

Hales, Laura

From: Dave & Hanne Miller [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 August 2009 01:07
To: Competition, EastCoves
Cc: Mazillius, Roger
Subject: New Primary School at East Coves - representation

Dear Mr Moffat,

With respect to the competition to run the proposed new Primary School at East Coves the following representation is made.

Issues that are considered to be important, and requiring detailed assessment by appropriately qualified and experienced professionals are:

- Whether the bidders have an appropriate low risk business model and support structure to pursue improvement in educational results and other Every Child Matters outcomes.
- Whether the Ethos and Management Style, via the governing body, will support or alienate the professional teaching and support staffs that are the inspirational face of education to our children.

Related feedback:

1. The public awareness sessions (held in July) were not managed appropriately to allow sufficient questions to be posed. Additional sessions that were cited did not materialise. Notes from the session were not emailed to all attendees that left email addresses.
2. Risks arising from the proposals are considered to be inadequately mitigated, especially for the most affected cohorts in the short term.
3. The objectives of raising standards are not justified on a per-school basis, and are perceived to be unjustifiable for every school.
4. Insufficient information was provided at the consultation stage (and subsequently) to allow parents to form a considered opinion of the proposals being consulted upon. (See mandatory DCSF guide)
5. Consultation input was not all adequately represented. (See also all Public Questions - Cabinet meeting 24/11/08)
6. The change of timetable (from that agreed at the cabinet meeting in November 2008) has resulted in unacceptable inability of parents to obtain clarifications relating to the proposals, due to school holidays.
7. Within the Voluntary Aided sector, proposals are considered to be related to (and now unduly influenced by) the Christ the King College 'approved' expansion proposal of February 2009, which referred to the expectation set by the earlier decision to approve the retention of year 9 in 2009 - a decision made by the LA but which should have lawfully been made by the Schools Adjudicator, upon evaluation of information available.
8. The proposed timescale is considered unachievable, with acceptable risk, and it is noted that there is a statutory requirement for LAs to publish a composite prospectus for 2010 by 12/09/09.
9. The IW council website's statement on publishing identities '*Please note, if you object, your comments may not be taken into account in the published committee report.*' (potentially to discourage representations), is considered unjustifiable, and contrary to duties imposed (to consider representations, and personally identifiable information), and powers granted, by legislation.

I hope the above representation is constructively considered.

Regards,

24/08/2009

Dave Miller