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14.1 Slides used in face-to-face meetings held in Chippenham, Trowbridge and Devizes

Slide 1

Slide 2

APPROACH

- Sufficient provision
  An additional 220 places are needed of which 50 are for complex needs in the North. These should be in line with the Department for Education (DfE) requirements.

- Value for money
  We need to get the best special school buildings for our money.

- Quality
  Great design helps harness the creative energy and passions of the pupils, teachers and support staff.

- Outcomes
  Thriving pupils and staff feel a sense of ownership and belonging to their school. This helps build good relationships, inspires outstanding learning and teaching and a healthy lifestyle.
THE SITES - NORTH

- Downland
- Larkrise
- St Nicholas
- Rowdeford

Local Authority maintained

SUFFICIENT Provision

350+ Places

Wiltshire Council
Where everybody matters

Sufficient provision

- We need at least 220 new special school places in Wiltshire by 2026
  123 in the North, of which 50 will be for complex needs
- Reduce overcrowding (in line with DfE guidance)
- Impact on timeline

Larkrise
- Currently 98
- Should only have 22

St Nicholas
- Currently 81
- Should only have 21

Rowdeford
- Currently 130
- Have plenty of space for 350
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VALUE
for money for our pupils

Slide 8

Value

- Cost effective buildings
- Maximise potential for reuse of existing buildings
- Reduction in running and maintenance costs
- Reduction in management costs
- More in-county specialist provision
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£20+ MILLION

LARKRISE  ST NICHOLAS  ROWDEFORD

Two small schools for 100 pupils are £3 million more expensive than a big school for 200

Remodeling existing buildings can bring value.
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QUALITY

Creativity, Energy and Passion
Quality

- Partnerships
- Transport - time and cost (public transport links)
- Considerate Constructors Scheme
- Community Engagement
- Facilities and resources
- Medical and health support
- Co-production and support from families
- Staffing, recruitment and retention

Outcomes

- Teaching and curriculum
- Pupil voice and influence
- Outreach/engagement with other schools
- In-reach/engagement with other schools
- 14+ pathways
Larkrise and Ashton St

Neither site meets the DfE’s minimum recommended area because of the site restraints and no additional land is available to expand the school.

Sufficient
Value
Quality
Outcomes

Rowdeford School

The expansion of the school may be possible under current planning policy. It would be prudent to submit a further pre-application enquiry supported by plans showing the siting and design of the additional buildings and external areas. Detailed costings should be prepared to enable a full appraisal to be made.

Rowdeford School:
Average pupil travel times reduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current routes average journey time per passenger (minutes)</th>
<th>Proposed route averages journey time per passenger (minutes)</th>
<th>Total difference in journey times (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larkrise</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdeford</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-1388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rowdeford School:
Some children will have a longer travel time, although most will be between 1 and 9 minutes more...
Rowdeford School: 
Less students travelling over 60 minutes

As-Is
- Larkrise: 11 routes total 188 miles — 11 Students over 60 mins
- St Nicks — 13 routes total 204.3 miles — 4 Students over 60 mins
- Rowdeford — 27 routes total 629.2 miles — 30 students over 60 mins
- Combined total 51 routes total 1021.5 miles — 45 students over 60 mins

Proposed
- Combined into Rowdeford
- 59 routes: 1043.4 miles — 2 Students over 60 mins

Chippenham: Land at London Road
9.22 Acres

Abbeyfield (Chippenham: Hardens Farm No 1)
6.6 Acres

Committed as part of a PFI scheme

Good site but travel concerns
Abbeyfield: 11 students travelling over 60 minutes

As-Is
- Larkrise: 11 routes total 188 miles – 11 Students over 60 mins
- St Nicks – 13 routes total 204.3 miles – 4 Students over 60 mins
- Rowdeford – 27 routes total 629.2 miles – 30 students over 60 mins
- Combined total 51 routes total 1021.5 miles – 45 students over 60 mins

Proposed
- Combined into Abbeyfield
- 64 routes: 1344.2 miles – 11 students over 60 mins

Rowde Primary

The Planning Officer considers this site to potentially be one of the better options – however it is outside the settlement boundary and is likely to require a right turning lane.
Slide 23

Trowbridge West Ashton Manor Farm
up to 15.57 acres (6.3 hectares)

Planning consider in remote countryside, and other issues, meaning there is likely to an objection in principle.

Slide 24

Melksham: Land at Woolmore Farm, Bowerhill
SN12 6QZ School

It is considered, however, that the designation of the site as Public Open Space, the severely restricted access rights and the proximity to a Listed building are such that it is not suitable for development as a new special school.

Slide 25

Wyke Road Trowbridge

Concerns over access would limit options, alternate use for residential being proposed as part of larger scheme.
14.2 Options appraisal May 2019

Executive summary

What’s the problem we are looking at?

Wiltshire Council is considering a range of options that have been put forward during the extended pre-publication consultation to enhance provision of special schools in the North.

The Vision for Special Education in Wiltshire document sets out a bold investment in two new centres of excellence in the County, a new centre in the North and Exeter House, Salisbury, in the South.

The Council is seeking to explore and test the range of potential delivery models and how these will best secure the Council’s offer of SEND excellence.

What’s the purpose of this report?

This report provides information about the historical thinking and debate that lead to the proposal for a single site option at Rowdeford and affords a perspective and approach to consider fresh options that have come forward as part of the ongoing and now extended pre-publication consultation. This report examines 15 options for the future delivery model and the extent to which these are a best fit to meet the Council’s strategic priorities for SEND going forward.

These are:

1. Do Nothing
2. Expand Larkrise
3. Expand St Nicholas
4. Develop Ashton Street
5. Expand Rowdeford as a new school
6. Develop Abbeyfield
7. Develop Rowde primary
8. Develop Trowbridge West Ashton Manor Farm
9. Develop Melksham Land at Woolmore Farm
10. Develop Wyke Road Trowbridge
11. Develop Chippenham Magistrates Court (suggested by a parent)
12. Develop Rowdeford as a new school with primary satellite provision in Larkrise and St Nicholas (suggested by parents)
13. Expand St Nicholas and Larkrise and maintain Rowdeford school (suggested by Wiltshire SEND Action Group)
14. Expand Rowdeford, Larkrise and St Nicholas on site and with new sites, keeping separate leadership teams, but creating an overarching board with the 4 MATs
15. Expand Rowdeford as a new school with St Nicholas as a satellite as part of a phased approach

Objectives and scope

The report aims to clarify the options appraisal methodology and how applying it against the 15 options gives a score.

All options are evaluated against 4 main criteria:

1. Sufficient provision – a minimum of 220 additional places are needed of which 50 are for complex needs in the North. These should be in line with the Department for Education (DfE) requirements. The council is looking at the best way of securing 400 places in the north of Wiltshire, with the potential to expand to a further 100 places should the need arise.
2. Value for money – The Council needs to get the best special school buildings for its money and use revenue appropriately to meet need.
3. Quality - Great design helps harness the creative energy and passions of the pupils, teachers and support staff.
4. Outcomes - Thriving pupils and staff feel a sense of ownership and belonging to their school. This helps build good relationships, inspires outstanding learning and teaching and a healthy lifestyle.

All four criteria carried the same weight – 25% of the overall score. However, each option needed to “unlock” before moving to the next in sequence. So, if there was not sufficient provision then it would not be possible to proceed to review the option for value for money. The report considers the barriers and issues associated with each potential option.
Key findings/recommendations
The key findings/recommendations are as follows:

The 15 options fall broadly into single site solutions, two sites, three sites and five site solutions.

Revenue costs increase with the number of sites.

Capital costs decrease with the use of retained infrastructure as compared to full new builds.

The option that scored the highest overall (7.07 out of 10) was single site provision at Rowdeford.

Capital cost £32M
Revenue cost £10.2M

Introduction

Wiltshire Council is seeking to ensure that its delivery model for SEND is developed to provide at least 220 additional places of which 50 are for complex needs in the North. These should be in line with the Department for Education (DfE) requirements.

Drivers for change

There are a range of drivers which suggest the need for a strategic review of the Council’s position in the North. These drivers are as follows:

a. Improving the choice in provision of the right places and the development of the right organisations.

b. Sustainability and capacity building - building system excellence not just more places in the system.

c. Value for money – the desire for economy (of scale), effectiveness & efficiency. The more savings in all areas means that more of the funding that is currently spent can be redirected into teaching and learning.

d. Drive to secure better quality and services. The Council is seeking to achieve a step change in success rates and outcomes. Staffing development in addition to recruitment and retention will be integral to the system and maximising of the possibilities.

e. Higher quality standards are being demanded which requires greater investment in the quality and content of services in terms of how it supports individuals to gain appropriate real-life skills and support them into independent living.

f. Development of cutting-edge ideas, research informed knowledge and skills and the sharing and development of those skills and capacities within and beyond the main special schools.

New issues since the proposals presented in November 2018

From the consultation

• There is limited demand for school-based nursery provision (we have good District Specialist Centres)
• There is significant interest in school based and coordinated use of other providers at post 14 in the new provision
• There is significant interest in the new provision being a maintained school rather than an academy
• The use of more than one location continues to be favoured over the one location (55% did not like the one school proposal, 45% supported the one school proposal). In February 2019, the Council decided to return to pre-consultation to avoid a breakdown of the relationship with the St Nicholas and Larkrise Friends groups. Through the consultation sessions respondents have suggested that they believe this plan leads to:
  o Lack of choice
  o Unequal approach to education for children with SEND
  o A lack of specific intent to fulfil statutory educational obligations
• There is a significant interest in having residential provision within the plan.

Other emerging and new factors

• Early growth in EHCPs. Over the last few years we have seen a growth in number of pupils with EHCPs and pressures on budgets. As noted above this has clearly been instrumental in driving this project.
However, in 2019 we have seen a significant increase in placements for pupils with MLD in the Jan/Feb 2019 placement plans. This seems to be driven by on-going concerns including reduced confidence in mainstream secondary schools/ELP and continued poor attainment and progress for young people with SEND at Key Stage 4. As a result, we have seen an increased request for special school places for children with SEND during this consultation. As a result, the Director of Education & Skills, has engaged external consultants (ISOS) to take forward an independent review leading to a plan to change approaches and spending. The time line for this project will lead to new plans being implemented from mid-2019 onwards, but these will take a while to directly impact on performance and outcomes for children/young people and subsequently demand on special school places.

- **Housing Infrastructure Fund.** In March 2019, a new application was made through the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) for Chippenham. This plan would lead to the potential for 7500 new homes in Chippenham. This is in addition to the growth already established and taken into account in local area plans in 2017 when original projections of SEND place demand were established. Following the same calculations that identified the need for 50 new places for children/young people with complex needs, it can be predicted that, if successful, between 2021 and 2043 at least 45 additional special school places would be needed, of which, 18 would be needed for children/young people with complex needs.

Should the application be successful both Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could support the building of new schools in Chippenham.

In taking forward this option appraisal it will be important to bear in mind how the views from the consultation and new factors impact on the relevance and capacity of the options reviewed.

**Developing Success Criteria**
To effectively consider the range of potential delivery models and to evaluate whether or not these would deliver the benefits that the Council is seeking, success criteria have been developed.
Sufficient provision
Does the model have the scope to deliver?
- We need **at least** 220 new special school places in Wiltshire by 2026
- **At least** 123 in the North, of which 50 will be for complex needs and the remainder for ASD/SEMH
- Reduce overcrowding (in line with DfE guidance)
- Achieve with an acceptable timeline

Value for money
Does the model have the potential to deliver savings that can be used to reinvest in enhanced teaching and learning and provide a sustainable financial future?
- Cost effective buildings
- Maximising contracted health services
- Maximize potential for reuse of existing buildings
- Reduction in running and maintenance costs
- Reduction in management costs
- More in-county specialist provision

Quality
Does the model lead to the development of a self-sustaining, self-improving system? Does the model lead to enhanced community engagement and inclusion that is meaningful, lived and enabled by the system?
- Partnerships
- Transport - time and cost (public transport links)
- Considerate Constructors Scheme
- Community Engagement
- Facilities and resources
- Medical and health support
- Co-production and support from families
- Staffing, recruitment and retention

Outcomes
Does the option foster outstanding SEND services that maximize independence and inclusion? Are children and young people equipped with the knowledge and skills they need to flourish in and where possible in adulthood, live independently (in their community), undertake further training and development, access relevant work experience, start an apprenticeship, or find their first job?
- Teaching and curriculum
- Pupil voice and influence
- Outreach/engagement with other schools
- In-reach/engagement with other schools
- 14 + pathways

Applying the criteria
An assessment scorecard has been developed to enable detailed proposals to be assessed against the success criteria. This assessment enables a review of potential options against the goals of the Council.

Special school heads, the Executive Director of WPCC, officers within the Council, consultees and the lead consultant for the project all engaged in developing the process. The options were scored by a number of officers, two headteachers (it should be noted that this was not undertaken by the headteachers of Larkrise or St Nicholas although it was sent to them) and a representative of WPCC.

Review of potential delivery models
This section considers the range of potential delivery models and their relative strengths and weaknesses, including their applicability to Wiltshire Special Education Needs and Disability Strategy for Children and Young People aged 0-25; with a specific focus is on the 3 Local Authority Maintained special schools in the North.
Option 1 – Do Nothing

Overview
Whilst there are acknowledged strengths in the current provision, the status quo is not an option as it does not achieve the required expansion of 50 complex places in the North.

Option 2 – Expand Larkrise

Overview
The site doesn't meet DfE’s minimum recommended areas because of the site constraints.

Key elements
The diagram below shows the sites and issues:

Option 3 – Expand St Nicholas

Overview
The site doesn't meet DfE’s minimum recommended areas because of the site constraints, and on the assumption that no additional land is available for the school to expand.

Key elements
The diagram below shows the site and issues:

Option 4 – Develop Ashton Street

Overview
The site doesn't meet DfE’s minimum recommended areas because of the site constraints.

Key elements
The diagram below shows the sites and issues:

The combined use of these two sites will also not meet site requirements.

Option 5 – Expand Rowdeford

Overview
The expansion of the school should be possible under current planning policy. Primary and secondary with sixth form provision. Expansion of Rowdeford to accommodate 200 extra places made up of secondary and primary aged young people from Larkrise and St Nicholas as well as new students. The main Rowdeford campus is remodelled to accommodate non-ambulate pupils. Residential catered for with a separate business case.

Assessments under the “Quality” criteria would be based on embracing the rural location, bringing professionals together, economies of scale and improvements in travel times.

Representatives from Rowdeford Charitable Trust particularly proposed using a house model, i.e. three separate buildings at Rowdeford under one SLT.
Key elements
The diagram below shows the sites and issues:

Option 6 – Develop Abbeyfield
Overview
One site is committed as part of a PFI scheme. The other is a good site but there are travel concerns.

Key elements
The diagram below shows the sites and issues:

Score (out of 10)
7.07

Capital build cost (estimate)
£32m

Annual revenue cost (estimate)
£10.2M

Option 7 – Develop Rowde primary
Overview
The Planning Officer considers this site to potentially be one of the better options – however it is outside the settlement boundary and is likely to require a right turning lane.

Key elements
The diagram below shows the sites and issues:

Score (out of 10)
n/a

Capital build cost (estimate)
£40m

Annual revenue cost (estimate)
£10.2M

Option 8 – Develop Trowbridge West Ashton Manor Farm
Overview
Planning consider this to be in remote countryside, and other issues, meaning there is likely to an objection in principle.

Key elements
The diagram below shows the site and issues:
Option 9 – Develop Melksham Land at Woolmore Farm

Overview
It is considered that the designation of the site as Public Open Space, the severely restricted access rights and the proximity to a listed building make it not suitable for development as a new special school.

Key elements
The diagram below summarises this option:

Score (out of 10)
na
Capital build cost (estimate)
£40m
Annual revenue cost (estimate)
£10.2M

Option 10 – Develop Wyke Road Trowbridge

Overview
Concerns over access would limit options, alternate use for residential being proposed as part of larger scheme.

Key elements
The diagram below summarises this option:

Score (out of 10)
na
Capital build cost (estimate)
£40m
Annual revenue cost (estimate)
£10.2M

Option 11 – Develop Chippenham Magistrates Court

Overview
The site doesn't meet DfE's minimum recommended areas for a 350-place school, but could be used for a smaller school, however it would increase costs due to site purchase.

Key elements
The diagram below shows the sites and issues:

Score (out of 10)
na
Capital build cost (estimate)
£40m
Annual revenue cost (estimate)
£10.2M
The next set of options are based on multiple sites, potentially under one executive senior leadership team (SLT).

Multiple sites would potentially attract some level of spilt site allowance to support costs such as site-specific reception, administration and safeguarding. (This can range from £50 – £97,000 per site per year). There would be a reduction in the available specialist staff on any one site and there would continue to be pressure on the revenue budget. In the Quality section assessment there will be benefits of proximity to families’ closest town location.

Option 12 – Develop Rowdeford with primary satellite provision in Larkrise and St Nicholas

Overview
This option was submitted by the Friends of Larkrise and St Nicholas representatives in the Jan-March 2019 consultation. Primary and secondary with sixth form provision at Rowdeford. Expansion of Rowdeford to accommodate 100 complex places made up of secondary aged young people from Larkrise and St Nicholas. The main Rowdeford campus remodelled to accommodate non-ambulate pupils. Residential catered for with a separate business case.

Larkrise and St Nicholas cap numbers at 50 each making overcrowding less of an issue. Only primary pupils being taken in.

Key elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (out of 10)</th>
<th>5.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital build cost (estimate)</td>
<td>£22m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual revenue cost (estimate)</td>
<td>£10.9M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There would be an executive head over all three sites and this would be established as one school.

Primary only transport would require journey times of 45 minutes or less. This adds a considerable annual revenue cost.

Option 13 - Extend St Nicholas and Larkrise onto new sites and maintain Rowdeford

This plan was put forward by the Wiltshire SEND Action Group:

- Leave Rowdeford as is
- Extend or replace St Nicholas on to a, as yet undecided, second site
- Extend Larkrise onto the Ashton Street site

Overview
Creating a minimum of 400 places over 5 sites. In terms of DfE standards the combined Larkrise site could offer 43 places, St Nicholas 21 and could use Abbeyfield to a significantly higher number. This
would place the majority of places in Chippenham. It would attract split site allowance. It would retain provision in three locations. This would be more expensive revenue wise and would not allow specialism to be rationalised in one place.

**Key elements**

**Option 14** - Expand Rowdeford, Larkrise and St Nicholas on site and with new sites, keeping separate leadership teams, but creating an overarching board with the 4 MATs

**Overview**

This includes elements of the proposals submitted by a combined group of 5 special schools supported by 4 Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs) in October 2017:

- Redesign the Larkrise site and/or add in the Ashton St site
- Redesign St Nicholas or use a free school application to develop on a new site
- Add new classrooms to Rowdeford and add post 16

In terms of sufficiency this would not meet DfE standards for Larkrise and St Nicholas and would need to use new sites similar to option 13. The free school option is not possible for replacement of school places.

**Score (out of 10)** 5.49

**Capital build cost (estimate)** £28m

**Annual revenue cost (estimate)** £12.5M

**Option 15** – Utilising the Rowdeford site and maintaining St Nicholas as part of one split site school to meet immediate need and review the Chippenham site when the potential growth in Chippenham is known

**Overview**

Primary and secondary with sixth form provision at Rowdeford. Expansion of Rowdeford to accommodate 400 complex places made up of secondary aged young people from Larkrise and St Nicholas, secondary from Rowdeford, primary Larkrise and new primary pupils. The main Rowdeford campus is remodelled to further accommodate non-ambulant pupils. Residential catered for with a separate business case.

Larkrise is closed when the new school opens, and St Nicholas becomes part of a new school on split sites managed by one executive. The St Nicholas site would be for 60 primary age pupils with

**Score (out of 10)** na

**Capital build cost (estimate)** £22M

**Annual revenue cost (estimate)** £10.9M
complex needs. (there are currently 42 primary pupils with complex needs at St Nicholas school).

If the HIF application is not successful a review can then be made as to whether the school is retained permanently or closed, and pupils join the Rowdeford school. If successful either the current site could be kept, or a new school built utilising the financial capacity with Section 106 and CIL to develop school capacity. At this point (potentially 2-5 years from now) there may also be another free school round which could also facilitate the funding of a school.

Capital funding would not be dissimilar to proposal 5, but as noted would need additional capital. While losing some of the benefits of one on site school it would also offer a choice of two school buildings and two different sorts of communities – one rural one urban.

**Key elements**

![Map of Wiltshire Council with highlighted area](image)

**Score (out of 10)**
6.39

**Capital build cost (estimate)**
£33M

**Annual revenue cost (estimate)**
£10.4M
14.3 Description of 21 indices used in Option Appraisal process

**Sufficient provision**
Of the right type and scope. The right places and the development of the right organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sufficient flexible provision to provide for the changing needs of SEND pupils now and in the future.</td>
<td>400 places with expansion for a further 100.</td>
<td>400 places with expansion for a further 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reduce overcrowding (in line with DfE guidance - BB104)</td>
<td>In line with BB104 Substantial reduction in overcrowding at Larkrise and St Nichols</td>
<td>In line with BB104 Reduction in overcrowding at Larkrise and St Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Impact on timeline</td>
<td>Sufficient new provision is opened before 2023 and comfortably accommodates growth for 2021.</td>
<td>Sufficient new provision is opened by 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value for money
Sustainability and capacity building. Building system excellence not just more places in the system. Economy (of scale), effectiveness & efficiency. The more savings in all areas means that more of the funding that is currently spent can be redirected into teaching and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4** Cost effective buildings that are fit for purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst securing great quality the gross internal floor areas (GIFA) capital build cost per m² is minimised (&lt;£2.5K/m²); average cost per pupil place &lt;£65K. And use of remodelling savings is maximised</td>
<td>Capital (GIFA) build cost per m² is competitive (£2.5-£3K/m²) ; average cost per pupil place &lt;£75K. And good use of remodelling to save on build costs</td>
<td>Capital build costs are high (&gt;£3K/m²) ; average cost per pupil place &gt;£75K. when benchmarked externally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5** Maximise potential for reuse of existing buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remodelling of existing building affords significant savings</td>
<td>Remodelling of existing building affords some savings</td>
<td>Remodelling is not an option or affords no savings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6** The spend on this project is proportionate to the council’s wide ranging responsibilities and provides the best value for money in reaching wider outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant but proportionate funds are prioritised for this vulnerable group as a future investment</td>
<td>Spend is proportionate in line with council’s priorities</td>
<td>Insufficient/excessive costs are identified in proportion to the council's overall responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7** Offers savings with reduction in management costs including DSG and CCG contracts. Offers savings with reduction in running and maintenance costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs are significantly reduced at the school. There is clear potential to maximise and reduce contractual spend. The approach to the reprovision offers potential for reductions in spend across the system. Good design makes schools much cheaper to run and maintain.</td>
<td>Management costs are reduced. There is some potential to maximise and reduce contractual spend. The approach to the reprovision offers some potential for reductions in spend across the system. Running and maintenance costs are reduced.</td>
<td>Management costs stay the same or are increased. There is limited or no potential to maximise and reduce contractual spend. The approach to the reprovision offers limited or no potential for reductions in spend across the system. Running and maintenance costs stay the same or are increased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decrease spend on expensive out of county and independent providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of out of county and ISS places is substantially reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 9 8 7</td>
<td>6 5 4 3</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Partnerships &amp; collaborations</strong> - an approach leading to the development of a self-sustaining, self-improving system; rooted in social inclusion and equality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A vibrant partnership of special schools, mainstream schools and colleges, local health and wellbeing providers and local businesses all working together to support children, young people and their families to thrive and be healthy and resilient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A good partnership of special schools, mainstream schools and colleges, local health and wellbeing providers all working together to support children, young people and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A nascent partnership of special schools, mainstream schools, local health and wellbeing providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Transport</strong> - time and cost (public transport links)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport for all is less than 45 minutes and delivers an outstanding quality experience for the pupils. Great access to school for parents using public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport for more than 98% is less than 60 minutes and for 100% is less than 75 minutes. A good quality experience. Good access to school for parents using public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport for more than 2% is over 60 minutes. Access to school for parents on public transport is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Community Engagement</strong> - inclusion that is meaningful, lived and enabled by the system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student differences are embraced and celebrated creating communities where everyone feels valued and accepted. Local Parent/Carer support groups eg WPCC have a very strong voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student differences are embraced and celebrated creating communities where everyone feels valued and accepted. Local Parent/Carer support groups eg WPCC have a strong voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segregation of students by ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Facilities and resources</strong> Including community access for resources and facilities and also how pupils can access offsite facilities and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding design helps harness the creative energy and passions of the pupils, teachers and support staff. Pupils and staff feel a sense of ownership and belonging to their school, prompting positive social interaction, outstanding teaching and learning, and a healthy lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great design helps harness the creative energy and passions of the pupils, teachers and support staff. Pupils and staff feel a sense of ownership and belonging to their school, prompting positive social interaction, outstanding teaching and learning, and a healthy lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designs are not perceived to be good nor do they instill a sense of ownership and belonging by pupils and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Choice</strong> More than 90% of parents and carers genuinely feel they have a choice when choosing a school. More than 80% of parents and carers got their first choice of school for their children.</td>
<td>More than 75% of parents and carers genuinely feel they have a choice when choosing a school. More than 70% of parents and carers got their first choice of school for their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 75% of parents and carers genuinely feel they have a choice when choosing a school. Less than 70% of parents and carers got their first choice of school for their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medical and health support</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Medical and health support</strong> &quot;Hub&quot; and &quot;spoke&quot; buildings facilitate outstanding integrated multi-professional timely medical and health support.</td>
<td>&quot;Hub&quot; and &quot;spoke&quot; buildings facilitate good integrated multi-professional timely medical and health support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated multi-professional timely medical and health support is not enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Co-production and support from families</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Co-production</strong> and support from families Outstanding family and community partnerships (particularly where students live and will live in the future) are leveraged.</td>
<td>Good family and community partnerships are leveraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community partnerships are not leveraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3%
### Staffing, recruitment and retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The award winning new buildings attract new teaching and wellbeing talent. Outstanding professional development is tailored and staff-driven.

New buildings attract teaching and wellbeing talent. Good professional development is tailored and staff-driven.

New buildings do not attract teaching and wellbeing talent. 4%

### Teaching and curriculum

#### Preparing children and young people with life skills for the future in their community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

World class inclusive education practiced across Wiltshire schools, settings and colleges, with individualised student supports through outstanding EHCP and SEN support programmes.

SEND students (with the exception of PMLD and those with significant cognitive disabilities) at the Special schools and Wiltshire mainstream schools significantly outperform the national average in both English and Maths at all Key Stages.

Outstanding achievement against measures detailed in EHCP.

Inclusive education practiced across Wiltshire schools, settings and colleges, with individualised student supports through outstanding EHCP and SEN support programmes.

SEND students (with the exception of PMLD and those with significant cognitive disabilities) at the Special schools and Wiltshire mainstream schools outperform the national average in both English and Maths at all Key Stages. Good achievement against measures detailed in EHCP.

Teaching and learning is not consistently impacted by best practice inclusive education. 8%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equality within a system of excellence.**

*Pupil Voice and influence*

- Outstanding engagement of SEND children and young people re transformed estate eg:
  - School councils
  - Involving pupils in recruitment and selection
  - Involving pupils in teaching and learning
  - Involving governors with pupil voice
  - National Takeover Day
  - Children's Mayor Programme

**Outreach/engagement with other schools**

- Development of cutting edge ideas, research informed knowledge and skills and the sharing and development of those skills and capacities within and beyond

- Outstanding outreach to mainstream schools from the new provision to support the inclusion and improved outcomes of SEND pupils.

**Inreach/engagement with other schools**

- Development of cutting edge ideas, research informed knowledge and skills and the sharing and development of those skills and capacities within and beyond

- Outstanding in-reach offers SEND pupils, based in mainstream, opportunities to learn at a centre of excellence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th><strong>14 + pathways</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outstanding “Transition to Adulthood” services - maximising independence and inclusion in preparation for adult life. Equipping young people with the knowledge and skills they need to flourish in adult life and where possible live independently (in their community), undertake further training and development, access relevant work experience, start an apprenticeship, or find their first job.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Good “Transition to Adulthood” services - maximising independence in preparation for adult life</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Transition to Adulthood services are not yet &quot;good&quot;.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8%
### 14.4 Summary of average scores for each plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average score (out of 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 site solutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2</td>
<td>Single site - Rowdeford 400 (Close all three schools and open as one new school on the Rowdeford site)</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3</td>
<td>Single site - Abbeyfield 400 (Close all three schools and open as one new site adjacent to Abbeyfield school in Chippenham)</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 site solutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 4</td>
<td>2 sites under single leadership - Rowdeford 350, Larkrise/ St Nicholas 50 (Close all three schools and open one new one predominantly based at Rowdeford with a satellite at either Larkrise or St Nicholas)</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 5</td>
<td>2 sites under single leadership - Rowdeford 350, New School 50 (Close all three schools and open one new one predominantly based at Rowdeford with a satellite a new site)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 site solutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 6</td>
<td>3 sites - Rowdeford 300 &amp; Larkrise 50 &amp; St Nicholas 50 (Close all three schools and open one new one predominantly based at Rowdeford with a satellite at Larkrise and St Nicholas)</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 7</td>
<td>3 sites - Rowdeford 300 &amp; New School A 50 &amp; New School B 50 (Close all three schools and open one new one predominantly based at Rowdeford with a satellite at two new sites)</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 site solution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 8</td>
<td>5 sites - Rowdeford 200, St Nicholas 50, Larkrise 50, New School A 50, New School B 50 (Close all three schools and open one new one predominantly based at Rowdeford with a satellite at Larkrise and St Nicholas and two others – one in Chippenham and one in Trowbridge)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>