR NOTING

14. EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2020 - Report by the Executive Director - Education & Children's Services

NOTICE OF MOTION

15. NOTICE OF MOTION - In terms of Standing Order No. 8.1 (1), the following notice of motion has been submitted:-

'The Committee notes the 'Programme for Administration - Progress Summary' that was submitted (in outline form) to the September meeting of the full Council and the discussion thereon.

By way of providing the public with a readily accessible statement of the Council's achievements against the programme, the Committee now asks for a report to be presented, at its next meeting, which quantifies the progress against each of the entries that lie within the remit of this Committee.'

Proposed by Councillor Kathleen Leslie
Seconded by Councillor Dominic Nolan

Members are reminded that should they have queries on the detail of a report they should, where possible, contact the report authors in advance of the meeting to seek clarification.

Morag Ferguson
Head of Legal and Democratic Services
Finance and Corporate Services
Fife House
North Street
Glenrothes
Fife, KY7 5LT

22nd October, 2019
If telephoning, please ask for:
Diane Barnet, Committee Officer, Fife House
Telephone: 03451 555555, ext. 442334; email: diane.barnet@fife.gov.uk

Agendas and papers for all Committee meetings can be accessed on
www.fifedirect.org.uk/committees
PRESENT: Councillors Fay Sinclair (Convener), David Barratt, Colin Davidson, Dave Dempsey, Ian Ferguson, Gary Guichan, Jean Hall-Muir (substituting for Councillor Rosemary Liewald), Helen Law, Dominic Nolan, Ross Paterson, David J Ross (substituting for Councillor Kathleen Leslie) and Alistair Suttie; Mr. George Haggarty and Bailey-Lee Robb, MSYP.

ATTENDING: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director, Education & Children’s Services; Shelagh McLean, Head of Education & Children's Services (Early Years and Directorate Support); Neil Finnie, Service Manager (Policy & Prevention); Lynn Gillies, Service Manager (Operations Glenrothes/Family Support), Children & Families and Criminal Justice Services; Sarah Else, Education Officer; Clark Graham, Early Learning Officer; Gillian Johnston, Project Manager (Early Learning and Childcare); Angela Logue, Education Manager, Education & Children’s Services; and Diane Barnet, Committee Officer, Legal & Democratic Services.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Linda Erskine; Mr. Alastair Crockett and Mr. William Imlay.

Prior to the start of business, the Head of Education and Children's Services (Early Years and Directorate Support) gave a verbal update on Woodmill High School, Dunfermline.

132. CHANGE OF MEMBERSHIP

Decision

The Committee noted that Councillor James Calder had replaced Councillor Jane Ann Liston and Councillor Gary Guichan had replaced Councillor Ryan Smart as a member of the Education and Children’s Services Committee. The Committee further noted, in accordance with the List of Committee Powers, that: Councillor David J Ross was substituting for Councillor Kathleen Leslie and Councillor Jean Hall-Muir was substituting for Councillor Rosemary Liewald on this occasion.

133. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were submitted in terms of Standing Order No. 7.1.

134. MINUTES

(a) Minutes of meeting of the Education and Children’s Services Committee of 21st May, 2019 and 27th August, 2019

The/
The Committee considered the minutes of the Education and Children’s Services Committee of 21st May and 27th August, 2019.

**Decision**

The Committee:–

(1) agreed to approve the minute of meeting of 21st May, 2019; and

(2) noted the minute of meeting of 27th August, 2019.

(b) Minutes of meetings of the Education Appointment Committee of 3rd May, 19th May, 17th June and 21st June, 2019

The Committee considered the minutes of the Education Appointment Committee of 3rd May, 19th May, 17th June and 21st June, 2019.

**Decision**

The Committee agreed to approve the minutes.

135. **A BETTER CONNECTED DIRECTORATE (ABCD) FOR 2020**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Children’s Services providing a progress update on the work undertaken by Education and Children’s Services in becoming ‘A Better Connected Directorate’ (ABCD).

**Decision**

The Committee:–

(1) noted the progress made on the Directorate re-design; and

(2) agreed to approve next steps identified to continue to strengthen collaborations across the Directorate to improve outcomes for children and families.

136. **SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Children’s Services providing an update on the progress made regarding the review of Third Sector organisations to support future commissioning following a previous report to this Committee on 19th March, 2019.

**Motion**

Councillor Helen Law, seconded by Councillor Gary Guichan moved that the timeframe for the final report to consider the outcomes and recommendations from the/
the review, including funding, be deferred to this Committee’s meeting on 11th February, 2020 - to allow fuller consideration by appropriate stakeholders.

Amendment

Councillor Fay Sinclair, seconded by Councillor David Barratt moved that the timeframe for the final report to consider the outcomes and recommendations from the review, including funding, be considered by this Committee at its meeting on 29th October, 2019 (as outlined in the report).

Vote

Amendment - 8 votes
Motion - 4 votes

Decision

The Committee:-

(1) noted the progress made to date; and

(2) agreed the timeframe for the final report to consider the outcomes and recommendations from the review, including funding, be considered by this Committee at its meeting on 29th October, 2019 (as outlined in the report).

137. EARLY LEARNING AND CHILDCARE UPDATE

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Children’s Services advising on the progress made in delivering the planned expansion of Early Learning and Childcare (ELC), from 600 to 1140 hours, from August 2020, for all eligible 2, 3 and 4 year olds.

Decision

The Committee:-

(1) agreed to support the continued development of pilot schemes, to inform the proposed model of delivery of 1140 hrs of ELC;

(2) agreed to approve the draft updated Early Learning and Childcare Admissions Policy, which reflected the ‘funding following the child’ approach for the 1140 hours expansion, for implementation for admissions from August, 2020;

(3) noted the progress that had been made in the training, recruitment and retention of suitably qualified early years practitioners to deliver the increase in provision; and

(4) noted the progress that had been made by the Nursery Build programme to accommodate 1140 hours of ELC in Fife.
138. CHILD POVERTY ACTION PLAN


Decision

The Committee noted:

(1) the contents of the report; and
(2) the progress of the work to date and next steps.

139. STAFF WELFARE PROGRESS REPORT - STAFFWISE SURVEY 2019

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Education and Children's Services providing an analysis of the 'Staffwise' staff welfare survey undertaken within all educational establishments, centrally based Education, Children and Families and Criminal Justice teams in January/February, 2019.

Decision

The Committee:

(1) noted the results and analysis of the survey;
(2) noted the conclusions and proposed actions; and
(3) agreed to consider a specific report on the secondary school sector/staff, including an exploration of the variation of responses to the ten survey statements between the secondary school sector and other school sectors - at its meeting on 11th February, 2020.

The meeting adjourned at 12.00 noon

The meeting reconvened at 12.10 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Fay Sinclair (Convener); David Barratt, Colin Davidson, Dave Dempsey, Ian Ferguson, Helen Law, Jean Hall-Muir, Dominic Nolan, Ross Paterson, David J. Ross and Alistair Suttie; and Mr. George Haggarty.
140. EDUCATION & CHILDREN’S SERVICES DIRECTORATE - REVENUE BUDGET 2018-2019 PROVISIONAL OUTTURN

The Committee considered a joint report by the Executive Director, Education and Children’s Services and the Executive Director, Finance and Corporate Services advising on the provisional outturn for the 2018-19 Education and Children’s Services Directorate Revenue Budget, for the areas in scope of the Education and Children’s Services Committee.

**Decision**

The Committee:

(1) noted the provisional outturn position (subject to audit) for 2018-19, as detailed in the report, and the reasons for the main variances;

(2) noted that the Education and Children’s Services Directorate continued to implement the Strategy approved by the Executive Committee on 13th January, 2015, to reduce the reliance on purchased care placements and increase the number of children who could be looked after safely at home or in kinship care; and

(3) otherwise noted the content of the report.

_Councillor Gary Guichan re-entered the meeting during consideration of the above item._

141. EDUCATION & CHILDREN’S SERVICES DIRECTORATE - CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN 2018-19: PROVISIONAL OUTTURN REPORT

The Committee considered a joint report by the Executive Director, Education and Children’s Services and the Executive Director, Finance and Corporate Services providing a summary of the Education and Children’s Services Directorate’s financial position against the capital budget, for the financial year 2018-19, as well as an overview of progress on individual projects within the capital investment plan.

**Decision**

The Committee noted:-

(1) the provisional outturn position for the 2018-19 Capital investment Plan, the figures being provisional and subject to audit; and

(2) the reported spend of £14.635m represented 73.5% of the approved capital programme for 2018-19.

142./
142. EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIRECTORATE - REVENUE BUDGET 2019-20 PROJECTED OUTTURN

The Committee considered a joint report by the Executive Director, Education and Children's Services and the Executive Director, Finance and Corporate Services providing an update on the forecast financial position for the 2019-20 financial year, for the areas in scope of the Education and Children's Services Committee.

**Decision**

The Committee:

(1) noted the current financial performance and activity as detailed in the report;

(2) noted that officers will ensure that the risks associated with Looked After Children were appropriately managed whilst acting to address the projected overspend in Children and Families Service; and

(3) noted that the Education and Children's Services Directorate continued to implement the Strategy approved by the Executive Committee on 13th January, 2015, as updated by subsequent reports, most recently the report to this Committee on 22nd January, 2019, to reduce the reliance on purchased care placements and increase the number of children who could be looked after safely at home or in kinship care.

143. EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES DIRECTORATE - CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN 2019-20: PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee considered a joint report by the Executive Director, Education and Children's Services and the Executive Director, Finance and Corporate Services providing information on the overall progress of the Education and Children's Services Directorate's capital programme, for the current financial year 2019-2020, as well as advising on progress on the major projects.

**Decision**

The Committee noted:

(1) the financial position as detailed in this report, and

(2) that the budget had been revised to reflect the outcome of the Capital Plan review undertaken in February, 2019 and the subsequent re-phasing exercise carried out in June, 2019.

144. EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

**Decision**

The/
The Committee noted the Education and Children’s Services Committee Forward Work Programme 2019/20.

145. NOTICE OF MOTION

In terms of Standing Order No. 8.1 (1), the following Notice of Motion had been submitted:

**Motion**

Councillor Dave Dempsey, seconded by Councillor David J. Ross moved as follows:

'The Committee:

- Notes that Headteachers are expected to discuss and agree their DSM budgets with their Parent Councils.

- Notes that such documentary evidence as has been made available to date suggests that this happens in a small minority of schools.

- Requests a report to its next meeting laying out all the available evidence on compliance with this expectation and any proposed measures to increase that compliance towards 100%.'

**Amendment**

Councillor Fay Sinclair, seconded by Councillor David Barratt moved that:

'The Committee notes the expectation on schools to engage with parent councils regarding their DSM budgets and asks the Education Directorate to work with schools to ensure that this happens'.

Prior to a vote being taken, Councillors Dempsey and Ross agreed to withdraw their motion.

**Decision**

The Committee, therefore, agreed in terms of the Amendment.

**VALEDICTORY**

The Convener advised that Peter McNaughton, Head of Education and Children’s Services (Primary Schools and Improvement Support) was leaving Council employ. Members joined with the Convener in expressing their appreciation of all of Peter's work with the Council and wished him well for the future.
Statutory Consultation on the Proposal to Close Gateside Primary School

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director (Education & Children’s Services)
Wards Affected: Ward 16

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to present the statutory consultation document relating to the proposal to close Gateside Primary School, to seek approval of its content.

Recommendation
The Education & Children’s Services Committee is asked to:

1. Approve the content of the statutory Consultation Proposal paper, in terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, relating to the proposed closure of Gateside Primary School and rezoning of the catchment area of Strathmiglo Primary School;
2. Authorise Officers to proceed to statutory consultation in terms of the Consultation Proposal;
3. Authorise Officers to make such amendments to the Consultation Proposal paper (including the time line) as may be necessary: and to
4. Note that the Consultation Report will be brought forward to a future Committee of the Council.

Resource Implications
There are no resource implications relating to finance, people or assets. A significant amount of officer time will be dedicated to the consultation process.

Legal & Risk Implications
The consideration and determination of this report is by the Council acting as Education Authority.

Impact Assessment
An EIA (Equalities Impact Assessment) was not required in the preparation of this report. Full impact assessments will be carried out as part of any statutory consultation process.

Consultation
Discussion has taken place with the Headteacher of Gateside and Strathmiglo Primary Schools. The Education Service wrote to all parents, in July 2018. The Education Service also held a parental meeting, in Strathmiglo PS, on 17 September 2018, to allow parents an opportunity to ask questions about education provision.
A letter was sent to parents in early February 2019, advising them of the current position with Gateside Primary School and to notify parents that the Education Service would be seeking approval by the Education & Children’s Services Committee to mothball the school with immediate effect.

1.0 Background

1.1 Gateside Primary School is a small rural school with capacity for 47 pupils. The Gateside Primary school roll has fallen progressively in recent years. The school roll for this year, and the previous 6 years, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School Roll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11 (no primary one pupils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5 (no primary one pupils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 The school building is currently being maintained by Property Services to ensure it is wind and watertight.

1.3 The Education & Children’s Services Committee, on 29 March 2019, considered the recommendation to formally mothball Gateside Primary School as the school had had no pupils enrolled for the academic session from August 2018.

1.4 The school has been formally mothballed since March 2019 and there has been no attempt by parents to seek the reopening of Gateside Primary School for academic session 2019/20. All pupils in this area have enrolled at Strathmiglo Primary School or other schools.

1.5 The Committee Decision of 29 March 2019 was:

(a) to mothball Gateside Primary School with immediate effect;

(b) that, during the mothballing period, any children wishing to enrol at Gateside Primary school would be offered a place at Strathmiglo Primary School and provided with free transport if they met the distance criteria; and

(c) to consider a further report in October, 2019 reviewing the decision.

1.6 The recommendations in this report reflect the outcome of the review of the decision to mothball the school.

2.0 Review of the decision to mothball

2.1 Gateside Primary School has remained mothballed since March 2019. A review of the decision to mothball the school was carried out in September 2019, based on
the current status of the school roll, the projected roll and any feedback received from stakeholders.

2.2 No parents of pupils living in this area have requested that Gateside Primary School be reopened for the August 2019/20 session.

2.3 Updated birth information has shown that the births in the area have not significantly increased in the last year and there is no other anticipated increased growth in pupil population in this area.

2.4 There have been no requests to enrol a pupil and no feedback has been received following the letter to parents advising them that the recommendation to mothball the school from March 2019 was being considered.

2.5 Therefore, the review concluded that, in light of the above, and the extant decision to mothball the school, the Education Service should move toward closure of the school. The reasons for mothballing remain and there is unlikely to be any change.

2.6 Therefore the Education Service is presenting a proposal paper for the closure of Gateside Primary School and the rezoning of the catchment area of Strathmiglo Primary School.

3.0 Consultation Documents

3.1 The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, as amended, provides for the publication of a proposal paper that:

- Sets out the details of the relevant proposal
- Proposes a date for the implementation of the proposal
- Contains the educational benefits statement for the proposal
- Refers to such evidence or other information in support of the proposal as the Council considers appropriate.

3.2 The proposal document is attached as an appendix to this report. The document will form the basis of the statutory consultation. Copies of the proposal document will be made available to all the statutory consultees.

3.3 The statutory consultees are:

- The parent council of any affected school
- The parents of the pupils at any affected school
- The parents of any children expected by the Council to attend the school in the next two years
- The pupils at any affected school (in so far as the Council considers them to be of suitable age and maturity)
- The staff of any affected school
- Relevant trade unions
- The community council
- The users of any affected school that the Council considers relevant.
4.0 Proposed Consultation Timeline

4.1 The proposed timeline is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 October 2019</td>
<td>Consultation proposal considered by Fife Council Education &amp; Children’s Services Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 November 2019</td>
<td>Parents and other statutory consultees to receive letters informing them of the dates for the statutory consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 2019 –10 January 2020</td>
<td>Consultation live (32 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January 2020</td>
<td>Report on consultation process is submitted to Education Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 February 2020</td>
<td>Education Service receives report from Education Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 March 2020</td>
<td>Consultation Report published 3 weeks before Education &amp; Children’s Services Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2020</td>
<td>Report submitted to the Education &amp; Children’s Services Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 This report provides the detailed proposal paper relating to the proposed closure of Gateside Primary School and rezoning of the catchment area of Strathmiglo Primary School, following the review of the Education & Children’s Services Committee decision to mothball Gateside Primary School in March 2019. This proposal paper meets the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

List of Appendices
Appendix A - Proposal Document

Background Papers
The following was relied on in the preparation of this report in terms of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1973:
- Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010
  [https://www2.gov.scot/Resource/0047/00477028.pdf](https://www2.gov.scot/Resource/0047/00477028.pdf)

Report Contacts

Shelagh McLean
Head of Education & Children's Services
(Early Years & Directorate Support)
Rothesay House
Telephone: 03451 55 55 55 + 444229
Email - shelagh.mclean@fife.gov.uk

Avril Graham
Sustainable Estate Officer
Education & Children’s Services
Rothesay House
Telephone: 03451 55 55 55 + 444204
Email – avril.graham@fife.gov.uk
FIFE COUNCIL EDUCATION & CHILDREN’S SERVICES DIRECTORATE

THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

The following schools are affected by this Proposal Document:

- Gateside Primary School
- Strathmiglo Primary School

This document has been issued by Fife Council as a proposal paper in terms of the Education (Publications and Consultation etc.) (Scotland) Regulation 1981 and Amendment Regulation 1987, 1988, 1989 and 2007 and the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

DISTRIBUTION

A copy of this document is available on the Fife Council web-site:
HYPERLINK http://www.fifedirect.org.uk/gatesideprimary

A copy of this document will be provided to:
- The Parent Council of the affected schools
- The parents of the pupils at the affected schools
- The parents of those pupils expected to attend the affected schools within 2 years
- The parents of those pupils expected in Strathmiglo PS nursery class
- The pupils at the affected schools
- School staff at the affected schools
- The trade unions representatives of the above staff
- The Community Councils – Auchtermuchty and Strathmiglo
- Relevant users of the affected schools
- Community Associations
- MSPs for the area
- The Constituency MP
- Perth and Kinross Council

A copy of this document is also available from:
- County Buildings, St Catherine Street, Cupar
- Main Reception, Fife House, Glenrothes
- Education & Children’s Services Directorate, 4th Floor, Rothesay House, Glenrothes
- The schools affected by the proposal
- Or email sustainableschoolestate.enquiries@fife.gov.uk

This document can be made available in alternative formats or in translated form for readers whose first language is not English. Please apply in writing to: Education & Children’s Services Directorate, 4th Floor, Rothesay House, Glenrothes or by email to: avril.graham@fife.gov.uk (telephone 03451 555555 ext. 444204). Page 25 of this document provides additional contact numbers, in different languages.
SUMMARY OF PROCESS FOR THIS PROPOSAL DOCUMENT

1. Consideration by the Education & Children’s Services Committee

This Proposal Document has been issued as a result of a decision by the Education & Children’s Services Committee of Fife Council of Tuesday 29 October 2019. Views are now sought in formal consultation on the proposals in this paper.

2. Proposal Document issued to consultees and published on Council Web-site

A copy of this document will be issued free of charge, on request, to the consultees listed on the preceding page, and it will also be published on the Council web-site: HYPERLINK http://www.fifedirect.org.uk/gatesideprimary

3. Publication of advertisement in local newspapers

An advertisement will be placed in the relevant local newspapers. In addition, there may be announcements related to the proposal process on local radio.

4. Length of Consultation period

An advertisement will be placed in local newspapers, week commencing Monday 11 November 2019. The consultation will commence on Tuesday 12 November 2019 and will thereafter run until close of business on Friday 10 January 2020, which covers the minimum statutory consultation period of 30 school days.

5. Public meeting/information sessions

A public meeting will be held in the Dining Room in Strathmiglo Primary School on Wednesday 27 November 2019 from 6.00 pm to 7.00 pm where there will be opportunities to:

- hear more about the proposal
- ask questions about the proposal
- have your views recorded so that they can be taken into account as part of the consultation process.

A drop in session has been arranged at Strathmiglo Primary School on Wednesday 27 November from 5.00-6.00 pm.

6. Involvement of Education Scotland

A copy of the proposal paper will be sent to Education Scotland by Fife Council. Education Scotland will also receive a copy of any relevant written representations that are received by the Council from any person during the consultation period or, if Education Scotland agrees, a summary of them. Education Scotland will further receive a summary of any oral representation made to the Council at the public meetings/information sessions and, as available (and so far as otherwise practicable), a copy of any other relevant
documentation. Education Scotland will then prepare and submit a report on the educational aspects of the proposal within a 3 week period (unless the Council and Education Scotland agree a longer period) after the Council has sent them all representations and documents mentioned above. However, for the avoidance of doubt, the 3 week period will not start until after the consultation period ends. Education Scotland may make such reasonable enquiries of such people at the school as they consider appropriate and may make such reasonable enquiries of such other people as they consider appropriate.

7. Preparation of Consultation Report

The Council will review the proposal having regard to the Education Scotland Report and written representations that it has received. In addition, oral representations made at the public meetings/information sessions will form part of that review. It will then prepare a Consultation Report. The report will include a record of the total number of written representations made during the consultation period, a summary of the written representations and a summary of the oral representations made at the public meeting as well as a copy of the Education Scotland Report and any other relevant information, including details of any alleged inaccuracies and how these have been handled. The report will also contain a statement explaining how it complied with the requirement to review the proposal in light of the Education Scotland Report and representations (both written and oral) that it received. The Consultation Report will be published and available for further consideration for a period of 3 weeks.

8. Decision

The Consultation Report, together with any other relevant documentation, will be considered by the Education & Children’s Services Committee, which will come to a decision whether to implement the proposal, in whole or in part, or not. The decision of the Education & Children’s Services Committee will be subject to the Council’s internal governance procedures before it becomes final. If the Council decides to implement the proposal, in whole or in part, the decision will be notified to the Scottish Ministers.

9. Scottish Ministers Call-in

Fife Council will notify the Scottish Ministers of the decision and give them a copy of the Proposal Paper and Consultation Report within 6 days of the Council making a decision to implement the proposal in whole or in part. The Scottish Ministers have an 8 week period, from the date of the Council’s decision, to decide if they will call-in the proposal. Within the first 3 weeks of that 8 week period, the Scottish Ministers will take account of any relevant representations made to them by any person. Unless the Scottish Ministers inform the Council that they do not intend to call-in the proposal before the end of the 8 week period, the Council will not proceed to implement any proposal during the 8 week period. If Ministers decide to call in a closure proposal, they must refer it to the Convener of the School Closure Review Panels (section 17A(2)) for determination by a School Closure Review Panel. The authority may not implement the proposal (wholly or partly) unless the Panel has granted consent.
to it (with or without conditions) and either the period for making an appeal to the sheriff has expired or, if an appeal has been made, it has either been abandoned or the sheriff has confirmed the Panel’s decision (section 17A(4)).

Until the outcome of the call-in has been notified to the Council, it is unable to proceed to implement the proposal.

The Scottish Ministers can issue a call-in notice if they consider that the Council has failed in a significant regard to comply with the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, which are relevant to the closure proposal or if they consider that the Council has failed to take proper account of a material consideration relevant to the decision to implement the closure proposal.

Note on Corrections

If any inaccuracy or omission is discovered in this Proposal Paper, either by the Council or any person, the Council will determine if relevant information has been omitted or if there has been an inaccuracy. It will then take appropriate action which may include the issue of a correction or the reissuing of the Proposal Paper or the revision of the timescale for the consultation period if appropriate. The relevant consultees and Education Scotland will be advised.
Fife Council

Education & Children’s Services Directorate

THE CONSULTATION PROPOSAL

PROPOSAL TO CLOSE GATESIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL
AND TO REZONE THE CATCHMENT AREA OF
STRATHMIGLO PRIMARY SCHOOL
Format of the Proposal Document

1. Introduction
2. The Proposal
3. Contextual Analysis
4. Gateside Primary School – The Case For Closure
5. Receiving School – Strathmiglo Primary School
6. Educational Benefits Statement
7. Reasonable Walking Routes to School/Transport Arrangements
8. Nursery Provision
9. Secondary School Implications
10. Cost Per Pupil
11. Financial Implications
12. Future Use Of The Site
13. Community Impact
14. Summary of Proposal
15. Projected School Rolls

Appendix 1 - Map of existing catchment areas
Appendix 2 - Map of existing school community and wider community
Appendix 3 - Map of proposed catchment area
Appendix 4 - Map showing travel route from Gateside to Strathmiglo
Appendix 5 - Glossary of terms
Appendix 6 - Financial analysis
Appendix 7 - Consultation Response Form
1. **Introduction**

1.1 This consultation paper sets out the rationale and implications in respect of the proposal to close Gateside Primary School and to rezone the catchment area of Strathmiglo Primary School.

1.2 This paper also sets out the consultation process and the means and timescales for making representations on the proposal.

1.3 In order to ensure that the school estate provides best value for money, the Education & Children’s Services Directorate must ensure that the number of pupil places is matched as efficiently as possible to the numbers of pupils living in each catchment area.

1.4 This paper details the closure proposal for Gateside Primary School and the rezoning of the catchment area for Strathmiglo Primary School. However, parents will continue to have the right to exercise parental choice and to make placing requests to alternative schools, subject to the normal constraints of pupil capacity being available.

1.5 Gateside Primary School was mothballed on 19 March 2019, following the formal decision by the Education & Children’s Services Committee. The school had no pupils enrolled for the academic session from August 2018.

1.6 Gateside Primary School is a small rural school with capacity for 47 pupils. The Gateside Primary school roll has fallen progressively in recent years. The school roll for this year, and the previous 6 years, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School Roll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11 (no primary one pupils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5 (no primary one pupils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The school building is currently being maintained by Property Services to ensure it is wind and watertight.

1.8 The Education & Children’s Services Committee, on 29 March 2019, considered the recommendation to formally mothball Gateside Primary School as the school had had no pupils enrolled for the academic session from August 2018.

1.9 The school has been formally mothballed since March 2019 and there has been no attempt by parents to seek the reopening of Gateside Primary School for academic session 2019/20. All pupils in this area have enrolled at Strathmiglo Primary School or other schools.
1.10 The Committee Decision of 29 March 2019 was:

(a) to mothball Gateside Primary School with immediate effect;

(b) that, during the mothballing period, any children wishing to enrol at Gateside Primary school would be offered a place at Strathmiglo Primary School and provided with free transport if they met the distance criteria; and

(c) to consider a further report in October, 2019 reviewing the decision.

1.11 This proposal paper reflects the outcome of the review of the decision to mothball the school.

2. The Proposal

2.1 The proposal is to:

- Close Gateside Primary School on 3 July 2020.
- Rezone the catchment area of Strathmiglo Primary School, to incorporate all of the current catchment area for Gateside Primary School, from 3 July 2020.
- In recognition of the continuation of the mothballing of Gateside Primary School, continue to offer a catchment area place at Strathmiglo Primary School for all pupils currently living in the Gateside Primary School catchment area.
- Seek alternative uses for the Gateside Primary School site.

2.2 Appendix 1 shows the existing catchment boundaries for Gateside Primary School and Strathmiglo Primary School. Appendix 2 shows the defined Gateside Primary School community area and the wider community area. Appendix 3 shows the proposed revised catchment boundary for Strathmiglo Primary School. Appendix 4 shows the detailed travel route currently in use by pupils being transported from Gateside to Strathmiglo Primary School. Appendix 5 provides a glossary of terms. Appendix 6 provides a detailed financial analysis on which the summary of financial implications is based. Finally, appendix 7 provides the Consultation Response Form.

3. Contextual Analysis

3.1 Guiding Principles

The Council has set a number of guiding principles for the review of the school estate, which were agreed by the Council’s Executive Committee on 2 October 2012, following a Fife school review and more recently at the Education & Children’s Services Committee on 28 August 2018:

(a) Every school should be rated as ‘A’ or ‘B’ for both condition and suitability, to include a number of accessible schools in each geographical area.
Schools should have an occupancy rate greater than 60% of capacity and, in order to ensure equity in provision, schools should be operating within an optimal occupancy and efficiency range of 80-100%. Consideration should be given to establishing a minimum number of pupils in any school which is less than 5 miles from another school; therefore, schools should have a minimum of 3 classes, recognising that effective learning requires interaction between pupils. This group activity is most effective when children are of a similar age and, to enable this, where possible schools should have a minimum roll of 50 pupils.

A strategy for a sustainable school estate should support the progressive reduction in the overall carbon footprint for the Council.

3.2 Review Factors

The factors considered in the review of the school estate include:

- Educational benefits
- Condition surveys
- Suitability assessments
- Recent investment in school buildings
- Energy performance data
- School roll projections and capacities
- Catchment areas, including impact of Strategic Development Allocations and Local Development Plans
- Cost per pupil
- Distance to nearest school
- Best Value model for existing Public Private Partnership (PPP) contracts i.e. increasing occupancy.

3.3 New Housing Developments within Gateside and Strathmiglo Primary School Catchment Areas

Fife Council adopted the Fife Local Development Plan on 21 September 2017, following a review by the Scottish Government. This plan sets out the planning policies and proposals for the development and use of land across Fife.

There are no housing units planned for future development in the Gateside Primary School catchment area. However, should any planning application for windfall development be submitted to planning, depending on the scale of development, it is likely that pupils from any development could be accommodated within the existing Strathmiglo Primary School classes.

There are 2 effective sites to be constructed in the Strathmiglo PS catchment area – Eden Bank Works, for 25 units during 2021-2022, and Bellfield for 5 units during year 2024. At the time of writing the report there were around 10 houses for sale in the villages of Gateside and Strathmiglo.

3.4 Rural School status

Gateside Primary School is classified as an accessible rural school.
according to criteria applied by the Scottish Government. As a result of this classification, and because fewer than 70 children were attending the school up until August 2018, each pupil attracts additional funding of some £2900 per annum to help partially offset the higher cost of educating children in such settings.

In addition, because Gateside Primary School is a rural school additional considerations must be applied in reaching any decision regarding a proposal to close the school. These are:

(i) Any viable alternative to closure
(ii) The likely effect on the local community in consequence of the proposal (if implemented).
(iii) The likely effect caused by any different travelling arrangement that may be required in consequence of the proposal (if implemented).

4. Gateside Primary School – The Case for Closure

4.1 The school roll for Gateside Primary School has steadily declined for the past 9 years. The current maximum capacity of the school is 47 pupils. The school roll, at the Census in September 2017, was 5 pupils, giving an occupancy level of 11%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School Roll</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 In June 2018, the Education Service was advised that, due to a number of pupil movements out of Gateside Primary School, there would be no pupils attending the school in August 2018. The one remaining family enrolled at Strathmiglo Primary School at the end of June 2018.

4.3 At that point it was agreed that the school would not be operational in August 2018. Prior to formally mothballing the school, the Education Service held a meeting with parents/carers in September 2018, to outline the position. The Education Service monitored the school roll and reviewed the number of nursery pupils eligible to commence P1 in August 2019. None of the parents of nursery pupils requested a place for Primary One in Gateside PS. The Education Service subsequently wrote to parents/carers of pupils living in the Gateside Primary School catchment area to advise that they would be moving forward with a formal committee paper seeking approval to mothball the school. There were no concerns raised by parents.

4.4 Births in the Gateside Catchment Area

Information provided by the NHS (Community Health Index records) have identified the number of births in the Gateside Primary School catchment
area of those pupils who would be due to start school in the next 4 years. These are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2019</th>
<th>2 pupils</th>
<th>August 2021</th>
<th>3 pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>4 pupils</td>
<td>August 2022</td>
<td>3 pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Building Condition

Gateside Primary School is currently rated in ‘B’ condition (Core Facts April 2019).

4.6 Suitability

Suitability is measured with regard to 5 main factors:
- Learning & Teaching
- Internal Social
- Internal Facilities
- External Social
- External Facilities

For each of these categories the following factors are considered:
- Functionality
- Accessibility
- Safety & security
- Fixed furniture and fittings.
- Environmental conditions

The present core facts suitability rating for Gateside Primary School is ‘B’. The survey information was provided by the Headteacher in 2015.

4.7 Accessibility

The present accessibility rating for Gateside Primary School is ‘C’.

4.8 Carbon

The EPC rating is D, which is the equivalent to an estimated emissions of \( \text{CO}_2 \) of 56kg per square metre.

4.9 Additional Information

Although Gateside Primary School had a small area used for pupil dining, the school was not used for any (non-school) community activities during academic sessions 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19. The school hired the village hall for PE activities.

4.10 Alternative Possibilities

4.10.1 Gateside Primary School is one of our primary schools and is located adjacent to the Local Authority boundary with Perth and Kinross Council. Whilst considering any other alternatives to closure, the Council has reviewed the local primary schools in close proximity to Gateside Primary School. Strathmiglo PS has the capacity to accommodate the number of pupils projected from within the existing catchment area of Gateside Primary School. There is no planned housing development within the Local Development Plan for Fife within Gateside Primary School catchment area.
which may have supported a declining school roll. Therefore, the Council has come to the conclusion that the rezoning of the Strathmiglo PS catchment area to include the existing Gateside Primary School catchment area will sustain the school roll, in the long term, at Strathmiglo Primary School; meet the occupancy rate of above 60% and allow Strathmiglo PS to continue to operate with more than 3 primary classes.

4.10.2 Continue to Mothball the school - Fife Council does not believe that this would be in the best interests of the community. To retain a building, which is empty and not in operation, for another year, would require Fife Council to continue to ensure security, undertake repairs and sustain maintenance contracts.

4.10.3 Gateside Primary School to reopen - This is not considered a reasonable alternative at this time. The parents who attended the parents’ meeting were disappointed that the school roll was not higher in Gateside PS, however, felt that at Strathmiglo PS there was a larger peer group to support pupils.

4.10.4 Therefore, the Council has concluded that the rezoning of Strathmiglo PS catchment area to include the existing Gateside Primary School catchment area will sustain the roll long term at Strathmiglo Primary School, as well as meet the occupancy rate of above 60% and allow Strathmiglo PS to continue to operate with more than 3 primary classes.

4.11 Special Considerations – Rural School Status

i. Any viable alternative to closure

The roll of Gateside Primary School has continued to decline over recent years. A shared headship was introduced for academic session August 2016/17 with Strathmiglo Primary School.

There are no other small schools in close proximity to Gateside Primary School where the catchment area can be rezoned to Gateside Primary School, as Gateside is on the edge of the border of the local authority. Increasing the catchment of Gateside Primary School is not possible as Gateside Primary School does not have sufficient capacity to include more than 2 classes of pupils from Strathmiglo Primary School.

The parents within the village have chosen to make placing requests to other schools and therefore the school has remained under 60% occupied since 2014. The school roll at September 2017 census was 5 pupils (11% occupancy). Fife Council believes that whilst the school was in operation with 5 pupils, the educational experience would be different and that the pupils would benefit from being part of a larger school. There is no mechanism available to the Council to increase the school roll. The school does not meet the guiding principles for the sustainability of the school estate. So, the Council considers that there is no viable alternative to closure.

ii. The likely effect on the local community in consequence of the proposal (if implemented).
The local community has been defined in three ways, as demonstrated in Appendix 2.

The first community considered is the school community. The existing school community has already become part of a larger, sustainable school community and as such will bring together all the children within the Gateside community. As stated above, the school community made no use of the school building for activities involving the local community, and no impact in this respect is anticipated.

The second community considered is the Gateside village community. This community makes no use of the school building for community activities. The community makes use of the village hall located in the village approximately 450 metres from the school, and implementation of the proposal would therefore not affect the holding of community events in the village. It is the view of the Council that the loss of the school premises would not adversely affect the community.

If the proposal is implemented, it is the view of the Council that the sustainability of the Gateside village community will not be affected; the community will continue. Children will continue to live in the community and will attend a school 2 miles from their existing school. It is also the view of the Council that there will be no significant impact on the desire for housing in the area. As outlined previously, although there are no allocated housing development sites in the settlement of Gateside within the Local Development Plan, should a developer come forward with a windfall site, this should not have any significant impact for the Education Service and would not be likely to lead to refusal to support any planning application.

A more detailed analysis of local community impact is provided in section 13.

Finally, the wider community of which Gateside village is part will benefit from the development of a more sustainable school estate, with a reduction in the costs resulting from maintaining deteriorating buildings. The longevity of the remaining schools will be improved, providing stability to the area and the community will be able to develop the already extensive community activities provided through Strathmiglo Primary School. There will be no impact on the use of shops, services and facilities in this wider community by residents of the Gateside community as a result of the closure of Gateside Primary School.

If the proposal is implemented the Council does not consider that there will be any adverse effect on the local community, whether defined as the school community, the village community or the wider rural community surrounding the village of Gateside. Overall the Council considers that there will be a positive effect on the local community.

iii. The likely effect caused by any different travelling arrangements that may be required in consequence of the proposal (if implemented)
Strathmiglo Primary School is 2 miles from Gateside Primary School. Primary age pupils who live more than one mile from their catchment school are entitled to free transport under the present Council policy. As a result of pupils moving at the end of session 2017/18, Fife Council offered all parents residing in the Gateside Primary School catchment area, who were already attending Strathmiglo Primary School, as a result of a placing request, and any new pupils, free transport to Strathmiglo Primary School. For those pupils who meet the distance criteria, this will continue for their school duration. The journey time from Gateside Primary School to Strathmiglo Primary School would be less than ten minutes by mini-bus or car, and whilst there will be variations in this for some pupils, the Council does not consider that there will be any significant adverse effects in consequence of this proposal. There will be a small environmental impact of bussing all of the Gateside pupils who may have previously walked to school.

There will be a reduction in travel between Gateside Primary School and Strathmiglo Primary School by the joint headteacher, and this will have a very small positive environmental impact and increase the time available to the headteacher for management and educational duties. It is unlikely that the arrangements school staff make to get to school will change in any significant way. There is unlikely to be any environmental impact arising from the arrangements staff make to get to school.

Other users of the school premises or facilities will not be affected in relation to transport arrangements. The village hall is approximately 450 metres from the school. Any community events which might have been held in the school are likely to continue to be held in the community centre, which would have a neutral transport effect.

4.12 Rationale for the closure of Gateside Primary School - Summary

Gateside Primary School meets a number of the Council’s guiding principles and factors relevant to the review:

- Occupancy of the school is less than 60%
- The school has fewer than 50 pupils
- The school has fewer than 3 classes.

5. Receiving School – Strathmiglo Primary School

5.1 Location

Strathmiglo Primary School is situated 2 miles from the Gateside Primary School building and the journey from school to school takes less than 10 minutes by mini-bus or car.
5.2 School Roll

The school roll at Strathmiglo PS was 76 pupils in September 2018, with an occupancy of 76%. The maximum capacity of the school is 100 pupils. There is a dining hall on site and a multi-use classroom for other curriculum activities on site. The school hires the public hall for physical education on a weekly basis.

Strathmiglo Primary School has 4 permanent teaching spaces within the school and therefore the rezoning of their existing catchment area with the existing Gateside Primary School catchment area could be accommodated within existing permanent classrooms in this school. The nursery in Strathmiglo PS is located in a separate building on site.

The addition of Gateside Primary School pupils into the Strathmiglo Primary School catchment area would help to ensure the sustainability of this rural school. School roll projections for Strathmiglo PS, based on the 2018 census, indicate that Strathmiglo PS will decline to an occupancy of 58% in 2026. With the proposed rezoning of the catchment area for Strathmiglo PS to include all the pupils living in the Gateside PS catchment area, this will sustain the roll to more than 50 pupils, 3 classes and an occupancy over 60%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School Roll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>73 (actual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Building Condition

Strathmiglo Primary School is currently rated in ‘B’ condition (Core Facts April 2018).

5.4 Suitability

5.5 The current core facts suitability rating for Strathmiglo Primary School is ‘B’. The survey information was provided by the Headteacher in 2015.

Accessibility

The permanent accommodation for Strathmiglo Primary School is rated as ‘C’ for accessibility. The temporary modular accommodation in which the nursery is located is rated as ‘C’ for accessibility.
5.6 Carbon

The building has an EPC rating of ‘E+ equivalent to an estimated EPC emissions level of 66kg per square metre.

5.7 Additional Information

Strathmiglo PS does not operate a morning or after school childcare service. The nearest childcare club is run from Auchtermuchty Primary School, which is situated 4 miles from Gateside Primary School.

The school staff at Strathmiglo PS run a range of school activities for pupils. Lunchtime clubs include Lego, scratch club and arts and crafts club. Multi sports, dance and singing classes operate throughout the year and are well attended by pupils from P1-P7 stages. Primary 1 pupils take part in woodland walks at lunchtime to learn about nature.

The community hall, situated on California, Strathmiglo is a 10 minute walk from the school and any pupils are accompanied by the correct ratio of adults to pupils.

The school has access to a private field, adjacent to the school and their playground, to deliver the recommended 2 hours of physical activity per week.

6. Educational Benefits Statement

6.1 Educational benefits for Gateside Primary School pupils

- In making this proposal, the Education and Children Service's Directorate believes that being part of a larger school will enable both the existing pupils living in the Gateside Primary School catchment area, and those pupils from Gateside PS attending Strathmiglo PS, to continue to benefit from an improved range of experiences through quality curricular opportunities, reflecting key principles of Curriculum for Excellence, including breadth, depth, and personalisation and choice. Engagement with community resources is a part of this. Primary 1 and Primary 2 pupils have an opportunity to visit local shops, pupils learn to play bowls at the local bowling club and use the local church for activities. The school has a very positive relationship with the community café and pupils visit every month.

- A significantly increased pupil population will enable Gateside pupils to be educated in age-based settings in which collaborative activities and active learning will ensure more rigorous development and progression of pupils’ skills and knowledge. Importantly, pupils will have opportunities to learn with and from their peers. They will have more opportunities to consolidate and extend their learning, articulate arguments, explore new ideas and find creative solutions to problems within groups of their peers. Pupils have access to lunchtime clubs and also the opportunity to visit elderly residents living nearby.
• Within the larger school, learners will have the opportunity to develop wider relationships and friendships which will see them better prepared to meet the social and learning opportunities and challenges ahead in the large context of secondary school. This is important in terms of developing their education from 3 to 18 years of age.

• At Strathmiglo Primary School, there will be a greater number of staff than previously located within Gateside Primary School. This will result in an increased range of staff specialism, knowledge, expertise, skills and talent as well as increased scope in the deployment of staff to meet the needs and respond to the differing interests and curricular choices of individuals.

• Increased opportunities for collaborative working between a larger number of teachers and pupil support staff will provide a wider range of learning and teaching approaches, develop a consistency of expectations and opportunities to share good practice, leading to better outcomes for children. Furthermore, collective professional activity will offer increased opportunities for moderation and curriculum development which will directly impact on school improvement. This will support the national and Fife-wide empowerment agenda.

• The larger school will provide a progressive and coherent curriculum, based on an enhanced range of planned learning and teaching approaches, which will have a direct positive impact on the quality of pupils’ wider achievements. More teachers and more PSAs will help ensure high quality staff interaction through joint planning and shared career-long professional learning opportunities.

• As Gateside PS was not in operation during session 2018/19, there has been increased management time for the Strathmiglo PS Headteacher to focus on school improvement and to rigorously monitor and evaluate pupil learning and transitions during last session. As a consequence of being in a single location, the Headteacher has had greater availability to provide support for pupils, parents and staff across the Nursery and Primary School on a regular basis.

• Strathmiglo Primary School has more and better facilities on site than Gateside Primary School and will provide a greater range of resources and wider opportunities for all learners. It is anticipated that the larger school will provide more flexible support to children with additional support needs and will provide opportunities for these children to be supported by a range of adults over time. A greater pool of adults can help facilitate the development of children’s independence and their capacity to interact with others.

• Outdoor physical education facilities and the hire of the local hall allow Strathmiglo Primary School to deliver the recommended 2 hours of physical education per week, to all pupils, throughout the year. This is crucial to the physical and emotional wellbeing of the children.

• A larger school roll at Strathmiglo Primary School offers children from the Gateside PS catchment area an increased possibility of participating in
teams in a range of local and national competitions and events. These educational, cultural and sporting activities provide a number of benefits for children in terms of both academic and social development and support the process of transition towards the larger and more varied educational setting of secondary school.

- Pupils will continue to have access to the lunchtime and after school clubs which are run by school staff and Active Schools at Strathmiglo Primary School.

- Through the newly reformed Strathmiglo Primary School Parent Forum and Council, parents from the Gateside PS catchment have been given the opportunity to become part of a larger parent community, providing more opportunities to engage in their children’s learning and development. The benefits of parental involvement in their children’s education are clearly recognised and any increase in parental involvement has the potential to directly benefit children in their learning.

6.2 Educational benefits for pupils of Strathmiglo Primary School

- Strathmiglo Primary School pupils will have increased opportunities to develop relationships and friendships with others from a wider geographical area, and improved opportunities to participate in co-operative and shared learning experiences.

- A larger school roll enhances the sustainability and viability of the school and offers greater security to learners within the Strathmiglo PS community.

6.3 Benefits for other users of the school

- Gateside Primary School has not been used by the community in the last 3 years. Should this proposal be implemented, community functions could continue to be staged in the nearby village hall.

6.4 Benefits for children who will/are likely to become pupils at the school within two years of the publication of this proposal paper

- The Gateside Primary School building did not have the facilities to accommodate an integral nursery class. Although the Strathmiglo nursery class is situated within a separate building, the school is well resourced with regard to pre-school education and will cater for pupils from Gateside aged 3 to 5 years.

- Having the Nursery and Primary 1 provision co-located on site will support progression and allow for greater curricular continuity during the transition between home and nursery and from nursery to Primary 1.

- The closure of Gateside Primary School from April 2020 will alleviate uncertainties for current and future pupils and their families and will provide long term stability.
6.5 Benefits for other pupils in the authority area

- The formal closure of Gateside Primary School would reduce inefficient operating expenditure, thus allowing redirection of resources to support pupils across Fife. The more efficient use of resources will result in a more equitable and “best value” model for deployment of resources across Fife schools. This has implications for the school estate, resources and staffing, all of which are considered to impact positively on children’s learning.

6.6 How the Authority intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects

- The transfer of existing pupils to Strathmiglo Primary School was carefully planned by Education and Children Service’s Directorate staff, school staff and parents/carers to ensure that children were supported through the transition.

- School staff have supported the pupils who transferred in session 2018, and the new pupils expected in August 2019, to establish new friendships and to integrate into their new setting.

- Particular priority will be given to ensuring continuity and support for children with additional support needs.

6.7 Any other likely effects of the proposal

- As all of the current Gateside Primary School pupils live more than 1 mile from Strathmiglo Primary school transport will be provided for all, in line with Fife Council policy.

6.8 Benefits the Authority believes will result from implementation of the proposal (and reasons for this belief)

- The education of current and future pupils from Gateside village and the surrounding area will take place in a larger setting which will facilitate delivery of improved education in a more sustainable context. Broadly, the Council believes the larger setting of Strathmiglo Primary School provides an increased range of opportunities to deliver Curriculum for Excellence for existing Gateside pupils and to enable new Gateside pupils to benefit from an educational setting designed to meet their identified needs.

- The expenditure currently required to maintain Gateside Primary School will be redirected to the benefit of all learners in schools across Fife. This redirection will positively impact directly on staffing, resourcing and school estate management, and will enhance educational opportunities for a larger group of children and young people. Taking account of the financial constraints which apply to all local authorities currently and in the foreseeable future this intention is consistent with prudent and efficient management of public funds.
7. **Reasonable Walking Routes to School/Transport Arrangements**

7.1 For the last academic session, all pupils living in the Gateside PS catchment area who were attending Strathmiglo Primary School were given free transport. As Strathmiglo PS is 2 miles from Gateside PS, free transport will continue to be provided for pupils living over 1 mile from Strathmiglo PS should the proposal be implemented. For those pupils who live within one mile of their primary school, parents have the responsibility to determine whether pupils are supervised on journeys to and from school.

7.2 Whilst Gateside PS was in operation during 2017/18, there were <5 pupils transported to Gateside PS. This proposal will result in all pupils continuing to receive transport to Strathmiglo Primary School, in line with current Council policy.

7.3 Pupils who will be transported (all pupils) will be collected and dropped-off at a suitable point within Gateside village.

8. **Nursery Provision**

8.1 Nursery provision for the catchment areas of Gateside Primary School and Strathmiglo Primary School is accommodated within accommodation at Strathmiglo Primary School. Accessibility to the nursery has been improved recently with the provision of wheelchair access to the main entrance of the nursery.

8.2 Strathmiglo PS nursery class currently has capacity for 24 pupils in the morning and 24 pupils in the afternoon. Strathmiglo PS nursery will expand in August 2020 to deliver 1140 hours and current indications are that there is sufficient space to do this within the existing building for the pupils living in this area. Currently the nursery is involved in the pilot for operating morning places only or full time nursery places (9-3pm). Staffing has been increased to ensure a quality learning experience for pupils in a nursery setting (i.e. to 4 Early Years Officers and a teacher access every third week).

9. **Secondary School Implications**

9.1 In terms of the School Admissions Policy for Primary and Secondary Schools in Fife, enrolment at a secondary school is based on the catchment area in which a pupil's home address is situated. No changes to secondary school catchments are being proposed as part of this consultation.

9.2 The policy also provides that standard enrolments for transfer from primary to secondary are organised annually between the secondary school and its associated primary schools.

9.3 Parents have the right to request that their child attend a school other than their designated catchment school (or to their designated catchment school if the child has not been offered a place there). Any such request is called a placing request and is governed by the Education (Scotland) Act 1980. Further information on placing requests and the procedure involved can be
found in the School Admissions Policy for Primary and Secondary Schools in Fife which can be found at www.fifedirect.org.uk.

9.4 Gateside Primary School and Strathmiglo Primary School are associated primary schools for Bell Baxter High School.

9.5 Pupils can continue to make placing requests to other non-catchment primary or secondary schools but would not be entitled to free or subsidised school transport. In most circumstances, where pupil places are available, placing requests will be granted.

10. **Cost per Pupil (see Glossary of Terms)**

10.1 The cost per pupil equates to the total expenditure for all running costs associated with a primary or secondary school divided by the number of pupils enrolled in the school at the September census.

10.2 The cost per pupil for Gateside Primary School was £16,438 during academic session 2017/18. The cost per pupil for Strathmiglo Primary School was £3785 for session 2017/18.

11. **Financial Implications**

11.1 The following savings will result from the closure of Gateside Primary School, assuming the building is disposed of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£117,896</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises Costs</td>
<td>£12,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>£2,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Saving</td>
<td>£132,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less transport costs £13,252

**Total Annual Net Saving** £119,294

A more detailed analysis of these figures is contained in Appendix 6.

11.2 **Grant Aided Expenditure (GAE)**

There will be no change to the Grant Aided Expenditure (GAE) allocation for Fife Council arising from the closure of this school.

11.3 The overall GAE allocation that Fife Council receives from the Scottish Government includes an element reflecting the higher cost of educating children in rural schools with fewer than 70 pupils. However, this is calculated using a formula that is based on the number of pupils attending small, rural schools within each local authority area. This calculation will be unaffected by the closure of a school with no pupils on the school roll.

12. **Future Use of the Site**

12.1 The school property is attached to the old school house. The school house is privately owned, and the services are shared. The resident of the school house has previously raised concerns about the future of the school. Detailed feasibility work will be required if the proposal is approved to separate services. The school is currently maintained by our Property
Services Team to ensure it is wind and watertight and is regularly checked by Janitorial Services.

12.2 If the closure proposal is approved by the Education & Children’s Services Committee in March 2020, consideration will be given to other educational uses for the school. If none can be identified other uses by the Council will be considered. If no alternative uses can be identified in this way the site will be disposed of.

13. Community Impact

13.1 In preparing this proposal the Council has considered a number of ways in which the closure of Gateside Primary School might impact on the community, taking account of research published by the Scottish Government in 2012 (Robinson and Whittaker, EAS Learning Research). This research identifies a number of key areas for consideration.

13.1.1 On the basis of this proposal all children from the Gateside community would be educated within Strathmiglo Primary School. Strathmiglo Primary School already has a number of Gateside PS catchment area pupils enrolled following successful placing requests. Pre-school pupils already attend the nursery within Strathmiglo Primary School.

13.1.2 Community links already exist between Gateside and Strathmiglo with pupils taking part in joint physical education activity and school trips.

13.1.3 Loss of social resource and community resource
Gateside Primary School has not been used by other community users during the last 3 academic sessions (2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19). The community of Gateside has access to a Memorial Hall (not owned by Fife Council), 450 metres from the existing school building. Closure of the school would have no impact on this aspect of village life.

13.1.4 Economic impact
Gateside Primary School is not a major employer within the community and in this respect the closure of the school will not have any economic impact. In addition, there are currently no large retail or service facilities located within Gateside whose continued viability might be dependent on the school. Within the village there is a local builder, garage retail business, hairdresser, the former local pub is now a residential house and the Mill has a selection of bespoke businesses. More retail and service facilities are located in Strathmiglo (2 miles), Auchtermuchty (4 miles) or Cupar (13 miles). Strathmiglo village has a post office, bowling club, local pub and a few shops. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed school closure will have any impact on the desirability of houses for purchase or let, and comparable Fife communities without schools continue to flourish.

13.1.5 Community and parental involvement
The education of children at Strathmiglo Primary School has not impacted on parents’ desire to be involved in their children’s education.
13.1.6 Impact on pupils
Strong educational and social links already existed between Gateside and Strathmiglo Primary Schools. Currently, children are benefitting from having access to larger peer groups, increased friendships and the increased social opportunities which this offers.

13.1.7 Attitudes to school closure
It is disappointing that there are not more pupils residing in the Gateside Primary School catchment area and parents understand the decisions that have been made. It is possible that parents in the community may have some concern regarding a formal proposal to close Gateside PS. However, to date there has been no feedback from parents to suggest any concern with the mothballing or potential closure of Gateside Primary School. Prior to the decision to mothball Gateside Primary School, all parents/carers of those pupils from the Gateside PS catchment area attending Strathmiglo PS or any other primary school in Fife were invited to provide feedback on the Council’s move to formally mothball the school. No letters/emails were received from parents/carers.

13.1.8 Loss of close relationship between headteachers/teachers and the local community
Teaching staff have established good communication and strong links with parents/carers in the Gateside community. Arrangements have been in place to ensure that these are maintained, and it is anticipated that there will be no impact on such relationships. The Headteacher of Strathmiglo PS has close links to the Community Council and has previously attended their meetings.

13.1.9 Pupils’ sense of community identity
Wherever possible and appropriate, pupils from Gateside village will have the opportunity to engage in community based educational and social activities with a view to reinforcing their links to Strathmiglo and minimising the risk that they will experience any loss of sense of community identity. The current participation of Gateside children in activities in the wider community would indicate that this does not represent an area of significant impact.

13.1.10 Loss of community confidence and a general decline in quality of life
The potential impact of the closure of the school in terms of community confidence and quality of life, while limited, is recognised. However, there is a Community Council in operation for the Auchtermuchty and Strathmiglo settlements.

13.2 In summary, there will be minimal impact on the Community, however defined. Where there may be impact this will not be significant and where identified will be addressed.
14. **Summary of Proposal**

The school roll of Gateside Primary School was 0 pupils for academic session 2018/19 and with a capacity of 47 this represents 0% occupancy. There were no enrolments for session 2019/20, representing an occupancy level of 0%. The school does not meet the guiding principles of being more than 60% occupied, having more than 50 pupils or 3 classes or more. The school roll is unlikely to increase with the current demographic profile of the catchment area and there are no approved housing sites within the school catchment area which will support a declining school roll. The school was formally mothballed, following the decision by the Education & Children’s Services Committee on 19 March 2019 with no feedback being received from parents in the Gateside catchment area to request that the school remains open.

15. **Projected School Rolls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strathmiglo PS</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateside PS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined School Roll Projections (Gateside and Strathmiglo rolls merged – based on 2018 census figure)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined School Roll</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 16. Statutory Consultation Process – Proposed Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 October 2019</td>
<td>Consultation proposal considered by Fife Council Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 November 2019</td>
<td>Parents and other statutory consultees to receive letters informing them of the dates for the statutory consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 2019 – 10 January 2020</td>
<td>Consultation live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public meeting held on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 27 November 2019 from 6.00-7.00 pm in Strathmiglo Primary School Dining Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drop in session at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strathmiglo Primary School on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 27 November from 5.00-6.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January 2020</td>
<td>Report on consultation process is submitted to Education Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 February 2020</td>
<td>Education Service receive report from Education Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 March 2020</td>
<td>Consultation Report published 3 weeks before Education &amp; Children’s Services Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2020</td>
<td>Report submitted to the Education &amp; Children’s Services Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The information included in this document can be made available in large print, braille, audio CD/tape and British Sign Language interpretation on request by calling 03451 55 55 00
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Core Facts
Core Facts are a series of data which are collected by local authorities to measure progress and success of a school estate strategy as well as benchmarking against other local authorities in Scotland. The core facts are used at both local and national level to:

- establish a baseline
- inform targets
- inform spending decisions
- support monitoring and evaluation of progress over time
- support assessments of value for money.


School Condition Rating
Condition core facts are established by professional review, carried out by the Council’s Asset & Facilities Management Service. Schools are assessed against a range of criteria set down by the Scottish Government and are examined on a 5-year rolling programme.

A: Good – Performing well and operating efficiently
B: Satisfactory – Performing adequately but showing minor deterioration
C: Poor – Showing major defects and/or not operating adequately
D: Bad – Life expired and/or serious risk of imminent failure.

School Suitability Rating
Suitability core facts are established through a similar process to the condition core facts process, undertaken by Headteacher and Business Managers. This information assesses how well the school environment supports the delivery of the curriculum against criteria laid down by the Scottish Government.

A: Good – Performing well and operating efficiently (the school buildings support the delivery of services to children and communities)
B: Satisfactory – Performing well but with minor problems (the school buildings generally support the delivery of services to children and communities)
C: Poor – Showing major problems and/or not operating optimally (the school buildings impede the delivery of activities that are needed for children and communities in the school)
D: Bad – Does not support the delivery of services to children and communities (the school buildings seriously impede the delivery of activities that are needed for children and communities in the school).

Suitability surveys are reviewed by Headteachers/Business Managers every 5 years. The last survey was completed by Headteachers in 2010. Where school investment has been carried out in a particular school, the following year’s Core Facts Update will be amended to reflect any subsequent change to the condition, suitability or accessibility rating.


School Accessibility Rating
Accessibility ratings are collated by the School Estate Team, along with the Education Access Officer, who undertake surveys of all the school buildings. These ratings are then ratified by the Accessibility Strategy Group. The ratings are classified as follows:
A: Fully accessible
B: Building partially accessible but Curriculum accessible
C: Partially accessible or not currently accessible but has the potential to be made accessible
D: Inaccessible and unable to be reasonably adapted to be made accessible.

As part of the Accessibility Strategy, there will be a number of accessible schools in each geographical area.

**Carbon Rating**
Energy performance data has been compiled for the majority of schools. The data is taken from either the Energy Performance Certificates (EPC) rating for each building or from the actual energy consumption data and performance. The ratings for carbon are as follows:

A rated = <34kg of CO2 emissions per m² of building floor area (best)
B rated = 35-40kg of CO2 emissions per m² of building floor area
C rated = 41-47kg of CO2 emissions per m² of building floor area
D rated = 48-54kg of CO2 emissions per m² of building floor area
E rated = 55-61kg of CO2 emissions per m² of building floor area
F rated = 61-68kg of CO2 emissions per m² of building floor area
G rated = >69kg of CO2 emissions per m² of building floor area (worst)

**Strategic Land Allocations**
Strategic Land Allocations are housing developments sites within Fife identified through Fife Council’s Structure Plan 2006-2026 (approved May 2009). The Structure Plan also includes infrastructure developments for business and employment, town centres, retailing, housing, affordable housing, transportation and waste management. A Strategic Land Allocation for residential units range from 300 units in a small town/village to 4200 units in a large town.

**Local Development Plan**
There are 3 adopted local development plans in Fife:

Mid Fife (adopted 23rd January 2012)
Dunfermline & West Fife (adopted 16th November 2012)
St Andrews and North East Fife (adopted 5th October 2012)

These plans detail the local development changes to infrastructure within settlements and include new plans with planning consent.

**Housing Land Audit**
Enterprise, Planning & Protective Services undertakes an annual audit (known as the Housing Land Audit) of the Housing Land Supply in Fife, using 1st April as the base date. The Audit monitors housing completions and makes predictions about future house building in Fife.

Homes for Scotland (representing the national house builders) and local developers are consulted on the information to be included in the Housing Land Audit to discuss and agree the Audit as far as possible.

**Public Private Partnership (PPP)**
There are 2 existing contracts in Fife (PPP1 and PPP2) where schools have been procured and constructed through this process. The schools are maintained for a period of 25 years by a contractor and after 25 years the building is handed to the Council for future repair and maintenance. An annual unitary charge includes design and construction, services delivery including building and grounds maintenance, finance costs, legal, insurances, management and risk.
Life Cycle Costs
Costs for replacing assets at the end of their life span. These include building, fabric, services and furniture and equipment to ensure the asset is maintain in a substantial condition.

Efficiency Range 80-100%
No local authority can effectively run at 100% occupied. The 80%-100% efficiency range allows a degree of flexibility within schools to support Curriculum for Excellence.

Cost per Pupil Calculation
The cost per pupil calculation for schools is computed in July of each year. The calculation is intended to bring together all comparable costs for each school and benchmark these at individual school level through the production of a cost per pupil figure.

The calculation is currently based on the School Revenue Budget Statements that are issued to schools in April of each year. The calculation takes into account a number of factors particularly the school roll from the last census at September of the previous year. The calculation takes schools running costs including an allocation for janitorial staffing costs. It excludes the costs for school transport, depreciation and the financing costs of schools built under PFI contract arrangements (PPP schools).

Having identified the relevant running costs for each school and by dividing these costs by the school roll this produces a cost per pupil figure which is used for comparison purposes.

Proposal Paper
The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 provides that where an education authority has formulated a relevant proposal in relation to any school, it must comply with the requirements of the Act before proceeding with the proposal. One of the requirements is that it must prepare and publish a proposal paper. Section 4 of the Act provides:

4 Proposal paper
(1) The education authority must prepare a proposal paper which:

(a) sets out the details of the relevant proposal,
(b) proposes a date for implementation of the proposal,
(c) contains the educational benefits statement in respect of the proposal,
(d) refers to such evidence or other information in support of (or otherwise relevant in relation to) the proposal as the education authority considers appropriate.

(2) The proposal paper must also give a summary of the process provided for in sections 1 to 17 (so far as applicable in relation to the proposal).

(3) A proposal paper may include more than one proposal.

(4) The education authority must:

(a) publish the proposal paper in both electronic and printed form,
(b) make the paper, and (so far as practicable) a copy of any separate documentation that it refers to under subsection (1) (d), available for inspection at all reasonable times and without charge:

(i) at its head office and on its website,
(ii) at any affected school or at a public library or some other suitable place within the vicinity of the school,
(c) provide without charge the information contained in the proposal paper:

(i) to such persons as may reasonably require that information in another form, and
(ii) in such other form as may reasonably be requested by such persons.

(5) The education authority must advertise the publication of the proposal paper by such means as it considers appropriate.

**Educational Benefits Statement**

The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 provides that where an education authority has formulated a relevant proposal in relation to any school, it must comply with the requirements of the Act before proceeding with the proposal. One of the requirements is that it must prepare an educational benefits statement. Section 3 of the Act provides:

3 Educational benefits statement

(1) The education authority must prepare an educational benefits statement which includes:

(a) the authority’s assessment of the likely effects of a relevant proposal (if implemented) on:

(i) the pupils of any affected school,
(ii) any other users of the school’s facilities,
(iii) any children who would (in the future but for implementation) be likely to become pupils of the school,
(iv) the pupils of any other schools in the authority’s area,

(b) the authority’s assessment of any other likely effects of the proposal (if implemented),

(c) an explanation of how the authority intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects that may arise from the proposal (if implemented),

(d) a description of the benefits which the authority believes will result from implementation of the proposal (with reference to the persons whom it believes will derive them).

(2) The statement must also include the education authority’s reasons for coming to the beliefs expressed under subsection (1)(d).

(3) In subsection (1), the references to effects and benefits are to educational effects and benefits.

**Rural School**

In terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 a rural school is a school designated as rural by Scottish Ministers. Section 14 provides:

14 Designation of rural schools

(1) In this Act, a "rural school" is a school which is designated as such by its inclusion in the list of rural schools maintained by the Scottish Ministers for the purposes of this subsection.
In determining the question of rurality when considering whether a school falls to be included in or excluded from the list of rural schools, the Scottish Ministers are to have regard (in particular) to:

(a) the population of the community (or settlement) in which the school is located,
(b) the geographical circumstances of that community (or settlement) including its relative remoteness or inaccessibility.

The list of rural schools is to be accompanied by an explanation of how the Scottish Ministers devised the list:

(a) by reference to subsection (2), and
(b) if they consider it appropriate, by reference to any recognised criteria available from a reliable source.

The Scottish Ministers are to:

(a) monitor the list of rural schools (and update it as regularly as they consider necessary),
(b) publish it (including as updated) in such way as they consider appropriate.

An education authority must provide the Scottish Ministers with such information as they may reasonably require of it in connection with the list of rural schools.

The Act also provides at sections 12 and 13:

12 Factors for rural closure proposals

(1) Subsection (2) applies in relation to any closure proposal as respects a rural school.

(2) The education authority must have special regard to the factors mentioned in subsection.

(3) The factors are:

(a) any viable alternative to the closure proposal,
(b) the likely effect on the local community in consequence of the proposal (if implemented),
(c) the likely effect caused by any different travelling arrangements that may be required in consequence of the proposal (if implemented).

(4) For the purpose of subsection (3)(b), the effect on the community is to be assessed by reference (in particular) to:

(a) the sustainability of the community,
(b) the availability of the school’s premises and its other facilities for use by the community.

(5) For the purpose of subsection (3)(c):

(a) the effect caused by such travelling arrangements includes (in particular):

(i) that on the school’s pupils and staff and any other users of the school’s facilities,(ii) any environmental impact,
(b) the travelling arrangements are those to and from the school of (and for) the
school’s pupils and staff and any other users of the school’s facilities.

13 Explanation of approach

(1) Subsections (2) and (3) apply in relation to any closure proposal as respects a rural
school.

(2) The proposal paper must additionally explain how the education authority complied
with section 12 when formulating the proposal.

(3) The consultation report must additionally explain:

(a) how the education authority complied with section 12 when reviewing the
proposal under section 9(1),
(b) any change of attitude that the education authority has had which is attributable
to its compliance with section 12 when reviewing the proposal under section
9(1).
## Gateside PS

### Estimated saving from closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers staffing</td>
<td>£87,815</td>
<td>Have assumed no job sizing implications for Strathmiglo HT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gateside was mothballed before revised allocations were implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the revised model, there would be a saving of 0.73 FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; clerical</td>
<td>£18,423</td>
<td>Both Gateside &amp; Strathmiglo were allocated 20 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom assistant</td>
<td>£11,525</td>
<td>Based on the revised model, there would be a saving of 0.73 FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The additional 6 pupils at Gateside would not increase Strathmiglo's allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>£83</td>
<td>Full amount of Gateside training budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other training</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>Full amount of Gateside training budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saving on Staff Costs</strong></td>
<td>£117,896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premises Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE REQUESTED BUILDING REPAIRS</td>
<td>£121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy costs</td>
<td>£4,257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENTS PAYABLE</td>
<td>£1,635</td>
<td>Assumed all premises costs saved, as small number of pupils unlikely to increase costs significantly at Strathmiglo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON DOMESTIC RATES</td>
<td>£3,588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SERVICES</td>
<td>£526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUNDS MAINT - CONTRACT</td>
<td>£68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREMISES INSURANCE</td>
<td>£590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTE COLLECTION</td>
<td>£1,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saving on Premises Costs</strong></td>
<td>£12,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL EXP-MILEAGE</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>All saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURNITURE</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>The flat rate would be saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Allocation</td>
<td>£364</td>
<td>Difference between individual budgets &amp; combined budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Allocation</td>
<td>£400</td>
<td>The flat small school rate would be saved, all other budgets follow the pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS COUNCIL</td>
<td>£370</td>
<td>The flat rate would be saved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING/PHOTOCOPYING COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>No saving would be redistributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>£1,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saving on Other Costs</strong></td>
<td>£2,306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAVING</strong></td>
<td>£132,546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1.7

FIFE COUNCIL – EDUCATION AND CHILDREN’S SERVICES DIRECTORATE
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

Proposal to close Gateside Primary School and rezone the catchment area of Strathmiglo Primary School.

1. Your Details (to be provided by parent/carers or interested parties to enable the local authority to inform any person who makes written representations on the proposal of the publication of the consultation report as required by the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your main interest in responding to this consultation?

I am a parent/carer of a child:

- [ ] Living in the Gateside PS catchment area

I am a parent/carer of a child attending:

- [ ] Strathmiglo PS
- [ ] Any other Primary School in Fife
- [ ] Any nursery in the Bell Baxter cluster area

I am a pupil attending:

- [ ] Strathmiglo PS
- [ ] Any other Primary School in Fife
- [ ] Any nursery in the Bell Baxter cluster area

I am a member of staff at:

- [ ] Strathmiglo PS
- [ ] Any other primary school in Fife
- [ ] Any nursery in the Bell Baxter cluster area

Other interested party
Please explain if you are responding on behalf of an organisation or other reason
3. Your Views
(a) Do you support the proposal to close Gateside Primary School from March 2020 and rezone the catchment area of Strathmigo Primary School (choose yes or no)?

YES [ ] NO [ ]

(b) If NO, what are your reasons?

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

(c) Are there any further comments on the proposal you would like to make?

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

4. About You

The following questions are voluntary. They are to assist Fife Council in fulfilling its obligations under the Equality Act 2010 in relation to the proposal. Your responses to these questions are confidential.

1. What is your age? 18 or under [ ] 19-24 [ ] 25-34 [ ] 35-44 [ ] 45-54 [ ] 55-64 [ ] 65-74 [ ] 75 and over [ ]

2. What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

3. What is your ethnic background?

Chose one from section A-E, and then tick one box which best describes your ethnic group or background.

A. WHITE
Scottish
Other British
Irish
Gypsy/Traveller
Polish
Any other white ethnic group, please write in:
B. MIXED OR MULTIPLE ETHNIC GROUP
Any mixed or multiple ethnic groups,  
Please write in:

C. ASIAN, ASIAN SCOTTISH, OR ASIAN BRITISH
Pakistani, Pakistani Scottish or Pakistani British  
Indian, Indian Scottish or Indian British  
Bangladeshi, Bangladeshi Scottish or Bangladeshi British  
Chinese, Chinese Scottish or Chinese British  
Other, please write in:

D. AFRICAN
African, African Scottish or African British  
Other, please write in:

E. CARIBBEAN OR BLACK
Caribbean, Caribbean Scottish or Caribbean British  
Black, Black Scottish or Black British  
Other, please write in:

F. OTHER ETHNIC GROUP
Arab, Arab Scottish or Arab British  
Other, please write in:

5. Do you consider yourself as having a disability?  
Yes ☐  No ☐

Thank you for taking part in this consultation

Please complete online at www.fifedirect.org.uk/madrasnewsite or return this form by post to: Gateside PS Closure Proposal, Education Service, 4th floor Rothesay House, Rothesay Place, Glenrothes, KY7 5PQ by the end of the consultation period on Friday 10 January 2020.
Building Fife’s Future – Woodmill and St Columba’s RC High Schools: Update

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director, Education & Children’s Services

Wards Affected: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8

Purpose

This report provides an update on progress with the development of the learning campus for Dunfermline.

Recommendation(s)

The Education & Children’s Services Committee is invited to authorise officers to:

(a) continue to explore potential funding sources;
(b) explore the community requirements and opportunities presented;
(c) investigate and negotiate, with the land owner, acquisition costs for the preferred site;
(d) continue to develop the Brief;
(e) appoint a Design Team to prepare designs for the schools; and
(f) report back to a future Committee on the outcomes of these actions.

Resource Implications

A significant amount of officer time will be dedicated to this project. The project will require significant investment and a dedicated team for delivery. Capital budget is currently allocated over the life of the Council’s capital plan, for the replacement of five secondary schools across Fife. However, it is recognised that this will need to be supplemented by additional funding in order to progress this proposal, in relation to which, discussions are ongoing with Scottish Government and Scottish Futures Trust. The budget cost for this proposal will be reviewed as due diligence is undertaken on the proposed design of the schools and an update will be provided as part of the business case for the project.

Legal & Risk Implications

The consideration and determination of this report is by the Council acting as Education Authority. Accordingly, Members of this Committee should refrain from expressing any view which may be construed as pre-determining any future planning application/s which the Council, as Planning Authority, may require to consider and determine in respect of the proposed site following hereon. Agreement to proceed with the preferred site will trigger a formal consultation under the terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.
Impact Assessment

An equalities impact assessment was not required in the preparation of this report as an impact assessment will be carried out as part of any statutory Educational Consultation process.

Consultation

Officers of the Education Service, Legal Services, Assets, Transportation & Environment Service and Financial Services have been consulted in preparation of this report.

1.0 Background

1.1 As a result of the fire at Woodmill High School, on Sunday 25 August 2019, the replacement of this secondary school became an immediate priority for the Education Service. The extensive damage to the building has resulted in the loss of the Department of Additional Support Unit, which accommodates 80 pupils in a ground floor wing. The school has also lost the north wing of the school, on 3 floors, resulting in the loss of classroom space for the pupils. The pupils are unable to return to the school at present as there are insufficient teaching spaces left to accommodate all of the S1-S6 pupils. Two-storey modular accommodation is being sourced to replicate classroom space to allow some of the pupils to return after the Christmas period.

1.2 As Woodmill High School and St Columba’s RC High School are both Category C for condition, the replacement of these schools was already a key element of the strategic plan for secondary provision within the Dunfermline, South and West Fife areas. Therefore, at the budget meeting in February 2019, Fife Council agreed to the allocation of £117.572m capital funding, over the 10 year period of the plan, to progress the work in this area of Fife. It was noted that in developing the capital plan, the affordability of these projects would rely on significant funding from the Scottish Government as well as developer contributions to support additional capacity.

1.3 To achieve replacement of these schools, the Education & Children’s Services Committee, of 29 March 2019, determined that a project proposal for a joint Learning Campus with Fife College should be progressed and:

a) approved submission of a project proposal to Scottish Government to endeavour to secure funding;

b) asked the Executive Director (Education and Children’s Services) to engage in formal discussions with the communities and, if necessary, to prepare a report for Education & Children’s Services Committee to commence a statutory education consultation;

c) endorsed a proposal that the Head of Legal Services, in conjunction with the Head of Assets, Transportation and Environment, agrees terms for an Option Agreement with Shepherd Offshore (Scotland) Limited for the purchase of a site for a joint learning campus (A separate report with the details of the Option Agreement will require to be submitted to Policy and Co-ordination Committee); and
d) approved the appointment of the necessary teams to progress a planning application

1.4 To create the joint Learning Campus in Dunfermline it is proposed that Fife Council acquires a site adjacent to the land recently purchased by the College. On this site we will be able to bring together a new Fife College, a new Woodmill HS, a new St Columba’s RC HS and community facilities.

1.5 This project would be the first of its kind in Scotland, acting as a pathfinder for change in the delivery of education across secondary, further and higher education. It is envisaged that the learning campus will also provide a digital gateway for learning opportunities across Fife, enabling enhanced learning opportunities, in particular within the senior phase.

2.0 Progress to Date

2.1 Project Proposal

2.1.1 A Council Learning Estate Strategy update paper was submitted to the Scottish Government in August 2019. This outlined the Fife Council commitment to investment in the secondary school estate in Dunfermline and South & West Fife, as detailed in the Capital Plan.

2.1.2 The solution preferred by the Council, to address the condition and capacity issues i.e. to promote a distributive model, was detailed, indicating that this approach would allow us to replace 3 condition ‘C’ schools (including Inverkeithing HS), whilst also allowing us to provide additional capacity to support new housing development as and when it is required.

2.1.3 The projects required to achieve the distributive model were outlined: the replacement of Woodmill and St Columba’s RC High Schools (both condition ‘C’) on a single site co-located with Fife College; the replacement of Inverkeithing High School (condition ‘C’) and the expansion of Queen Anne and Dunfermline High Schools (both condition ‘A’). The co-dependency of these projects, and all the work required to contribute to meeting the overall demand for school places, was stated.

2.1.4 It was explained that this approach to replacing and developing the school estate provides best value, as the alternative would be a requirement to build an additional secondary school, to provide extra places, however this would not address the condition of existing schools in the area.

2.1.5 The additional benefits: to include a consolidated, more sustainable future school estate; the improvement of place making through the further integration of community provision within the school estate (2 of the schools proposed for replacement are full community use schools) and of course the considerable joint educational and economic benefits that are expected to flow from co-location with Fife College, were described.

2.1.6 The paper indicated that investment included within the Council’s Capital Plan assumed a level of Scottish Government support towards some of the projects and that the funding assumptions made were based on the previous Scottish Government funding model. Therefore, a contribution of 67% had been assumed for some of the projects within the £117.6m investment approved in the Fife Council Capital Plan.
2.1.7 The paper confirmed that Fife Council has a clearly defined learning estate strategy approved and in place; that the strategy aligns with that approved by the Scottish Government and COSLA in the April 2019, and that the key project proposals that have been identified meet the principles identified within the Scottish Government strategy.

2.1.8 Finally, the submission indicated that what Fife Council will be able to achieve, within the timeframe of the current capital programme, would be augmented significantly through support from the initial phase of the Scottish Government New Schools Investment Programme.

2.1.9 On 4 September 2019, the Scottish Government announced that funding had been made available for a new shared learning campus to support the replacement of Woodmill High School as quickly as possible. The proposed learning campus is to bring together pupils, students and staff at Woodmill High, St Columba’s High School and Fife College in modern, fit for purpose and low carbon facility buildings. The new campus could be ready for occupation during academic session 2024/2025.

2.1.10 Subject to agreed Brief, the estimated cost of constructing the entire campus is between £150 million and £180 million. Construction costs have been estimated based on 3Q19 BCIS indices. Since spend will be incurred in future years, inflation indices will apply. The cost estimates are based on current Scottish Government metrics which do not include the cost of addressing the recently declared climate change emergency.

2.1.11 The Scottish Government will fund 100% of the college element of the Dunfermline Learning Community Campus, up to £90 million, via capital grant.

2.1.12 The schools’ element of the campus would be funded as part of the £1 billion learning estate investment programme through a new revenue funding model. Local Authorities will be required to borrow from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) or use their own capital monies to pay for the upfront cost of constructing a new learning facility. As the new Scottish Government funding model is revenue based, their contribution will pay for ongoing maintenance of the new facility and other outcomes to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

2.2 Community Engagement

2.2.1 Prior to the fire at Woodmill High School, and prior to the funding announcement by the Scottish Government, to outline the vision for this learning campus concept, the Education Service, as well as colleagues in Property Services and the Communities Directorate, held 23 informal engagement sessions during June and August 2019.

2.2.2 Further sessions for families in the Cowdenbeath area who may choose to attend St Columba’s RC High School were held after the October holidays 2019.

2.2.3 The sessions were informal and gave parents/carers or interested parties an opportunity to give feedback on their thoughts of a learning campus, benefits for pupils who could be located under one roof and the benefits for pupils to link to further education at Fife College. These comments can be found at Appendix A.

2.2.4 Currently, progressing to statutory consultation is not necessary, or advisable, as there are a number of questions that can be anticipated to be raised during such consultation that cannot yet be answered. Any lack of detail in responding to such questions could undermine the success of consultation.
2.3 Option Agreement
2.3.1 Fife College has already purchased part of the site from Shepherd Offshore to replace the existing Fife College building on Halbeath Road, Dunfermline. This building is expected to open for session 2024.
2.3.2 The Council is working towards securing the Options Agreement to purchase a site from Shepherd Offshore.

2.4 Design Team
2.4.1 Property Services have dedicated an internal Project Manager and the Education Service has appointed a Change Manager to work with the schools throughout the process.
2.4.2 A governance framework is being confirmed in conjunction with Fife College, the Scottish Government and Scottish Future’s Trust.
2.4.3 Services have developed a strategic brief for the secondary schools’ element of the project, using feedback from pupil and staff questionnaires, discussions with the schools’ senior leadership teams and involvement of the Property Services teams.

3.0 Next Steps

3.1 Further engagement with pupils, parents, staff and community stakeholders, to ensure that stakeholders are included in discussions regarding how we might address the challenges raised during the initial sessions, will be critical in the development of any formal proposal, design and business case for the project.

3.2 A full planning assessment will require to be undertaken as part of the planning application process.

3.3 A statutory consultation Proposal Paper will be developed and presented to a future Education & Children’s Services Committee for approval, at the point where the detailed project design is better defined.

3.4 Teams will continue to develop the Brief in conjunction with Fife College.

3.5 Therefore officers should:

- continue to explore the potential funding sources
- explore the community requirements and opportunities presented
- investigate and negotiate with the land owners acquisition costs
- continue to develop the Brief
- appoint a Design Team to prepare designs
- report back to a future Committee on the outcomes of these actions

List of Appendices

A. Engagement Feedback
Background Papers
Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010

Building Fife’s Future – The School Estate
http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_PDF-ECS280818.pdf

Building Fife’s Future – Education Infrastructure Development
http://publications.fifedirect.org.uk/c64_AgendaPapersECSC061118.pdf
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Head of Education & Children's Services
(Equity and System Improvement)
Rothesay House
Glenrothes
Telephone: 08451 55 55 55 + 444229
Email – shelagh.mclean@fife.gov.uk

Sustainable Estate Officer
Education & Children’s Services
Rothesay House
Glenrothes
Telephone: 03451 55 55 55 + 444204
Email – avril.graham@fife.gov.uk
Pre-Engagement – Learning Campus, Dunfermline

In relation to the joint learning campus, the following comments were received:

Creation of a joint campus (including Fife College, Woodmill High School and St Columba’s RC HS) located on the former Shepherd Offshore site

Today I attended a public information session at Touch PS regarding the joint campus of Fife College, Woodmill High School and St Columba’s RC HS. This was very interesting and I am thankful to have been given the opportunity to be involved in this. I am happy to share some ideas I had after this engagement session.

Regarding the joint campus of Fife College, Woodmill High School and St Columba’s RC HS, I think the idea of a joint campus is very good, whereby it is possible for each High School to benefit from the others facilities. I think a new High School is very important for the city of Dunfermline, since it has been, and will continue to rapidly expand. I would like to add a few points:

1. The location.
   This seems on one hand ideal: a huge tract of land available with good transport links. However, has the short distance to the nearby highway (100-200m?) been taken into account? In my opinion a school should be at least 1000 feet or 300 meters away from the highway (if you read the latest studies regarding this matter), in order to avoid exposure to the air pollution (and related health risks) from the highway. Avoiding air pollution at a young age is particularly important.

2. Unique character.
   I understand that the 2 high schools and Fife college will be brought together to one big campus. I think it is important to keep in mind that the children starting high school are 11 or 12 years old. For these young kids starting in a new school this needs to look like a safe haven, and should preferably not look massive, but instead welcoming and friendly. Each School should maintain/have its own identity to achieve this.

3. Food shops
   While working as a GP in Dunfermline over the last few years I have been continually amazed by the long queues of high school kids at the fish and chips shops and other junk food establishments at lunch time (often located next door to a high school). If we want to tackle the obesity crisis affecting our country, we need to start tackling this at a young age. If there will be a new campus built, can they please (!) allow only healthy food shops in the near vicinity?

The creation of this joint campus is a great idea. In fact, something which I think should have happened a long time ago. However, if the campus was to move to this site, my question is, would this change catchment areas? As a resident of Crossgates, this site would be closer than our current catchment of Beath High. Would Crossgates PS students therefore be eligible to register at the new campus?

Doesn’t affect me.

A joint campus may be good to build resources for a state of the art campus.

Further to my attendance at the City Chambers consultation yesterday I would like to submit the gist of what I spoke about with the very helpful education officers who were in attendance.

It is important that the new learning campus is planned not only as a ‘traditional’ educational campus but to also have Community Use at its core as well. There is the
opportunity here to deliver a facility which will have very significant benefits to the whole community (not just the pupils) in terms of promoting an active & healthy lifestyle.

Sport in particular can deliver fantastic benefits to the mental & physical health of all ages within our community & I would hope that very careful consideration is given to the planning of first class sporting facilities as part of the campus. Sport can act as a vehicle to encourage integration & understanding across the various faiths + socio-economic groups and should be taken as a core principle on which the new campus is designed for both pupils & everyone else in our local community.

I appreciate we are at an early stage in the planning and that more in-depth consultations will take place prior to any architects brief being arrived at. I have attached a document put together by the members of the Woodmill & St Columbas Community Sports Hub regarding our view of what a new campus could & should deliver for our local community and most importantly how we can help achieve those aims.

I would hope that Fife Council will take full advantage of the extensive, practical knowledge & experience of people like those in our Sports Hub to enable the delivery of a project that will achieve very significant benefits to the well being & development of our local community.

While I don’t have any problems with the concept of a joint campus, I am worried about traffic implications given the current issues at Carnegie PS/Fife College. I think there needs to be staggered starts and possibly little all day parking other than staff. The college students can be inconsiderate when driving. I would also like to know more about the other potential risks involved in a shared campus rather that it just being “sold” to us.

I have concerns about safeguarding of the younger high school pupils being around older college students. Overall I am supportive of it in principle as it appears to be the only decent solution to a very difficult situation.

Why was the decision taken on the proposed site of the learning campus taken ahead of the public engagement sessions? Is there an alternative site?

St Columba’s RC HS is not part of the local community the way that Woodmill is. Why just not build St Columba’s on the Shepherd Offshore site.

Need to retain the schools in separate buildings.

Why are Woodmill and St Columba’s RC HS parents not been given an option to comment on the site?

Yes I am fine with this proposal. It’s an opportunity for the schools to share/utilise resources – classes and playing fields. It is also a good opportunity for senior level pupils to get access to higher education via Fife College.

Issue regarding child protection with younger pupils on the same site/building as Fife College students.

Size of campus may be intimidating for younger pupils.

Moving both schools will rip the heart out of Abbeyview.

Low income families will not be able to access community facilities in the new school due to cost of transport getting there.

Combining the schools and the college is a ploy to boost the numbers of pupils going to college instead of university.

Need to ensure that schools do not have easy access to fast food outlets.

Fife Council are only doing the learning campus because this is what Scottish Government wants.

Whole site needs to be non-smoking.
Woodmill & St Columba’s Community Sport Hub
How we can add value to a new learning campus....

Our approach....

- Since 2016 several partners have been collaborating to improve the sporting offer to local people in and around the Woodmill area of Dunfermline.
- This collaborative, called the Woodmill & St Columba’s Community Sport Hub (CSH) brings together Dunfermline Reign Basketball Club, Dunfermline Carnegie Hockey Club, Carnegie Judo Club, Dunfermline Boxing Club, Abbeyview Bowling Club, Fife Council Sports Development & Active Schools, Dunfermline & West Fife Sports Council Community Use Schools and the PE Departments of both High Schools.

Our collective vision is:
- A healthy community actively involved in leading, participating and performing in a variety of sport and physical activities.

Our collective aims are:
- To maximise opportunities available to the local community through the promotion of current activities and exploring the development of new activities.
- To support sports clubs and members to continue to develop and expand their organisation.
- To maximise working relationships with key partners.
- To explore the possibility of improving, upgrading and creating facilities as well as improving access to facilities.
- To provide educational opportunities to the local community.
- To develop women and girl’s participation in sport.

- We have established a CSH action plan that identifies how we will work towards our agreed outcomes.

Our current contribution....

...to the Curriculum for Excellence

Health and wellbeing are at the core of the curriculum for excellence. Sport plays a key role in supporting the health and wellbeing of young people. We are aware of our contribution and have demonstrated impact against the following areas:

- Developing successful learners – Carnegie Judo club and Fighting Chance Scotland have delivered programmes at Woodmill High School which have increased the engagement and improved the behaviour of disaffected young people.
- Developing confident individuals – Dunfermline Reign deliver a Helping Hearts programme that mixes basketball with healthy eating advice. This programme has been delivered to over 2,000 PS 7 pupils.
○ Developing responsible citizens – the clubs in the CSH provide a learning environment in the community with clear values that teach young people life skills, such as team-work, in a fun setting.
○ Developing effective contributors – Carnegie Hockey provide leadership training to youth members of the club via their weekly club youth sessions, after school clubs & Dunfermline & West Fife Sports Council Primary school hockey festivals.

......to Fife’s Community Plan

The Council’s aspiration is to put fairness at the heart of everything, bringing together communities and services in a way that means everyone can get involved in improving their neighbourhoods and creating a fairer Fife. We are aware of our contribution and have demonstrated impact against the following areas:

○ Opportunities for all – Both the Judo and Boxing clubs have developed opportunities for young people from a disadvantaged background, while the basketball and hockey clubs have developed programmes to re-engage women in sport.
○ Thriving places – Each week, over 700 people of all ages participate in sport across the facilities involved in the Community Sport Hub.
○ Inclusive growth and jobs – Carnegie Hockey and Dunfermline Reign has received investment from sportscotland to employ staff for the first time. Over the past few years this has created 5 new jobs with local young people being employed to deliver for the clubs in local schools. The investment was made in a way that the clubs can sustain the employment of these jobs going forward.
○ Community-led services – Since 2014 Dunfermline Reign have been operating the PE facility at St Columba’s RC Hg in community time. The club brought in over £400k of external investment to develop the facility and have in place an access agreement with Fife Council until 2039. The club is the sole user of the facility and has the space running at over 80% occupancy through its volunteer key holder approach. This agreement has shown that a voluntary led approach can work and has breathed life into a facility that wasn’t being used outside of school hours.

Our potential to make an even more significant contribution

- As a collective we are striving to achieve our vision and are always seeking opportunities to work in partnership with other organisations on shared aspirations.
- We are aware of the upcoming development of a learning campus, incorporating St Columba’s RC and Woodmill High Schools, on a single site with Fife College, offering a unique opportunity to design purpose-built facilities, jointly delivering an innovative curriculum, meeting the diverse needs of all learners in the area of Dunfermline. It is believed such a proposal could, potentially, set a national template for collaborative investment and co-production.
- With our connection to both schools and commitment to the local community there are a few areas that the CSH believe we can add value to the development of the learning campus.
We want to bring what we can to something that could be very unique!

- **Facility Design**
  - We aim to be providing sport in this local community for a long time and can advise of the development of a facility that meets the needs of community participants.
  - We have experience of the technical requirements of elite sport and the facilities that are required.

- **Facility Operation**
  - Dunfermline Reign have an access agreement to St Columba’s RC HS until 2039 and have a model in place that demonstrates that facilities, if properly designed, can be operated in a cost effective and empowered way through volunteers.
  - We would like to explore this model with a view to providing a significant saving in staffing costs in the new campus.

- **Complimenting teaching with sports coaching**
  - Our coaches have strong relationships with PE Departments, but these could be stronger.
  - We would be interested in exploring opportunities to use club coaches to engage with pupils that maybe don't relate to traditional curricular sport and with a view to improving their health and wellbeing and subsequently attainment. This could be achieved through a school of sport approach, which we have experience in delivering at Queen Anne HS.

- **Establishing sporting academies**
  - The connection to Fife College may provide opportunities for young people with talent to combine their studies with performance coach support.
  - There are clubs in the CSH that compete at the highest level of national competitions and the outlet is there to create something that would set Fife College apart from its peers.

We would summarise by saying that we are excited about playing a key role in the development of a learning campus in our community. We have a track record of offering sport to local people and the passion and creativity to make that offer even better.

March 2019

Contact: James Steel, Chairperson, Dunfermline Reign Basketball Club (soc48798), tel: 07949277526
I think this is an excellent idea. Very innovative. It will improve relationships between school pupils and increase curriculum opportunities. It will also be an opportunity to create fit for purpose community facilities that can be used by all outwith school hours.

I would like to highlight the following significant concerns I have for this proposal to co-locate St Columba’s RCHS, Woodmill HS and Fife College on a single site within Dunfermline’s eastern expansion area. Whilst I am fully support St Columba’s and Woodmill having a joint building (indeed I can see many benefits of this model) I am strongly opposed to this being located on the same site as Fife College.

I attended a recent consultation and the discussion at this heightened my fears as the Fife Council staff did not seem to have taken the following concerns into account and gave non-specific, political answers to many of my questions. Furthermore they often gave different answers and staff contradicted each other; a worrying state of affairs given only one ‘preferred option’ is being presented to stakeholders. I am very worried that the Council staff are not aware of issues and not fully briefed before coming to a consultation event.

**Rationale for this decision**

Whilst we understand the financial situation and the efficiency of building on a single site, we must also ensure that decisions are made based on best evidence for excellent quality education for all – ensuring high standards and pupil care are paramount. Nothing has been presented to stakeholders regarding the cost benefit of the preferred option when compared to other alternatives (such as building replacement schools within the footprint of the existing sites on Woodmill Road).

**Risks of combining FE with secondary education**

From the discussion with Fife Council staff at the consultation it would appear that there has been no robust analysis of this model in other Council areas.

Staff at the consultations gave very mixed and incoherent responses to this question with a range of responses including: this has never been done before and is an experiment; the existing model in Methil is not comparable (with no explanation why) and there is some evidence showing that this model can have a positive impact on attainment (with no detail added to this response). My understanding is that the campus in Methil is a similar model and I assume that there has been comprehensive analysis of the impact of this on pupil behaviour and attainment which should be made available in full detail to ensure we can be assured of appropriate rigour in the analysis – and ensure there is a positive impact for all pupils.

There is a risk that secondary education is being used as a feeder system to FE with the main driver for this decision being the significant falling numbers and government focus on the further education sector.

One member of staff at the consultation indicated that there are strategic links with HE naming Edinburgh Napier University and St Andrews University – however my understanding is that very few pupils from KY postcodes are accepted to St Andrews and therefore the links between HE and secondary education in Fife are lacking in impact and meaning. Parents should be given this detail to ensure full transparency and candour.

There are existing links for pupils to the FE sector for all school in Dunfermline and I would be interested to know why these are not considered appropriate to continue.

**Relational security and evidence of trauma informed practice**
The Scottish Government have identified trauma informed care as a key priority for all public services within Scotland. There is a growing awareness of the impact of ACEs to pupils learning and emotional safety and security. The staff at the consultation were unaware of this and were not able to answer any questions on measures that would be in place to ensure all aspects of trauma informed care, and relational security were taken into account and addressed within proposals. Parents should be given detailed information on the measures that will be in place to reduce risks for all components of relational security for all pupils:

- **Team Boundaries**
  - Educational provision
- **Other people Mix**
  - Dynamics
- **Insider world Personal world**
  - Physical environment
- **Outside world Visitors**
  - Outward connections

Whilst there was an acknowledgment that these plans would include some security aspects for the physical building, and all staff would have disclosure Scotland checks in place (as is a legal requirement), this does not take into account the wider environment, visitors, the dynamics of this environment and psychological safety of pupils. This could have a significant and damaging effect on attainment and learning for pupils.

**Other options & way forward**

My understanding is that there are options for new buildings for St Columba’s and Woodmill to be developed separate to the Fife College site – though the staff at the consultation were unclear on this and very reluctant to discuss any alternative proposals. Parents should be given information on all possible alternatives to ensure a full and meaningful consultation has taken place.

Having discussed the consultation with a number of other parents there is strong feeling that the Council has already made a decision in principle to move to the new joint campus site; leaving the inevitable impression that the consultation is in name only. It would be helpful for Fife Council officers to make clear that the consultation will have meaningful impact on the final decision.

Please ensure this is included in the consultation response and provide a full and detailed response to my concerns within this email.

3) On the question of combining Fife College and the two schools, this site was once promised to be a place for large numbers of new jobs by Hyundai, Motorola and Shepherd Offshore. It is not clear to me that being near our own little Spaghetti Junction is the best place for children to learn.

Cllr Kate Stewart raised her concerns regarding the pupils in the Abbeyview area having to walk to the new school. This is difficult for low income families who would not be able to afford transport.

I live in Crossgates and feel that the village should be included in the catchment area for the new campus. The “new” school would be closer than the current “Beath HS”.

My wife and I both attended the information session on 19th June, in Abbeyview, about the proposed changes to Woodmill, St Columba’s and Fife College. Thank you for running this event, it was good to understand what plans are afoot and the thoughts behind them.
With regards to your joint campus plan, we both believe that keeping the two high schools and college separate (as they are now) would be the best approach. While we are not against both high schools being on the same campus, our fear is that you will in fact be creating a single school, where the only difference is that there will be separate time-tabling and a second headmaster - with everything else shared (class-rooms, teachers, administration, eating, toilet and sports facilities). This, simply to cut costs, if not immediately then in 5-10-20 years’ time. If you can design and build a campus that encourages community (within the school) but doesn’t (and can’t in the future) erode the different ethos’ and learnings of the two schools then that would be the best approach.

That said, my wife and I believe that having a joint campus with a college is a bad idea. I know the term ‘child protection’ has almost turning into a politically-correct ‘dirty’ word these days, but it is much more than simply ensuring that a child isn’t sexually groomed or abused - I only mention this because of the way the idea of protecting our children was dismissed during the information event.

The idea that ‘going to college’ is as simple as moving to the classroom next door sends the wrong signal about life and teaches the wrong lesson. We fully agree that where needed college courses should be opened up to some high-school pupils, but we believe that most children will simply drift from high-school, to the college in the classroom next-door, without having to make any effort. Making an effort, applying yourself and trying hard are extremely important lessons to learn, as opposed to drifting, which a joint school/college campus would promote.

While it is important for our children to be prepared for life, we believe children should be children and grow into adults at their own pace. Including a college on-site may well make opportunities easier to offer but at the cost of our children's childhood. Once again, thank you for providing the information at the event and I hope you consider our feedback when moving your plans forward.

I am writing to point out a few issues regarding the re-siting of Woodmill School and Saint Columba’s.

1. The loss of the Community Use to the residents and tenants of Abbeyview, this currently has over 50,000 people using this facility every year.
2. The loss of the only comprehensive school to the residents and tenants of Abbeyview which has a population of 10,000 at the time of writing.
3. The fact that a super campus will mean most of the children in Abbeyview will have to walk to the campus adding on a round trip of up to 3 miles to them as most will not qualify for a bus pass.
4. Have you looked at just moving Saint Columba’s and giving the ground over to Woodmill for development, the Catholic School covers the whole of the West Fife Area and does not have traditional ties to the local community.

A precedent has been set with the replacement of both the High School and Queen Ann within their present sites, this will leave the population of Abbeyview with just one Primary School.

Positives - I acknowledge and fully support the proposal as I believe there is a critical need for additional school places together with a requirement to provide more modern secondary schools as a replacement for the now somewhat outdated Woodmill and St Columba's RS HS. I can also see the benefits of locating the joint schools with the Fife College campus. However, if the transport and community use facilities (i.e. exactly the same including swimming pool) are not retained in the new campus then I would be against the move.

Negatives - I have some concerns around the transport infrastructure and the increased level of traffic in the area of the proposed site. At present both the current sites and busy and congestion is caused at the key times of the day (start & finish). Unless greater investment in the road and transport infrastructure is made, car sharing for
teachersons/lecturers and students is promoted/mandatory together with accessible walking routes to the new campus then I can only foresee major congestion given the location near one of the main arteries in and out of Dunfermline, the Fife Leisure Park and the access to the motorway.

Community use for the new campus is essential. I strongly believe that the campus should mirror the facilities currently available at the existing places but be better. In particular an appropriate sized swimming pool (similar to that currently at Woodmill) should be in the plans. The loss of the current swimming pool at the existing Woodmill High School and Inverkeithing High School would be dreadful not only for the school kids but also for the rest of the community as they are both well used as Community Use Swimming pools.

Maximising the flexibility of space should be the priority and the need to provide opportunities for community use given the rising population of Dunfermline. The whole ethos of the initial design should be to future-proof as much as possible.

I attended an information session at St Margaret’s RC Primary school just before the summer holidays and wanted to give some feedback on the proposal of a joint campus for St Columbus, Woodmill and Fife College.

As mum to 3 school age children I must express my concern at the joint campus proposal. I have a number of concerns with this proposal, which I have summarised below.

- Number of students on one campus - there was lots of discussion at our information session around the “number of seats” required at the campus but on each of these “seats” would be a child - in many cases, young, vulnerable children. The management of the sheer number of people accessing this campus gives me great concern. How will the safety and security of these children be managed, alongside the very different needs of the older students.
- Security. - Both physical and psychological security of the young people attending the campus. As it stands there seems to be little detail around how the buildings would be physically secure to stop college students entering the school area and vice versa. The joint campus in Levenmouth has already highlighted the ways this can go wrong and I am concerned about replicating the same model which has shown some deep flaws already.
- Travel - with so many individuals studying and working on the same campus transport and travel is another real concern. Having a disabled daughter I know first hand the issues with parking and transport in and around the existing school buildings which have a fraction of the number of people attending on a daily basis. Again, when this was questioned at our information session there was no information available on this. This is an area that surely needs to be considered before a decision can be made one way or another. Waiting until the decision is made is too late.

Overall I have a real concern about having children aged 12 and 13 on the same (and ultimately very open) campus with much older and mature students. There is a clear child protection issue. Having worked in a college environment I am aware of how little control you have over the comings and goings within the campus and you cannot disclosure check every individual coming through the door. I don’t believe under this proposal the safety and well being of the children can be guaranteed. Furthermore the issues in Levenmouth need to be a warning for future joint campus developments.
Building Fife’s Future – Inverkeithing HS Site Selection Update

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director, Education & Children’s Services

Wards Affected: 5, 6

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide further detail regarding the outcomes of the educational requirements and technical assessments of site options for the replacement of Inverkeithing HS.

Recommendation(s)

The Committee is asked to:

1) Agree preferred options for the location of the replacement school.

2) Authorise officers to:

(a) continue to explore potential funding sources;
(b) explore the community requirements and opportunities presented by both options;
(c) investigate and negotiate with the land owners acquisition costs for the preferred options (i.e. 4 and 5);
(d) prepare the Brief for each option;
(e) appoint a Design Team to prepare designs for the new school for each option; and
(f) report back to a future Committee on the preferred option.

Resource Implications

The project will require significant investment and a dedicated team for delivery. Capital budget is currently allocated over the life of the Council’s capital plan, for the replacement of five secondary schools across Fife. However, it is recognised that this will need to be supplemented by additional funding in order to progress this proposal, in relation to which, discussions are ongoing with Scottish Government and Scottish Futures Trust regarding potential opportunities for additional investment. The budget cost for this proposal will be reviewed as due diligence is undertaken on the preferred site and the proposed design of the school and an update will be provided as part of the final business case for the project.

Legal & Risk Implications

The consideration and determination of this report is by the Council acting as Education Authority. Accordingly, Members of this Committee should refrain from expressing any view which may be construed as pre-determining any future planning
application/s which the Council, as Planning Authority, may require to consider and determine in respect of any proposed site/s following hereon. Key risks are identified within the report. Agreement to proceed with a site other than the existing school site will trigger a formal consultation under the terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

**Impact Assessment**

An equalities impact assessment was not required in the preparation of this report as an impact assessment will be carried out as part of the statutory Educational Consultation process.

**Consultation**

The Headteacher and senior leadership team from the school has been involved in discussions.

Extensive public engagement events have already been carried out in relation to the replacement of Inverkeithing HS, the results of which are to be found in Appendix 3 to this report. Any change to the existing site will be subject to a statutory consultation under the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

**1.0 Background**

1.1 This report responds to the decision of the Education & Children’s Services Committee, from 28 August 2018, which asked that the processes and timetables for the implementation of changes to Secondary School infrastructure across Fife, particularly referencing those relating to determining detailed proposals for change, are set out.

1.2 In November 2018, following consideration of a report entitled ‘Building Fife’s Future – Education Infrastructure Development’, the Education & Children’s Services Committee authorised officers to undertake the steps necessary to prepare these detailed proposals for change.

1.3 The priorities identified were Dunfermline & South West Fife Secondary School Infrastructure and Glenrothes Secondary School Infrastructure. It was accepted that it is important to consider the wider areas in their totality, to ensure that we adopt a strategic approach rather than create a disparate set of individual development plans for each school.

1.4 Consequently, the Capital Plan 2019-2029, as agreed in February, includes provision of funding on a phased basis for Secondary Schools in West Fife, for Glenrothes/Glenwood High Schools and for extensions to other secondary schools to provide increased capacity to accommodate pupils from new housing development.

1.5 Education and Children’s Services Committee agreed, on 19 March 2019, to progress projects required to address the condition and capacity issues in the Dunfermline & South West Fife area through the development of a distributive model, which would require a number of co-dependent projects across all of the secondary schools in the area to be progressed on a phased basis. This approach ensures that the additional capacity could be in place as required, and that best value can be demonstrated, through the planned replacement and expansion of schools in poor condition (Woodmill, St. Columba’s and Inverkeithing) and the expansion of existing schools to
provide additional capacity (Dunfermline and Queen Anne).

1.6 The scale of the investment required to fund the replacement and expansion plans described above is significant. Within the 2019-29 Capital Plan, the Council included a budget of £117.572m, phased over the life of the plan, to progress the work in Dunfermline & South West Fife. However, it should be noted that, in developing the Capital Plan, the affordability of these projects relies on significant contributions from the Scottish Government, and developer contributions to fund additional capacity.

1.7 The phasing of projects within the Dunfermline & South West Fife area will therefore require taking account of:

- the timing of when and where additional capacity is required
- the need to phase spend across the life of the Capital Plan in order to maintain affordability, and manage the impact on the revenue budget
- the timing of potential funding from the Scottish Government becoming available, and discussion/agreement around specific projects they may agree to support.

1.8 Officers were asked, specifically, to bring forward an option for replacing the existing buildings of Inverkeithing High School. As part of the development of such a proposal, a site assessment is required to be undertaken to review potential sites against the education requirements.

1.9 On 19 March 2019, the Education & Children’s Services Committee considered a report on sixteen potential sites which identified that six sites should be taken forward for more detailed investigation.

1.10 The Committee:

1) noted the completion of the Phase 1 site assessment exercise, in line with the education criteria previously set by the Executive Committee, but asked that the Phase 1 exercise be extended eastwards to establish if there were sites east of the existing site which merited inclusion in the phase 2 feasibility studies;

2) agreed that the six sites set out in the report, as well as the Spencerfield and Caldwell’s Paper Mill require further consideration, and authorised the preparation of phase 2 feasibility studies on those sites, to be reported to this Committee in May; and

3) agreed to authorise the Executive Director, Education and Children’s Services, to engage in formal discussions with the communities and, if necessary, to prepare a report for this Committee’s consideration with a view to commencing a statutory education consultation.

1.11 On 21 May 2019, The Education children’s Services Committee:

(1) noted the completion of the phase 1 site assessment exercise, in line with the education criteria previously set by the Executive Committee;

(2) agreed that the Inverkeithing South Site 18 at Caldwell Mill/Ballast Park be removed from the list of sites for assessment at the phase 2 stage, due to the challenges associated with addressing flood prevention and mitigation, potential contamination and other challenges associated with the development of these
sites for a school; and

(3) agreed that six sites required further consideration and authorised the preparation of phase 2 feasibility studies to be reported to Committee in August on the remaining six sites as follows:

**Inverkeithing North**
- Site 3 - Inverkeithing High School
- Site 4 - North of the A921 - West
- Site 22 - North of A921 - East

**Rosyth**
- Site 10 - Fleet Grounds
- Site 11 - HMS Caledonia
- Site 12 - West Rosyth

1.12 Indicative locations of the potential sites assessed are detailed in Appendix A.

### 2.0 Education requirements

2.1 On 16 August 2016, the Executive Committee considered a report outlining the Authority’s educational requirements and “agreed the criteria . . . required to test any available site options for … assessment of sites for any future school developments” as follows:

i. “a single school and site for the children and young people in order to both provide a coherent and efficient curriculum for all pupils and deliver the best value requirements;

ii. a site where the net acreage was consistent with relevant space guidance in order that it could contain a school, as well as the open space, of sufficient size and appropriate shape to accommodate the peak forecast roll and an element of future expansion. The aspect ratio of the site should also be of suitable proportions to enable the design of the new school to create a building which was attractive and inspiring and would create a civic presence without being unduly constrained by the site;

iii. a site should be located within the designated catchment area, where pupil population was greatest, whilst being accessible by foot, bicycle, car and public transport. It should be located to minimise pupil travel distance and support the delivery of appropriate community facilities;

iv. a sufficient site area to accommodate all curricular, external learning, sports facilities and community engagement, therefore any site would be assessed having regard to the size of the site and its ability to accommodate the school, and not only its curricular activities but all extracurricular activities In accordance with current Fife Council priorities;

v. a site which was able to ensure that the building design could deliver full accessibility for all pupils, staff and the public, including appropriate vehicular access and car parking facilities;
vi. a site which could enable a design that would deliver a safe and secure environment, with ease of movement throughout the building and the site;

vii. the school should be available for occupancy within a reasonable timescale;

viii. a site where the cost of the site and site preparation could be contained within the capital budget available for the project or where any increased costs could be accommodated within the wider Council’s capital resources.”

2.2 On 13 December 2016, the Executive Committee noted that these criteria relate solely to the site characteristics and not to the detailed design of the new school building. Additionally, it was noted that these criteria relate to the Education Authority’s requirement for a school.

2.3 A detailed planning assessment is required and undertaken as part of any planning application process in due course. The Planning Authority will determine any application on the basis of the Development Plan and other material planning considerations.

2.4 Executive Committee also recognised that application of the education criteria was insufficient to definitively identify a new site and that a range of technical, environmental and planning considerations would impact on site selection. However, it was considered appropriate, before embarking upon any of the technical studies that a two-stage process be considered to limit the in-depth work required, by early elimination of those sites which did not match the base education criteria. This would then be followed by the more detailed technical assessment of a reduced numbers of sites i.e.:

Stage 1
- Site assessment based on the educational criteria outlined above
- Assessment supported by high level consideration of any significant issues
- Identification and elimination of those sites which did not satisfy the above criteria and were not deemed worthy of further consideration

Stage 2
- Detailed technical assessment of the remaining sites deemed worthy of further consideration
- Further consideration of any education criteria not capable of completion during Stage 1 due to lack of supporting evidence only established during the Stage 2 studies
- Further consideration of any other issues identified during the technical assessment

2.5 The Stage 1 process identified the sites detailed in 1.10 above.

3.0 Process

3.1 The Stage 2 assessment has been primarily based on a SWOT analysis which examines the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats applicable to each site. This approach has been used a number of times in looking at school sites. As an example, this methodology was used at Waid Academy and led to relocation of the proposed new facility within the campus, realising several benefits not available at the
original proposed location.

3.2 The purpose of this analysis is to build upon the earlier assessment based on the education criteria and critically explore the various technical issues that arise on each of the sites. This promotes a comprehensive understanding of the site selection in a structured way, thus providing a firm foundation for determination of the preferred site in an easily understandable and transparent manner.

3.3 The assessment was initially carried out within the technical team responsible for delivery of the project, as an integral part of their professional assessment of the different sites, by use of individual design disciplines. All of the individual issues raised were then subjected to peer review, by the whole technical team, to provide a summary SWOT Analysis. This is detailed in Appendix B.

3.4 The assessment also picks up on Education Criterion 7 i.e. “the school should be available for occupancy within a reasonable timescale”, which could not be assessed as part of the Stage 1 assessment. This is primarily determined by ownership and planning issues and these are outlined in the SWOT analysis. In addition, Education Criterion 8 i.e. “a site where the cost of the site and site preparation could be contained within the capital budget available for the project or where any increased costs could be accommodated within the wider Council’s capital resources” has also been addressed, in Section 6.0 Budget Costs, below.

4.0 Stage 2 Site Assessment

4.1 During the technical assessment numerous issues were examined, some of which were closely related to, or dependent upon, others. Therefore, it is helpful to focus on these key groupings across sites rather than the individual issues which are detailed in the summary SWOT Analysis.

Education

4.2 In addition to those factors already examined and reported in the earlier reports to the Education & Children’s Services Committee on 19 March 2019 and 21 May 2019, some additional related issues became apparent through the Stage 2 assessment process.

4.3 Construction of a new school on any of the sites, with the exception of Site 3:
- could be carried out without any need for decant
- would not impact on the operation of the existing school
- should not impose any restrictions on achieving all educational aspirations
- however, would distance the new High School from the existing Inverkeithing Primary School and the Treetop Family Nurture Centre

4.4 Redevelopment of the existing building (Site 3) would involve a whole school decant, to an as yet unidentified site, during the construction period of at least two years. Any redevelopment or demolition of the existing buildings will require a major programme of asbestos removal. In addition, there is known, but unquantified, asbestos contamination of the grounds surrounding the school and a lack of space to accommodate both a decanted school and the construction works safely. Another large decant site would require to be identified and made available.
4.5 Any large scale decant would be disruptive for the school and involve two whole schools moves. Such a large decant would incur substantial additional costs, in the region of £12m for a full decant village, and this would impact on the available budget to deliver a new state of the art secondary school (both capital and revenue). Additionally, at this time, there may be limitations on the ability to resource such a decant as a significant number of temporary modular units are required to support the ongoing arrangements at Woodmill HS.

4.6 Due to the constraints of the existing structure any remodelling of the existing school building may not fully comply with the design brief and may have to be a ‘best fit’, potentially compromising the desire to raise the school from ‘Suitability C’ to ‘Suitability A’.

4.7 Construction of a new school on the existing site would reduce the available sports/social areas for about three years: during construction of the new school; demolition of the old school and reinstatement of sports pitches and social space. However, three years is the minimum period, as it is not yet known how long it will take to get demolition consent for a Category B Listed Building.

4.8 **All of the sites** are within the existing catchment area of Inverkeithing HS and all of the sites would require appropriate transport arrangements to be in place for those young people who meet the distance eligibility criteria, as determined in the current School Transport policy. The availability of walked routes to school are not likely to be significantly impacted by the site selection process. However, the numbers of young people being entitled to transport would increase for sites 10.11 and 12.

4.9 Any proposal to relocate the existing Inverkeithing HS and build a new school on a different site location to site 3 will impact on some pupils who are having to travel further to attend this new school. However, there will be some pupils who will live nearer to the school.

4.10 No site can be identified as **fully** complying with criterion iii i.e. the part stating that the site should be 'located within the designated catchment area where pupil population was greatest', as pupil projections indicate that the overall pupil population will remain split by the M90 and that the pupil population in each area represents around 50% of the total number of pupils.

4.11 Appendix C provides details of the outcome of the community engagement exercise, relating specifically to the proposal to replace the Inverkeithing HS buildings, which is overwhelmingly supportive of retaining a secondary school on a site in Inverkeithing.

4.12 **All sites** are capable of supporting the development of the distributive model for secondary provision and delivering a new school to accommodate a pupil roll of up to 2000.

**Design**

4.13 **All sites, other than the existing site**, should allow for a new build that provides full flexibility of the building layout to suit all educational requirements. The additional considerations, with respect to design, are detailed in 4.13 to 4.25 below.

4.14 **Site 3 – Remodel/Extend Existing Buildings**: The listing of the existing buildings does impose certain limitations on the potential remodelling/extension of the new
school. Although no detailed design work has been undertaken, discussions with Historic Environment Scotland indicate that only limited demolition may be acceptable and that most of the existing structure would need to be maintained. Experience from previous projects have demonstrated that although it is technically feasible to uplift the condition of existing buildings, from Condition C to Condition A, it is much harder to raise suitability in the same the way.

4.15 Of particular concern is the multiplicity of levels within the existing building, due to the close modelling of the building levels to the sloping terrain. From previous studies/projects it would appear that there is no guarantee that full accessibility can be achieved, even with multiple lifts. In addition, it is likely that even where accessibility can be provided, it will be at the expense of ease of use and convenience by having to use more than one lift located in different parts of the building to access upper floors. In the event of a fire, or other emergency, this would make it difficult to evacuate building users quickly.

4.16 As with all refurbishment/remodelling projects there is the potential that unforeseen defects exist that could not be detected until the reconstruction works were underway.

4.17 **Site 3 – New Build**: There is an opportunity to create a gateway building on the approach to Inverkeithing.

4.18 Maintenance of the existing school throughout the construction of a new school limits the available area for redevelopment and this would impose restrictions on the design of the new school. The new school will be located closer to the A921 than would be optimal resulting in potential noise issues, which will also restrict the amount of natural ventilation from opening windows.

4.19 Demolition of the existing school prior to construction of a new school would enable optimum use of the site to achieve all educational requirements but would result in a whole school decant for at least two years.

4.20 **Site 4 – North of A921 (West)**: There is an opportunity to create a gateway building on the approach to Inverkeithing.

4.21 This is located in a high-risk flood area and considerable hydrology and flood investigations would be required to minimise the risks. It is likely that the sports pitches would be located in a potential flood risk area, but it should be possible to locate a new school outwith the flood risk zone.

4.22 **Site 22 – North of A921 (East)**: There is an opportunity to create a gateway building on the approach to Inverkeithing.

4.23 A new access off the A921 would be required. Due to the difference in level between the A921 and the site it is likely that significant retaining wall would be required to support the access road. These may be located in close proximity to the new school giving an oppressive outlook and introducing potentially significant differences in level within the environs of the school.

4.24 **Site 10 – Fleet Grounds**: The site will allow for full flexibility of building layout and servicing strategies. The topography of the site is relatively flat.
4.25 **Site 11 – HMS Caledonia:** If the new school were to be centrally located within the site, on elevated land, it would offer good views across the waterfront.

4.26 **Site 12 – Rosyth West:** The new school would be highly visible due to its hilltop location.

**Access**

4.27 **Site 3 – Existing School Site:** The existing site has well established vehicular and pedestrian available routes to school networks. Due to the site topography and the existing narrow and steep entrance there may be some issues during the construction phase.

4.28 **Sites 4 & 22 – North of A921:** These would require a new access off the A921, with a substantial ramp down into both sites. The new access is likely to be taken off the existing signalised junction between the A921 and Hillend Road. There are two existing pedestrian underpasses under the A921 which, although obviating the need to cross the A921, could be considered substandard accesses to a school. Additional pedestrian access from the east could be provided through the provision of a new footbridge at Hillend, although this would incur additional cost of approximately £1.5m - £2m (therefore this has been included in the construction costs in section 6 for these two sites). The current derestricted A921 could act as a significant barrier to sustainable modes of transport.

4.29 **Site 10 – Fleet Grounds:** This has reasonable existing access routes for pedestrians, cyclist and vehicles. Pedestrian and cyclist access to/from the north would have to be improved with widened footways and crossing facilities on the A985 trunk road. Vehicular access could be taken off the existing roundabout with no or limited alterations to accommodate school buses.

4.30 **Site 11 – HMS Caledonia:** Although the site can be accessed off the existing road network, the existing pedestrian routes are poor. Upgrades for both vehicular and pedestrian routes would need to be determined and more detailed work would be required to establish the extent and cost of this.

4.31 **Site 12 – West Rosyth:** Although the site can be accessed off the existing road network there are no substantive pedestrian routes. Upgrades to vehicular and creation of a pedestrian network would be required. More detailed work would be required to establish the extent and cost of these upgrades.

**Ownership**

4.32 Selection of any site other than Site 3 would involve site acquisition costs. As with other recent school building projects, no allowance for site acquisition has been included in the development costs (see section 6). Likewise, however, no account has been taken of any potential capital receipt that could be realised for the sale of an existing site. In this case we have taken advice from the District Valuer on appropriate potential purchase costs, which are reflected in ongoing commercial negotiations with the land owners. The broad similarity of the land in question is such that there is unlikely to be any material variation between the sites in the cost of land purchase.
4.33 **Site 3 – Existing:** This is the only site that is wholly owned by Fife Council and either of the potential developments here would not incur any site purchase costs.

4.34 **Sites 4 & 22 – North of A921:** These agricultural sites are in the same ownership and the landowner has indicated a willingness to engage with the Council on purchase of either site for potential redevelopment for a new school.

4.35 **Site 10 – Fleet Grounds:** Part, but not all of the site is already owned by Fife Council. Depending upon agreement on the final boundaries there are potentially three other owners. Two of the owners have indicated their willingness to engage with the Council on purchase of their sites for potential redevelopment for a new school.

4.36 The third owner is the Ministry of Defence (MOD) and should this site be included in the defence review then this part of the proposed site will not be available until 2024 at the earliest. Whist it may be beneficial to include the MOD portion of the site, if the timescale for acquisition does not fit in with the proposed programme for delivery of the school then simply acquiring a larger site from one of the other landowners would enable the required site area to be assembled.

4.37 **Site 11 – HMS Caledonia and Site 12 – West Rosyth:** Both of these sites are owned by the MOD and although early indications were that the MOD were willing to engage with the Council on the acquisition of either of these sites, it has now indicated that due to slippage in the Defence Review that the earliest that these sites may be available will be 2024.

**Planning**

4.38 A detailed planning assessment has not been undertaken of each of the sites. Prior to submitting a planning application, a detailed planning assessment will be undertaken to support that application. However, at this stage consideration has been given to some key planning issues when evaluating each of the sites.

4.39 **Site 3 – Remodel/Extend Existing:** The existing school is already in education use but is a Category B listed building. During preliminary discussions Historic Environment Scotland (HES) indicated that they were not supportive of demolition of the existing Category B listed building as they considered that the buildings were robust and would be capable of sensitive restoration. This would preserve a Category B listed building for the foreseeable future thus enhancing Fife’s cultural heritage.

4.40 **Site 3 – Newbuild:** Although HES’s strong preference is to retain the school in its current form they did accept that changes would be required if the buildings were to continue to function as a secondary school and meet the requirements of the curriculum. HES indicated that provided the main teaching block and the attached two ‘roundels’ to the east of the main block were retained in their current form, with appropriate internal remodelling and upgrading, they may be open to a discussion about some selective demolition of the attached and detached lower storey building blocks to the west of the main block, with appropriate extensions in this area.

4.41 **Site 4 – North of A921 (West):** Lies outside the settlement boundary and is considered to be in countryside for policy advice. A large area of the north eastern part of the site is at risk from flooding from the Inverkeithing Burn. Land is prime agricultural land. Site is within the Forth Rail Bridge viewpoint 2 viewcone.
4.42 **Site 22 – North of A921 (East):** Lies outside the settlement boundary and is considered to be in countryside for policy advice. Land is prime agricultural land. The site is close to Hillend. Site is within the Forth Rail Bridge viewpoint 3 viewcone.

4.43 **Site 10 – Fleet Grounds:** Protected Open Space; Part of Existing Green Network Asset, it lies inside the settlement boundary. The site is within the consultation zone for the nuclear facility at Rosyth dockyard. The east of the site has planning permission for a new football pitch - this is to replace the one which would be lost through development of the new Lidl along Admiralty Road.

4.44 **Site 11 – HMS Caledonia:** Part of Existing Green Network Asset passes through the site. It lies inside the settlement boundary. The site is within the consultation zone for the nuclear facility at Rosyth dockyard. The site is remote from the main residential areas of Rosyth and Inverkeithing.

4.45 **Site 12 – West Rosyth:** This site is outside the settlement boundary and considered to be in countryside for policy advice. At present it is distant from residential areas. It is north of the Rosyth Container Terminal and on the access road to West gate. SNH have previously commented on landscape issues on proposed development on the site to the west. The site is within the consultation zone for the nuclear facility at Rosyth dockyard. The site is remote from the main residential areas of Rosyth and Inverkeithing. Land is prime agricultural land. There is some risk of surface water flooding in the north east corner of the site.

**Timescales**

4.46 It is not possible to provide definitive timescales for delivery of a new school on any of the sites, at this stage. Once the final site selection has been concluded further detailed work will be required to confirm a specific timeline.

4.47 **Site 3 – Existing:** Any redevelopment of the existing building will involve a prolonged delivery period due to the need for a whole school decant to another site; obtaining listed building consent for partial demolition and subsequent remodelling of a Category B Listed Building. It should be noted that a suitable site for decant has not yet been identified.

4.48 Construction of a new school on the existing site is also likely to have a prolonged programme due to the need to demolish the existing Category B Listed Building and demolition consent is likely to be a protracted process. It is recommended that, should this option be selected, no works commence until consent has been obtained for the demolition of the existing listed building.

4.49 **Sites 4, 10 & 22:** Discussions are on-going with the various landowners and early indications are that acquisition of any of these sites should not impact unduly on early delivery of the project, should this be required. In assembling Site 10 - Fleet Grounds some land could be acquired from the MOD and, if included in the Defence Review, would not be available until 2014. Should this be the case then additional land could be acquired from one of the other owners and there would then be no impact on early acquisition of the site.

4.50 **Sites 11 & 12:** The MOD has recently indicated that, due to the Defence Review slipping from 2022 to 2024, these sites will not be available before then. Given the current slippage of the Defence Review, there is no guarantee that the sites will be
Infrastructure/Utilities

4.51 Site 3 – Existing: Both redevelopment options, on the existing site, should be able to reuse the utilities for the redevelopment, with a minimal uplift to cater for the increased roll. This may be accommodated within the existing utilities infrastructure.

4.52 Site 4 – North of A921 (West): The existing utility networks that serve the current Inverkeithing HS are adjacent to this site and potentially the capacity from the existing school could be re-used.

4.53 Extensive drainage will be required to address flooding issues and it may be difficult to position the SUDS to drain into existing water courses.

4.54 Site 22 – North of A921 (East): The existing utility networks that serve the current Inverkeithing HS are adjacent to this site and potentially the capacity from the existing school could be re-used.

4.55 The existing 11kV overhead high voltage (HV) electricity supply cables would need to be diverted and existing intermediate pressure (IP) gas, water main and foul water sewers may need diverted.

4.56 Site 10 – Fleet Grounds: Gas main and underground high voltage cable may need to be diverted. Finalisation of the boundaries may enable avoidance of these services thus eliminating need for diversion.

4.57 It is likely that a minor diversion of the Fife Coastal Path will be required.

4.58 Site 11 – HMS Caledonia: Until access can be gained to the site it is difficult to determine the risks associated with undocumented buried services within the site (which won’t appear on utility record plans) and what service diversions may be required.

4.59 All required utilities could already be available, although it is known that a gas main crosses the site and may need to be diverted.

4.60 Site 12 – Rosyth West: There is no, or limited, infrastructure and the site is remote from main utility connections.

4.61 An existing 11kV high voltage (HV) electricity supply cable crosses the site and may need to be diverted. A 33kV HV runs north-south along the east boundary of the site.

Other Considerations

4.62 Site 3 – Remodel/Extend Existing: Redevelopment of the existing buildings would address the ongoing maintenance responsibility associated with the building fabric of a listed building.

4.63 Experience elsewhere in the Building Fife’s Future Programme suggests that there is also the potential for a negative public perception of remodelling and extension of the existing building, against all other sites, due to the need for decant and the provision of
partial new and partial rebuild of the existing facilities.

4.64 **Site 3 – Remodel/Extend Existing & New Build:** A new build option on the existing site is likely to incur additional site abnormal costs, as the existing earthworks material may be unsuitable for re-use, which are likely to be expensive to remove off site due to the unquantifiable presence of buried asbestos. This may make the re-use making earthworks required to develop site prohibitive. This may also apply in a lesser degree to the remodelling/extension of the existing building.

4.65 Either of the two redevelopment proposals on the existing site will result in the Family Centre and the Primary School being close to a construction site for several years. Consideration may need to be given to a short term decant of the Family Centre and Primary School during decontamination works, to allay potential fears of cross contamination.

4.66 **Site 4 – North of A921 (West) and Site 22 - North of A921 (East):** Both sites have a lack of good connectivity to any residential areas other than Hillend. Additional pedestrian access from the east could be provided through the provision of a new footbridge at Hillend.

4.67 **Site 4 – North of A921 (West):** There are extensive stands of giant hogweed on Site 4, which is spreading into Site 22, that would require to be eradicated. Advice from our invasive species expert is that eradication is unlikely to be permanent, as re-infestation is likely to occur via both the existing watercourses and the railway line to the north. This could be addressed by establishing a 15m wide bio-security zone to the north, west and possibly east of the site, fenced off from the school, which enable continuous monitoring and safe treatment as and when required.

4.68 **Site 22 – North of A921 (East):** This site has been infected with Japanese Knotweed that may spread to Site 4 and eradication of this can take up to four years or more and, depending upon the treatment method and proposed site layout, is likely to prolong delivery of a new school.

4.69 **Site 11 – HMS Caledonia:** The existing buildings at HMS Caledonia are of an age that they are likely to contain asbestos, and it is likely that buried debris and possibly other contaminants from the original construction will also be encountered.

4.70 Due to the presence of existing MOD buildings it is difficult to assess any potential sub-structure issues from a desk top study. Further detailed studies would be required to establish any potential issues.

4.71 **Site 12 – West Rosyth:** The site is remote from residential areas.

### 5.0 Community Impact

5.1 In terms of educational facilities, the overall impact on the community should be a positive one, with a new school being proposed on a site which will have enhanced facilities for the young people in the catchment area.

5.2 It is recognised that the current facility is extensively used and valued as a community use school and it is intended that this should continue in the replacement building, which would offer a range of facilities that would be state of the art. The detail of these facilities would be determined through the design process, although it is not
anticipated that a swimming pool would be included in any new facility.

5.3 Feedback from the community engagement sessions indicates that the loss of the community facilities for Inverkeithing (i.e. should the site not be 3, 4, or 22), would be opposed strongly, albeit they would be included within any new school. The maintenance of the community wing at the existing site would provide some mitigation for any loss, however the capital and ongoing revenue costs associated with this option would be significant and could be considered as an additional project as part of the more detailed design work proposed. Recognising that the community wing was largely built at the same time and is in similar condition as the remainder of the existing school, if provision is to be retained it may also be appropriate to consider a new build solution, which in the long term could be more cost effective. Again however, the cost of such a building could be significant.

5.4 Initial estimates would indicate a cost for separation and basic refurbishment/remodelling of the existing building (plus relocation of the existing all-weather pitch which is currently located on a different part of the site) to be in the region of £5m to £6m plus, with the capital costs of a new build solution being more expensive. It is important to stress that these are initial high level indicative cost estimates that would require to be verified following survey and agreement of a brief. If this option were considered it would be appropriate to undertake a review of local community facilities to help assess optimum provision. Likewise, consideration could be given to the most appropriate operating model.

5.5 If a decision is taken to relocate Inverkeithing HS to site 4, 22, 10, 11 or 12, the existing main teaching campus would be declared surplus. Site 3 would no longer be required for educational purposes and options for its reuse or disposal would be presented for consideration in due course. Were the community wing retained there would of course be a reduction in any capital receipt.

6.0 Estimated Costs

6.1 Estimated costs for each of the sites have been prepared on the basis that the proposed new build schemes will comply with the Scottish Government’s recommended metrics. Our aim, as a minimum, is to work within the metric, as at Levenmouth Academy, or to better this, as exemplified both at Waid Academy (where additional council services have been incorporated within the space metric) and at Dunfermline HS (where the new school was delivered under the space metric). The recommended space metric for this size of school is set at 10m²/pupil, resulting in a proposed new build school of 20,000m². Initially, this would be applicable to all new builds across all of the sites. However, any remodelling of the existing structure, allied to a new build component, could not reasonably be expected to comply with a new build space metric, due to the need to fit a substantial portion of the required accommodation within the existing floorplates.

6.2 A range of costs are not covered by the metric e.g. site acquisition, off-site road works, IT provision etc. The feasibility studies included consideration of the estimated total costs required to provide the school, excluding site acquisition costs. The high level budget costs for these are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Total Estimated Costs (inclusive of fees and IT costs but excluding site acquisition) (£million)</th>
<th>Acquisition Costs Yes/No</th>
<th>Additional Decant Costs Applicable Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Existing Site (Remodel &amp; Extend)</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Existing Site (New Build)</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 North of A921-West</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No West Rosyth 1-Fleet</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 West Rosyth 2-HMS Caledonia</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 West Rosyth 3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 North of A921-East</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N.B. Construction costs have been estimated based on 3Q19 BCIS indices. Since spend will be incurred in future years, inflation indices will apply. The cost estimates are based on current Scottish Government metrics which do not include the cost of addressing the recently declared climate change emergency.

### 7.0 Stage 2 Assessment Outcomes

7.1 Having considered the range of factors, as detailed in the report and Appendices, it is evident that there are number of key issues that are common across more than one site, as well as a number of other factors that require consideration.

7.2 The following appear to be the options, set out in no particular order:

(a) **Option 1 - Site 3 – Existing - Remodelling/Extension:** Re-use of the existing school buildings may not produce the best design to satisfy entirely the Education Brief. Although it will be possible to raise the building from Condition C to Condition A, the same guarantee cannot be provided with regard to Suitability. A major concern would be that accessibility may comply with the minimum required by regulation but is likely to fall short of Fife council’s standards. A whole school decant would impact on education provision and would be prohibitively expensive. This will also be difficult to programme, due the potential delays in obtaining Demolition Consent for a Category B Listed Building. The Stage 2 Assessment demonstrates that this option **does not comply** with the following education criteria for site selection:

   v. a site which was able to ensure that the building design could deliver full accessibility for all pupils, staff and the public, including appropriate vehicular access and car parking facilities
   
   vi. a site which could enable a design that would deliver a safe and secure environment, with ease of movement throughout the building and the site
   
   vii. the school should be available for occupancy within a reasonable timescale

(b) **Option 2 - Site 3 – Existing – New Build – No Decant:** Maintaining the current school on the site during construction of a new school will not provide the optimum solution due the new school being located in a sub-optimal location on the site. This will also be difficult to programme due to the potential delays in obtaining the necessary Consents for partial demolition and remodelling of a Category B Listed Building. The Stage 2 Assessment demonstrates that this option **does not comply**
with the following education criteria for site selection:

ii. a site where the net acreage was consistent with relevant space guidance in order that it could contain a school, as well as the open space, of sufficient size and appropriate shape to accommodate the peak forecast roll and an element of future expansion. The aspect ratio of the site should also be of suitable proportions to enable the design of the new school to create a building which was attractive and inspiring and would create a civic presence without being unduly constrained by the site

v. a site which was able to ensure that the building design could deliver full accessibility for all pupils, staff and the public, including appropriate vehicular access and car parking facilities;

vi. a site which could enable a design that would deliver a safe and secure environment, with ease of movement throughout the building and the site;

vii. the school should be available for occupancy within a reasonable timescale

(c) Option 3 - Site 3 – Existing – New Build- With Decant: Demolition of the existing school before building the new school would address the design issues inherent in the option whereby the school remains in operation throughout the new build. However, it would introduce the same difficulties outlined in the remodelling/extension option with regard to decant. This will also be difficult to programme due the potential delays in obtaining Demolition Consent for a Category B Listed Building. The Stage 2 Assessment demonstrates that this option does not comply with the following education criteria for site selection:

vii. the school should be available for occupancy within a reasonable timescale

(d) Option 4 - Sites 4 and 22 – North of the A921 (East & West): These sites are similar and the boundaries between them are to all intents arbitrary. There are a range of technical issues, some of which will impact on the use of the sites but can substantially be addressed at a cost. However, these sites have poor connections to residential areas, other than Hillend, and essentially are on the ‘wrong side’ of the busy A921, which is subject to a 60mph speed limit. They are somewhat isolated when considering meaningful local connections. The Stage 2 Assessment demonstrates that, including and in light of the various technical challenges, these options do not comply fully with the following education criterion for site selection:

iii. a site should be located within the designated catchment area, where pupil population was greatest, whilst being accessible by foot, bicycle, car and public transport. It should be located to minimise pupil travel distance and support the delivery of appropriate community facilities

(e) Option 5 - Site 10 – Fleet Grounds: Notwithstanding the need to finalise the proposed site boundaries, and provided that there are no substantive delays in acquiring the site, as anticipated, then the Stage 2 Assessment demonstrates that this site does not comply fully with the following education criterion for site selection:

iii. a site should be located within the designated catchment area, where pupil population was greatest, whilst being accessible by foot, bicycle, car and public transport. It should be located to minimise pupil travel distance and support the delivery of appropriate community facilities
8.0 Preferred Location

8.1 Having considered a range of factors, the more detailed site assessment process that has now been undertaken indicates that all sites will present technical and timescale challenges. On balance, based on construction costs, option 5 (Site 10 – Fleet Grounds) offers the best value location for the replacement of the Inverkeithing HS buildings. However, account must be taken of the potential capital and ongoing revenue costs, for Fife Council, to continue to deliver existing community use facilities for the Inverkeithing, Dalgety Bay and Aberdour communities.

8.2 Once these costs are accounted for i.e. the acquisition of land, the construction costs and the budget required for Community Use Facilities, option 5 costs become comparable with option 4 (Sites 4 and 22).

8.3 Accordingly, it is necessary for the Council to consider there to be 2 options to be preferred. It is clear that options 4 and 5 can meet all but one of the educational requirements for site selection fully and are capable of furnishing the state of the art building that will deliver outstanding educational facilities.

8.4 The contents of this report and appendices outline the full technical SWOT analysis, the outcomes of the community engagement exercise and the additional considerations to allow members to determine the preferred options.

8.5 The final criterion to be considered is that the preferred site is:

\[ \text{viii. a site where the cost of the site and site preparation could be contained within the capital budget available for the project or where any increased costs could be accommodated within the wider Council’s capital resources} \]

8.6 Based on the information included in this report it is possible to determine preferred options. However, the scale of the investment required to fund any of the possible sites is significant and should be considered in terms of the overall affordability of the Council’s Capital Investment Plan.

8.7 The preferred options are 4 and 5.

9.0 Next Steps

9.1 If Committee agrees these as the preferred options for the replacement of Inverkeithing High School, then officers should:

- continue to explore potential funding sources
- explore the community requirements and opportunities presented by both options
- investigate and negotiate with the land owners acquisition costs for options 4 and 5
- prepare the Education Brief for each option
• appoint a Design Team to prepare designs for both options
• report back to a future Committee on the preferred option.
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Appendix A - Site Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area (Hectares)</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 03 Inverkeithing High School</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 04 North of A921 - West</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>77.02</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 10 West Rosyth 1 (West)</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 11 West Rosyth 2 (PPS Calvandity)</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>53.35</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 12 West Rosyth 3</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 22 North of A921 - East</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (c) Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Fife Council 100023385 (2017).
### Site 3: Remodel/Extend Existing School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>- Design of school will be ‘best-fit’ rather than best education design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing educational site</td>
<td>- Full school decant required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Close proximity to Inverkeithing Primary School and the Family Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>- Design of school will be ‘best-fit’ rather than best education design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expansive views to the north</td>
<td>- Full school decant required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Embankment to A921 gives good screening to the buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>- Partial retention of Category B Listed Building may be more palatable to Planners &amp; HES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Established safe routes to schools</td>
<td>- Existing education facility so precedent for site use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing bus drop off may be suitable to incorporate into the new scheme proposals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>- Partial retention of Category B Listed Building may be more palatable to Planners &amp; HES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Already in Fife Council ownership</td>
<td>- Existing education facility so precedent for site use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>- Partial retention of Category B Listed Building may be more palatable to Planners &amp; HES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partial retention of Category B Listed Building may be more palatable to Planners &amp; HES</td>
<td>- Existing education facility so precedent for site use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing education facility so precedent for site use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>- Partial retention of Category B Listed Building may be more palatable to Planners &amp; HES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Established routes &amp; infrastructure on the site</td>
<td>- Existing education facility so precedent for site use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td>- Partial retention of Category B Listed Building may be more palatable to Planners &amp; HES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing utilities into existing school likely to be re-used for development</td>
<td>- Existing education facility so precedent for site use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimal uplift on overall capacities to suit higher pupil roll which may be able to be accommodated with existing infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix B**

**Site Appraisal Swot Analysis**

**Inverkeithing HS Feasibility Study**

**Item 06b Inverkeithing AppB SWOT Analysis**
## Site Appraisal Swot Analysis

### Site 3: Remodel/Extend Existing School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared facilities with Primary School</td>
<td>• Current school is rated as a ‘C’ for suitability, may not be able to achieve an ‘A’ rating due to compromises in design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to further improve collaborative working between the schools &amp; family centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to segregate existing sports pitches to allow change in level to be incorporated into design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Repair &amp; restoration of Grade B Listed Building enhances the cultural heritage</td>
<td>• Potential poor condition of existing fabric once opening works commence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addresses the ongoing maintenance responsibility associated with building fabric of a listed building</td>
<td>• Potential underpinning works required to existing rotunda’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible reduction on section 6 (carbon emissions) regulatory targets</td>
<td>• May need significant retaining walls in close proximity to the building, which may be oppressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modification costs to existing structure could attract significant cost &amp; risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Challenges associated with altering a concrete frame with asbestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prolonged programme due to settlement risks associated with building on existing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fitness of existing structure and how asbestos would be managed going forward would have to be considered as part of design work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing HV to West of site may need diverted if site layout cannot be developed to maintain required stand-off distances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning risk as part demolition of listed building would be required</td>
<td>• Potential for major delays due to unknown timescale for obtaining partial-demolition and redevelopment consent from HES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for major delays due to unknown timescale for obtaining partial-demolition and redevelopment consent from HES.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site 3: New Build on Existing Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Asbestos risk</td>
<td>• Planning risk as part demolition of listed building would be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential decant of the Family Centre &amp; the Primary School as a result of the existing asbestos issues and this has not been costed at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential site contamination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher costs associated with refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Availability of a suitable site for decant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DDA access routes may be difficult to deliver given change in site levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### Site Appraisal Swot Analysis

### Inverkeithing HS Feasibility Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing educational site</td>
<td>• Existing school will be impacted by loss of playing field beyond completion of the new school and close proximity to construction site for several years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close proximity to Inverkeithing Primary School and the Family Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No decant required during construction of the new school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site layout maximises the external sports provision</td>
<td>• External site components compromised due to retention of existing buildings during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embankment to A921 gives good visual screening to the buildings</td>
<td>• Buildings are close to the main road impacting noise and natural ventilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Panoramic views north across to adjacent farmland</td>
<td>• Layout is compromised by the need for the existing school to remain operational throughout construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New build allows for full flexibility of building layout and servicing strategies</td>
<td>• Layout is compromised due to the topography of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established safe routes to schools</td>
<td>• Extensive retention and underbuilding required to the building due to level changes on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing bus drop off may be suitable to incorporate into the new scheme proposals.</td>
<td>• Extensive fill required for pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Already in Fife Council ownership</td>
<td>• Limited location for SUDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing education facility so precedent for site use</td>
<td>• Significant changes in levels could result in alternative access routes being required for DDA access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established routes &amp; infrastructure on/to the site</td>
<td>• Potential issues with incorporation of car parking into proposed design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The existing utility networks that serve the current Inverkeithing HS are adjacent to this site</td>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal uplift on overall capacities to suit higher pupil roll which may be able to be accommodated with existing infrastructure</td>
<td>• Unknown programme as a result of demolition of a listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive public perception of a new school</td>
<td>• Schools &amp; Family Centre would be in close proximity to a construction site for a prolonged period of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site 3: New Build on Existing Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>• Some decant to new school, primary school and Family Centre may be required during asbestos removal and demolition of existing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared facilities with Primary School</td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to improve collaborative working between the schools &amp; family centre</td>
<td>• Existing HV to West of site may need diverted if site layout cannot be developed to maintain required stand-off distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to create a gateway building on approach to Inverkeithing</td>
<td>• DDA access routes may be difficult to deliver given change in levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prominence on main road could be a ‘gateway’ for Inverkeithing</td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>• Intermediate gas pressure line may need diverting to accommodate the car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing school could continue in operation until new school complete</td>
<td>• Capacity issues and difficulties associated with changeover of services if existing school was live during construction and commissioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building footprint could be stepped to integrate with existing topography.</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Live utilities to existing school could be utilised for site temporary supplies/accommodation for initial site works</td>
<td>• Existing earthworks material may be unsuitable for re-use making earthworks to develop site prohibitive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Appraisal Swot Analysis

#### Site 4: North of A921- West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Located adjacent to the existing school</td>
<td>• Located in a high-risk flood area, considerable hydrology and flood investigations would be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required site components fit neatly onto the site</td>
<td>• Sports pitches in high flood risk area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>• May need significant retaining walls to support new access road to the building, which may be oppressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building could be positioned to minimise any impact from main road, noise pollution etc.</td>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Panoramic views north across to adjacent farmland</td>
<td>• Limited access routes for vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reasonable flat site</td>
<td>• Road access from A921 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New build allows for full flexibility of building layout and servicing strategies</td>
<td>• Safety of the adjacent road underpasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site is relatively clear of existing buried/overhead utilities (exception is buried foul water – see ‘Threats’ below)</td>
<td>• Not in Fife Council ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The existing utility networks that serve the current Inverkeithing HS are adjacent to this site</td>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>• Unknown timescale for acquisition of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No decant of the existing school required</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive public perception of a new school</td>
<td>• Increased distance from existing primary school and family centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of connectivity to residential areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bio-security issues - giant hogweed buffer zone required and continual monitoring of hogweed thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Appraisal Swot Analysis

**Site 4: North of A921- West**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building could be positioned outwith high flood risk area</td>
<td>• May require a long access road into the site to address the level issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to create a gateway building on approach to Inverkeithing</td>
<td>• May require changes to the A921 to accommodate an access from this road (widening, new junction etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity for enhanced external sports pitches due to size of site</td>
<td>• Vehicle access of the main A921 may not be acceptable to planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to align building with topography and avoid public sewer no build zone</td>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th><strong>Planning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existing school's utilities capacity potentially could be re-used</td>
<td>• Scottish Planning Policy limits development on flood plains, may be rejected by SEPA and planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th><strong>Infrastructure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Development of existing open water courses to enhance ecological value</td>
<td>• May be difficult to position the SUDS to drain into existing water courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extensive drainage requirements to address flooding issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Before existing school is decanted there may be a short window where both schools are required to run concurrently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | **Other** |
| | • Disruption/disturbance to wildlife corridor along Mill Lane & Cast Burn |
| | • Ongoing threat of Giant Hogweed invasion |
| | • 11kV overhead HV exists in North-South orientation along the East boundary of the site. |
# Site Appraisal Swot Analysis

## Site 22: North of A921- East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site can easily accommodate all requirements</td>
<td>• May need significant retaining walls in close proximity to new school to support new access road to the building, which may be oppressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No decant requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site can accommodate all requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established location - adjacent to the existing Inverkeithing High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moderate level change across the site</td>
<td>• Not in Fife Council ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main development area out with flooding zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building could be positioned to minimise any impact from main road and trainline, noise pollution etc.</td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building orientation optimises solar gain to classrooms</td>
<td>• Drainage capacity may need to be increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sports pitches act as a buffer between the building and residential area</td>
<td>• Large amount of top soil to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The A921 road to south and the East Coast railway line to the north screened by dense vegetation</td>
<td>• Cost associated with likely option to construct vehicular from A921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Panoramic views north across to adjacent farmland</td>
<td>• Lack of established public transport links to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New build allows for full flexibility of building layout and servicing strategies</td>
<td>• Pedestrian access through an underpass is unlikely to be supported by Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing primary utility infrastructure networks to the site</td>
<td>• Proximity of flood-lit pitches to residential area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Centrally located between Inverkeithing and Dalgety Bay</td>
<td>• Unknown timescale for acquisition of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good access routes for pedestrians from Hillend and Dalgety Bay</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased distance from existing primary school and family centre</td>
<td>• Increased distance from existing primary school and family centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive public perception of a new school</td>
<td>• Close proximity to existing housing in Hillend with increased traffic access through Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bio-security issues - giant hogweed buffer zone required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Japanese Knotweed treatment required – program implications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Appraisal Swot Analysis

**Site 22: North of A921- East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to create a gateway building on approach to Inverkeithing</td>
<td>• Building is within the Forth Rail Bridge ‘Viewpoint 3 viewcone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity for enhanced external sports provision due to the generous site area</td>
<td>• Fife Council don’t permit access off the A921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upgrade pedestrian &amp; cycle connectivity to core paths, National Cycle Network and public transport network</td>
<td>• Access – safely dropping kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upgrade both existing underpasses for cycle and pedestrian access</td>
<td>• Underpasses are a safety threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of existing open water courses to enhance ecological value</td>
<td>• May require changes to the A921 to accommodate an access from this road (widening, new junction etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of areas near the steeper embankments into habitat zone to enhance ecological value</td>
<td>• May be subject to flooding (Part of site - low risk and could be limited to area of playing fields)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing buried potable water main crossing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing buried foul water sewers crossing site in multiple locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Before existing school is decanted there may be a short window where both schools are required to run concurrently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bio-security issues - giant hogweed buffer zone required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Japanese Knotweed spread outside of the site boundary cannot be controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disruption/disturbance to wildlife corridor along Mill Lane &amp; Cast Burn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

**Site Appraisal Swot Analysis**

### Inverkeithing HS Feasibility Study

#### Site 10: Fleet Grounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site can easily accommodate all requirements</td>
<td>• Not all of the site is in Fife Council ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No decant requirements</td>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>• Proximity of flood-lit pitches to residential area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Topography of the site is relatively flat</td>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Habitat area positioned along northern boundary creates buffer between</td>
<td>• Unknown timescale for acquisition of that part of the site not already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building and agricultural fields</td>
<td>Fife Council ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sports pitches act as a buffer between the building and residential</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas</td>
<td>• New school remote from existing primary school and family centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New flood-lit pitch located to existing pitch to minimise light</td>
<td>• Retaining existing MUGA during construction could restrict construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollution across the site</td>
<td>access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New build allows for full flexibility of building layout and servicing</td>
<td>• Existing 11kV electrical infrastructure and gas main follows route of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>existing Fife Coastal Path and requires to be diverted to suit the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reasonable access for pedestrians and cyclists, good access for</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicles</td>
<td>• New school remote from existing primary school and family centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing road infrastructure in place</td>
<td>• Retaining existing MUGA during construction could restrict construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing primary utility infrastructure networks to the site</td>
<td>• Existing 11kV electrical infrastructure and gas main follows route of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>existing Fife Coastal Path and requires to be diverted to suit the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive public perception of a new school</td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Site Appraisal SWOT Analysis

## Site 10: Fleet Grounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Options for multiple sustainable and vehicular access routes into the site</td>
<td>• Potential that the gas pressure main runs within the boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Options to improve connectivity into cycle route 76</td>
<td>• High voltage cable may require diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>• Fife Coastal Path diversion required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity to Rosyth town centre</td>
<td>• Negotiations required with Transport Scotland. Difficult to determine likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate existing football club into the new facilities</td>
<td>implications until detailed design and planning consultations commence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### Site Appraisal Swot Analysis

#### Inverkeithing HS Feasibility Study

**Site 11: HMS Caledonia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No decant required</td>
<td>• Not all required sports pitches fit neatly on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School centrally located within the site; building positioned on elevated land offers good views across waterfront</td>
<td>• Maybe accessibility issues as a consequence of split-level site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New build allows for full flexibility of building layout and servicing strategies</td>
<td>• Poor pedestrian routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential modifications required to existing roads infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing road infrastructure</td>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Separate entrance and exit to ease congestion</td>
<td>• Not in Fife Council ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing building services &amp; drainage infrastructure</td>
<td>• Unknown timescale for acquisition of the site. 2024 at the earliest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Although site topography is challenging, the site is generally platformed on the areas of the site proposed for the building and the pitches</td>
<td>• New school remote from existing primary school and family centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>• Details of the site are unknown and likely to be classified so contamination risk cannot be easily established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive public perception of a new school</td>
<td>• An exposed site on the edge of the residential area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Longer construction programme as a result of demolition and decontamination requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unknown condition of existing building services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Various utility disconnections/removals required once existing MoD Caledonia buildings are decanted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site 11: HMS Caledonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve core paths and cycle connections</td>
<td>• Unsure of site remediation requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct National Cycle Route 76 connection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Timescales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce programme by staged demolition and construction phases</td>
<td>• Unknown timescale for acquisition of the site as indications are that MOD review now slipped by two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate existing football club into the new facilities</td>
<td>• Gas pressure main located across the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to acquire the site under the City Deals</td>
<td>• Likely to be major offsite road improvements required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk of undocumented buried services within site which won’t appear on utility record plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timeframe for demolition is extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 12: West Rosyth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site can accommodate all requirements</td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No decant required</td>
<td>• Not all sports pitches fit neatly on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal impact on existing landscape features</td>
<td>• Site topography is extremely challenging and would require very extensive cut &amp; fill. Only half of the site is useable as a result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building could be highly visible due to hilltop location</td>
<td>• Extensive retention would be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New build allows for full flexibility of building layout and servicing strategies</td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing road infrastructure</td>
<td>• Limited or no drainage infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site is relatively clear of existing buried/overhead utilities. No obvious diversions required to suit development proposals.</td>
<td>• Remote to main utility connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Separate entrance and exit to ease congestion</td>
<td>• Access and egress routes for vehicles and pedestrians would be difficult due to the topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive public perception of a new school</td>
<td>• Road network immediately adjacent to the site would have to improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No pedestrian routes and would be very difficult to create any safe pedestrian routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Light pollution risk due to proposed location of all-weather pitches to barracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not in Fife Council ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timescales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unknown timescale for acquisition of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2024 at the earliest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New school remote from existing primary school and family centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remote from the residential areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site 12: West Rosyth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of areas near the steeper embankments into habitat zone to enhance ecological value</td>
<td>• Site conditions unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core paths and cycle route connection improvement</td>
<td>• Likely to be major offsite road improvements required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>• Existing 11kV HV crosses South corner of site and may need diverted if required stand-off distances cannot be observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to acquire part of the site to the east to enable the school and pitches to be one level</td>
<td>• Existing 33kV HV (primary asset) exists in North-South orientation along the East boundary of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to acquire the site under the City Deals</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proximity of site to the MoD site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Engagement – Inverkeithing HS New Site Location

The Education Service was asked by both the South West Area Committee and Education & Children’s Services Committee to engage with both parents/carers of our pupils in this area of Fife and other interested parties on the potential sites, wider community impact on replacing these community use schools and the vision to increase capacity of these replacement schools and Queen Anne and Dunfermline High Schools as a result of expected pupil numbers from new housing.

Nineteen engagement sessions were arranged in the first instance, with 6 of these either in local services offices or community centres and the remaining 13 in primary/secondary schools. Three further sessions were arranged after the summer holidays for evenings and a Saturday morning and a further 5 were arranged in the Cowdenbeath area (St Columba’s RC associated primary) for after the October school holidays.

The sessions in the schools, prior to the summer holidays were not well attended by parents/carers, however the feedback received has been included below.

The comments in relation to Inverkeithing High School have been included below:

Inverkeithing High School – location, as well as school/community requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Here is some feedback regarding the proposed re-development of Inverkeithing High School (I have two daughters at North Queensferry PS – P3 and P6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main concern is around the timescale of any re-development. My interpretation of our discussion is that the best case scenario for a new school being ready is 3.5 years from the consultation period beginning (0.5 year consultation, 1 year design, 2 year build). This could extend further if there is any delay in any of these phases, if there is difficulty finding funding, or if the Woodmill/St Columba’s campus is prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During this time period the Inverkeithing High role is due to increase significantly, putting more pressure on an already dilapidated building. I am worried that the approach to the current school will be to place a ‘sticking plaster’ on any structural or other problems given a new school is on the horizon. This appears to be the worst of both worlds for pupils with the school reaching capacity as the building nears end of life. I am also concerned that this situation will be a deterrent to attracting teachers and other staff to the school. All of this leaves me with real concerns that Inverkeithing High can provide the optimum conditions for educating my children and other pupils in the coming years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of the sites proposed my preference would be for one of the three sites closest to the current High School. I am sympathetic to the argument that Inverkeithing High School should remain in Inverkeithing. However, my strong preference is to get this school built as quickly as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope this is helpful feedback. Thank you for holding the meetings and I look forward to engaging further throughout the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This surely is much needed. School is not fit for purpose. Must stay in Inverkeithing. It would keep the heat out of Inverkeithing community for the high school to go. Inverkeithing is the centre of the catchment. Please keep Inverkeithing HS in Inverkeithing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion as not within my catchment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not happy about the Rosyth location. They will increase travel time in the taxi to bus stop is already very early. My son’s sleep will be affected and he has mental health issues that could</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


be aggravated by this. Sites 4 and 22 are best as they will leave ALL students travel unaffected and have plenty of space.

Location should stay at current site. Create a new school here and knock down the current one. It is a danger to the pupils.

Fife Council wins – facilities will be lost! Keep the school in Inverkeithing.

What will happen to the wing? Will there be a pool at the new school? Swimming is a life skill and should be part of the curriculum.

If the school moves it needs to be on a regular public bus route. School buses will leave before after school clubs.

Love Inverkeithing High School to stay in Inverkeithing. I love that the nursery, primary school and high school are nearby. Would love the wing/community space to stay or be replaced.

Old paper mill site is a good spot. Keep the school in Inverkeithing.

Would be great if kept in Inverkeithing. Keep community use in Inverkeithing, especially classes and swimming pool.

The swimming pool must be rebuilt on new site. Not enough space at leisure centres for swimming lessons.

We need: swimming pool, community centre and current location to keep nursery, primary and high school together.

Keep the wing and community use facilities.

Would want to keep the hub of nursery, primary, high school and community use wing. Inverkeithing needs this for the community.

Two high schools close together won’t work (Inverkeithing moving to Rosyth and Dunfermline)

New high school must stay in Inverkeithing. Please maximise community use, sports facilities.

Inverkeithing would need a new community centre if the high school moves.

Business will have an effect, shops will close, Inverkeithing will deteriorate.

Inverkeithing has a lot of new build buildings. Has it been considered how kids will get to school safely as free buses not option within 2 miles.

Central location is important to facilitate walking to school. Ideally Inverkeithing location, but understand the need for best location for majority.

To remain in Inverkeithing – it’s central, easy access for walking and for traffic. Centre for all primary schools attending. Do not want Rosyth, especially Dockyard due to large vehicles. There are no facilities near by.

I would prefer the high school to remain in Inverkeithing, would like to know if they will be considering the usage of the community wing and the relation with the town. The playing fields are also important to the town use with the gala, and football teams, and primary school. The amount of clubs and activities that use the wing, and the swimming pool, as well as the high school, PE department.

Community use wing needed for Inverkeithing – including a swimming pool.

High school to remain in Inverkeithing for central catchment.

Upon building a new high school, they need to take into account all the new houses that are being built in Inverkeithing. It is not only the high school that is important to Inverkeithing but the community use of the facilities – “the wing” is a great facility to help keep our kids active and be able to learn to swim.

Inverkeithing High School should stay in Inverkeithing. Shops will loose out on business. I have lived in Inverkeithing for 30 years (all my life).

Yes please, cause it is falling apart.

Stay in Inverkeithing, community use still. How long will it take? Formal communication when?

Please do not change location of high school. It should stay in Inverkeithing.

Need swimming pool facilities, need the wing with gym equipment. Location needs to stay beside primary and nursery.

Keep high school a possibly. Just refurbish the old school. Too much changes and disruption.
High School should be kept in Inverkeithing as its important for it to be kept in the community. It’s walking distance for a lot of people who don’t have access to their own car!

Inverkeithing High School should stay in Inverkeithing and shouldn’t be moved. Why chuck away a high school, do it up, or keep it where it is. They need a swimming pool. Why chuck away the high school means what’s going to happen to the wing if this happens. The school and wing is important to us.

Keep the swimming pool (school pupil – aged 7 years)

High School should remain in Inverkeithing as location is more suitable for all pupils travelling from Rosyth, Inverkeithing, Dalgety Bay, North Queensferry and Aberdour. It is also very important to retain full use of the wing. It’s used for school and public use – will still remain fully functional for the new school. Plus it’s off the main road system which is safer for kids. Rosyth options will be too busy and not acceptable for all ids (except Rosyth) to be travelling that distance. Inverkeithing is central to all.

This needs to stay in Inverkeithing as does the wing. It is central from Aberdour, Dalgety Bay, North Queensferry and part of Rosyth and would be a big loss not just to the school but as a social gathering for residents as well. There is also a swimming pool in the Wing which we would lose if everything is closed down again a big loss to the community.

Rosyth is too far for travel. We need swim facilities. The wing is essential for Inverkeithing community.

What will happen to the old school? What will happen to the wing as a community use? Too many questions that needs to be answered you can’t just build it where even higher up people please.

With the new housing developments planned I think that a Rosyth location would be more suitable.

I am a resident in Inverkeithing, I live on the High St and my eldest daughter is at the Inverkeithing High School. Here are my thoughts about the proposed new Inverkeithing High School sites.

Firstly, the Inverkeithing High St relies heavily on the custom from older pupils of the High School and the families connected to them, this keeps the town bustling and alive. Without this custom there is no doubt the town will suffer and like so many small towns in fife (so many High St’s have died, empty shops and businesses), The High School is a great amenity to have in a town - to lose this will be an added blow to a town.

The High school itself is a remarkable example of Brutalist architecture from the 1960’s and as a result it is listed. It is shocking how little this seems to matter to Councils and Developers considering in London and other cities Brutalist architecture is being protected and appreciated. This listing MUST be taken in to consideration, its unique, it is irreplaceable. Surely this could be used as a plus point rather than seen as a bind? This 1960’s architecture wont be seen again - Inverkeithing has already lost so many cherished (many listed) buildings due to a ‘quick fix’ of knocking down and building new characterless houses etc.

The existing school site could be re-purposed including parts of the original Brutalist architecture. It would be exciting to see this develop and give a great boost to the community. To keep elements of the old school and incorporate them into a new school would be the best and most progressive solution. After all it is part of the Scottish Governments policy to reuse and repurpose old buildings rather than demolish.

Too many bad decisions have been made for Inverkeithing in the last 20 years. Let’s make a good one for the community and surrounding towns. Keep Inverkeithing the hub. Don’t kill the High St. Don’t let it become a new build housing site with no school. With a bit of ingenuity and care the school site can be rejuvenated, not abandoned and something positive and exciting can happen to the town. An abandoned sad looking listed building is not good for moral - have a look around Inverkeithing it is full of them.
Dunfermline can already be served by a new wing to the High School there and eventually a new school in the 2nd site may serve the huge increase in new builds BUT meanwhile focus on what the smaller towns need. HES has already spoken about working with the proposal to reuse parts to the original school, we have lost the old primary school to greedy developers and arsonists, let’s stop this happening to the High School. To move the school from Inverkeithing would not only be a bad decision for the town it would highlight the sorry state of protecting architecture in Fife and retaining a sense of pride for the history of its buildings.

4) Inverkeithing High School should remain in Inverkeithing, rather than being moved to Rosyth. As was mentioned at the meeting, it seems that everything is being taken away from Inverkeithing. Soon it will only be a dormitory for Edinburgh.

I attended one of the recent consultations about potential sites for a new Inverkeithing High School. It was with much dismay I learned about the possibility that Rosyth was being considered for the proposed new school. Inverkeithing has had a grammar/secondary school for 200 years since around 1819 and it is just inconceivable that the school would be moved out of the town now – that would not be a progressive change. The current school is so perfectly sited next to the nursery and primary school, all of which form the perfect educational campus for children – not to mention the community wing which is so well-used by parents and children alike and is especially important for families who don’t have their own transport.

With creative design/architecture and thinking, the existing school site could absolutely be adapted to build a dynamic and inspirational new school that would stand out yet again to win future awards.

I strongly object to any consideration being given to moving our High School out of Inverkeithing – it has always been and will always remain an essential part of our community.

(Inverkeithing resident/parent and former Chair of the 1st IHS school board)

Following attendance at the public engagement meetings regarding the replacement sites for Inverkeithing High School, I would like to feedback the following points:

1. My son already travels on the school bus service from Rosyth to Inverkeithing High and there are no concerns with this. There is a good service in place and I can see no reason why this can not continue for a replacement in Inverkeithing.

2. The road network at the existing site is already in place and coping with the school traffic.

3. (a) I am opposed to building on the Fleet Grounds site as it is surrounded by residential housing. The house owners have bought these properties at a point where there is no high school nearby. It would be unfair to establish a high school there as litter, noise and vandalism are bound to be encountered.

   (b) The road network surrounding the Fleet Grounds are inappropriate for the large number of buses and cars that would be accessing the school.

4. The MOD land would be ideal as there is plumbing, drainage, sewage, electricity etc already established there. It is also on an isolated site away from residential properties and can be accessed directly from the A985 road.

I hope you will take these points into consideration when making the site selection.

Inverkeithing is a town on the up. There is a lot of community effort going in to various regeneration initiatives. The recent news of a cash injection to the town centre is so promising. The towns businesses rely to a degree on the knock on benefits of lunch time and after school trade by school children, staff and the community using the community use facilities. Scotland’s biggest affordable housing Fraser avenue project, residents and businesses of the future would surely benefit from a replacement school on the existing site. It is a beautifully large site on an elevated bright position and can be accessed by bike, on foot, by bus or by train- surely a big advantage for a school of the future.
Please do all you can to keep inverkeithing high school in Inverkeithing. It is surely pretty much centre of the school catchment, there is probably scope too to design it in a way that the current school can operate while its being built, then demolished and sold for housing to release equity to cross fund. It is absolutely fantastic that it loads old like we will be getting a much needed high school. The current site is a fantastic site and this is an opportunity to really improve Inverkeithing.

I very much hope that the feasibility studies show that the current site is the majority of the catchments preferred site, the best value for money, the must sustainably located site and would be a real asset for the ongoing regeneration of Inverkeithing.

Will the preferred site be reported to the committee in August and what is the process thereafter?

Similar to the Woodmill/St Columba's scenario I acknowledge and fully support the proposal as I believe there is a critical need to modernise the school. I would also be in favour of the new school being on its same location for transport issues. In addition it needs to accommodate community use and have a swimming pool.

In response to the ‘Have Your Say’ on shaping the future of Inverkeithing and Dunfermline’s secondary schools - specifically point number 2 “Inverkeithing High School – location, as well as school/community requirements”:

I have two children currently attending Donibristle Primary School, in P7 and P4. I am therefore very concerned for their secondary school experiences, as even a small amount of disruption could have an adverse effect on their received teaching and ultimately their qualifications and future careers.

I understand that retaining the site of Inverkeithing High School cannot be reasonably expected (due to the lack of available space on the playing fields) for concurrent building of a new school andrazing to the ground of the existing building. I am therefore perplexed as to why it has been included in the shortlist of six potential sites of the new school. Decanting the pupils (to a temporary school or specific ‘village’ location) appears to be a very disruptive option and an unnecessary amount of pupil movement.

Furthermore, opting for a site on an extremity of the Inverkeithing High School catchment area – i.e. each of the three proposed sites in Rosyth – appears unreasonable to everyone who does not live in Rosyth. To expect Aberdour and Dalgety Bay pupils to travel along an already log-jammed A985 through Rosyth has to be a significant shortcoming to building the school so far west.

In my opinion, since the current site appears to be untenable as a new site location, and with each of the three Rosyth sites being as inadequate as each other, with regards to location, the only sound options left are the two sites that are positioned to the immediate north of the current campus, i.e. across the A921 (regrettably I do not remember the numbers given to these adjacent sites). The only downside of this location is the flooding that occurs occasionally in the south east corner of the site, i.e. in close proximity to the Inverkeithing ‘double roundabout’, but the two sites here are of large enough acreage that this need not be of concern. Additionally, one of the many significant advantages of this location is that it is adjacent to the current school and therefore the incumbent pupils will feel they are a part of the construction of the new school, being able to witness the planning, land surveys, building design, educating them in town planning, architecture, civil engineering, quantity surveying and ultimately watching on as the new build stretches up from the landscape. Innumerable school projects could be amassed through this engagement of the new school, enhancing the theoretical education that they already receive in the current curriculum. Should the new school be built out of sight of the current school, then the opportunity to include pupils in the design and build of their new school is lost. As an engineer myself, this would feel like a wasted opportunity to educate those pupils whose future careers could involve such a plethora of subjects. I would like to think that the school itself, as well as Fife Education services would welcome this.
Traffic management / infrastructure at this location (two sites) would be only marginally impacted, since the three-way traffic light junction with the A921 and Hillend Road immediately to the north-east of the current school site would be adjusted to the addition of a fourth junction, forming a specific, dedicated route into the new school campus. Traffic is already disrupted on the A921 with the current school / community use / Inverkeithing town traffic using this junction, therefore the additional new school road would create only a minimal influence on the road network, and thereby presents an impact that is considerably less than a new school built at the west end of Rosyth. Not only would the latter location add extra bus-loads of pupils being ferried to and from the school through Rosyth twice a day, but it also would result in the addition of extra car journeys through Rosyth with parents driving their children to and from breakfast clubs and after-school clubs. The environmental impact of the slow-moving / standing traffic would not be justifiable. In addition, it is clear to me that residents of Rosyth, who have no school involvement, would not tolerate this significant increase in traffic density.

Moreover, the three potential sites in Rosyth are located very near to the shipyards / industrial units. One Dalgety Bay mother I met at an engagement session was very concerned at this prospect. If a Rosyth site was selected, she would remove her child(ren) from the school and move away from the catchment area. This is of significant concern. If this fact was to be further considered by other parents, they too may react in a similar manner. Fife Council has a responsibility to protect our children when we send them to school. If there was to be any level of threat, be it physical, by intimidation or potentially of a sexual nature, then this must be considered in the new school site selection process. I have two daughters and I had not realised the proposed Rosyth sites were juxta positioned to the dockyards. This disturbs me greatly.

Rosyth is newly located in the Inverkeithing catchment and it seems unfair that it can have such a strong influence on the new secondary school position. At the other extremity of the catchment, Aberdour is expecting new housing in the near future, which in itself is regrettable to the local residents, however, it will increase its school pupil numbers. This not insignificant fact aids the argument that the statistical mean of the distribution of the pupils in the Inverkeithing High School catchment area is centred slightly east of the current school position, i.e. towards Dalgety Bay and Aberdour. Even if there was a potentially viable alternative site in the Dalgety Bay area, which would greatly reduce my own children’s efforts to travel to the school, I can rationally understand that a location within Inverkeithing makes the most common sense. Maintaining the status quo as far as possible creates less impact to all attending pupils is therefore similar.

Finally, the town of Inverkeithing would be dealt a significant blow should it see the closure of its High School. Inverkeithing already suffers with town centre issues and losing its school could sound the death knell for the area.

Footnote: In light of the recent dreadful fire at Woodmill High School, I assume that Inverkeithing HS is now no longer the number one priority to receive a replacement school? It would be very much appreciated if you could provide an estimated timeline for the developments of all the intended schools that require replacement.

Thanks for your emails. I’m sure these comments will be taken into account by the team managing the consultation write-up but in any case, I’ll certainly raise it as one of the possible impacts of a change in school location. I’m keen to ensure the decision is not made on educational requirements in isolation as the council has a responsibility to consider the wider implications of any decision.

Kind regards,

David Barratt
Hi David,

An excellent email to which I would like to add my full support David.

David, as XX mentions, we are involved in a project to turn around the Preston Hill Quarry site, and are working closely with the developers to support their proposal which is under consideration by the planners at Fife Council.

The pool at Inverkeithing High School is a crucial element in the development and delivery of our plans and its loss would create a significant gap in the facilities required to deliver the project.

The reason for this is that diver training with both PADI and BSAC (diver training agencies) require the use of a pool in the initial stages of training, with further instruction in sheltered water (the quarry) taking place at a later stage.

The loss of the facility would impact the charity Craig and I have set up to deliver training to disadvantaged young people and would result in less students progressing through the scheme due to increased costs, distance and time required to travel to an alternate location.

I would like to add my name also to the list of those with an interest in this facility and would hope that an early review of the impact of any planned closure be undertaken.

Best regards,

Good Morning

I am writing this to raise my concerns and disappointment at the prospect of the closure of the community use pool and building at Inverkeithing High school. Myself and another professional diver are involved in the development of Prestonhill quarry and loosing this crucial facility will have a severe impact on our business plan and pilot scheme we will be rolling out to the local community. It will also have an adverse effect of the water safety and water safety campaign that has been run recently. Countless people have learned essential swimming skills in there and still countless more will learn to swim as well as safely learn the use of SCUBA in a safe confined environment. To loose this facility will have a detrimental effect on our plans for Prestonhill Quarry and the local community and should have serious considerations against the closure of the great facility. I will eagerly await your response.

I am the MSYP for Dunfermline & West Fife, and the MYP for Mid Scotland & Fife.

Before the summer holidays, re my manifesto point of having pupil say in the new school, I asked multiple Woodmill pupils what they would want in a new school. I took that information and compiled it into basic points. Here are what the pupils said:

- Better Looking Building (modernise)
- Better Bathrooms (more bins in bathrooms, wet walls/cant be written on/anti graffiti)
- Updates School Uniform
- Phone Allowance at Breaks
- More Dress Down Days
I was going to carry out further consultations at Woodmill and also at St Columbas, but recent events have scuppered that, so here is all I have so far. I hope this information is of use to you during early planning stages. If you require any further clarification on these points, please contact me as I would like these pupils opinions to be taken into consideration.

I am writing with regard to the consultation on the proposed site for the replacement Inverkeithing High School (IHS). I live in Dalgety Bay and have one child in S1 at IHS.

I have looked at the criteria to be taken into account when considering the new school site and have the following comments to make:

1) With regard to ensuring accessibility, an attractive and inspiring design, a safe secure environment and ability to provide curricular and external learning I would fully expect that these will all be mandatory considerations for the design of the new school and constantly monitored by experts throughout the design and build so that any changes to the plans do not adversely affect any of these issues. I would also hope that all learning from recent high school rebuilds is acknowledged and used. I would hope inclusion of all catchment pupils will be made possible, with a Department for Additional Support would be included in the design, and that the new building will be able to accommodate pupils and staff with disabilities.

2) 'the new school should be within the designated catchment and where pupil population is greatest' - I feel strongly that Inverkeithing, in its position at the centre of current catchment area, is the right location for the new school. While Inverkeithing itself may not represent the greatest pupil population, the current school's location is right in the middle of the catchments of Aberdour, Dalgety Bay, Inverkeithing and Rosyth so is ideally placed. If the school was moved to Rosyth the catchment area would need to be reviewed again and given how painful and protracted the recent catchment review was I am sure (would hope) that the council would prefer to avoid this.

3) 'the new school should be accessible by foot, bicycle, car and public transport' - if the site was moved from its current site it would make it much less accessible for around half the current pupil population. All pupils from Dalgety Bay would be entitled to free bus transport whereas at the moment a good proportion can and do walk. Rosyth is of course within cycling distance from Dalgety Bay but only for those who are confident cyclists on busy roads. It would only be Rosyth (and possibly Inverkeithing) pupils who could easily walk to school, significantly reducing the numbers walking and therefore reducing Fife Council's ability to promote walking to school as part of the School Travel Plan. This would be a sad state of affairs, especially given Scotland's unenviable levels of childhood obesity. Assuming the new school is built in Inverkeithing I would also hope that safer walking routes from Rosyth are also considered as I am in full agreement with the Rosyth families who are concerned about their children having to cross the M90 slip roads to walk to and from school.

4) 'available for occupancy within a reasonable timescale' - given that the current IHS site is the only proposed site owned by Fife Council I would assume that this is the best option in this regard. I am however concerned about issues with asbestos and hope that pupil and staff safety will be given the highest priority if this site were chosen.

So for all the reasons stated above, my view is that the new IHS should be located in Inverkeithing, at the heart of the catchment area. I feel that the impact on Inverkeithing of losing its high school and community use facilities will be significant and should be avoided. I
I am writing with regard to the consultation on the proposed site for the replacement Inverkeithing High School (IHS). I live in Dalgety Bay and have one child in S1 at IHS and another in P3 at Donibristle Primary.

I have looked at the criteria to be taken into account when considering the new school site and have the following comments to make:

1) with regard to ensuring accessibility, an attractive and inspiring design, a safe secure environment and ability to provide curricular and external learning I would fully expect that these will all be mandatory considerations for the design of the new school and constantly monitored by experts throughout the design and build so that any changes to the plans do not adversely affect any of these issues. I would also hope that all learning from recent high school rebuilds is acknowledged and used.

2) 'the new school should be within the designated catchment and where pupil population is greatest' - I feel strongly that Inverkeithing, in its position at the centre of current catchment area, is the right location for the new school. While Inverkeithing itself may not represent the greatest pupil population, the current school's location is right in the middle of the catchments of Aberdour, Dalgety Bay, Inverkeithing and Rosyth so is ideally placed. If the school was moved to Rosyth the catchment area would need to be reviewed again and given how painful and protracted the recent catchment review was I am sure (would hope) that the council would prefer to avoid this.

3) 'the new school should be accessible by foot, bicycle, car and public transport' - if the site was moved from its current site it would make it much less accessible for around half the current pupil population. All pupils from Dalgety Bay would be entitled to free bus transport whereas at the moment a good proportion can and do walk. Rosyth is of course within cycling distance from Dalgety Bay but only for those who are confident cyclists on busy roads. It would only be Rosyth (and possibly Inverkeithing) pupils who could easily walk to school, significantly reducing the numbers walking and therefore reducing Fife Council’s ability to promote walking to school as part of the School Travel Plan. This would be a sad state of affairs, especially given Scotland’s unenviable levels of childhood obesity. Assuming the new school is built in Inverkeithing I would also hope that safer walking routes from Rosyth are also considered as I am in full agreement with the Rosyth families who are concerned about their children having to cross the M90 slip roads to walk to and from school.

4) 'available for occupancy within a reasonable timescale' - given that the current IHS site is the only proposed site owned by Fife Council I would assume that this is the best option in this regard. I appreciate that there are issues with asbestos and listed status but am assured by those who know that both of these can be overcome, provided that consultation with the correct expert bodies occurs from the outset and momentum maintained.

So for all the reasons stated above, my view is that the new IHS should be located in Inverkeithing, at the heart of the catchment area. I feel that the impact on Inverkeithing of losing its high school and community use facilities will be significant and should be avoided. I also feel that even considering building on a site such as Fleet Grounds which provides such a valuable sporting facility for so many children and adults, including my own son, is unacceptable.

My children will be attending Inverkeithing high school in a few years time (currently at Donibristle primary).

We would like to note that our preferred site would be the current Inverkeithing high school site. This would allow all catchment children to be able to walk to school, rather than have to
be bused to a location outside Rosyth. There is plenty of room for a new school to be built on this site.

If the site were to be built down by the dockyards in Rosyth, we would move away from the away, as I don’t see this as a safe or commutable location for teenage children.

As a full tune working mum, I wouldn’t be able to collect my children after after school sports activities, which would mean that they wouldn’t get the opportunity to take part in these.

I hope other Dalgety Bay and Aberdour parents have voiced the same concerns.

I am writing to give my opinion on the current proposal of the joint campus for Woodmill/St Columbus & Fife College. Whilst this seems like a great new innovative way of teaching/learning I feel the funding would be best used to make other catchment High Schools fully inclusive to all its pupils. Currently there is no accessible catchment High School for disabled Children living in Aberdour, Dalgety Bay, inverkeithing & Rosyth. That’s 7 primary Schools!!!

In this day and age I cannot find the words to express how disappointing/embarrassing/humiliating/frustrating/ and discriminating this is. Fife Council promote Children and Their Rights as per the Children’s Charter.

Article 12 (Respect the Views of The Child) My Son XXXXXXXX has very strongly expressed his views to stay with his peers and go onto his catchment High School with them, he has been told by Fife Councils Education Access Officer that Inverkeithing is unsuitable for him (he uses a wheelchair) and it was impossible to make accessible. This is currently causing major stress & upset to him.

Also Fife Council’s policy for Inclusion is made up of 9 ingredients, one of which is Building Flexibility and Access..... this ingredient is non existent in Inverkeithing High School and therefore not Inclusive to all its catchment pupils let alone my son.

Inclusion/included is one of the Child Protection Indicators Safe, Healthy, Achieving, Nurtured, Active Responsible, Respected & Included (SHANARRI) not to mention Respected & Safe! All of these indicators are not meeting disabled children’s needs within this area. Getting it Right For Ever Child (Girfec) for me and many more, takes priority over new and innovative learning. We really need to concentrate on providing children within Fife Equal Opportunity’s for Secondary Education before we jump to Innovative/Virtual Teaching ..... let’s not Run before we can Walk.

I’ll leave you with a quote from XXXXXXX aged 8 “I just want to go to school with my friends, I want to be the same, I want to walk but I can’t ..... so why should I be made to go to a different High School, I won’t know anyone and I won’t be with my class who look after me”.

Let’s ask ourselves if Girfec or SHANARRI indicators or The Children’s Charter are protecting XXXXXX ???

Funding MUST make this downfall right.... a replacement High School for Inverkeithing HAS to be the priority.

As for expanding Dunfermline High School.... which was our accessible catchment High School.... We were told this wasn’t an option last year!!! So the fact that this is on the table and now a possibility just infuriates me.

Consider to build on existing playing fields as previously delivered at Dunfermline HS

No preference about where school is located, however, needs to have right school design on the best site and delivered as quickly as possible.

Need for a Department of Additional Support in Inverkeithing HS

Capital budget should be spent on Inverkeithing HS first as joint campus will be more complex to deliver

Feasibility study should include an option to build on existing site and be fully costed before any decision on the location.
| Decision making process should be transparent as parents feel a decision has been made |
| Full Economic Impact is required |
| Need to retail a high school to the East of the motorway to service the inevitable housing developments that will take place in this area over the next 30 years. |

If the school is moved from its existing location then:
- this will kill off the high Street
- all community facilities, including the swimming pool, and any community programmes must be maintained on the existing site.
- loss of existing campus of Nusery/Primary Secondary
- Inverkeithing and Dalgety bay pupils disadvantaged by any move away from the existing site
- this will result in fewer pupils walking and cycling to school
- there is unlikely to be an economic use for the existing building leading to years of neglect and vandalism and ultimately to the loss of a Listed Building
- Safety concerns if the school is relocated to Rosyth close to the Dockyard where nuclear submarines etc are docked
- Safety concerns about school being located so close to armed security personnel protecting the Dockyard
- Security issues at Dockyard result in the surrounding streets being closed which will disrupt access to a new school in Rosyth

- We fully support the need to replace the existing High School at Inverkeithing. Notwithstanding assurances from the council regarding its serviceability, it seems generally accepted that the premises are not really fit for purpose either in terms of facilities or capacity going forward.
- We strongly support the creation of the new High School on or adjacent to the existing site, which is an ideal location being at the centre of the school's catchment area. (Options 3, 4 & 22)
- The High School is also an integral part of the local community, with the Community Hub facilities valued and well utilised.
- It would rank as insensitive and a snub to this Historic Royal Burgh, if the council was to take away its High School.
- We see no merit in the sites to the west in Rosyth (options 10, 11, and 12) which would place the school in a far corner of its catchment area, in itself contravening Fife’s own policy on school locations.
- Additionally, such a location would remove the option for a significant number of pupils of walking or cycling to school.
- Pupils in the east of the catchment area, so Aberdour and the eastern parts of Dalgety Bay, and parents would face significant journeys to and from school each day, mainly by car with a commensurate cost to the environment. And, again, in contradiction of Fife’s own policy which is to get pupils away from travelling to school by car.
- The remoteness of the Rosyth options would deter, if not actually prevent, significant numbers of people from using the type of facilities offered by the existing Community Hub.
- Additional traffic to a new school in the west would further slowdown the A921 and A985 which are already very busy at “school run” time in the morning.
- Our own research suggests that there is no direct scheduled bus service to options 10, 11, 12 from the east of the catchment area with journey times between 40 minutes to an hour and at least one change required.
- Infrastructure around the proposed sites at Rosyth appears at best inadequate – no rail link, few buses, poor roads and no shops or food outlets – would be akin to putting the school in the middle of an industrial wasteland.
Ms C Lindsay  
Executive Director Education and Children's Services  
Fife Council  
Fife House  
North Street  
Glenrothes  
KY7 5LT

Dear Ms Lindsay,

PROPOSED SITE OF INVERKEITHING HIGH SCHOOL

I am writing to you to raise the Community Council’s concerns about the proposed relocation of Inverkeithing High School. While we realise that this decision has yet to be finalised we feel it is important to inform you of our support for the existing site and our reasons for this:

- The current joint campus of the High School, Primary School, Nurture Centre and Community Use Wing has clear advantages for positive relationships, enhanced support during transition, collaborative and active approaches to learning and strong community links. Co-located schools facilitate joint working among schools and other partners, and provide shared approaches to addressing local issues. While more could be made of the co-located nature of the Inverkeithing campus, removing the High School would be a damaging step for the local community and adjacent community use and education facilities. We believe the benefits of 3-18 one-site education cannot be stressed too much.

- The path between Dalgety Bay and the existing High School site has only recently been upgraded at a cost of several hundred thousand pounds. The location of the school was integral to the justification of spending such a significant amount of public money. To move the school would call into question the justification for such a spend.

- The existing site is centrally located within the school catchment. As it stands, this means the Council currently assesses virtually all of Rosyth, Inverkeithing and Dalgety Bay as within walking distance. Moving the school to the fringe of the catchment would be a backward step in efforts to encourage active travel to school and would lead to a greater spend on free travel entitlement, with all of Dalgety Bay and Inverkeithing needing to be bussed to school.
• The existing school is well located in terms of transport links with the surrounding road network also well set up to avoid significant congestion at the beginning and end of the school day. Alternative sites such as the Fleet Grounds would need significant work to avoid congestion on a trunk road and impacting on the surrounding area.

• The existing site is suitable and reported challenges don’t appear sufficient to rule out the site. While the final technical report has not yet been seen, it has been suggested that challenges include the level of asbestos, listed status, and availability of space.
  
  o The level of asbestos cannot be used as justification to build elsewhere. The inevitable demolition of all or most of the existing school will be costly and will require mitigation to protect the adjacent nursery, primary and residential properties. This would be the case regardless of where the school is built.
  
  o The listed status simply requires the council to demonstrate that no alternative use could be identified and that redevelopment was not possible. As the Council is already investigating the costs associated with re-development, it should not be difficult to demonstrate re-use is cost prohibitive. It should not be difficult to further demonstrate repurposing the school for another use is wholly impractical and not cost effective. Maintaining aspects of the existing school such as a single wheel could be practical and may satisfy HES.
  
  o It has been suggested that there is insufficient space to build the school within the existing site without first requiring the demolition and/or full decant of the existing school. Review of the size of existing comparable schools suggests there is sufficient space to accommodate the footprint of a new school without requiring demolition first. In the event that a partial demolition was required to facilitate space to build the new school, the layout of the existing school would allow one or both of the wheels to be removed with minimal disruption and with sufficient space to the west to compensate with temporary accommodation. Furthermore, there are extensive sports grounds to the east and west of the existing school meaning that the loss of fields or even the MUGA to the east would not leave the school without sports grounds in the interim.

• The future of the existing site is the responsibility of Fife Council whether it is used for the new school or not. Consequently, the cost of demolition and remediation of the site should be factored into all options and should not become a discriminating factor for the existing site.

• There is a precedent in Fife for successfully building a new school within the grounds of the existing school – Dunfermline, Beath and Auchmuty High Schools.

• The existing site is the only one to be currently owned by Fife Council.

We hope you will also consider asking David Barratt, one of our local councillors, for the site drawings he has created showing that there is ample room on both sides of the existing school for a new school.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Chair
Dolgety Bay and Hillend Community Council
Comments in general

I attended the meeting yesterday, thank you for the opportunity to do so. I offer the following comments.

1) Abandoning the existing school building to another budget and then letting others worry about it is not a responsible way of managing assets which taxpayers of various sorts have paid for. It is silo thinking. The various options for the existing school should be identified and costed, so that the public and their representatives can make an informed decision on these assets.

2) Given that the clear intention is to eventually extend the sprawl of the Western Expansion of Dunfermline southwards to Limekilns/the Dockyard, recreating the poorly designed mess of the Eastern Expansion on the other side of the City, the decision to build a new school to serve this sprawl has undoubtedly been taken by officials. Nothing is likely to change their attitude.

Fife Council and its predecessors have wanted to build an outer motorway box and an inner ring road box around/in Dunfermline for many decades. Parts of both have been built, the others rear their ugly heads from time to time, disguised as something else. The Western Expansion is a test of whether Fife Council has progressed into the 21st Century, or is still stuck in the 1960s. If the Western Expansion contains land allocations for this motorway box, or the road itself, then it will be clear that Fife Council has taken no notice of the "Climate Emergency" the Scottish Government has called and is ploughing along with it head stuck firmly in the past.
Support for Voluntary Organisations

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director (Education & Children’s Services Directorate)

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

This report provides information on the independent review of Third Sector commissioned services and options for efficiency savings and future commissioning arrangements.

Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that Committee:

(1) Consider which option to approve to achieve the efficiency saving of £410,000, as set out in Section 3 of this report.

(2) Consider which option is to be explored regarding further savings, leading to a sustainable and efficient commissioning model within Education & Children’s Services

Resource Implications

The report to Committee in September confirmed the total award for grant funded organisations by Education & Children Services in 2019/20 was £3,901,371. This included commitments to Third Sector organisations funded by Criminal Justice Social Work, Our Minds Matters, and Pupil Equity Funding.

The total expenditure for Third Sector services in scope for the independent review is £3,676,574

Legal and Risk Implications

This report is based on ongoing discussions with those who undertook the independent review and outlines the risk implications based on the reported findings.
Impact Assessment

An EqIA was completed and submitted with the Committee report in March 2019.

Consultation

The appointment of independent consultants to undertake the review has been overseen by a Steering group with representation from the Third Sector and Officers within Fife Council. The review process has included individual meetings with all Third sector organisations in scope; 2 workshop sessions with Third Sector and Fife Council representatives; meetings with stakeholders including Health, Education and Social Work colleagues.

Data and background information has been provided to the consultants to ensure there is awareness and consideration of previous thematic reviews and outcomes. The Final Report is to be further considered by the Steering group and will be shared with all Third sector organisations who took part in the review to ensure transparency.

It is of note that there are a number of third sector organisations, who sit outside the scope of this review. Whilst opportunity has been afforded to share information, it would be prudent to advise that their views are not represented within this independent report.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 A report was presented to Education & Children’s Services Committee on the 19th of March 2019. The decision at Committee was to proceed with an independent review to secure efficiency savings of £410,000 and support future commissioning arrangements. On this basis, there was no change made to Third Sector awards, pending the outcome of the review.

1.2 Reports to Committee have provided information on previous thematic reviews. They have also set out the current monitoring and evaluation framework that is in place to review the impact of commissioned services, contributing to the objectives and outcomes within the Education & Children’s Services Plan. As previously reported there is a long history of partnership working in Fife with the Third Sector and many of the current services commissioned by Education & Children’s Services have been in place for a significant period of time. The partnership in Fife has led to several innovative approaches including the Partners for Change programme, Public Social Partnership initiatives and consortia involving Third sector organisations with the aim of developing an efficient and coordinated approach to service delivery; with a focus on meeting the needs of vulnerable children and families.

1.3 In its Revenue Budget for 2017-2020, the Council approved a budget saving of £900,000 in respect of support provision across Education, Social Work and the Third Sector. A saving target of £450,000 was attributed to both Fife Council Family Support Services and grant funded Third sector organisations, to achieve a total saving of £900,000.
1.4 In 2018, Family Support Services within Fife Council were subject to redesign and achieved a saving of £450,000, leading to a more streamlined and efficient service, working collaboratively across children’s services. However, only £40,000 of the savings attributed to third sector organisations was approved. A shortfall on this part of the saving of £410,000 therefore remains.

1.5 Funding from Fairer Fife was confirmed in March 2019 to appoint external consultant/s to undertake an independent review working closely with Council Officers to consider current commissioning arrangements. The aims of the review were to undertake:

- Mapping of existing resources
- Examination of trend data and outcomes
- Engagement with Third sector organisations and key service leads in Fife Council
- Consideration of delivery models
- Complete an options paper with recommendations

1.6 The timescale for completion of the review was 6 months. Whilst there was a delay in commencing the programme of work this has now been completed within the agreed timescale, subject to final sign off of the report. The independent consultants have maintained a focus on the immediate issue of achieving a £410,000 efficiency saving considering the impact on current provision alongside consideration of a more transformational approach to support a wider review of commissioning arrangements to achieve a more sustainable model.

2.0 Review programme and emerging themes

2.1 The review process has enabled a ‘conversation’ to develop regarding the current delivery models within Fife, taking account both the Third sector landscape and the interface with universal and statutory services. Individual interviews with Third sector organisations and 2 workshop opportunities identified a number of challenges as well as opportunities. The review report will be made available to the steering group and all 3rd sector organisations that have been involved, on completion. However, key findings have been shared and a number of themes have emerged, largely drawn from the engagement with Third sector services.

2.2 Themes drawn mainly from the 3rd sector include:

- Levels of need appear to be high which can limit the opportunity for early intervention and preventative work
- Due to a combination of the complexity of need and levels of poverty, short term programmes do not always lead to sustainable change for some families who may require longer term support other than crisis support
- Current service configuration is fragmented with wide ranging service and accessibility criteria.
- Funding streams for example access to Pupil Equity funding and Our Minds Matter presents challenges
- Many Third sector organisations report that they deliver services beyond current service level agreement outputs/outcomes and often add value because of accessing external funding
- Lack of clarity regarding models/approaches/outcome and impact measures
• Although there may be some misconceptions across the partnership, at a local level there are strong relationships
• The Commissioning model adopted by the Alcohol and Drug Partnership is seen as effective and subject to continuous review and improvement
• Third sector organisations report that they have considered all opportunities for efficiency savings with some now working to a reduced workforce and limited availability i.e. operating over a 4-day week
• Awards to organisations receiving funding over £100,000 were reduced by 1% in 2018/19

3.0 Short & Long-term options

3.1 Short Term Options:

The review process focused on the impact of the efficiency saving of £410,000 previously approved at Committee and the independent consultants have put forward options for consideration. These range from:

1. No deduction from the E&CS budget but consideration to securing the saving from another part of the Council
2. Partial saving i.e. less than £410,000
3. 11.2% reduction across all Third sector organisations in scope
4. Proportionate reduction based on size of award
5. Merging of organisations
6. Back office efficiencies

3.2 Committee are invited to consider which option would be the preferred choice to deliver the required efficiency savings of £410,000.

3.3 The independent consultants note that ‘if the full saving of £410,000 is taken there will be a reduction in the services currently offered by the Third Sector and there will be reductions in staffing’. However, this hasn’t been quantified. They consider that this will impact on increased demand for council services.

3.4 If the decision is made to take a proportionate cut based on the size of award the following financial impact would be incurred out of a sample of grant awards;

• 1 service receives £749,162 (over 5 workstreams) a cut of £89,900
• 1 service receives £512,320 (over 6 workstreams) a cut of £41,000
• 1 service receives £510,000 a cut of £61,000
• 1 service receives £300,000 (over 3 workstreams) a cut of £36,000
• 1 service receives £219,104 (over two workstreams) a cut of £26,000
• The lowest saving to be achieved would be from a service that receives £14,000 a cut of £1,120

3.5 It is of note, that over the last year, there have been increases in the number of children whose names have been placed on the child protection register and increases in the number of children being placed in residential care. Whilst the impact of poverty is known to affect these percentage figures, there is less firm evidence to suggest a direct correlation between a reduced voluntary sector provision and an increase in demand for statutory services. This hasn’t been borne out in Fife to date.
3.6 However, there is general agreement that pathways into services, the positioning of services and service specific measures of impact that align to strategic priorities would greatly assist in providing a sound evidence base of the significant value of third sector provision, whilst also recognising the additionality they can bring.

3.7 Long term options - Early negotiations regarding an independent review to support a more effective commissioning model in Fife was based on a shared perspective across the partnership that a more sustainable, efficient and effective set of arrangements were required. Previous collaborative reviews have highlighted areas of strength across the partnership, however, there remain challenges in terms of best value; overlap and duplication of services, models of delivery, evidence of impact and outcomes and maximisation of resources. The independent consultants were asked to consider commissioning models across Scotland and any learning that could be transferable to the Fife context including the current range of Third sector organisations.

3.8 The independent consultants set out a perspective on the guiding principles required to effectively commission services, highlighting a requirement for shared outcomes, relationships, strategic needs assessment and a formalised framework. Examples given were:

- Recommissioning of current Third Sector services within a clear budget and informed by an assessment of need and evidence of effective delivery models
- Joint arrangements through a Hub model based on a locality approach
- Maintain current commissioning arrangements but increase the Third sector’s involvement the identification of need

3.9 Committee are invited to consider which approach they would choose to explore further to ensure that the required transformational change can progress, leading to a more effective and sustainable commissioning model, to meet the needs of vulnerable children and families in Fife.

3.10 The current position has created levels of uncertainty across the third sector, with both providers included within the scope of this review and those that sit out with this, being challenged in how their services can move forward to meet increasing levels of need without a clear strategy or agreed plan. This places sustainability, the ability to secure additional funding, recruitment and retention and evidence of impact at risk; exposing the very core of third sector provision.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 The current review process has confirmed a number of findings from previous thematic reviews, however, the involvement of independent consultants has enabled an opportunity for open dialogue supported by governance through the Steering group

4.2 The solution to achieving the budget saving of £410,000 remains challenging and rooted in the need to develop a significantly different commissioning strategy and relationship with the Third Sector.
4.3 The independent consultants have confirmed a preference, that should this efficiency saving be required, that proportionate cuts across services based on size of award would have the least impact, but note this is not without risk.

4.4 There is agreement that the longer-term option of recommissioning, if agreed, should be developed around a strategic needs assessment to ensure that the strategy is fit for purpose, providing a sustainable model that can also be responsive to changing need.

4.5 The Independent consultants have confirmed a view that change is required, and that transformational change could offer the route into a more sustainable and effective relationship, with services that provide a better fit.

4.6 If decisions regarding the short term saving and/or the longer-term options, are delayed, consideration will need to be given to the associated costs this will incur. Both in terms of budgets, but also the development of a more cohesive suite of supports to vulnerable children and families. There is some urgency around this. Ongoing uncertainty for Third Sector providers in terms of future planning is also a pressing matter.

Background Papers

The following papers were relied on in the preparation of this report in terms of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1973:

- Policy Paper: Review of Support for the Voluntary Sector – Policy and Resources Committee, Fife Council 16.02.06
- Code of Guidance on Funding External Bodies and Following The Public Pound - COSLA/Accounts Commission 1996
- Voluntary Sector Monitoring & Evaluation Framework
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Kathy Henwood
Head of Education & Children’s Services (Enhancing Opportunities for the Vulnerable) Education & Children’s Services Directorate
Rothesay House, Glenrothes
Telephone: 03451 55 55 55, Ext 441189
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Lynn Gillies
Service Manager- Children & Families
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Our Minds Matter: Extending Fife Schools’ Counselling Service

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director, Education & Children’s Services

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

This report outlines proposed extensions to Fife’s Our Minds Matter (OMM) framework in response to the additional funding made available from the Scottish Government for counselling services in schools. The paper summarises the additional funding to support young people’s emotional wellbeing and how it could be best deployed.

Recommendation(s)

The Education and Children’s Services Committee is invited to:

a) Note the progress of the implementation of OMM,

b) Approve the proposed extension of the contract with the existing counselling provider (DAPL) until the end of the financial year 2019-20,

c) Approve the plans for new provisions involving counselling in schools.

Resource Implications

Since its introduction three years ago the OMM framework has been supported through existing Fife resources and funding of £280 000 invested by Fife Council. The framework promotes a strong partnership approach across Education and Children’s Services, partners, families and communities. Work to promote the framework and its principles is also designed to support schools to make informed decisions on Pupil Equity Fund spending to support emotional wellbeing in line with OMM.

In July 2019 Scottish Government formally confirmed that Fife Council will be allocated a share of £12 million, from funding which is being made available to all Scottish Local Authorities for this financial year. This will rise to a share of £16 million in the following year. The share for Fife is £738,000 in financial year 2019-20 rising to £1,000,000 for 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23, and baselined into the Local Government Settlement thereafter.

Legal & Risk Implications

New approaches and ways of supporting young people’s emotional wellbeing will take time to embed and become established into our broad, general practice to ensure success in improving the emotional wellbeing of our young people in Fife.
Impact Assessment

An impact assessment has been completed and is available on request.

Consultation

Consultation with young people and the adults around is woven through the Our Minds Matter work, this has included:

- Inquiry-based workshops with focus groups of young people, garnering their views on useful supports for emotional wellbeing
- Pupil surveys
- Discussion with a wide range of focus groups (young people and adults)

In addition to this ongoing work there has been more targeted consultation regarding the use of the national funding with the Our Minds Matter Steering group members and with the Secondary Head Teachers.

Further consultation on the underlying detail of the proposals summarised in this paper will be undertaken as we a) begin the process of implementing the model, b) define associated commissioned services’ briefs and c) work towards full implementation by September 2020.

1.0 Background

1.1 This paper follows on from the report taken to the Education and Children’s Services in May 2019 which outlined the strategic approaches around supporting young people’s emotional wellbeing in Fife through the implementation of the Our Minds Matter Framework.

1.2 The paper outlined the key principles of Our Minds Matter, which are as follows:

- Recognition that children and young people need support from the broad pastoral care around them, through solution focused approaches, and a means of identifying and providing additional help if they experience difficulties.
- Emotional health does not sit separately to general health and wellbeing and must be seen in the context of wider needs. It is recognised widely that young people face many challenges growing up and so some caution should be exercised in labelling young people with ‘mental illness’ diagnoses or medicalising the normal growing up process.
- Responsibility for children and young people’s health lies with the wide range of supporters around them – families, friends and professionals.
- Through Getting it Right for Every Child (GIRFEC), staged intervention approaches provide a common language and structure to understanding how support can be planned and joined across services, see Diagram A.
1.3 Since the launch of Our Minds Matter in 2017 our strategy in Fife has centred upon:

- Strengthening provision at the Universal and Additional levels of practice to reduce the instances of young people’s needs escalating to an intensive level,
- Working to develop equity of core, quality provision across Fife in terms of young people’s access to support
- Developing a distributed leadership model for emotional wellbeing development work, with an ‘across-partners, shared’ approach wherever possible.

1.4 Key actions within implementation of OMM include:

- Commissioning of three external services to: engage with the wider Fife community for the purposes of raising awareness of mental health issues and reduce stigma (Scottish Association of Mental Health – SAMH), engage with young people to provide school level approaches to emotional wellbeing (Fife Employment Access Trust – FEAT) and access to counselling services in secondary schools (Drug, Alcohol and Psychotherapies Limited – DAPL)
- Increased collaboration across the Children’s Services Partnership, including joint responsibility for the OMM Steering Group
- Development and introduction of a mental health training package for key school staff
- Development and piloting of the ‘Branch Out’ mental health curricular resource in secondary schools,
- Provision of a wide range of project work in primary schools to address wellbeing including mindfulness, relaxation and low-level anxiety groups
- Deployment of Primary Mental Health Workers to ensure connections from CAMHS to all Children’s Services.
- Extensions to the School Nursing Service, which includes an increase in the number of School Nurses in Fife, rising from 9.0 FTE to 12.41FTE by 2019 and to 26.0 FTE by 2022.

1.5 In 2018 the South East Improvement Collaborative (SEIC) introduced a new workstream on emotional wellbeing to build upon the wide range of good work already underway across the collaborative. It is expected that this work will inform further developments at SEIC level and within local authorities in supporting emotional health and wellbeing.
1.6 Between August 2018 and June 2019 leaders within Fife Our Minds Matter partnership worked closely with the National Taskforce for Young People’s Emotional Wellbeing, which was at the time chaired by Dame Denise Coia. Fife’s approach was well received through this process with interest from many Local Authorities and organisations across Scotland.

1.7 When the taskforce’s recommendations were published in July 2019 the report recognised the importance of straightforward principles and partnership approaches to supporting young people’s mental health and endorsed Fife’s Our Minds Matter approach.

2.0 Counselling in Schools Context

2.1 In July 2019 Scottish Government confirmed the provision of £12 million funding to local authorities for this financial year 2019/20 to support the access of a school counselling service, in line with the commitment set out in the Programme for Government published in September 2018. It confirmed that this initial funding would be supported by funding of £16 million in future years to support the ongoing delivery of the access to counselling in schools service.

2.2 The key purpose of this paper is to outline proposals for the most effective use of this funding, in line with the Our Minds Matter framework.

2.3 The Scottish Government requires delivery of the counselling service to be a joint approach between national and local government which will enable children and young people to be supported more efficiently and effectively with issues affecting their mental health and wellbeing. The provision of counselling will help school staff to engage children and young people with appropriate support services within their local communities and at an early stage.

2.4 The following aims and principles were provided by the Scottish Government to inform service design:

Aims:

To provide, in partnership with national government:

- Access to counselling through schools, enabling locally provided support for children and young people towards positive mental health and wellbeing.
- High quality and effective counselling support as part of a range of supports available locally to children and young people.
- Counsellors who are accredited and working to an agreed standard across Scotland
- Access to counselling through primary, secondary and special schools, ensuring consistently high-quality services available locally, for pupils aged 10 and over.
Principles:

- The commitment to the provision of counselling through schools should be delivered in partnership between national and local government, and relevant partners, and should build upon the services already in place wherever possible.
- The provision of counselling should be part of a holistic (child-centred) approach to improving the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people.
- Counselling services should be delivered within an agreed definition of counselling by qualified counsellors registered with an appropriate registration body.
- Counselling services should be available to pupils in secondary school and for those aged 10 years and over in primary schools, special schools and in communities.
- In recognition of the need to ensure that young people’s needs are met appropriately, services should ensure that robust assessment is carried out and that young people are enabled to access alternative supports where counselling may not be the best approach.
- There should be availability of counselling services during school holidays, to ensure continued support to vulnerable young people.
- The provision of counselling through schools should align with and enhance local services to support the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people.
- Counselling services should be accessible. Utilising technology, virtual approaches and delivery in non-educational settings where communities need it, particularly in rural communities.
- Local policies and procedures in relation to child protection and information sharing should be followed. The requirements of the registering body, for example in terms of professional conduct and supervision should also be followed.
- The commitment to counselling will be delivered in two phases, with full delivery expected by September 2020.

3.0 Approaches to Effective Implementation

3.1 To support the development of the Fife counselling in schools model, the Educational Psychology Service have developed evidence-based guidance - *Counselling in Schools: An approach to Support Effective Implementation*.

3.2 This guidance outlines opportunities, limitations and best practice in implementing a school counselling model. These are summarised below, and the full paper is available on request from Educational Psychological Service.

3.3 Opportunities provided through provision of a counselling service in schools

- Counselling must build on the continuum of wellbeing support already available in school
• It will provide increased specialist adult support for young people whose wellbeing issues impact on their learning
• It is an additional resource to tackle attendance and engagement issues for this group of young people
• When effectively used, it can free up time for school staff to address other pupil needs at a more universal level
• It can strengthen Child Wellbeing Pathway assessment information and planning in school through input from the Counsellor
• Local management allows the counsellor to target and address local mental health themes

3.4 Limitations of a school counselling model

• It cannot make an impact as a stand-alone service
• Counselling is not always the most appropriate form of support
• A service can quickly become swamped with referrals if not managed carefully
• It needs to be actively managed by school leadership to ensure prioritisation of young people, and that the support offered is flexible and responsive
• Counselling in school is not a replacement for referral to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)
• Reporting on impact and outcomes is complex and needs to include both the individual young people who access the support, and the impact on whole-school wellbeing measures

3.5 Good practice

• Build counselling in schools into a continuum of support, and make sure this continuum and how to access it is well understood by staff, pupils and parents
• Use the Child Wellbeing Pathway (CWP) to ensure that the team around the child make a clear assessment of need, with pupil agreement, identify a clear task for Counsellor and a feedback loop to the person co-ordinating planning in school
• Design a clear referral system, which can be prioritised flexibly, and that exit from counselling is planned and supported by the wider school support team
• Ensure that practical issues have been thought through and planned
• Decide from the start how evaluative information will be gathered and reported on
• Build it into partnership working from the start

4.0 Current Counselling Service in Fife Schools

4.1 When Our Minds Matter was introduced ‘Drugs, Alcohol and Psychotherapies Limited’ (DAPL) were commissioned to provide counselling intervention, therapeutic group work and themed work (e.g. addressing anxiety) with all Fife secondary schools, with schools making requests for assistance through the GiRFEC Wellbeing Pathway.

4.2 DAPL receives requests for assistance to support around 300 Fife pupils per year, approximately 60% female and 40% male. The biggest proportion of referrals are for S4 age, closely followed by S3 and the reasons for referral are summarised as follows:
4.3 DAPL uses the YP- Core outcome measurement tool to evaluate the impact of their sessions on young people as recommended by the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapies. This monitoring tool uses the following scale:

- 10-14 Mild
- 15-19 Moderate
- 20-24 Moderate - Severe
- 25-40 Severe

In relation to this tool DAPL report that 92% of the young people who engaged in counselling sessions with them made progress in their score. The mean score for young people prior to counselling sessions is 19.8 and therefore would sit within a ‘Moderate/Moderate-Severe’ measurement. After counselling sessions the mean score for young people reduces to 10.7, within the ‘Mild’ classification.

4.4 The in-school counselling service sits alongside the wider therapeutic services at additional and intensive levels of need provided by partners across Fife which include NHS CAMHS, Clinical Psychology and School Nurses Service. And builds upon the broad, universal practices of nurture, listening, signposting and coaching support which a wide range of adults provide around young people on a day to day basis.

5.0 Extending the Service Design

5.1 In order to effectively inform service design in relation to the national funding an initial engagement and consultation event was held with Fife Secondary Head teachers as key stakeholders in the delivery of the Scottish Government counselling in schools’ provision.

5.2 The range of options was discussed, and key design features were agreed as:

- We will substantially increase the offer of 1:1 and group Counselling Service for young people which is provided by specialist, commissioned service
- We will continue to work for strong support around young people from the adults around them on a day-to-day basis
- We will ensure rigour in the evaluation of the impact of the additional funding through recruitment of a part-time Educational Psychologist who will provide support for implementation, evaluation of impact, alongside training for staff.
- We will work to ensure that additional services procured continue to build upon the strengths of the Our Minds Matter framework of capacity building at Universal and Additional level, partnership working and integrated services.
5.3 In addition to attending to these key features we will work to broaden the 1:1 and group counselling service model to include additional offers of support.

5.4 The detail of this model will be further developed in collaboration with Headteachers and the Locality Networks. Agreeing this model in principle demonstrates the commitment that schools have to the existing counselling offer that OMM has already delivered, and the value that is placed on further developing this work as part of a wider integrated team approach to wellbeing support in schools.

5.5 The estimated total cost (12 months) is £1 million (£738 000 pro rata in 2019-20 and beyond).

5.6 Commissioned services will be allocated on a weighted basis on a formula agreed with Secondary headteachers as follows:

- 96% of the funding will be considered as a core allocation based on Secondary School roll.
- 4% of funding will be used as an enhancement to allocation taking account of Secondary Schools’ Free Meal Entitlement on a 3 year rolling basis

5.7 Opportunities to work service across localities will be explored to enable flexible use of the resource, which responds to variations in needs within each High School.

5.8 The strategic overview of the new extended counselling in schools’ model will be held by Rona Weir, Education Manager, in conjunction with the OMM Steering Group. With the implementation and evaluation being overseen by the Educational Psychologist.

5.9 The operational lead will be the responsibility of a seconded, High School senior leader. They will take day-to-day lead on the partnership with the commissioned school counselling services, schools and partners.

6.0 Next Steps

6.1 The extended model will begin to be implemented during the 2019-20 financial year and will be fully imbedded by August 2020.

6.2 A project lead will be seconded as soon as possible to take forward the design and implementation of the project.

6.3 The final detail of this new model will be developed in consultation with headteachers and other stakeholders.

6.4 In order to quickly extend the 1:1 and Group commissioned Counselling service for young people the existing commissioned, third sector Counselling service provided by DAPL, will be increased for the remainder of this financial year. DAPL’s annual allocation of £60 000 will be increased by an additional £60 000 for their service until the end of March 2020.

6.5 In February, commissioned service for the 1:1 and group counselling service will be opened to third sector applications, as part of the planned review of current Our Minds Matter commissioned services.
In addition to the 1:1 and group counselling service for young people additional counselling services will be commissioned as quickly as possible to provide support for the following additional strands of counselling support:

- For young people which includes family members
- To develop in-school listening, coaching and adult mentoring services
- For peer to peer support services
- Which broadens options for Young People to access support through the use of technology, virtual approaches and delivery in non-educational settings (e.g. at home)

The costs of these additional services are estimated to be approximately £715 000 per annum (approximately £520 000 in 2018-19).

Part-time Educational Psychologist support for the project will be put in place with immediate effect.

A mechanism to enable a self-evaluation approach to supporting young people’s emotional wellbeing at a school level will be piloted and refined, in collaboration with headteachers.

The OMM framework will continue to guide developments in supporting young people’s emotional wellbeing across the Children’s Services Partnership

7.0 Conclusion

In Fife we have a well embedded framework to support young people’s wellbeing – Our Minds Matter. This framework is built on a strong multi-agency links across the Children’s Services Partnership.

OMM has been recognised and promoted nationally through the National Taskforce for Young People’s Emotional Wellbeing as an example of good practice which other local authorities and health boards may wish to explore.

The new Scottish Government funding enables us to build on existing good practice and support the development of an extended counselling in schools service, supported by a clear evidence-based implementation framework and within an integrated support team, to best support young people’s emotional wellbeing.

We have agreement from secondary headteachers as key stakeholders about the proposed model in principle and are seeking support and endorsement from the Committee to enable us to progress this vital area of work.
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Education & Children’s Services Directorate Plan

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director, Education & Children’s Services

Wards Affected: All wards

Purpose

The purpose of this report is:

• To provide an overview of the Education and Children’s Services Directorate Plan for 2019-20, including: a summary of outcomes achieved during the 2018-19 school year, and an overview of the Directorate’s priorities for improvement for 2019-20.

• To provide an overview of the Children’s Services measures within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework, and to illustrate how the key messages from this set of measures have been captured within the more comprehensive view of performance provided within the Directorate Plan.

• To inform elected members of changes in FTE staffing levels over the past three years within the Education and Children’s Services Directorate.

Recommendation(s)

Members are invited:

• To note the summary of outcomes for 2018-19 provided in appendix 1, which provides a comprehensive overview of current performance across the children’s services provided by Fife C, including those specific aspects of performance measured within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (appendix 2).

• To approve the approach taken by the Directorate to improve outcomes for children and young people in Fife – as outlined in the Directorate’s Plan for Improvement for 2019-20 (see appendix 3).

• To note recent changes in the FTE staffing of the Education and Children’s Services Directorate (appendix 4).

Resource Implications

The resources required to implement the Directorate’s priorities for improvement will be met from within existing budgets.

Legal & Risk Implications

The publication of the annual Education & Children’s Services Directorate Plan satisfies a number of legal requirements on Fife Council. In particular:

• The review of performance for the school year 2018-19 (summarised in appendix 1) meets the requirement for: the publication of an annual Standards & Quality Report for Fife schools, and the requirement to publish an annual review of outcomes achieved within the National Improvement Framework for schools.
• The improvement plan for the school year 2019-20 (outlined in appendix 3) meets the requirement for publication of an annual improvement plan for Fife schools, within the National Improvement Framework.

In addition, the overview of children’s services measures within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (summarised in appendix 2, and reported in the context of the Directorate’s wider performance in the rest of this paper) meets the requirement for Fife Council to audit performance of its services using appropriate performance indicators.

Impact Assessment

The Directorate Plan highlights the Directorate’s key priorities for improvement over the coming year. These will lead to improved outcomes for all children and young people, but will have a particular focus on: closing the attainment gap for children living in socially disadvantaged areas; improving life chances and opportunities for Fife’s most vulnerable children and young people (including looked after children and the care experienced).

Consultation

The development of the Education & Children’s Services Directorate Plan has been informed by a range of consultation and engagement activities with children, young people and staff, undertaken both by the Directorate and the wider Children’s Services Partnership.

1.0 Background

1.1 The Education & Children’s Services Directorate Improvement Plan can be found at: https://www.fifedirect.org.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication.pop&pubid=767975AF-EB15-ECBC-85B21B1A3B310654

1.2 The Plan incorporates two key elements:

• A review of performance over the past year, in the form of a Standards & Quality Report. This meets a number of legal requirements for the Council to review service performance for schools.
• An Improvement Plan for the year to come. This also meets legal requirements to produce an improvement plan within the National Improvement Framework for schools in Fife.

1.3 Appendix 1 of this report provides a summary of key messages from the Standards & Quality Report (SQR). This is based substantially on reports made to the Education & Children’s Services Committee over the past year; it provides a summary of key performance issues highlighted through these reports.

1.4 Appendix 2 of this report provides a summary of current measures for Fife’s children’s services within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF). As the report highlights, the LGBF measures reflect a focus on specific aspects of the Directorate’s performance, as reviewed within the Standards & Quality Report.

1.5 Appendix 3 provides an overview of the Education & Children’s Services Directorate’s Improvement Plan for 2019-20. This reflects the key areas for further improvement captured within the Standards & Quality Report (appendix 1), together with a recognition of the ways of working that will be needed to improve these outcomes.
1.6 Appendix 4 provides a summary of changes to staffing levels within the Education and Children's Services Directorate Plan over the past three years.

2.0 Outcomes for children and young people: 2018-19

2.1 The first part of the Directorate Plan includes a review of outcomes for the school year 2018-19. This meets the legal requirement to produce a Standards & Quality Report for Fife schools, but reflects Fife’s approach to the delivery of integrated children’s services.

2.2 Appendix 1 provides a summary of the key messages from the Standards and Quality Report for 2018-19. These reflect the key messages contained in the papers reported to the Education & Children’s Services Committee over the past year, and provide a comprehensive overview of the performance of the children’s services provided by Fife Council.

2.3 There are also a number of indicators for children’s services within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework. These measure specific aspects of children’s services and are designed to provide “can openers” for understanding the performance of children’s services within local authorities.

2.4 Appendix 2 provides a summary of the current measures reported within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework for Fife’s children’s services. The table compares the value of each measure for Fife with that for Scotland. It also provides a measure of the ranking for the measure, relative to the other 31 local authorities in Scotland.

2.5 A range of benchmarks are used by the Directorate to understand its current performance within the context of the service provided. Many of these reflect the fact that social disadvantage has a significant influence on demand and outcomes for children’s services, including: levels of attendance at school, school attainment, demand for children and families social work services, etc. This is a significant issue for Fife, as it has a relatively high level of child poverty and would rank between 24th and 26th amongst Scotland’s 32 local authorities, for the key measures of social disadvantage (levels of child poverty, free meal registration rates, etc). The final column of the table in Appendix 2 provides a broad, contextual comment about Fife’s relative performance for the Local Government Benchmarking Framework measures, given the influence of social context on outcomes for children and young people, demands for services, etc.

2.6 The key messages from appendix 2 reflect some of those apparent in appendix 1. Specifically, the local government benchmarking framework measures recognise that:

- The quality of early years provision is good, compared with national inspection outcomes.
- The system costs for early years provision and schools are low.
- Educational outcomes for looked after children are good, compared with outcomes achieved nationally.
- The children and families strategy is enabling an effective approach to prevention for Fife’s most vulnerable children.
The attainment of Fife’s higher attaining pupils is generally lower than national but broadly in line with expectations, based on levels of child poverty in Fife;

Levels of school attendance are lower than national but broadly in line with expectations, based on levels of child poverty in Fife.

Although Fife has fewer looked after children than would be expected given its levels of child poverty, unit costs for children and families social work services are relatively high.

Although Fife is relatively successful in supporting young people to maintain positive destinations after school, the numbers of school leavers who initially enter a positive destination from school are lower than is seen nationally.

The current Local Government Benchmarking Framework includes two different sets of measures for school attainment. Those based on the traditional “key measures” of the old curriculum have been included in appendix 2. The additional measures are based on total tariff points. These are recognised by a range of national stakeholders, including the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES), as failing to provide a like-for-like measure of attainment between schools following different curriculum models; total tariff points typically favour schools in more affluent areas and tend to disadvantage those pursuing vocational awards.

Comparing the key messages from Fife’s Standards & Quality Report (SQR) for 2018-19 (appendix 1) with those from the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (appendix 2), it is apparent that the SQR reflects the key messages from the Local Government Benchmarking Framework. However, a number of other key messages are also apparent in the SQR, including:

- The relatively high quality of Fife’s schools and registered care services.
- Fife’s success in generally improving educational outcomes and closing the attainment gap for: the key skills of literacy and numeracy; young people achieving one or more Highers, providing a wide group of learners with a route from school on to higher education.
- The need to strengthen support for the emotional wellbeing, resilience and confidence of children and young people.

### 3.0 Priorities for improvement: 2019-20

The second part of the Directorate Plan includes an improvement plan for the coming year for the Directorate’s services. This meets the legal requirement to produce an Improvement Plan within the National Improvement Framework for schools. Again, the Improvement Plan reflects Fife’s approach to the delivery of integrated children’s services. It also incorporates the Community Justice services delivered by social work teams within the Directorate.

Appendix 3 provides an overview of the Directorate Improvement Plan for 2019-20. This includes a focus on four key themes: Opportunity, Equity, Relationships, and Empowerment.

The themes of Opportunity and Equity reflect a focus on those outcomes that remain areas for improvement. These include:

- The need to broaden the Directorate’s current impact in improving attainment and closing the attainment gap for the key skills of literacy and numeracy, by ensuring that more school leavers achieve qualification sets at National 5.
- The need to improve support for the progression of pupil learning, to ensure that these are sustained through all stages of the pupil’s learner journey.
• The need to improve the support for our least engaged and hardest to reach learners, enabling them to identify and successfully follow a pathway into a positive destination from school.
• Further development of the Children and Families Strategy, including Home 2 Fife which will enable more vulnerable children and young people to be cared for within a Fife setting.
• Further development of preventative working in community justice services.

3.4 The themes of Relationships and Empowerment reflect a focus on the ways of working and activities that will be needed, if outcomes are to improve. These include:
• Improving engagement, participation and school attendance, to enable better life opportunities and attainment for all children and young people.
• Better supporting our children and young people, to strengthen their confidence, resilience and emotional wellbeing.
• Working with staff to help improve their wellbeing, to improve their quality of life and their impact on outcomes for our children, young people and other service users.
• Further developing relationship-based practice as the foundation for improving outcomes for children, young people and other service users.
• Further developing “A Better Connected Directorate”, extending its scope from collaboration between professionals to provide a means of achieving genuine Community Empowerment across the Directorate’s services.
• Building the capacity for self-evaluation and improvement, to improve the quality and impact of Directorate services.

4.0 Conclusions

4.1 Appendix 1 provides a summary of the outcomes achieved during 2018-19 across the range of children’s services provided by the Directorate. This summarises a range of information reported to the Education & Children’s Services Committee over the past year.

4.2 As is apparent from section 2, this review of outcomes incorporates the key messages from the more narrowly focussed set of measures used within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (as summarised in appendix 2).

4.3 Members are invited to note this summary of outcomes, which provides a comprehensive overview of current performance, including those specific aspects of performance identified through the Local Government Benchmarking Framework.

4.4 Appendix 3 provides an overview of the Directorate’s Improvement Plan for the coming year, which addresses the key areas for improvement facing the Directorate at this time that are identified in appendix 1.

4.5 Members are invited to approve the approach taken by the Directorate to improve outcomes for children and young people in Fife – as summarised in the Directorate’s Plan for Improvement for 2019-20.

4.6 Appendix 4 provides an overview of the Directorate’s staffing levels over the period 2017-2019, as contextual information regarding delivery of the Directorate Improvement Plan.
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### Appendix 1

**Education & Children’s Services Directorate**

**Standards and Quality Report 2018-19: Key Messages**

The table below summarises the outcomes reported by the Directorate during the 2018-19 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Attainment** | There has been a sustained improvement in attainment for:  
- Literacy & numeracy for P1, P4 and P7 (CfE declarations)  
- Literacy & numeracy at SCQF levels 4 & 5  
- School leavers achieving one or more Higher School/pre-school inspection outcomes compare well with national | There has been only limited improvement for:  
- Attainment of school leavers achieving awards at SCQF levels 1-4  
- The proportion of school leavers with qualifications sets at SCQF level 5 (e.g. 3, 4 or 5 National 5 awards) |
| **Equity** | There has been a significant closing of the attainment gap for:  
- Literacy & numeracy in P1, P4 & P7 (CfE declarations)  
- Literacy & numeracy at SCQF level 4  
- Literacy at SCQF level 5  
- School leavers achieving one or more Higher | There has been limited progress in closing the attainment gap for:  
- Numeracy at SCQF level 5  
- Achievement of 3, 4 or 5 awards at National 5  
Feedback from both schools and pupils highlights a need to further strengthen support for learning, including feedback to learners |
| **Wellbeing** | The development of initiatives to improve the support for the emotional wellbeing of children and young people, including:  
- The Our Minds Matter Framework across Fife Partnership  
- A workstream within the South East Improvement Collaborative  
There is a reducing use of exclusions by schools | Feedback from children and young people highlights the need to significantly improve our support for confidence, resilience and emotional wellbeing  
Improvements in school attendance levels will be needed, if further improvements are to be achieved in closing the attainment gap |
| **Employability** | The proportion of young people aged 16-19 years old who are participating in the economy has seen a sustained increase over recent years | The proportion of school leavers initially entering a positive destination from school has remained broadly constant over recent years and is now below national  
Only 65% of pupils said that school helped them know the skills needed for a range of different careers (source: Pupilwise survey). |
| **GIRFEC** | Phase 1 of the Children and Families Strategy has helped to stabilise a previously increasing trend in the number of looked after children (LAC), use of purchased placements, etc Educational outcomes for LAC compare well with national  
All registered care services were evaluated as good or better | There continues to be a significant financial pressure arising from purchased placement costs  
Further work is needed, within the Home 2 Fife strategy, to reduce the number of children looked after outwith Fife  
Educational outcomes for LAC are still lower than for their peers |
| **Communities** | Progress has been made in implementing the Community Justice Outcomes Improvement Plan (CJOIP).  
Evaluation of ABCD has been generally positive  
82% of children and young people say that they are supported to know their rights and responsibilities (source: Pupilwise survey) | Further development of ABCD will should help empower communities across Fife.  
Pupils generally give less positive responses to questions about being respected by others in their school and local area, and for having the chance to share ideas for making things better (51-65%). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Fife</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHN2</td>
<td>Cost per Secondary School Pupil (£ per pupil)</td>
<td>6,880.43</td>
<td>6,344.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Significantly better than ranking based on social context would indicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN19b</td>
<td>% school attendance rate (looked after children)</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN1</td>
<td>Cost per Primary School Pupil (£ per pupil)</td>
<td>4,983.72</td>
<td>4,643.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN20b</td>
<td>School exclusion rates (per 1,000 'looked after children')</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN22</td>
<td>% of child protection re-registrations within 18 months</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN3</td>
<td>Cost per Pre-School Education Registration (£ per pre-school pupil)</td>
<td>4,437.02</td>
<td>4,011.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN18</td>
<td>% of funded early years provision which is graded good/better</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN8a</td>
<td>The Gross Cost of &quot;Children Looked After&quot; in Residential Based Services (£ per Child per Week)</td>
<td>3,485.11</td>
<td>3,589.84</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Somewhat better than ranking based on social context would indicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN20a</td>
<td>School exclusion rates (per 1,000 pupils)</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN23</td>
<td>% LAC with more than 1 placement in the last year (Aug-July)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN6</td>
<td>% of pupils from deprived areas gaining 5+ awards at Level 5 (SIMD)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN7</td>
<td>% of pupils from deprived areas gaining 5+ awards at Level 6 (SIMD)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN17</td>
<td>% of children meeting developmental milestones</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN19a</td>
<td>% school attendance rate</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN9</td>
<td>% of children being looked after in the community</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Broadly in line with social context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN5</td>
<td>% of pupils gaining 5+ awards at Level 6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN10</td>
<td>% of adults satisfied with local schools</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN21</td>
<td>% participation rate for 16-19 year olds</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN4</td>
<td>% of pupils gaining 5+ awards at Level 5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Somewhat worse than social context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN8b</td>
<td>The Gross Cost of &quot;Children Looked After&quot; in a Community Setting (£ per Child per Week)</td>
<td>327.93</td>
<td>433.21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN11</td>
<td>% of pupils entering positive destinations from school</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Education & Children’s Services Directorate Improvement Plan 2019-20

Our Purpose
As a Directorate, we have a common purpose of Improving Life Chances for All

---

Our Values
In working together to achieve our purpose we will continue to uphold the Directorate’s values:
- Compassion
- Ambition
- Respect
- Equity

---

Our Focus for Improvement in 2019-20

Opportunity
We will improve life chances and opportunities for our children, young people and communities
- We will support more young people to achieve qualification sets at National 5, providing them with a wider range of post-school opportunities
- We will provide all young people with pathways into a positive destination on leaving school
- We will engage in effective early intervention that helps to prevent and reduce reoffending.

Equity
We will ensure that all of our children and young people benefit from improving opportunities
- We will extend our current successes in closing the attainment gap to include all learners and all stages of their learner journey
- We will further develop the Home 2 Fife strategy, to reduce the number of children looked after outwith Fife’s local communities

---

Relationships
We will recognise the key role of relationships in improving opportunities
- We will improve the engagement and participation of children and young people with Directorate services, including attendance at school
- We will work with staff to help improve their wellbeing
- We will further develop relationship-based practice as a way of working

---

Empowerment
We will empower our children, young people and staff to participate fully in the life of their local communities
- We will work with our children and young people to strengthen their emotional wellbeing and resilience
- We will further develop A Better Connected Directorate, as a basis for effective community empowerment across the Directorate’s services
- We will improve our collective capacity for self-improvement across the Directorate, as will be reflected in our inspection outcomes
### Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5,623.26</td>
<td>5,775.51</td>
<td>5,749.51</td>
<td>(26.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Families &amp; Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Families</td>
<td>402.98</td>
<td>410.38</td>
<td>414.75</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Services</td>
<td>132.88</td>
<td>144.48</td>
<td>152.14</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>535.86</td>
<td>554.86</td>
<td>566.89</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTORATE TOTAL</td>
<td>6,159.12</td>
<td>6,330.37</td>
<td>6,316.40</td>
<td>(13.97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South East Improvement Collaborative

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director - Education & Children’s Services

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the work of the South East Improvement Collaborative and the engagement of Fife practitioners.

Recommendation(s)

The Education and Children’s Services Committee is invited to:
- note the contents of this report;
- note the progress of the work to date and next steps
- approve the updated version of the SEIC Plan Phase 2

Resource Implications

The report to committee in November 2018 detailed a workforce plan. Funding of £1.2 million was allocated from the Scottish Government to support the focus on developing collaboration. Funding has not yet been confirmed for the current phase but a similar amount has been requested. All 5 local authorities contribute to the work of SEIC within existing staff.

Legal & Risk Implications

There are currently no identified legal implications. The risks are identified in the South East Improvement Collaborative Plan (Phase 2 update).

Impact Assessment

An impact assessment has not been completed as this is a progress report on the development of the South East improvement Collaborative and an update on the original plan.

Consultation

The nature of the South East Improvement Collaborative involves on-going consultation to evaluate and drive improvement.

The most recent consultation exercise was completed as an evaluation carried out by the University of Edinburgh.
1.0 Background

1.1 A report to Committee in November 2018 outlined the South East Improvement Collaborative phase 2 plan that met the principle of the joint agreement between COSLA, SOLACE, ADES and the Scottish Government.

1.2 The South East Improvement Collaborative Plan (Phase 2) was used as a strategic driver for the collaborative work between the 5 authorities (City of Edinburgh, East Lothian, Fife, Midlothian and Scottish Borders).

1.3 There are currently 6 workstreams with specific aims to improve outcomes: Quality Improvement, Data and Analysis, Leadership and Professional Learning, Mathematics and Numeracy, Equity and Parental Engagement and Emotional Wellbeing.

1.4 There are a growing number of networks emerging as a direct response from practitioners that help to create a collaborative culture. These networks allow groups of practitioners to work together and learn from each other.

1.5 Our shared vision “working together, empowering all, improving outcomes” helps us to ensure that all 5 local authorities are bought into what we are trying to achieve.

1.6 Our aims are agreed as;
1. Improving our attainment and achievement, including closing the attainment gap.
2. Improving quality in our schools and early years’ settings.

2.0 Progress Update

2.1 The South East Improvement Collaborative is now a key feature within the Education and Children’s Services Directorate Improvement Plan supporting the work with partners to ensure improvement across our priority areas. The diagram shows how the plans in Fife and SEIC fit together to drive improvement for our children and young people.
2.2 The SEIC phase 2 plan has been revised for session 2019/20. The plan can be found here and on the website http://www.seicollab.co.uk/. Further information can be viewed about progress to date.

2.3 Work has begun on developing a way of bringing together a number of groups whose work will help achieve the main aims of the SEIC. A system, that we have called the SEIC Empowered System, will allow schools, local authorities, Education Scotland and the SEIC to work collaboratively to improve outcomes for young people. The SEIC Empowered System will clarify the roles of each, identify common priorities, create plans for improvements built on well informed research and develop focused workstream and network activity strengthening middle leadership. The Empowered System is visually set out below.

![SEIC Empowered System Diagram]

2.4 The strands of the empowered system over and above the workstreams and networks will provide a structure to support schools and early years settings. Four specific strands include: SEIC Associates; Research schools; Learning schools and Curriculum Pioneers. They are as follows:

**SEIC Associates**
SEIC Associates are highly skilled leaders (Headteachers and Depute Headteachers) in their field and will work with local authorities on school reviews and capacity building. SEIC Associates will remain in their substantive posts, work on specific projects and receive high quality professional learning. This development will contribute to an empowered school-led system where schools will be at the heart of supporting other schools across the five local authorities.

**Research Schools**
A research school will display experience and evidence of using research in practice. It will have capacity to deliver a programme of activities for other schools. There will be a commitment to share lessons learned with other schools with an evidence base to show impact.
**Learning Schools**
A Learning School will be a school which has shown that it can potentially support others. Schools will apply for this status, there will be a rigorous selection of Learning Schools and clarity will be sought that they have the capacity to support without detriment to their own standard. A prototype will be set up over session 2019-20 which will then be evaluated before being trialled more widely.

**Curriculum Pioneers**
As part of the SEIC Empowered System we will include an identification of those who are leading the way in the development of pedagogy. Such practice can be identified against National benchmarks. Work is being done on the practical ways in which we can identify and quality assure examples of ‘best’, ‘interesting’, ‘emergent’ practice which could then be shared.

2.5 The SEIC Empowered System will be underpinned by robust data, professional learning, self-evaluation and a commitment to supporting others.

2.6 All five Local Authorities across SEIC agreed that Monday 21st October would be a joint In-Service day to enable practitioners to explore the theme of ‘collaboration’ through many different contexts. All workstreams and many networks are hosting events across all 5 authorities. Schools have the opportunity to attend events if they believe it will be purposeful for their improvement journey. Participation figures for the workstream events are detailed in Appendix 3.

2.7 Fife schools have opportunities to engage with a number of SEIC workstreams and networks. These sessions provide opportunities for supporting improvement processes through conditions for collaboration, focussed professional learning and sharing practice. Participation figures of Fife schools attending SEIC sessions are in Appendix 4.

2.8 The impact of the workstreams are currently monitored through, short term measures of progress, as detailed in the updated phase 2 plan. The wider evaluations will inform the next 3 year plan.

2.9 A Fife SEIC Forum has been created with representation from all sectors to ensure there is two way communication between the work of the SEIC and Fife and to identify how collaborative working could further strengthen at both a system level and improving outcomes. All local authorities are establishing a similar forum to ensure good communication.

2.10 Education Managers in Fife and SEIC Fife QIO are working on the alignment of strategic work to ensure there is ongoing regular engagement proving added value in the system, through attendance at professional learning events, collborative learning, supporting each other and using best practice to inform developments.

**3.0 Conclusion**

3.1 An increasing number of Fife practitioners are involved in the added value that SEIC has brought through collaborative working. Many Fife schools have established networks through either facilitating or attending SEIC events. Others have made their own connections working collaboratively on an area of improvement.
3.2 All Fife schools have had the opportunity to engage in a SEIC activity. However, schools have autonomy over engagement as they are aware of what will support the identified needs of their own school and what additionality the authority is offering that can be enhanced by the work of SEIC.

3.3 Evaluations from Fife staff who have participated in SEIC work shows a direct positive impact on their confidence in improving outcomes in the classroom.

3.4 The South East Improvement Collaborative Plan (Phase 2 update) provides a platform for developing empowered schools that see the benefits from working collaboratively. As we continue to implement the plan we need to take cognisance of changes in legislation, guidance and cultures.

3.5 The progress of improvement within the South East Improvement Collaborative is being monitored against a set of measures that have been based on the Scottish Government’s chosen key measures for closing the attainment gap. These measures have been chosen to measure progress against the National Improvement Framework. SEIC is currently developing a scorecard based on these measures which reflect the local context of the region and align with Scottish Government key measures. Our scorecard will be used to monitor the implementation of the SEIC 3 year strategic plan moving forward.
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1. Fife staff who have a strategic lead role with workstream and networks (Appendix 1)
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4. Fife Schools participation in SEIC events (Appendix 4)

Background Papers
The following papers were relied on in the preparation of this report in terms of Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1973:

- South East Improvement Collaborative Plan phase 2 (update)
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- National Thematic Inspection – Readiness for Empowerment, December 2018
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The information below provides a list of Fife staff who are involved with the workstreams or networks within the South East Improvement Collaborative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workstream/Network</th>
<th>Fife Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement Workstream</td>
<td>Peter McNaughton, Head of Education &amp; Children’s Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tara Wood, Depute Headteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Workstream</td>
<td>Stuart Booker, Improvement Officer (Strategy &amp; Knowledge Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Workstream</td>
<td>Sarah Else, Education Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths &amp; Numeracy Workstream</td>
<td>Alison Dakers, Numeracy &amp; Mathematics Principal Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Workstream</td>
<td>Angela Logue, Education Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Wellbeing Workstream</td>
<td>Young People from Waid Academy, Bell Baxter High School, Queen Anne High School and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenwood High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN Network</td>
<td>Alistair Haldane, Education Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD Network</td>
<td>Ross Martin, Team Manager (Service Development &amp; Strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology Network</td>
<td>Vivienne Sutherland, Principal Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2 Network</td>
<td>Jackie Funnell, Education Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Technologies Network</td>
<td>David Imrie, Skills Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Network</td>
<td>Clark Graham, Early Learning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools Network</td>
<td>Isla Lumsden, Headteacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEIC and Education Scotland Team

The following table outlines the SEIC team that will provide the support to drive forward the key aims within the SEIC plan.

### SEIC Team to support SEIC Empowered System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement Manager</td>
<td>Education Support Officer (Professional Learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement Officer (Borders)</td>
<td>Education Support Officers (Digital) x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement Officer (East Lothian)</td>
<td>Senior Development Officer (Equity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement Officer (Edinburgh)</td>
<td>Statistician/Data Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement Officer (Fife)</td>
<td>Project Officer (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement Officer (Midlothian) –</td>
<td>Support Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table outlines the newly formed Education Scotland SEIC team where identified staff support workstream and network activity as well as other elements within the SEIC Empowered System. The Education Scotland team also support work within individual local authorities.

### Education Scotland Team to support SEIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Regional Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Education Officer – Inclusion &amp;</td>
<td>Education Officer – Inclusion &amp; Equalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Education Officer – Technologies</td>
<td>Education Officer – STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Education Officer – Languages</td>
<td>Education Officer – Digital Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Education Officer – NIF Advisor –</td>
<td>Education Officer – Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Specialist – Professional Learning &amp;</td>
<td>Education Officer - CLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment Advisor (Borders)</td>
<td>Development Officer – Mentors in Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment Advisor (East Lothian)</td>
<td>Development Officer – Food &amp; Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment Advisor (Edinburgh)</td>
<td>Development Officer – Improving Gender Balance &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment Advisor (Fife)</td>
<td>Development Officer – Digital Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment Advisor (Midlothian)</td>
<td>Development Officer - CLD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fife Participation – In-Service 21/10/19

The following graphs detail the engagement levels for some of the SEIC Collaborative In-Service day events.

Schools had the option to self select what would be appropriate to support them in their school improvement priorities.

Aspects of some events have already had a focus within Fife which is reflected in the figures.
Fife Schools Participation

Key events delivered to support the SEIC Plan where Fife schools have benefited collaborative professional learning to take back to their schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Event/Activity</th>
<th>No of Fife Schools involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Special/Early Headteacher Engagement</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Headteacher Improvement Engagement</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Quality Improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Collaborative Leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative Writing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions in Broad General Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey to Improving Wellbeing, Inclusion and Equity</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Conference</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIC Associates</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Subjects Leads</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Reading – Numeracy and Mathematics</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife SEIC Forum</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIC Columba 1400</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy and Mathematics Pedagogical approaches</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Support Needs Engagement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIC Complex Needs</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on Attainment and Education Outcomes

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director, Education & Children’s Services

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to inform the Education and Children’s Services Committee of the progress of learning for pupils in Fife schools. In particular, the paper provides an overview of:

1. Achievement in literacy and numeracy for pupils within the Broad General Education (BGE) and in each stage of the senior phase.
2. Progress in closing the attainment gap for literacy and numeracy
3. Evidence about the wellbeing of pupils within Fife schools

The paper is based on a range of stage-based information about outcomes within Fife schools that is available in September each year. A further paper will be presented in March, informing the committee of outcomes achieved by school leavers, based on information about the attainment and post-school destinations of school leavers that is released in February each year.

The paper also provides an overview of the range of strategies being developed to ensure that the levels of pupils’ attainment and achievement continue to increase.

Recommendation(s)

The Education and Children’s Services Scrutiny Committee is asked to:

(1) Note progress in raising levels of engagement, attainment and achievement
(2) Comment on the approach being taken to further develop attainment

Resource Implications

There are no resource implications arising from this report.

Legal & Risk Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

Impact Assessment

An EqIA has not been completed and is not necessary as no change or revision to existing policy is proposed.
1.0 Background

1.1 It is our ambition for each child in Fife to enjoy a high-quality education that encourages them to be the most successful they can be and provide them with a learning journey from 3 – 18 years which leads onto future opportunity. To achieve this, one of the areas we, collectively, must succeed in is to raise attainment consistently and, at all stages, for all our children and young people in Fife.

1.2 Specifically, in Fife, we know that there are more and more children growing up in poverty. Recent research highlights that children living in Scotland’s most deprived areas are behind their peers in the development of key skills, being:

- 6 – 13 months behind their peers in problem solving at age 5;
- 11 – 18 months behind their peers in expressive vocabulary at age 5;
- Generally, around two years behind their peers by age 15


1.4 The National Improvement Framework (NIF) highlights four broad areas of priority:

- Health and Wellbeing
- Attainment, including Literacy and Numeracy and Wider Achievement
- Equity
- Employability

The Education and Children’s Services Directorate’s priorities (Appendix 1) reflect these key national priorities, and the importance of GIRFEC (the national approach to Getting it Right for Every Child) and community empowerment in achieving improvement across these areas.

1.5 The Directorate’s approach to improving educational and life outcomes for Fife’s children and young people involves:

- Improving the development and progress of learning for children and young people as they progress through their schooling. Wellbeing and the progress of learning in the key learning skills of literacy and numeracy are central to this aim. Data on these outcomes – and progress in closing the gap in these outcomes – are available in September each year and form the basis of this report

- Providing young people with pathways to a wider range of post-school opportunities, including improving the qualification sets of school leavers from Fife schools. Wider attainment and employability skills are central to this aim. Data on these outcomes – and progress in closing the gap for these outcomes –
are available in February each year and will form the basis for a report on school leaver outcomes that will be presented to the committee in March/April next year.

1.6 Raising attainment is a core Directorate priority. Factors known to help raise attainment include effective leadership, high quality learning and teaching, a positive ethos, effective tracking and monitoring of pupil progress and effective self-evaluation. These are areas that we as a Directorate are prioritising.

1.7 With this in mind, the Education and Children’s Services Directorate has focussed its efforts to improve attainment outcomes for pupils. This includes a structured look, through our Quality Improvement processes, at pupil experience, achievement and progression in the Broad General Education phase and a focus on analysing attainment and raising attainment strategies. We have also updated our Raising Attainment Strategy which provides advice and guidance to support schools in raising attainment.

1.8 In the senior phase, our raising attainment strategy is being further developed in consultation with Secondary Heads and senior officers. A key focus in secondary has been to continue to improve levels of Literacy and Numeracy and to further close the poverty related attainment gap.

1.9 The recently formed Strategic Governance Board also takes an overview of attainment and achievement across all sectors. A workstream dedicated to looking at how we can further raise attainment is now in place and has developed guidance for schools to support them in raising attainment. This has been shared with all Head Teachers.

1.10 The national drive to close the “Poverty-Related Attainment Gap” further supports the work of our schools in raising attainment. Across Fife, almost all primary and secondary schools are in receipt of additional monies through the Pupil Equity Fund, with nine of our schools also benefitting from being part of the Scottish Attainment Challenge Schools Programme. As result of this, schools are developing and implementing a range of strategies to target barriers to learning, identified for individuals and groups of pupils, within each school context.

1.11 The Directorate’s attainment review process at school and local authority level ensures that we work closely with schools to drive improvement in attainment. This includes both support and challenge.

1.12 Attainment is reviewed at every level of the Directorate. Headteachers and staff have a key responsibility for securing improvement. At present, in Secondary schools, scrutiny meetings are being held between Headteachers and Officers to review attainment in SQA exams and to determine what further action is needed to bring about further improvement.

1.13 To support this work, each school produces an annual Standards and Quality Report which is a self-evaluation statement of progress, including attainment. This supports dialogue between the school and local authority in relation to attainment, progress towards national measures and next steps in the school’s development.

1.14 The following sections of this paper provide an overview of the key educational outcomes for children and young people attending Fife’s schools, in terms of outcomes for:
• Health and Wellbeing
• Stage-based achievement and attainment for literacy and numeracy
• Progress in closing the attainment gap in literacy and numeracy.

1.15 A further paper, outlining educational outcomes for school leavers will be presented, following the spring 2019 update of the Insight Tool, which will provide information regarding post-school destinations and the attainment of school leavers.

1.16 The aim of providing this holistic view of educational outcomes is two-fold:

- To help Elected Members form a comprehensive overview of primary and secondary education and the ways in which it meets the needs of its learners.
- To show how Fife is meeting its legislative obligations, “to secure improvement in the quality of school education which is provided in the schools managed by them… with a view to raising standards of education.” Standards in Schools Act (2000).

1.17 Importantly, reporting by Head Teachers at Area Committee level also provides a mechanism for Fife Council in relation to this responsibility.

2.0 Current Position

Attainment in Literacy and Numeracy

2.1 A key focus for Fife’s Education and Children’s Services Directorate is attainment in literacy and numeracy. Success in literacy and numeracy contributes to the successful development of core skills for life, learning and work. This focus on literacy and numeracy is supported by the Directorate’s Literacy Strategy and Numeracy Strategy and through the work of our Pedagogy Team. This is also the focus of the Pupil Equity Fund Networks, aimed at supporting staff in closing the poverty related attainment gap in numeracy and literacy.

2.2 The expectation is that, nationally, most pupils should attain the expected level for their age and stage as set out within the Curriculum for Excellence document, Building the Curriculum 5, A Framework for Assessment (see: https://www.education.gov.scot/Documents/btc5-framework.pdf). Figure 1 shows an overview of the expected progression for most of our learners. Within primary education there is an expectation that, for most learners, early level is achievable by the end of Primary 1, 1st level by the end of Primary 4 and 2nd level by the end of Primary 7. As we move through the Broad General Education and into Secondary Education Level 3 should be achieved by most learners by the end of S3. Not every child will be able to attain these expectations. This is something we accept and value.
2.3 With the move from the previous 5-14 Curriculum to Curriculum for Excellence (CFE) within early 2000, there had been no collection of pupil CFE data at a national level or within most local authorities.

2.4 Though a range of work is now being undertaken across Scotland, there remains little consistency across authorities as to how pupil attainment is being tracked, recorded and reported. As such, the data being presented nationally remains experimental until such time as there is confidence, nationally, with regards to the consistency and accuracy of this. Thus, when figures from all authorities are published in December 2019, it is important to bear this in mind.

2.5 For session 2018-2019, when comparing the data with regards to the percentage of pupils who have achieved the expected level for their age and stage, we can see that there has been a clear increase in attainment in all areas within P1, 4 and 7. (Fig 2, 3, 4, 5) for pupils in our primary schools. The average increase since 2017 was 10% across all stages and areas of attainment; the increase ranged from a 3% increase for numeracy in stage P1 to a 16% for Writing in stage P7. There has been a slight dip at P4 Listening and Talking which will be now be a focus for this session. Where there is a variance of less than 1% this is negligible across the pupil cohort.
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2.6 In the secondary sector (see figure 6) whilst there was a slight decrease in 2017-18 in the proportion of pupils being declared as achieving level 3 for reading, writing and numeracy (a decrease of 2%) this has since increased to bring this more in line with 2017. Work continues within this sector to moderate assessment information within literacy and numeracy.

(Fig. 6)

2.7 The progress with improving attainment for the key skills of literacy and numeracy is also evident in measures of attainment for literacy and numeracy in the senior phase.

(Fig. 7)
2.8 Attainment for literacy at SCQF level 4 by the end of S4 is relatively high, with approximately 90% of pupils achieving a formal award at this level of attainment by the end of stage S4 (fig 7). This is in line with areas of Scotland with a similar social context. Attainment for numeracy at SCQF level 4 is now also close to 90% and remains significantly better than for areas of Scotland with a similar social context.

2.9 There was a fall in the proportion of pupils achieving awards at National 5 nationally this year, reflecting changes to national guidance on presentation and changes to National 5 examinations. This was reflected in outcomes for literacy and numeracy by the end of stage S4 at SCQF level 5 (fig 7). The impact of these changes has carried over in the attainment for literacy and numeracy at SCQF levels 5 and 6 (Higher) in S5 this year across Scotland. Attainment for these outcomes remains in line with areas of Scotland with a similar social context.

By the end of stage S5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Literacy SCQF Level 5</th>
<th>Literacy SCQF Level 6</th>
<th>Numeracy</th>
<th>Numeracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closing the Gap in Attainment

2.10 There is evidence that Fife has made significant progress in closing the attainment gap for the key educational outcomes of literacy and numeracy over recent years.

2.11 Fife’s approach to recording achievement of CfE levels was reviewed for 2016-17, in light of revised national guidelines. As a result, data on achievement of CfE levels in Fife is only available for the period since 2017. Figure 10, below, shows the average proportion of P1, P4 and P7 pupils achieving the expected CfE level. As can be seen:

- The proportion of pupils achieving the expected level of CfE has improved for each SIMD Quintile since 2017.
- There is still evidence of an attainment gap in literacy and numeracy in primary schooling (shown by the upwards gradient from left (lower attainment in more deprived areas) to right (higher attainment in less deprived areas). However, there is also evidence of a continued closing of the attainment gap (the difference in outcomes across the chart from left to right is much less pronounced in 2019.
than in 2017). This progress in closing the attainment gap is in addition to significant progress made prior to 2017, although this progress was evidenced using different measures (as reported to this committee in previous years).

![Graph showing attainment by SIMD quintile](image)

2.12 Table 1, below, shows attainment for literacy and numeracy for pupils in S4 living in the most and least deprived social areas in Fife. Attainment at SCQF level 5 has risen for both groups of pupils by a similar amount, leaving the attainment gap broadly unchanged. Attainment for numeracy at SCQF level 4 has improved for pupils in the most deprived areas and has been maintained at a high level for pupils from the least deprived areas, leading to a closing of the attainment gap. However, there was a reduction in the proportion of S4 pupils achieving literacy at SCQF level 4 and a widening of the attainment gap this year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SIMD Quintile 1 (most deprived)</th>
<th>SIMD Quintile 5 (least deprived)</th>
<th>Attainment gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
<td>84.4 79.0 45.8 36.6</td>
<td>96.3 94.5 78.0 70.7</td>
<td>12.0 15.4 32.2 34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td>80.5 83.6 51.4 42.1</td>
<td>95.3 94.3 85.2 77.9</td>
<td>14.7 10.7 33.8 35.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attainment has improved for pupils in both social contexts for Literacy and Numeracy at SCQF level 5 and for literacy at SCQF level 6. The attainment gap closed for literacy at SCQF level 5 but widened for numeracy at SCQF level 5 and for literacy at SCQF level 6. There was a closing of the attainment gap for numeracy at SCQF level 6, due to a slight reduction in attainment for numeracy at SCQF level 6 for pupils in the least deprived areas.

2.13 Fife’s continued efforts with regards to developing leadership, pedagogy and breaking the cycle to reduce inequity in educational outcomes has focussed on addressing disadvantage and improving life chances for all. Literacy development in Fife is now recognised as best practice. Work done to improve Numeracy and Mathematics is also well received by our school leaders and has received national recognition. Work within our Early Years’ service continues to have positive impact on the lives of our young people over a number of sessions and this will continue to be built upon. Work being undertaken through interventions supported by the Scottish Attainment Challenge fund is beginning to show early signs of impact on many of our most vulnerable learners. This is a topic for a report to Committee later in the year.

Wider Achievement

2.14 The levels of success our children have in national examinations is important. However, there is more to public schooling and the development of our young people than examination results. Within each school, staff use a range of systems to track and monitor children’s broader successes and achievements. This helps to ensure that the needs of potentially vulnerable groups and individual children are understood and assists schools, working with partners as appropriate, to provide equity of access and opportunity for all learners.

2.15 From feedback through the Education Scotland inspection process and from our own knowledge of school practice, we are aware that a number of our schools are raising awareness of the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) through the Rights Respecting School Award scheme. This is a priority across schools in Fife and work within this is noted in recent school inspections:

“*There is a strong commitment to children’s rights at Pitcoudie Primary. Senior leaders are improving approaches to ensure that all learners contribute to the life of the school, and have a say about their learning. Each class has designed its own class charter related to the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), and teachers refer to this during lessons*”

Pitcoudie PS
2.16 Across schools, children are increasingly involved in school groups and take on a range of roles such as Prefects, House Captains, Junior Road Safety Officers and buddies to develop important skills. These include effective communication, team work and building confidence in their abilities to express their own views and listen to those of others.

2.17 Many pupils benefit from a range of after school clubs offered by schools and partners including sports clubs, outdoor activities, Eco clubs and a range of arts clubs. These are helping children to develop interests and social skills in different settings.

2.18 In all schools, learners are actively engaged in successful fundraising activities to support local, national and international causes, thus developing awareness of the lives of others and the support they can offer to help bring about change.

2.19 Many of our schools also participate in a range of awards programmes including, the John Muir Award, Natural Connections, Duke of Edinburgh, SQA Personal Achievement and Leadership Awards, Saltire Awards which recognise volunteering and Dynamic Youth Awards. Our Catholic schools engage with the Mini Vinnies, an award focussed on work within the local community. For a second year we have a number of schools engaging with First Chances (primary) in collaboration with St Andrews University. This allows children to develop their skills, motivation and self-esteem. Each year, pupils follow a specially-designed programme, culminating in an annual residential summer school at the University.

2.20 Young people often continue these connections through the St Andrew’s University REACH programme and The Sutton Trust Summer School. Our schools have a number of connections with Fife College and a number of different universities to provide young people with a range of experiences.

2.21 In some instances, schools have been particularly successful in local and national awards, with Fife schools winning a range of awards, such as:

- Plastic-Free Schools status awarded by Surfers Against Sewage
- Silver School Sports Award – Carnock PS
- Digital Schools Award - Markinch Primary School
- Silver award for Rights Respecting Schools - Kirkcaldy West PS
- Sport Scotland Gold Award status - North Queensferry PS
- Kingdom FM Local Hero awards - Best School In Fife – Lynburn PS
- COSLA Excellence Awards “President's Award” – Kirkcaldy HS

**Health and Wellbeing Outcomes**

2.22 As we noted in last years report, it is acknowledged, nationally, that improved measures are needed to support the identification of future improvements in health and wellbeing for children and young people. A new national Health and Wellbeing Survey is being developed to meet this need, this is still in development.

2.23 Another important source of evidence about wellbeing comes from the perception measures, which provide an insight into the child’s view of Fife schools.
2.24 The Education and Children’s Services Directorate undertakes the Pupilwise and Parentwise surveys every three years. These ask for pupil and parent views across a range of questions, covering all aspects of wellbeing. These surveys were undertaken last session and reported to the Education and Children’s Services Committee on 22 May 2018.

**Employability Outcomes**

2.25 In order to take forward employability knowledge and skills within the primary sector, Early years centres and primary schools are integrating Developing the Young Workforce (DYW) within their planned curriculum and are working towards implementation of ‘The Careers Education Standard 3-18, Developing the Young Workforce’.

2.26 Developing the Young Workforce /Skills for learning, life and work are integrated across children’s experiences with the focus being on developing skills, knowledge and concepts. Across Fife, we are promoting enterprise and enterprising approaches within every classroom. This encompasses enterprising approaches to learning and teaching which ensures all children develop a ‘Can Do’ attitude. This includes entrepreneurial experiences. This work continues to be reflected within feedback from inspections:

“There is a whole school approach to Developing the Young Workforce (DYW) and the school’s ‘Skills to Success’ progression framework is embedded in daily learning and teaching. Almost all children are developing a strong awareness of employability, skills for learning, life and work and how their learning, both in and out of school, relates to this. This highly effective practice is an area of strength of the school”

*Townhill PS*

“*The high profile that senior leaders have given to providing young people with learning that is directly relevant to their future careers. Young people are benefitting from a wide range of projects and opportunities across the school to engage with employers, develop their skills and confidence, and experience the world of work.*”

*Inverkeithing HS*

2.27 We continue to take a robust approach to developing money/financial education, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) learning, sustainable education and work experience through engagement in social enterprise in partnership with Skills Development Scotland. We now have in place a well-established STEM strategy in conjunction with Fife College with key performance targets for schools set by Scottish Government.

2.28 Almost all schools have collated a register of parental occupations and are taking the opportunity to involve parents in supporting their Developing the Young Workforce programmes.

2.29 Work is ongoing across schools with Skills Development Scotland to support primary schools to use ‘My World of Work’ (‘My WOW’). Current figures show that 25% of our Primary 7 young people are registered and using this resource compared to 18% nationally.

2.30 In secondary schools DYW is well established as an integral part of the curriculum. We are working very closely with Fife college to further promote this initiative and to
present ‘Apprenticeships’ as part of the curriculum on offer to our young people. We have a significant investment in the ‘Foundation Apprenticeship’ programme.

2.31 At the start of the session we appointed a DYW Coordinator in each secondary to work develop the curriculum and to work in partnership with business and industry

2.32 In the secondary sector Skills Development Scotland staff are based in schools and help to deliver Career Management Skills and the Careers Education Standard. Skills Development Scotland staff directly support young people in a number of ways, including targeted group work and individual interviews.

2.33 All Early Learning Centres and schools in Fife are working to implement the Careers Education Standard and develop flexible pathways to ensure that Developing the Young Workforce is a key driver within their curriculum.

3.0 Conclusion

3.1 The challenge set out in national and international policy initiatives to raise attainment for all learners is welcomed, in light of the need for more learners to gain higher levels of attainment so that they can compete and flourish in today’s job market.

3.2 The overall attainment in Fife schools in Curriculum for Excellence in the primary sector has improved in all measures in school session 2017/18 though has levelled out in session 2018/19.

3.3 Over the past 6 years we have incrementally raised attainment, though we are ambitious to make a bigger difference. Fife has identified long term, medium term and short-term strategies, including partnerships, which aim to raise attainment even further. The success of these strategies will depend upon everyone at every level having the ambition and desire to raise attainment for our young people.

3.4 In line with the National Improvement Framework, significant progress is being made in Fife, with the development of a curriculum that meets the needs of all learners – based firmly on the development of personal skills, employability skills and the key skills of literacy and numeracy. This continuing work will ensure Fife is well placed to see further improvement in future years. The work of the Pedagogy Team and the additional funding through the Pupil Equity Fund will continue to drive these developments, with an explicit focus on how this can lead to improved attainment.

3.5 The success of our schools in developing and delivering successful programmes of learning which meet the needs of young people have been the result of a great deal of hard work and collective effort from practitioners. Work within and across our clusters of schools, has both supported and challenged our Head Teachers to develop appropriate learning pathways, moderation of high-quality learning, teaching and assessment and targeted interventions for learners.

3.6 The national publication, How Good Is Our School (HGIOS) 4, is used both by schools and practitioners, involves a much greater challenge for schools, through more stringent application of national standards and increased expectations. As such, our Quality Improvement systems and collaborative improvement approaches, including Learning Partnerships, will continue to focus on improving attainment and closely connect this to improvement planning and review processes within schools.
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Education & Children’s Services Directorate
Revenue Budget 2019-20 Projected Outturn

Report by:

Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director Education and Children’s Services
Eileen Rowand, Executive Director Finance & Corporate Services

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide members with an update on the forecast financial position for the 2019-20 financial year, for the areas in scope of the Education and Children’s Services Committee.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

a. consider the current financial performance and activity as detailed in this report;

b. note that officers will ensure that the risks associated with Looked After Children are appropriately managed whilst acting to address the projected overspend in Children and Families Service;

c. note that the Education and Children’s Services Directorate continues to implement the Strategy approved by the Executive Committee on 13 January 2015, as updated by subsequent reports, most recently the report to this committee of 22 January 2019, to reduce the reliance on purchased care placements and increase the number of children who can be looked after safely at home or in kinship care.

Resource Implications

The Directorate remains committed to managing the budget and developing and implementing the strategy to address demographic pressures on spend.

Legal & Risk Implications

The Directorate requires to discharge its duty as Corporate Parent to all Looked After Children and to support their families accordingly. It is committed to proactive management of the budget to reduce the level of care placements whilst managing the risk to individuals.

Impact Assessment

An EqIA has not been completed and is not necessary as no change or revision to existing policies and practices is proposed.
1.0 Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the projected outturn for the Education and Children’s Services Directorate (excluding Criminal Justice), for the 2019-20 Revenue Budget, and to highlight the major variances as at August 2019. This is the second monitoring report to the Strategic Committee for the 2019-20 financial year.

2.0 Major Variances

2.1 Education and Children’s Services 2019-20 Projected Outturn

2.1.1 The projected overspend, for this financial year, for Education and Children’s Services (excluding Criminal Justice) is £7.445m. A summary of the 2019-20 projected out-turn is detailed in Appendices 1-4. This shows projected expenditure against budget across the service headings within the Directorate. It should be noted that the balances are extracted from the ledger system and are shown as rounded thousands. This may mean that there are some rounding differences contained within the appendices, but these are immaterial values that do not impact on the overall financial position. The following paragraphs provide a brief explanation of the main areas where there are significant variances (+/- £0.250m) to budgets.

2.2 Education Service

2.2.1 DSM Budget: - projected underspend (£3.119m), movement £0.037m

Under the Devolved School Management Scheme, schools’ budgets are calculated and allocated with reference to a range of formulae based on appropriate data, for example school roll. The Scheme also recognises that schools require some flexibility to manage resource between financial years and to assist in meeting this a carry forward of under / over spend of up to 2.5% of service managed budget is allowed. Schools carried forward £3.179m into 2019-20 under this provision.

2.2.2 The provisional outturn currently reflects a high-level projection, as schools’ budgets will be adjusted in due course to reflect the impact of school rolls from August 2019, and the budget required for teaching staff in post.

2.2.3 In addition to the core DSM budget, the schools’ Pupil Equity Fund (PEF) has also been included in their devolved budgets. Any unspent PEF at 31 March was carried forward for schools, and in addition schools’ allocations for 2019-20 have been applied to budgets. These amounts are £2.827m, and £10.049m respectively. As PEF is a ring-fenced funding source it has no impact on the variance within the service, as any under (or over) spends are carried forward.
2.2.4 Non-DSM/Childcare: - projected overspend £1.144m, movement (£1.227m)

2.2.5 The projected overspend mainly relates to maternity pay and long-term absence, where overspends of £2.423m and £0.640m are included within the projection. These costs are in relation to teachers but are borne by the non-devolved central Education budget and not the DSM. These overspends are reduced by a projected underspend in Early Years, of £1.288m, mainly due to the timing of recruiting additional Early Years Officers to match the intake of children throughout the year. Underspends are also projected within Special Education of £0.244m, Support Services of £0.196m and Education Administration of £0.159m.

The movement since the last report is due to an increase in projected underspend in Early Years from updated pay projections, of £0.328m, and a reduction in the projected outturn for Special Education of £0.612m, due to increased income and a projected underspend in teachers’ pay.

2.3 Children and Families Service – projected overspend £9.420m, movement £2.015m

2.3.1 The position for the service reflects a projected overspend on employee costs of £0.642m, due to agency staff costs and unachieved staff turnover. In third party payments, the cost of purchased care placements is projected to overspend by £6.781m, kinship care by £0.649m, continuing care by £0.943m and grants to voluntary organisations by £0.470m, due to unachieved savings. An overspend is also projected on Supplies and Services of £0.226m, partly due to anticipated professional fees in relation to arranging permanence for children. Partly offsetting the projected overspend is a projected underspend on transfer payments of £0.569m, which is due to lower than anticipated payments to foster carers. The projection at August reflects the achievement of £1.382m of mitigating actions in terms of reviewing placements and managing care arrangements.

2.3.2 The projected outturn for Children and Families Service takes account of a number of mitigating actions to contain the expenditure at this forecasted level. The Service will continue to identify further cost reduction measures in order to reduce the Service overspend further. Future monitoring reports will take into account the amount of cost reduction achieved. These actions will be undertaken whilst ensuring that children are placed in the most suitable care arrangements to ensure their safeguarding.

2.3.3 The projected position for the service is influenced by various factors. Cost pressures on the budget have arisen from higher than anticipated placement numbers, however the position reported is also due to a reduction in Children and Families budget. This is based on the estimated impact of the Strategy approved in January 2015, which included assumptions around reduced numbers of purchased care placements, and the reduction in future budget requirement that this would enable. As 2019-20 is the last year of the original Strategy, significant reductions in placement numbers were anticipated. Consequently, the budget for Children and Families Service has reduced in 2019-20 by £3.3m. However, the reduction in placement numbers required has not been achieved and therefore this reduction in budget is a factor in the level of projected overspend.
2.3.4 At 30 June 2019 there were 358 purchased care placements and 40 continuing care placements. At 31 August the number of purchased care placements was 353 and continuing care was 39. In terms of the Strategy, to balance the budget in 2019-20, the number of purchased care placements would need to reduce significantly to around 240.

3.0 Savings

3.1 Revenue Budget Savings 2019-20

3.1.1 The combined savings target, as approved in the 2019-22 budget process and earlier budget processes for the Directorate (excluding Criminal Justice), for this financial year is £3.621m. An indication of the forecast achievement of savings is attached at Appendix 5. Savings anticipated to be achieved are indicated by a green RAG status coding. Those indicated amber are where the saving is currently expected to be achieved in part or where evidence of achievement of the saving through future revenue monitoring is required before the saving can be flagged as green.

3.1.2 Savings flagged as red in Appendix 5 require significant work to be undertaken before these savings can be achieved. Additional information in relation to the savings, where there is currently a variance, are included below:

- Acceleration of savings: Children and Families – the significant early success of the Children and Families Strategy indicated that additional savings could be achieved, however, pressure on child placement numbers have led to an increase in purchased placement costs

- Joined Up Support: Family work / Third Sector – the shortfall relates to the unachieved portion of the saving which is in relation to the grants to voluntary organisations budget. Voluntary sector support was agreed for a 6-month period earlier this year. A further report is to be submitted to committee, and once approved this saving can be updated.

4.0 Conclusions

4.1 The projected outturn for the Education and Children’s Services Directorate Revenue Budget (excluding Criminal Justice) for 2019-20 is a projected overspend of £7.445m. The dominant factors within the projection are the projected overspend in respect of long-term absence and maternity leave within Education, and the overspend in Children and Families service due to higher than anticipated child placements compared to the expectations of the Strategy and the impact of Continuing Care. These overspends are partly offset by the projected underspend within DSM (mainly due to the carry forward of underspend from 2018-19) and within Early Years, due to recruitment lead in times.
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## BUDGET MONITORING REPORT SUMMARY TO 31 AUGUST 2019-20

### EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT BUDGET 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>FORECAST 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>FORECASTED VARIANCE £m</th>
<th>FORECASTED VARIANCE %</th>
<th>PREVIOUS REPORTED VARIANCE £m</th>
<th>MOVEMENT FROM PREVIOUS REPORTED VARIANCE £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE MANAGED NET BUDGET</td>
<td>369.382</td>
<td>376.827</td>
<td>7.445</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>6.620</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF SERVICE MANAGED BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL SERVICES - DEVOLVED</td>
<td>198.446</td>
<td>195.327</td>
<td>(3.119)</td>
<td>-1.57%</td>
<td>(3.157)</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL SERVICES - NON DEVOLVED</td>
<td>106.766</td>
<td>107.910</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>(1.227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN AND FAMILIES excl CRIMINAL JUSTICE</td>
<td>64.169</td>
<td>73.589</td>
<td>9.420</td>
<td>14.68%</td>
<td>7.406</td>
<td>2.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; CHILDREN'S SERVICES</td>
<td>369.382</td>
<td>376.827</td>
<td>7.445</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>6.620</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BUDGET MONITORING REPORT SUMMARY TO 31 AUGUST 2019-20

### EDUCATIONAL SERVICES - DEVOLVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT BUDGET 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>FORECAST 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>FORECASTED VARIANCE £m</th>
<th>FORECASTED VARIANCE %</th>
<th>PREVIOUS REPORTED VARIANCE £m</th>
<th>MOVEMENT FROM PREVIOUS REPORTED VARIANCE £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE MANAGED NET BUDGET</td>
<td>198.446</td>
<td>195.327</td>
<td>(3.119)</td>
<td>-1.57%</td>
<td>(3.157)</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF SERVICE MANAGED BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>96.358</td>
<td>94.866</td>
<td>(1.491)</td>
<td>-1.55%</td>
<td>(1.401)</td>
<td>(0.091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>95.143</td>
<td>93.678</td>
<td>(1.465)</td>
<td>-1.54%</td>
<td>(1.597)</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSERY EDUCATION</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>2.305</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
<td>-1.98%</td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>4.226</td>
<td>4.108</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td>-2.78%</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA GROUPS</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL SERVICES - DEVOLVED</td>
<td>198.446</td>
<td>195.327</td>
<td>(3.119)</td>
<td>-1.57%</td>
<td>(3.157)</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EDUCATIONAL SERVICES - NON DEVOLVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT BUDGET 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>FORECAST 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>FORECASTED VARIANCE £m</th>
<th>FORECASTED VARIANCE %</th>
<th>PREVIOUS REPORTED VARIANCE £m</th>
<th>MOVEMENT FROM PREVIOUS REPORTED VARIANCE £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE MANAGED NET BUDGET</td>
<td>106.766</td>
<td>107.910</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>(1.227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF SERVICE MANAGED BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>20.046</td>
<td>22.030</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY EDUCATION</td>
<td>19.539</td>
<td>20.660</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>(0.113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSERY EDUCATION</td>
<td>26.408</td>
<td>25.120</td>
<td>(1.288)</td>
<td>-4.88%</td>
<td>(0.960)</td>
<td>(0.328)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>30.720</td>
<td>30.477</td>
<td>(0.244)</td>
<td>-0.79%</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>(0.612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA GROUPS</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>-3.53%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>2.654</td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
<td>-5.66%</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>-18.73%</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFE MUSIC SERVICE</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT SERVICES</td>
<td>1.925</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
<td>-10.20%</td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>-10.15%</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>(0.224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDCARE</td>
<td>1.870</td>
<td>1.882</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL SERVICES - NON DEVOLVED</td>
<td>106.766</td>
<td>107.910</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>(1.227)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Budget Monitoring Report Summary to 31 August 2019-20

### Children and Families Excl Criminal Justice

#### Service Managed Net Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current Budget 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>Forecast 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>Forecasted Variance £m</th>
<th>Forecasted Variance %</th>
<th>Previous Reported Variance £m</th>
<th>Movement from Previous Reported Variance £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Managed Net Budget</strong></td>
<td>64.169</td>
<td>73.589</td>
<td>9.420</td>
<td>14.68%</td>
<td>7.406</td>
<td>2.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Analysis of Service Managed Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current Budget £m</th>
<th>Forecast £m</th>
<th>Variance £m</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Previous Reported Variance £m</th>
<th>Movement from Previous Reported Variance £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; F West</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>3.377</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>7.15%</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; F East</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>-1.29%</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; F Fife Wide</td>
<td>36.100</td>
<td>44.794</td>
<td>8.694</td>
<td>24.08%</td>
<td>6.713</td>
<td>1.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; F Residential</td>
<td>3.582</td>
<td>3.674</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; F Family Placement</td>
<td>10.677</td>
<td>10.754</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>(0.187)</td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Families Senior Manager</td>
<td>2.022</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support</td>
<td>2.918</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; F Central</td>
<td>3.497</td>
<td>3.526</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>(0.153)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subjective Grouping

#### Service Managed Net Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Grouping</th>
<th>Current Budget 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>Forecast 2019-20 £m</th>
<th>Variance £m</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Previous Reported Variance £m</th>
<th>Movement from Previous Reported Variance £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Managed Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>64.169</td>
<td>73.589</td>
<td>9.420</td>
<td>14.68%</td>
<td>7.406</td>
<td>2.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Current £m</th>
<th>Forecast £m</th>
<th>Variance £m</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Previous Reported £m</th>
<th>Movement from Previous Reported £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>(0.524)</td>
<td>(0.659)</td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
<td>25.76%</td>
<td>(0.183)</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Income</td>
<td>(0.517)</td>
<td>(0.621)</td>
<td>(0.104)</td>
<td>20.03%</td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Income</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>469.03%</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Current £m</th>
<th>Forecast £m</th>
<th>Variance £m</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
<th>Previous Reported £m</th>
<th>Movement from Previous Reported £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>64.693</td>
<td>74.248</td>
<td>9.555</td>
<td>14.77%</td>
<td>7.589</td>
<td>1.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Costs</td>
<td>22.697</td>
<td>22.950</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>(0.339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises Related Expenditure</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Related Expenditure</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>11.38%</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>1.931</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>40.31%</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Payments</td>
<td>35.036</td>
<td>43.843</td>
<td>8.807</td>
<td>25.14%</td>
<td>6.689</td>
<td>2.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Payments</td>
<td>3.945</td>
<td>3.731</td>
<td>(0.213)</td>
<td>-5.40%</td>
<td>(0.441)</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Finance &amp; Charges</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services Charges</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FIFE COUNCIL
**TRACKING APPROVED 2019-20 SAVINGS**
**EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE**
**AUGUST 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approved Budget Year</th>
<th>Title of Savings Proposal</th>
<th>Savings Target £m</th>
<th>Overall Forecast £m</th>
<th>(Under)/over £m</th>
<th>Rag Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Families / Criminal Justice</td>
<td>2017-20</td>
<td>Acceleration of savings</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>2018-21</td>
<td>Joined up support: Familywork / Third Sector</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>2017-20</td>
<td>Approved savings on track to be achieved</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>2018-21</td>
<td>Approved savings on track to be achieved</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>2019-22</td>
<td>Approved savings on track to be achieved</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.621</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.546</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1.075)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rag Status Key:-**

- **Green** - No issues and saving is on track to be delivered
- **Amber** - There are minor issues or minor reduction in the value of saving, or delivery of the saving is delayed
- **Red** - Major issues should be addressed before any saving can be realised

#### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rag Status</th>
<th>Savings Target £m</th>
<th>Overall Forecast £m</th>
<th>(Under)/over £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>(1.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.621</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.546</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1.075)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education and Children’s Services Directorate

Report by: Carrie Lindsay, Executive Director, Education and Children’s Services
Eileen Rowand, Executive Director, Finance and Corporate Services

Wards Affected: All

Purpose

This report provides members with information on the overall progress of the Education and Children’s Services Directorate’s capital programme for the current financial year 2019-2020, as well as informing members of progress on our major projects.

Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that members;

i) note the financial position as detailed in this report, and

ii) note that the budget has been revised to reflect the outcome of the Capital Plan review undertaken in February 2019 and subsequent re-phasing exercise carried out in June 2019.

Resource Implications

There are no direct resource implications. At the present time the Directorate is projecting a final outturn of £33.562m, the plan is showing a variance of £1.324m in the current year as at August 2019.

Legal & Risk Implications

There are no legal implications arising from this report. However, there is a risk that the actual outturn will vary from the projection contained in the report. Any potential over or under spend will be managed within the capital programme in 2019-2020 and the programme re-profiled over future years.

Impact Assessment

An EqIA has not been completed and is not necessary as no change or revision to existing policies is proposed.

Consultation

Not Applicable.
1.0 Background

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide information on the overall progress of projects within the capital programme for the current year as well as providing an update on projects under individual headings within the capital plan.

1.2 This report focuses on one year; the projected outturn is currently £33.562m, which is a variance of £1.324m from budget, however, this may change as projects develop throughout the financial year.

1.3 Appendix 1 provides the cost detail on individual projects and programmes within the capital plan where expenditure exceeds £1m.

1.4 Appendix 2 provides the projected final outturn for Education and Children’s Services for the year 2019-2020.

2.0 Issues and Options

2.1 Key Issues / Risks

2.2 Major Projects

Appendix 1 provides a summary of the projected outturn for the major projects and programmes within the Education and Children’s Services Capital Plan. Madras College is progressing well on site and is showing advancement of £0.283m which reflects this progress. This project will be closely monitored over the Autumn/Winter period as weather conditions can have a major impact on capital spend projections.

2.3 Early Learning and Childcare (ELC) has over 50 projects within the programme and the programme is 33% complete. This theme is still on programme although there is slippage of £0.598m on two projects, however, the project teams are confident that these projects will still meet the August 2020 delivery date.

2.4 Potential Risks and Actions

2.5 ELC (1140 hrs) programme

The Early Learning and Childcare theme is funded via a specific capital grant from the Scottish Government. This is a significant area of investment and there are a number of projects being progressed in order to meet the commitment for ELC expansion. Careful monitoring and review of these projects will be required to manage within the funding available, with projects being reviewed and the scope amended where appropriate. This will include reviewing the cost metrics, utilised by the Scottish Government in the budget allocation, against tendered costs. Any resultant shortfall in funding in this area will require to be met from the Education rolling programmes within the E&CS Capital Plan or by reviewing the operating models for individual ELC settings (which may have an impact on the choice of provision available).

2.7 Financial Performance – 2019-2020 projected spend

2.8 Appendix 2 details the projected outturn for 2019-2020 against the main projects and Investment Themes.
The projects across the investment themes are projecting an overall slippage of £1.507m. The Early Learning and Childcare theme is showing slippage of £0.598m which is due to delays on projects at Pitteuchar East Nursery, Southwood Nursery and the new provision to Carnegie Leisure Centre.

The Primary School Development theme has slippage of £0.399m. This relates to re-scheduling of work in line with proposed housing developments. Projects will be addressed in future years.

Education Rolling programme currently has slippage of £0.583m which relates to minor delays across a variety of projects within the school estate. Where possible other projects will be advanced to offset this slippage in the current year.

### 3.0 Conclusions

3.1 The projected outturn position for the capital programme for Education and Children’s Services Directorate is currently £33.562m. A slippage of £1.324m is projected, where possible other projects will be advanced to offset this slippage in the current year.

3.2 The management of capital resources require us to look across financial years, as well as within individual years. The current year performance is only a snapshot of the existing plan and the Directorate will adjust expenditure levels within future years of the plan to accommodate the advancement of projects.
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## APPENDIX 1

### CAPITAL PROJECTS TOTAL COST MONITOR 2019-29 TO 31 AUGUST 2019

#### EDUCATION & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL PROJECT</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>ACTUAL SPEND TO DATE £m</th>
<th>CURRENT &amp; FUTURE YEARS PROJECTION £m</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECTED OUTTURN £m</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECTED BUDGET £m</th>
<th>VARIANCE £m</th>
<th>VARIANCE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madras College</td>
<td>E&amp;CS</td>
<td>5.692</td>
<td>44.477</td>
<td>50.169</td>
<td>50.170</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Childcare</td>
<td>E&amp;CS</td>
<td>6.535</td>
<td>22.199</td>
<td>28.734</td>
<td>28.734</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Development</td>
<td>E&amp;CS</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>88.042</td>
<td>88.042</td>
<td>88.042</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimbleton Home Reprovision</td>
<td>E&amp;CS</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Education &amp; Children's Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12.646</strong></td>
<td><strong>155.693</strong></td>
<td><strong>168.339</strong></td>
<td><strong>168.339</strong></td>
<td><strong>(0.000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.000%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capital Plan 2019-20 Forecast Expenditure

### Appendix 2

**Education & Children’s Services Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Project</th>
<th>Current Budget 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Outturn 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Variance £m</th>
<th>Outturn As A % of Plan</th>
<th>2020-29 Approved Capital Plan £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Fife’s Future</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras College New Build</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>12.283</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
<td>32.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras College Refurbishment Works</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Secondary School Auchmuty</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Secondary School Viewforth</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Glenrothes-Glenwood</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools West Fife</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Fife’s Future</strong></td>
<td>12.219</td>
<td>12.414</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>101.6%</td>
<td>193.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investment Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Current Budget 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Outturn 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Variance £m</th>
<th>Outturn As A % of Plan</th>
<th>2020-29 Approved Capital Plan £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICT Programme</strong></td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>105.0%</td>
<td>9.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning and Childcare</td>
<td>12.242</td>
<td>11.644</td>
<td>(0.598)</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>9.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurseries and Primaries Pressures</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>2.504</td>
<td>(0.072)</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Development</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>(0.399)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>87.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Rolling Programme</td>
<td>3.964</td>
<td>3.426</td>
<td>(0.538)</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>38.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Refurbishment</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment Themes</strong></td>
<td>21.572</td>
<td>20.065</td>
<td>(1.507)</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>148.614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Children’s Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current Budget 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Outturn 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Variance £m</th>
<th>Outturn As A % of Plan</th>
<th>2020-29 Approved Capital Plan £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Looked After Children Homes Reprovision</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked After Children</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>1.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Children’s Services</strong></td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>1.899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Education & Children’s Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education &amp; Children’s Services</th>
<th>Current Budget 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Outturn 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Variance £m</th>
<th>Outturn As A % of Plan</th>
<th>2020-29 Approved Capital Plan £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Education &amp; Children’s Services</strong></td>
<td>34.886</td>
<td>33.562</td>
<td>(1.324)</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>343.703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education &amp; Children’s Services</th>
<th>Current Budget 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Outturn 19-20 £m</th>
<th>Projected Variance £m</th>
<th>Outturn As A % of Plan</th>
<th>2020-29 Approved Capital Plan £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Capital Grants</td>
<td>(10.200)</td>
<td>(10.200)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>(7.100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants &amp; Contributions</td>
<td>(2.266)</td>
<td>(2.266)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>(120.164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Receipts</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education &amp; Children’s Services</strong></td>
<td>(12.466)</td>
<td>(12.466)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>(127.264)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11 February 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Service(s)</th>
<th>Contact(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Planning</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Shelagh McLean</td>
<td>Moved from October 2019 meeting at request of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anytime Anywhere Learning</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Brian Scott</td>
<td>Deferred from October 2019 at request of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Outcomes</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Maria Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the 15-24 Learner Journey</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Maria Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Social Work Officer Report</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Kathy Henwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Children's Services Directorate - Revenue budget 2019/20 Projected Outturn</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services; Finance and Corporate Services</td>
<td>Alison Binnie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Children's Services Directorate Capital Investment Plan 2019/20 Projected Outturn</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services; Finance and Corporate Services</td>
<td>Alison Binnie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Families Social Work Strategy Update</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Kathy Henwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Children's Services Committee Work Programme 2020</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Carrie Lindsay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 31 March 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Service(s)</th>
<th>Contact(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Phase Outcomes</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Maria Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Equity fund</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Sarah Else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection Inspection</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Kathy Henwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Voluntary Organisations</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Kathy Henwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Children's Services Committee Work Programme 2020</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Carrie Lindsay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 May 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contact(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services Inspection</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Kathy Henwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of School Day Update and Anti Poverty Plan</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Sarah Else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Children's Services Committee Work Programme 2020</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Carrie Lindsay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>01 September 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Children's Services Committee Work Programme 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>03 November 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Children's Services Committee Work Programme 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unallocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunfermline North Catchment Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Uplift in Payments to Foster Carers 2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the Walked Routes to Schools - Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Title
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Service(s)</th>
<th>Contact(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Equity Fund (PEF)</td>
<td>Education and Children's Services</td>
<td>Sarah Else</td>
<td>Agreed with Convener in June 2019 that full report would go to Committee in August/September.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>