

# WARDS AFFECTED All Wards

# FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS: Education and Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee Cabinet

9 June 2005 13 June 2005

#### A City Academy to Replace New College

#### Report of the Service Director (Policy & Resources)

#### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 At its meeting on 4 April 2005, Cabinet agreed to be a co-signatory for an Expression of Interest to be submitted to the DfES for an Academy to replace New College. (This report is attached.)
- 1.2 At that time a position on the sponsors had not been secured. Members are now asked to agree to sign the Expression of Interest with New College governors (Interim Executive Board) and the named Sponsors the Church of England and David Samworth.
- 1.3 Members have been concerned to ensure that there is full consultation on the proposal. Members are asked to advise whether they would wish a consultation to take place before agreeing to sign an Expression of Interest, or to receive the consultation that has to be carried out during the feasibility stage as a basis for giving its final support for an Academy. If government accepts the Expression of Interest, the funding for the feasibility study (up to £500, 000), including the consultation stages, would be awarded to the potential sponsors. Therefore, by accepting the Church of England and David Samworth as the named sponsors, Members would effectively be supporting now an academy run with a Christian ethos. In practice, there would be limited opportunity for participants in any consultation to influence the ethos of the academy.
- 1.4 Members need to be aware that the sponsors and the DfES are pressing for an urgent decision. As a result, there is a risk that this opportunity will be lost if it is not supported at this time. The Academy would bring significant capital investment into the City, up to £20 million, and would enable the standards agenda to be addressed in a new environment. If the Academy is not supported, the City Council would need to make a case for a Additional BSF

1

capital at the annual Strategic Business Case (SBC) review meeting. There is no guarantee that this would be approved. If not this would impact on other schools if members wished to invest in New College.

- 1.5 Members are also asked to support the proposal that this should be a Sports Academy. This would involve providing some places for students with identified high sporting potential. The Sponsors have also indicated that they may consider an appropriate second specialism in due course.
- 1.6 The Sponsors are also asking whether 33 acres, as currently proposed, is sufficient provision for a specialist Sports Academy. There is currently surplus land including land held by the LEA for use by other schools. Any requirement to provide additional space would be negotiated during the feasibility period. Any agreement to be co-signatory is without prejudice to our position on this matter.

### 2. Summary

See above.

#### 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Education and Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee is asked to give its views on the recommendations for consideration by Cabinet.
- 3.2 Cabinet is asked to:
  - (a) consider whether it wishes to agree to be a co-signatory with the Church of England and David Samworth and the New College Interim Executive Board for the Expression of Interest for an Academy to replace New College.
    - (b) note the issues raised about:
      - Consultation and prior commitment to a school with a Christian ethos set out in Paragraph 1.3.
      - The specialism and selection as set out in paragraph 1.5.
      - sufficient playing fields as set out in paragraph 1.6.

#### 4. Headline Financial and Legal Implications

4.1 These are as reported previously in the attached report.

#### 5. Consultation

5.1 None.

#### 6. Report Author/Officer to contact:

6.1 Adrian Paterson Service Director (Policy & Resources) Ext: 7702

## **DECISION STATUS**

Key Decision	Yes
Reason	Significant in its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards
Appeared in Forward Plan	No
Executive or Council Decision	Executive (Cabinet)