

1 Questionnaires sent out and returned

Number of Questionnaires sent out:	Staff & Governors	86
	Parent	365
	Other Organisations	54
Number of questionnaires returned:		85
Response rate:	Staff & Governors	41%
	Parent	16%
	Other Organisations	6%

2 Who responded

Governor	13
Teaching Staff	4
Support Staff	13
Other Staff	5
Parent of Nursery child	11
Parent of Infant child	21
Parent of Junior child	28
Other Organisations	3
Total all categories	98

Please note that this total will exceed the total number of responses due to the following reasons:

Some parents have children in more than One setting, or

Some governors answer the questionnaire in more than One capacity e.g. staff member.

3 Results

Results are based on the number of questionnaires returned. Therefore, each questionnaire is counted once.

The % is the percentage of respondents who answered the question.

Each of the groups shown below had a different colour questionnaire, although the wording of the question was identical.

	Rolleston Infant & Junior Schools should:				No clear opinion	
	Become 1 all through Primary		Stay as separate schools		Number	%
	Number	%	Number	%		
Staff & Governors	14	47%	10	33%	6	20%
Parent	18	35%	23	44%	11	21%
Other Organisations	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%

Parents comments

Query	Response
Why have two different schools on the same grounds? They should become one all through primary school.	1. The Committee paper recommends an all-through Primary School.
I believe that the infants and juniors should stay separate because it is ran well enough as it is, and with juniors being a lot older not realising but there could be a lot of accidents with the infants when children get excited at play times etc.	2. There is no evidence to suggest that all-through Primary Schools experience more accidents. Both schools operate safe and secure procedures for supervision.
There is too much bullying in both schools, it will be even worse if they are joined together.	3. Bullying is not identified as a greater problem at these schools than elsewhere, and is appropriately and efficiently managed by the staff.
As a parent governor of the infants, I still feel that the school would be better off staying as two separate schools. I know that it is in the early stages of change.	4. Headteachers of Primary schools conventionally manage the needs of all ages of pupils without loss of individual attention.
A, One Headteacher - I cannot understand how he or she will have one to one time for each pupil. His or her workload will be doubled. B, There is obviously going to be a cut back on some teachers, or is there? C, Larger Classes	5. Amalgamation carries with it no presumption for staffing cuts though there will be a rationalisation of staffing responsibilities. Staff enjoy protection for a period of two years during this process.
If the amalgamation goes ahead I wish everyone concerned the best, but feel that both sides of the school are running smoothly as they are. I do understand that the intake numbers have dropped, but I like the school as it is.	6. All schools must conform to KS1 Class Size requirements and must then staff the school according to the available budget.
Its obvious if both come together as one they will be mixed together at playtime and dinner times, plus also losing the infants dinner ladies, the ones who look after them at dinner times. Also having just one Headteacher is a bad idea, as it would put too much pressure on one person to deal with too many children and complaints.	7. The staffing requirement for midday supervision levels will not need to be different if pupil numbers remain as they are. 8. See 4.
In my view I think it's a hard job with two Headteachers, what will it be like with just one?	9. See 4
I believe in leaving things alone if they are running okay.	10. The proposal does not relate to the efficiency of the schools, only to the viability.
Do not lose the individuality of 2 schools, it has worked since I was a pupil there 37 years ago, why change it?	11. See 10
My daughter is coming to the end of her time with Rolleston, having attended both schools, I think there are good and bad points about amalgamation, but I can only hope that the powers that be have the interests of the children at heart, not just the balance sheet.	12. See 10
I think it would be good for infant and juniors to become one as it is a big step for the infants, so they will know what the juniors is all about when they move up.	13. This has been stated in the consultation to be an advantage to pupils.

**Rolleston Infant and Junior Schools
– Written Questionnaire Responses**

Appendix 1 (B)

Query	Response
<p>Although my child may possibly be leaving Rolleston school next year, I don't have a clear opinion because there seems to be many for and against to the proposition for a primary school. I think disruption will be caused but this won't last forever, however, the cost, how much? Where is the money coming from? The school is already losing two teachers due to loss of funds, wouldn't it make sense to keep the teachers, rather than lose them and then spend money on 'A PRIMARY SCHOOL'. Class sizes don't need making larger.</p> <p>What will happen to the special needs unit, there is no mention of this?</p> <p>I seriously think that this decision will take a long time and although some if not the majority 'wont be too bothered' there is a number of parents who are very bothered about their [children's] education. And even though it won't affect my child in the long run, I still think that it will take a long time to sort out. I would be happy to see a good outcome for all.</p>	<p>14. Some savings will accrue from the rationalising of the Headteacher / Deputy posts, and this can be used to support development in the new school. There will be some redirection of central funds to meet the capital needs of the new school.</p> <p>15. The loss of two staff at the Junior school in December 2001 was not related to the proposal for amalgamation but is an illustration of the financial difficulties caused by a falling pupil population.</p> <p>16. See 6</p> <p>17. There is no proposal in this amalgamation process to change the provision of an MLD Unit at this site.</p> <p>18. The process matches the <u>minimum</u> legal timeframe for a change of status.</p>
<p>Has there been any further action for a bicycle shed?</p>	<p>19. This has been passed on to the Governing Body for comment.</p>
<p>There needs to be more homework.</p>	<p>20. This was not a view supported by OFSTED in the recent inspection at the Junior school</p>
<p>I have doubts about the very young children mixing with the older ones. Life can be very daunting for a four year old starting in the nursery anyway.</p>	<p>21. See 4</p>

Staff/Governors Comments

Query	Response
<p>The falling rolls mean that it is more difficult to set a balanced budget. We are dependant upon special funds which are tagged for special purposes; the amount of money left to governors' discretion is very small.</p>	<p>22. Local Management of Schools has required Governing Bodies to make financial decisions based on their judgement of need and value for money. There may be some small saving to be achieved by the amalgamation in the first instance. Later cost savings will be at the discretion of the Governing Body.</p>
<p>We have two very good schools which operate very well independently (with good liaison between the two). The prime reason for amalgamation appears to be financial and I don't feel this should be the main consideration. Amalgamation will also cause much stress to staff members and has even now begun to do so. This must affect their teaching skills.</p>	<p>23. See 10</p>
<p>Both schools are purpose built for the age ranges 4-7 and 8-11 and neither would be satisfactory to accommodate the other age range. Both schools are well maintained. A bid for money to amalgamate the 2 schools should take this into consideration. The ideal would be for an administrative block to be built between the 2 schools to link them and to accommodate offices, staff room, head teachers' room etc.</p>	<p>24. See 14</p>
<p>I am aware falling numbers on roll are a problem. However there is new housing in the area with young married couples moving in and so it can be expected that roll numbers will increase in the future – plans should allow for this.</p>	<p>25. The forecast numbers on roll will be adjusted to take account of this development when it comes on stream. Currently it is not providing additional pupil numbers.</p>
<p>Now is the time!</p>	<p>26. See 1</p>
<p>An all through primary school means changes. Staff apprehension should be put aside in the joint re-organisation for the pupils benefit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The children's development and education comes first. • There needs to be one building to cater for the needs of the children, ideally new, ideally central hall space and office. • The staff need to support each other, parents, link workers and all those who are involved in the education of the children • The children need a happy secure and well-equipped working environment. 	<p>27. See 14</p>

**Rolleston Infant and Junior Schools
– Written Questionnaire Responses**

Appendix 1 (B)

Query	Response
<p>I can see the possible financial implications of not amalgamating, but feel that finance should not be the ultimate factor. We are a happy secure staff in a happy, secure, comfortable bright building. Amalgamating would upset these factors greatly. Over the years we have accomplished a family atmosphere in our school, and are proud that our children are given the opportunity to attend a school that liaises between home and school making the transition easier, promoting happy secure children which in turn promote good learners. In a much larger school I feel staff and children would not feel as secure.</p>	<p>28. See 10</p>
<p>If the buildings were joined by a corridor, I feel the schools would still work to a certain extent very separate. Staff in both buildings wanting to stay on familiar ground, forming a split staff scenario which may not instil security throughout for the children.</p>	<p>29. Amalgamation must achieve educational advantage as well as financial improvements. The new Governing Body and Headteacher would work together to avoid separation and actively create a viable all-through Primary school. There is no evidence which supports the view that there is a loss of security for pupils in all-through settings.</p>
<p>With the way in which the teaching system changes from one year to the next, I feel that a major change like the amalgamation may unsettle all parties involved. The Infant School work in a very different way to the Junior School and it would be hard for both sides to adjust to the changes.</p>	<p>30. Creating a successful amalgamation and joint ethos will undoubtedly be a challenge for the new Governing Body, Headteacher, staff and parents working together. All parties will need to commit to this process and ensure successful outcomes for pupils.</p>
<p>I don't know the ins and outs of what would happen if we were an all-through school, so have no opinion either way.</p>	<p>31. -----</p>
<p>From a dining supervisors point of view I think it would be a good idea for the schools to amalgamate.</p>	<p>32. -----</p>
<p>The only reason I support the proposed amalgamation is on financial grounds. It is clear there is a falling number of children in the area to retain admissions and the system of finance means there will be less money for the school and some staff would have to be made redundant. There is no possible reason on education grounds as both schools have good OFSTED results. I fear this merger may result in a set back for the children's education. There is no attempt by the education authority to tackle the loss of children from the school at ten to county secondary education. There is no convenient city education for secondary schools in this area.</p>	<p>33. There is no assumption that further staffing reductions will be made as a result of the amalgamation proposal as the same number of teaching and support staff will be needed for the existing school roll.</p> <p>34. The educational reasons for amalgamation do not relate to the existing success of the schools, but to the new opportunities for supporting learning and teaching in an all-through context.</p> <p>35. The LEA is to review the impact of Secondary Reorganisation and the pattern of pupil loss to County schools.</p>

**Rolleston Infant and Junior Schools
– Written Questionnaire Responses**

Appendix 1 (B)

Query	Response
<p>The benefits of becoming an all through primary school would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuity and progression for the children both in the curriculum and personnel. • Continuity with parents because of no transition to a new school/new staff. • A shared vision/ethos, currently perceived as being very different in the separate schools by many parents. • The opportunity to be more closely involved with KS2 curriculum, and wider age range to teach. • Sharing out curriculum responsibility workload; either shared responsibility for a subject area (KS1+KS2 staff paired) or fewer subjects to be responsible for. 	<p>36. The Education Scrutiny Committee's policy acknowledges these educational and organisational objectives.</p>
<p>However, the distance between the schools would be a hindrance to unifying the staff. A physical connection between the buildings is essential and ideally new staff areas need to be established so that there is no resentment over one set of staff having to 'move in' with the other set. Prior to any date for becoming one school it would be great to have some team building exercise to unify the staff more and help us feel involved in the process. Would not like to see the infant identity get lost. The responsibility that our Y2s undertake improves their confidence and I would hate to see that alter.</p>	<p>37. See 14, 29 and 30</p>
<p>Whilst sorry to lose the 'special' atmosphere present in an infant school and the extra independence year 2 children experience by being at the top of the school, I feel amalgamation is the only way forward for the schools to remain viable. Falling rolls have impacted on the schools financially, but also developmentally. The smaller staff team has meant increased work loads for individual members of staff and the school finds it increasingly difficult to undertake new initiatives with the energy and enthusiasm necessary to make them really successful. The amalgamated school would alleviate the above.</p> <p>Other benefits would arrive from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One ethos 2. No KS1-KS2 transition 3. Professional development opportunities for staff to work across two key stages. 4. Opportunity to build and maintain effective relationships for parents throughout their child's primary life. 5. Progression and continuity in delivery/planning of the curriculum. 	<p>38. See 29 and 30</p>

**Rolleston Infant and Junior Schools
– Written Questionnaire Responses**

Appendix 1 (B)

Query	Response
<p>But, I feel most strongly that if amalgamation to be successful and schools rising profile of standards to be sustained, capital investment [will be] imperative to link the schools. Amalgamation with both schools remaining separate buildings would be in name only and will impact on the new head's ability to create an all through primary with a unified team of staff committed to establishing an effective school.</p>	<p>39. See 10 and 14</p>
<p>To make Rolleston an all through primary school I feel a few factors need to be addressed. In one way I feel it would be a very good idea. As an all through primary school the transition from KS1 to KS2 will/would be smoother. There would be continuity between both key stages which would benefit the children and parents. There would be a whole school shared ethos/vision again benefiting the children/parents. The workload for the teaching staff would be lighter (but then this could cause problems with responsibility of curriculum areas and points for pay). There would also be awareness for the teachers of each key stage and the opportunity to move into another key stage.</p> <p>For it to work I strongly believe a physical link is needed between both schools. Also to build up relationships between both members of staff and definitely a clear shared whole school vision.</p>	<p>40. See 29 and 30</p> <p>41. See 14</p>
<p>To ensure complete integration of the two schools major building work needs to be carried out. A new large staff room is a necessity, also a larger administrative area, without a major spend the schools will be a primary school in name only.</p>	<p>42. See 14</p>
<p>I have doubts about the very young children mixing with the older ones. Life can be very daunting for a four year old starting in the nursery anyway. From my own point of view, I am very happy with my place of work and would not wish for it to change.</p>	<p>43. See 3, 4 and 29</p>

Other Agencies' comments

Query	Response
It is the opinion of Leicester Education Action Zone that children's education would be better served by an all through primary due to financial viability and the potential temporary drop in attainment that can result from transition between two different schools. We believe that children's learning needs can be met better through continuity of education provided by an all through primary school.	44. See 1
I think all through primary schools are more effective allowing pupil partnership peer tutoring, a more extensive support culture. In addition delay or dips in achievement through transfer can be minimised. However I feel the school community is best placed to make this decision.	45. See 29

1 Questionnaires sent out and returned

Number of Questionnaires sent out (approx):	Staff & Governors	43
	Parent	198
	Other Organisations	45
Number of questionnaires returned:		64
Response rate:	Staff & Governors	63%
	Parent	22%
	Other Organisations	13%

2 Who responded

Governor	12
Teaching Staff	5
Support Staff	9
Other Staff	1
Parent of a child in a class in Southfields Infant School	31
Parent of a child in a class in Newry Junior School	12
Other - Parent of a preschool child living in the area	1
Other - Member of the local community	0
Other - School/Organisation	2
Other - Miscellaneous	3
Total all categories	76

Please note that this total will exceed the total number of questionnaires returned due to the following reasons:

Some parents have children in more than One setting, or

Some governors answer the questionnaire in more than One capacity e.g. staff member.

3 Results

Results are based on the number of questionnaires returned. Therefore, each questionnaire is counted once.

The % is the percentage of respondents who answered the question.

Each of the groups shown below had a different colour questionnaire, although the wording of the question was identical.

	Southfields Infant & Newry Junior Schools should:				No clear opinion	
	Become 1 all through Primary School		Stay as separate schools		Number	%
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Staff & Governors	16	67%	5	21%	3	13%
Parent	19	54%	9	26%	7	20%
Other Organisations	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%

Parents comments

Query/Comment	Response
This is a good idea.	1. The Director will recommend to the Governing Bodies to proceed with the change of status proposal.
Why make changes? The schools work well as they are and I hope that they continue to do so.	2. Neither school can remain viable into the future because of continuing falling pupil numbers and there are particular financial challenges to be faced by Southfields Infant School
My children are/have been happy and are doing well at the separate schools.	3. An all-through primary School will be committed to providing the same security and success opportunities.
Uniforms/dress code should be introduced. It would make the children feel that they belong there.	4. The Headteacher of the new all-through Primary School will have the opportunity to make recommendations to the new Governing Body on this matter.
Child didn't find it hard to adjust to transfer to Junior but would have been fine also in an all-through school.	5. Research suggests that children in all-through Primary Schools experience fewer problems as they transfer between age groups.
Will both school buildings be used or just one?	6. The proposal is to maximise provision within the existing Junior School building. There may be some opportunity for new build within a phased programme.
It would be a good idea to join the buildings, as staying in 2 separate buildings wouldn't be any different.	7. It is felt that the proposal outlined in 6 above will make for better provision and maximise savings.
If there is to be one Headteacher, I would have an opinion on who it should be.	8. The vacancy will be advertised nationally and the new Governing Body will interview all applicants who meet the person specification and persuade the selection panel that they will be the best person for the job.
If schools were joined it would be easier for parents to drop children off and collect them.	9. Parents often find that all-through Primary Schools reduces the time spent dropping off and collecting children because of the single site.
I want to be able to choose to send my child to different school for their Junior education.	10. Open enrolment legislation will continue to provide for parental preference though the Department believes that the all-through provision will be attractive to parents and reduce the need for transfer.
If schools are joined the children will be able to play together and the older ones will look after younger children.	11. Many all-through Primary Schools maximise the advantage for social care and peer group support.
If the schools are amalgamated, it may help with the problem of low numbers.	12. The new Governing Body will seek to offer provision which attracts increasing numbers of pupils and maximises sustainability.
Having an all-through school would give a 'flow' to the primary education, as there is no transfer at Junior stage. It would not interrupt the child's learning.	13. Research suggests that this is true and is a prime reason for the Department pursuing an amalgamation.
There is isolation at present. It is a definite 'them and us' attitude.	14. The new school will promote a unified approach to providing children's Primary School experience on this site and will reduce differences.

**Southfields Infant and Newry Junior Schools
– Written Questionnaire Responses**

Appendix 2 (B)

Query/Comment	Response
Uniting will mean a stronger Primary School.	15. The new all-through Primary School will strengthen curriculum and management to provide the best opportunities for local children.
Amalgamation is a better idea than an unwanted City Academy.	16. The Academy proposal is a separate issue for the Council to consider.
If they join, I would like to see the same level of communication between parents and teachers.	17. See 14 and the new school will expect to build on the good provision which already exists.
Need to ensure the long-term future of a merged school before going ahead.	18. The Department's experience in a previous City school amalgamation promotes the view that this is a viable and sustainable proposal.
I have experience of this type of merger. It put the school in a weak position as pupil numbers in the area fell, because this smaller merged school was easier to split and distribute than other schools that had not recently undergone change.	19. There is a challenge to the new Governing Body and the Headteacher to ensure that the new school is attractive to parents and sustains or increases pupil numbers.
My experience of an all-through Primary School is that it has more involvement from the parents and better facilities.	20. The new school will seek to build on the very good provision that exists.

Staff/Governors Comments

Query/Comment	Response
Only way forward for school, staff and pupils. All-through is better than closure of both schools.	21. See 1 and 2.
Disappointed that there will be very little new build and classes will be larger.	22. It is proposed that there is a phased programme to improve provision. Class sizes will not exceed the legal maximum nor be outside the range experienced by similar schools.
Happy to go along with the consensus of opinion at Southfields Infant School.	23. See 1 and 2.
Southfields is a happy and effective teaching base.	24. See 20.
Is long overdue. It will be advantageous to all children and give a more effective climate in which both sets of staff can work.	25. See 20.
Because of low numbers in both schools, we have to amalgamate to be financially sound.	26. See 1 and 2.
Amalgamation would mean less upset to children at transfer to Junior phase.	27. See 7.
I have heard that kids have to sit a test to find out who will get into the Junior School. I do not agree with this.	28. No test will be implemented for transfer from one phase to another and pupils can expect to transfer through the school.
An all-through Primary is only worth having if the basics are right. A Primary School building is the first priority, because without it the rest will not be effective or worthwhile if raising standards is the issue.	29. See 6 and 22. The new school will be part of the City's drive to raise standards.
The extended school proposals should be included as a basic requirement for the new primary School.	30. Both existing schools make good provision for out of hours learning and the new Governing Body will seek to build on this.
An appropriate working group to develop the idea is needed now.	31. A joint Working Group has been in existence for some time and is working in partnership with Department officers.
It is vital that enough time is given to planning the amalgamation in terms of communication, disruption to pupils and staff, envisaged outcome and building changes.	32. A clear timetable to September 2004 is in place and the process will be managed effectively at both LEA and school level, with a particular intention to reduce the impact of disruption to pupils' learning.
Do not want an amalgamation in name only. Putting up a new sign and maybe a corridor between the 2 schools is not the answer and will not work.	33. The proposal is in respect of a phased improvement programme for the junior building alone.
The LEA has completely ignored the comments, concerns and recommendations of the schools working party.	34. The new build proposals of last year could not proceed without central Government funding and the Department has therefore adopted a pragmatic approach to meet the urgent needs of the schools whilst gaining the best provision within available resources. The joint working group is fully integrated into all discussions about the implementation of the improvement plan.
Cramming/squashing pupils into the Junior School building is not satisfactory.	35. The initial survey of the existing Junior School indicates that adequate space and facilities are available to meet the needs of all the pupils. Implementation will ensure phased improvements on the existing provision.

**Southfields Infant and Newry Junior Schools
– Written Questionnaire Responses**

Appendix 2 (B)

Query/Comment	Response
Retaining the porta-cabin for foundation stage (up to 90) children is appalling.	36. The demountable building provides very good space for some of the Foundation Stage provision pending any new build though it is likely that KS1 children will be in the main building at the point of change of status.
I would only recommend an all-through school if it benefited the pupils. Until it does, I will not support.	37. See 2, 3, 11, 14 and 15.
A good idea especially if it brings the whole of the foundation stage under the one roof.	38. The phased programme will address this longer-term goal.
Where does this fit with the Academy?	39. See 16.
Re-jigging of accommodation is probably what we would get and is not a satisfactory resolution. We have no hope of getting a purpose built school.	40. The proposal includes an improvement and refurbishment plan which brings considerable financial input to advantage the existing Junior School building and improve overall provision. There is no central Government funding to provide a brand new purpose built school.
What happened to the proposed 'pot of money'?	41. See 34 and 40.
As numbers fall we may need to amalgamate to survive but we do deserve to have good quality up to date provision.	42. See 40.
Quality of education can only be improved for the pupils of both schools with a good learning environment, appropriate building areas and financial resources.	43. See 40.
Promises of improvements need to be honoured for the change of status to work.	44. See 40.
Moving all the pupils into one existing building will not address the needs of the school community.	45. The improvement plan is intended to increase the advantage to local families and will include an opportunity for the new school to further develop purposeful links with the community.
The new proposals do not take into account the concerns raised by the schools.	46. See 34.
The two schools are challenging enough with the 'luxury' of additional space. Take that away and these would be difficulties.	47. The advantage of additional space has a high cost implication which the individual schools can no longer sustain. Similar sized schools do manage successfully in the accommodation implied by the improvement plan for the existing junior school.
Time and energy need to be spent with the schools to look creatively. We feel excluded from all of the processes.	48. See 34.
The two schools should remain separate to continue the good work.	49. See 2.
I would not send my child to a school that has a same site building.	50. Most Primary provision in the City and the County is within a same site building.
If mobiles are put up temporarily, this would turn into permanent.	51. There is no proposal for mobile or temporary accommodation. The demountable will continue to be used within the phased programme to eventually provide permanent all-through Primary accommodation.

**Southfields Infant and Newry Junior Schools
– Written Questionnaire Responses**

Appendix 2 (B)

Query/Comment	Response
The LEA should invest further in the two separate schools, with refurbishment and replacing mobiles.	52. The Department does not see this as cost effective use of funding and higher than average costs for schools with falling roles must be addressed to ensure the most effective use of public money.
I support the proposals/feel that children would benefit from an all-through Primary School, but only on the clear understanding that proper funding is provided for the expansion of the school buildings to enable all children and staff to work in a suitable and safe environment.	53. See 6, 14, 15, 18 and 20.
Please bear in mind that if in one building, resources from KS1 school need to be accommodated.	54. The plan will address all aspects of transfer of resources to ensure the best practical levels of provision.
It would be beneficial to be able to monitor children's progress from nursery to when they leave for Secondary School.	55. Good practice expects all-through Primary Schools to track the progress and performance of pupils throughout their Primary school experience.
If the school is all based in Newry, the overcrowding would mean we would lose the calm atmosphere that we have now.	56. See 35.
It is in no-ones interest to amalgamate on the cheap. The need for extensions to one of the buildings needs to be acknowledged and properly funded if the benefits of amalgamation are to be realised.	57. See 22, 34, 35, 40, 47 and 50.

Other Agencies' comments

Query/Comment	Response
The success of the project will depend on proper investment in the project. Without this investment the education of the children will suffer and be worse than before amalgamation.	58. See 2, 6, 18, 34 and 40.
The buildings need to be suitable for different age groups. For example if KS1 pupils are to be taught in the Newry building and vice-versa.	59. See 40.
Appropriate support needs to be given to staff including training and time for the staff to work on generating the right ethos.	60. The new Governing Body and Headteacher will combine to produce a School Improvement Plan to include opportunities for staff development and ensure a unified approach to establishing the ethos and provision of the new school.
There needs to be good communication and consultation with parents and the local community.	61. The joint working group should continue to keep parents and the community informed at school level.
There needs to be appropriate support for governors and senior managers to plan. There needs to be additional leadership resources in order that the management of the two existing schools does not suffer whilst the necessary preparation for opening the new school is carried out.	62. The Department's officers have held a number of meetings with Governors and senior managers and will continue to support the process through partnership working.