

Evaluating *Options for Change*

1 Evaluation Framework

The Evaluation Framework was endorsed as a robust process by the Council's Children and Families Scrutiny Committee at its meeting of 7 September.

An Evaluation Panel, chaired by Head of Strategy, Planning and Performance and including representatives of the Cheshire East Admissions Forum and Officers of Cheshire East Council was established to apply the agreed framework. This group met on four occasions.

The framework includes key criteria that must be met for an option to be recommended to the Council's Cabinet Member (Portfolio Holder) for formal consultation and has been applied to all options (Appendix 2) received during informal consultation. The fundamental criteria included in the framework are:

- Improved Outcomes for Children – Attainment and Achievement
- Addresses Surplus Places
- Affordability
- Deliverability
- Sustainability

The overriding requirement in this evaluation process is for any preferred option to deliver improved attainment, achievement and outcomes for children and young people and to do so an option has to meet all the additional criteria.

2 Key Questions

In order to evaluate these criteria a number of key questions were framed:

Will the proposal improve attainment and achievement?

There are several factors which went into answering this question. In essence this was an evaluation by the panel of which option had the greatest potential and ability to deliver a combination of choice, improvement, attainment and achievement. The sustainability of achievement and attainment was also considered.

Will the proposal remove sufficient surplus places?

There are surplus places across the town and the majority of these are mainly at Macclesfield High School, resulting in an unsustainable future budget profile. Proposals which did not immediately address this were not evaluated any further.

Does the proposal require additional capital and revenue resources, which are not currently available?

Any proposal that is dependant upon capital or significant revenue funds or support from the local authority makes it unaffordable. Any proposal which did not best utilise the facilities at the High School to reflect the significant capital investment would not be scored highly.

Is the proposal deliverable and is likely to have the support of key stakeholders, including children, families and governing bodies?

There are several factors which go into answering this question. For the proposal to proceed it has to be legal and deliverable by the Local Authority. An unpopular option without total support of governing bodies or other key stakeholders will not be deliverable. A focal point for unpopularity was centred on pupil movements and transport and infrastructure implications.

Can the proposal be rapidly implemented and remain sustainable in the long term?

The current situation has created instability and negatively impacted in several areas. Given the continuing pressure on the High School and need to quickly reverse the position a prompt but sustainable solution is required. Proposals must avoid creating, as far as possible, any future instability in the other High Schools within Macclesfield. Options which delivered significant and sustainable support were viewed more favourably.

The Evaluation Framework is show overleaf.

3 Evaluation Framework

Stage	Criteria	Key Question	Commentary	Assumptions/Definitions
1	Addresses surplus places	Does the proposed option reduce surplus places to an acceptable level?	The removal of surplus places is a requirement. Failure to do so has a direct and negative impact on school budgets.	Must reduce surplus places. Must contribute to a whole town solution.
2	Affordable (Capital)	Are all transition and implementation costs affordable?	Current financial climate is severely limiting with limited opportunities to access capital funding Capital funding for 2011-2012 will be significantly reduced.	For an option to meet this criterion, it must: a) require no Capital investment* or, require limited capital investment (<£1m) for reasonable and minor modifications to existing accommodation**. *For the purpose of this top line stage in the evaluation process, for an option to satisfy this criterion it must include the utilisation of existing accommodation; the asset must be sufficient to meet current and projected capacity. **Conditional on the release of Government funding.
3	Deliverable	Is the proposed option achievable within existing frameworks? Does the option have the necessary support from key stakeholders to enable it to be enacted? Can the option be achieved within the required timescales?	Proposals are subject to legal/statutory frameworks. Options that require significant movement and/or displacement of children or young people are likely to be highly unpopular	Compliant with all legal/statutory requirements. Proposer (LA/DfE) has the authority to deliver. Use of school transport budget as proxy indicator of pupil disturbance. Initial implementation preferable by September 2011

Stage	Criteria	Key Question	Commentary	Assumptions/Definitions
4	Sustainable	<p>Is the proposed option viable within existing and future school budgets without the requirement for additional external funding?</p> <p>Is the proposed option capable of delivering an appropriate curriculum offer?</p> <p>Will the preferred option deliver a long term solution which is unlikely to be revisited in the near future?</p>	<p>The LA is not in a position to provide additional funding</p> <p>The preferred solution must be able to deliver the full curriculum offer either individually or through robust partnerships</p>	<p>Financial modelling indicated medium term viability of school budget</p> <p>Pupil numbers sufficient to deliver appropriate curriculum /or partnership arrangements to ensure curriculum offer.</p> <p>Cost per pupil indicators sustainable for the foreseeable future based on current data including pupil forecasting to 2017.</p> <p>Assumes no secondary school with a capacity below 600 places (Y7-11)</p>
Options that have satisfied all of the preceding four criteria will be evaluated against the following final and most fundamental criterion of improving attainment and achievement and delivering better outcomes for children and young people.				
5	Improves achievement and attainment	<p>Will the preferred option deliver a solution that will promote and deliver improved achievement and attainment and better outcomes for children and young people?</p> <p>Does the proposed solution provide significant external support?</p>	<p>All options have the potential to deliver improved standards of achievement and attainment. However, significant external support considerably improves the likelihood of this being achieved.</p> <p>An option which can be expected to deliver significant external support scores a 1. An option which improves achievement and attainment but does not deliver significant external or equivalent support scores a 2.</p>	Should all other criteria be met , does the proposed option have a greater probability of delivering improved achievement and attainment based on previous experience and evidence?

4 Options Appraisal

The informal public consultation which commenced in June generated a number of options in addition to those originally proposed.

In broad terms the proposals fell into three categories:

Those that sought to close Macclesfield High and redistribute pupils to other schools.

These would result in significant disruption to pupil learning and would result in large scale transit of pupils with consequent disruption to families, associated health and safety issues and impact on carbon reduction targets. In general, many of these options did not satisfy either the surplus places or affordability criteria and did not result in a 'best use' of the high quality asset and continued provision on the Macclesfield High site. The redistribution of pupils would also necessitate further capital investment in other schools which is not available.

Those options that sought to maintain Macclesfield High as a viable school without the benefit of external support, albeit with a smaller net capacity.

A number of such options proposed that the Planned Admission Numbers (PAN) at some or all other Macclesfield school should be reduced. This is not recommended as it runs contrary to principles of parental choice. The panel concluded that all the evidence points to the fact that without significant external support and expertise, the rapid improvement in performance required to improve the popularity and make the Macclesfield High School sustainable would not be achieved. In general, most of these options did not satisfy either the deliverability or sustainability criteria.

Those options that sought to close Macclesfield High and replace it with a new entity, either as an Academy or Hard Federation with another school.

The panel concluded that these options were the most likely to succeed, in that they ensured continuity of learning provision on the Macclesfield High site, provided the required significant additional expertise, and allowed the school to make a 'fresh start' with all the attendant positive publicity this would attract. The evaluation panel concluded that an Academy model was more secure and preferable to a Federation model. The panel also concluded in order to differentiate between options that might satisfy all criteria an evaluation of the likelihood, capacity and expertise to enhance and develop Achievement and Attainment should be made.

The panel evaluated the ability of each option to deliver a long term solution which has the most likely chance of delivering improvement in attainment and achievement and therefore delivering the fundamental criterion of better outcomes for children and young people, whilst also addressing the key issue of surplus school places at Macclesfield High School. The Panel recommended that Option 2 - the replacement of this school with an Academy sponsored by a partner able to provide the necessary improvements at Macclesfield High will

provide a more secure, long term arrangement with a higher likelihood of success for delivering improvements in achievement and attainment .

5 Local School Proposals

From the time of the original discussions in early 2010 and when the original single proposal was recommended in June 2010; which had the support of the four secondary headteachers and the Principal of Macclesfield College and subsequently, of the Local Authority and governing bodies of Macclesfield and Tytherington High schools, the local and national context changed significantly. This change shaped a set of evaluation criteria which were different from those made when the original proposals were endorsed by the Authority. The most significant change was under the 'Affordability' criteria in response to changes in the financial climate.

6 Original Proposal

- 6.1 The original option (known as Option A) was: Macclesfield High School (MHS) should close and that Tytherington High School (THS) should expand across the site of the existing school and that of THS incorporating the pupils on roll of MHS into the expanded school. The expanded THS would then deliver 11-18 provision across the two sites but deliver one 6th Form.

Tytherington High School had a number of preconditions which included:

- Significant capital investment was required. An earlier feasibility study indicated that between £10m and £15m was required and this should be made up of a school/local authority bid to central government for matched funding to rationalise and improve the THS site¹.
- There was a significant revenue support programme to cover transition elements from the local authority.
- The Admissions policy for all Macclesfield High Schools should be examined and referred to the Cheshire East Admissions Forum².

- 6.2 After evaluation using the new criteria, the original proposal (Option A) was rejected. Firstly, not all the conditions could be delivered by the Local Authority. Secondly, with the changed national and local context the 'Affordability' and 'Deliverability' criteria could not be satisfied because of the transport and change implications of the 'two site' proposal. The success of any proposal also required it to be deliverable and have a level of support within the Community. The feedback from the informal consultation period did not suggest this proposal had the significant support of the Community. There was a very high proportion of objection from Tytherington High School community and little positive support from the Macclesfield High School community.

¹ THS has separately been awarded a capital grant by the local authority based on its condition and is not linked to this precondition. The exact scheme will be confirmed once the outcome of this review has been concluded.

² After consideration the Local Authority referred Fallibroome's admissions policy to the Schools Adjudicator. The outcome of this is described in Appendix 1

7 Further Proposals

7.1 Discussions with **Fallibroome Academy** covered a number of matters and concluded with a proposal to develop a 'Two-Academy' structure under the overall governance of Fallibroome Academy Trust. As an outstanding school with Academy status this option fell in the preferred structural category of the evaluation panel. The proposal came with a number of preconditions and features:

- The intention is to establish several 'centres' of specialist provision at the Macclesfield High School site for the benefit of both institutions which might feature a pastoral support centre, staff development centre and IT centre.
- The school required total control of the 6th Form element at Macclesfield High School known as LZ6. Fallibroome 6th Form students would be taught from the LZ6 building as well as from the Fallibroome site. After further discussion this position was modified and Fallibroome would seek to negotiate use of the building owned by the College. The Fallibroome post-16 dress code would apply to all members of the 6th form.
- The school could not inherit a budget deficit and would require the Local Authority to explore this with the DfE in discussions over sponsorship and arrival at the funding arrangement with the new school
- The school want a transition grant and support from the Local Authority.
- The achievement of a PAN of 150 may affect the number on roll of other Macclesfield schools and would require the recruitment of pupils who currently choose secondary provision outside Macclesfield.
- The school want to explore all options regarding the recruitment of staff to the new Academy and would not necessarily commit to a TUPE transfer.
- The Fallibroome Academy Trust Board of Governors reserve the right to amend or abort these proposals following the completion of a due diligence exercise.
- Further advice on the potential for a DfE grant is pending

7.2 Discussions with **Macclesfield College of Further Education** (the College), covered a number of matters and concluded with a proposal to develop a new Academy with the college as principal sponsor. As an outstanding College, the Department of Education has confirmed that it can, like outstanding schools, be a principal sponsor. This option fell in the preferred structural category of the evaluation panel and was like the Fallibroome Academy proposal, a variant of the original Option 2. The proposal came with a number of preconditions and features:

- The Macclesfield High School would close and a new 11-16 Academy would immediately open on the site with the College as sponsor and deliverer of the current post 16 provision on the site.
- The post 16 provision would be maintained and developed and include the A Level offer of the Macclesfield High School.
- Macclesfield College is an Associate College of Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU). The University strongly welcome the creation of an Academy and would provide additional expertise from their Institute of Education to ensure that high academic standards are achieved.
- The college would seek the support of a 'blue chip' company as an associate to this option.
- The College would want to further develop the Learning Zone as a focal point for other diverse community activity and access to facilities.
- The College are keen to expand their provision into vocational performing arts and construction options to reduce leakage out of the Authority.
- The College do not want to inherit a budget deficit and would ask the LA to explore this with the DfE in discussions over sponsorship and arrival at the funding arrangement with the new school
- The College would want to market and manage the site with one unified ethos and vision and would deliver the operation for the whole site with a well developed HR, Financial and site management teams.
- The College would want to enhance its positive record of working closely with Learners with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (LLDD) and strengthen the good links with Park Lane School involvement and being fully inclusive within the 11-16 school.

8 Conclusions

8.1 The panel concluded that the options most likely to meet the criteria were ones which centred on the opening of an Academy on the same site as the Macclesfield High School for September 2011. Of the original options therefore, Option 2 was the closest. During the informal consultation period a further three options came forward which basically satisfied the criteria to a greater or lesser degree. These were Options 33, 35 and 38:

- Option 2 - To establish a Macclesfield Academy involving Macclesfield High School and another local high school. (Option B)
- Option 33 - Hard Federation with another school, reduction in capacity at Macclesfield High School.

- Option 35 - Close Macclesfield High School. In partnership with Macclesfield College open a new 11-16 high school (with a reduced capacity) within the old Macclesfield High School buildings in September 2011. Macclesfield College appoints a Head teacher. Fully integrate the Macclesfield High School 6th form in to the LZ6. Macclesfield College Corporation would appropriate governance arrangements within the Academy arrangements.
- Option 38 - Merge Tytherington High School & Macclesfield High School as one split-site school. Teach age 11-16 cohorts on each site. Remove the Sixth form provision at the Tytherington site, with a shared 6th form at the Macclesfield High Site.

Whilst Options 33, 35 and 38 satisfied the criteria they were not scored as highly as Options 2, 39 or 40 because an Academy model was more secure and preferable to a Federation model.

8.2 As variants of Option 2, Options 39 and 40 went forward for further consideration.

Option 39 was rejected because of the preconditions and the inability of the Authority to underwrite and commit to transitional revenue support. The ownership of the LZ6 resource by the College was also a significant aspect. The Authority in its discussions with parties assessed the likelihood of a negotiated agreement between the College and Fallibroome for access in the way that Fallibroome described in their vision of the 6th Form, as low. This would also potentially result in damaging competition between the two current 6th Form providers on the single site.

9 Recommended Option

Option 40 therefore satisfied each of the Fundamental Criteria and in the opinion of the Evaluation Panel, was the most logical and had the greatest potential to deliver further improvement in Achievement and Attainment for children and young people. The explicit and enthusiastic support of Manchester Metropolitan University and the Colleges links to Industry and the further commitment to develop the Learning Zone as a focal point for other community activity were also significant elements. The College had already secured the backing of their Corporation and the equivalent dialogue from discussions with the Authority was not evident from Fallibroome. The timescales to deliver this option by September 2011 are very tight and the Authority felt that the College was better positioned to deliver this in time and to the high standard required.

This table must be read in conjunction with the Council's '**Evaluation Framework**', which explains the assumptions made and defines the criteria used to evaluate each option at the pre-statutory stage of the school re-organisation process.

No	Options	Notes	Removes Surplus Places	Affordable	Deliverable	Sustainable	Commentary	Improves Attainment and Achievement (Ranking: 1 = Strongest)
1	Closure of Macclesfield High School and Expansion of Tytherington High School. (Option A)				X		Dispersal of pupils across two sites	N/A
2	To establish a Macclesfield Academy involving Macclesfield High School and another local high school. (Option B)	<i>Assumes continuing 6th Form offer for MHS students</i>						Ranking: 1 - Provides secure, long term arrangement with high likelihood of improvement in A and A
3	No change (Option C)		X				Does not remove surplus	N/A
4	The establishment of a single Trust working across the high schools in Macclesfield. (Option D)		X				Does not remove surplus	N/A

5	Creation of a 3-19 all-through school, integrating a local primary school on the Macclesfield High School site. (Option E)			X			Requires capital investment to remodel primary requirements	N/A
6	Re-launch of Macclesfield High School as a Specialist Vocational/'Technical' School (Option F)	<i>Presumed reduction in pupil numbers</i>		X			Requires capital investment to remodel vocational/ technical requirements	N/A
7	Closure of Macclesfield High School and redistribution of pupils across the remaining secondary schools. (Option G)				X		Removes provision on MHS site and requires relocation of pupils	N/A
8	Use of Macclesfield High School site for Post 16 provision for the whole town (Option H)				X		Removes provision on MHS site and requires relocation of pupils	N/A
9	Current Macclesfield high schools each lose one form entry to Macclesfield High School. (Option I)				X		Would not be supported by all schools. Does not address MHS issues	N/A

10	<p>The expansion of Tytherington High School and closure of Macclesfield High School. Tytherington High School to comprise: a) Tytherington High School North (Manchester Road) and b) Tytherington High School South (Park Lane). Each site teaches years 7 to 11 to those children in their catchment areas. (Tytherington High School South pupils will not attend the north site and visa versa). The 6th form college would only exist on Tytherington High School South site. Taking away 6th form students from the Tytherington High School North site would increase the total number of pupils at the Tytherington High School South site.</p>				X		Requires substantial pupil movement	N/A
----	--	--	--	--	---	--	-------------------------------------	-----

11	<p>Tytherington High School and Macclesfield High School form a hard federation with one governing body having full financial control of sites, benefiting from economies of shared resources, shared specialist facilities, shared teaching staff. Positive marketing and public relations of Macclesfield High School. Separate shared sixth form between Tytherington High School and Macclesfield High School, to be located at LZ6. Subject to securing capital investment on Tytherington High School site for its 7 - 11 students.</p>	<i>Presumed reduction in pupil numbers at MHS</i>	X				Does not remove surplus	N/A
12	<p>Macclesfield High School closure. Part/Full Macclesfield High School site to be used for Cheshire East Special Educational Needs Provision for Secondary SEN and Autistic Spectrum Condition. Additional surplus space (capacity) could also be allocated for the use of Park Lane Special School. Students of the High School should be divided between the 3 remaining high schools could be managed in two years time,</p>				X		Removes provision on MHS site and requires relocation of pupils	N/A

13	Put a cap on entry into Macclesfield High School (i.e. propose closure: phasing out all existing year groups) and run the school from Tytherington High School to ensure access to curriculum. Allow the other three High Schools to increase their intake by one form, empty Macclesfield High School building to be used for Special Education Need provision. If Tytherington High School needs capital investment on the site then they should receive it regardless.			X			Requires capital expenditure at other school	N/A
14	Consider a public/private partnership federation (possibly with King's school) using the Tytherington High School campus, transferring pupils from Macclesfield High School to Tytherington High School/Kings.				X		Removes provision on MHS site and requires relocation of pupils	N/A

15	A single 6th form located on the LZ6 campus but in an effort to offer greater flexibility at post 16 education, the college undertakes a feasibility study to the opening of a Construction/Tradesmen type training college offering City & Guilds level training and qualification in Brick laying, Electrical, Carpentry/Joiners, Painting and Decorating, Plumbers etc making it a Cheshire centre of excellence for the building trade and associated companies.	<i>Presumed increase in pupil numbers at other sites</i>		X			Requires capital expenditure at other school	N/A
16	Macclesfield College acquires Macclesfield High School surplus accommodation for greater provision of Technology & Science Specialism	<i>Not an option - suggestion for re-use of building</i>						N/A
17	Integration of the town's sixth forms together on one site.				X		Would not be supported by schools	N/A
18	Macclesfield High School problems to be fixed at Macclesfield High School. Mothball redundant classrooms; reduce staffing numbers to suit the expected pupil intake.		X				Does not remove surplus places	N/A

19	Make Macclesfield High School attractive with new management and a new core focus.		X				Does not remove surplus places	N/A
20	Appoint a 'Super-Head'. Financial 'incentives and rewards' for a successful head from a neighbouring high school. They will adopt the role of 'super head' to set up and guide a new leader/management team to run the schools to raise their standards.		X				Does not remove surplus places	N/A
21	Use the state of the art purpose built premises of Macclesfield High School as the main school in Macclesfield to accept new form entries from the other schools.		X				Does not remove surplus places	N/A
22	Close Tytherington High School and with high quality leadership make Macclesfield High School the best school in the Cheshire East.				X		Removes provision on THS site and requires relocation of pupils	N/A
23	Demolish Tytherington High School and send pupils to Poynton High School and to Macclesfield High School				X		Removes provision on THS site and requires relocation of pupils	N/A

24	Close Macclesfield High School and expand Fallibroome High School and All Hallows Catholic College				X		Removes provision on MHS site and requires relocation of pupils	N/A
25	Create a "super" primary school out of the Macclesfield High School.				X		Removes provision on MHS site and requires relocation of pupils	N/A
26	A school specialising in Science and Technology would be an asset to Macclesfield - Ground breaking educational (vocational diploma) course at the new Macclesfield Technical High School.	See option 6						N/A
27	Close Macclesfield High School. Create a Free school under group/parent leadership on the Macclesfield High School site.	See option 2						N/A
28	Close MHS. Establish a University Technical College on the site of the MHS.				X		Would not be supported by schools. Requires pupil movement	N/A

29	Fallibroome High School federation with Macclesfield High School. Macclesfield High School ceases to be foundation school and would federate with Fallibroome Academy specialising in vocational learning and Visual/Media arts. Governance would become the responsibility of Fallibroome Academy Trust under direction of an executive Head with Heads of school on each site.	See option 33						N/A
30	Reduce Macclesfield High School accommodation to meet current capacity. Expand the Park Lane Special School to include the surplus accommodation relinquished following the reduction. Locate Secondary aged pupils from Park Lane Special School in the 'shared' site building, leaving Park Lane Special School to expand their capacity for infant and primary aged pupils.			X			Requires capital expenditure to remodel to special school	N/A
31	Close Macclesfield High School and open an Academy with a reduced capacity.	See option 2						N/A

32	With another school, open an Academy with a reduced capacity – on the Macclesfield High School site.	See <i>option 3</i>						N/A
33	Hard Federation with another school, reduction in capacity at Macclesfield High School.							Ranking 2 - Does not provide security of arrangement and long term relationship. Good potential to improve A and A
34	Macclesfield High School to remain open. Appoint an outstanding management team. Address surplus places by LA objecting to Fallibroome Academy Admission arrangements re: PAN, thus reducing its intake to 7FE (from 8FE).		X				Does not remove surplus places	N/A

35	Close Macclesfield High School. In partnership with Macclesfield College open a new 11-16 high school (with a reduced capacity) within the old Macclesfield High School buildings in September 2011. Macclesfield College appoints a Head teacher. Fully integrate the Macclesfield High School Sixthform in to the LZ6. Macclesfield College Corporation would become the Governing Body of the new school.							Ranking: 2 - Does not provide security of arrangement and long term relationship. Good potential to improve A and A
36	Carry out a merger / arrangement with All Hallows which is acceptable in legal terms within the Macclesfield High School catchment Area (following a review of Macclesfield catchment areas)				X		Limits provision for non-faith pupils	N/A
37	Create a Centre of Excellence for Teachers – to create an environment where both teachers and students reach the highest possible standards. Single contact centre for health and educational professionals ie speech & language, OT, etc... Also a training centre for teachers from mainstream schools.	Not an option - suggestion for re-use of building						N/A

38	Merge Tytherington High School & Macclesfield High School as one split-site school. Teach age 11-16 cohorts on each site. Remove the 6th form provision at the Tytherington site, with a shared 6th form at the Macclesfield High Site.	<i>Presumes reduction in places and reuse of accommodation for 6th form</i>						Ranking: 2 - Does not provide security of arrangement and long term relationship Has the potential to improve A and A
39	'Two-Academy' model with Fallibroome Academy having overall governance control and developing a number of specialist centres for pastoral support, staff development and IT. Split Fallibroome 6th Form between the THS and MHS sites.				X		Preconditions are not deliverable	N/A
40	Macclesfield College of Further Education as main sponsor creating a new 11-16 Academy with the College delivering all post 16 provision and maintaining present A level offer with Manchester Metropolitan University Institute of Education as a provider of expertise to ensure high academic standards.						This is the preferred option of the Evaluation Panel	Ranking: 1 - Provides secure, long term arrangement with high likelihood of improvement in Achievement and Attainment and A