Outcome of the Statutory Consultation on the proposal to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools

March 2015

This report has been issued by South Lanarkshire Council in response to the consultation undertaken in terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010. This report includes recommendations of the outcome of the consultation which will be presented to the Executive Committee of South Lanarkshire Council.

If you need this information in another language or format, please contact us to discuss how we can best meet your needs.

Phone: 01698 454545 Email: education@southlanarkshire.gov.uk
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1. **Purpose of the report**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise all stakeholders on the outcome of the statutory consultation exercise undertaken in respect of the proposal to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools with effect from August 2015. This includes a report from Education Scotland on the educational aspects of the proposal and Education Resources’ responses to all questions and issues raised during the consultation period.

2. **Recommendations**

2.1 It is intended that the consultation report, along with any relevant documentation, will be considered by the Executive Committee of South Lanarkshire Council on 29 April 2015.

2.2 It is recommended that the Executive Committee:

- Note the contents of the report;
- Agree the proposal to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools with effect from August 2015.

3. **Background**

3.1 A consultation proposal document was issued as a result of a decision by the Executive Committee of South Lanarkshire Council on 19 November 2014 to consult on the proposal below:

- Re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools

3.2 The statutory consultation, in terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 was carried out over the period 1 December 2014 to 23 January 2015 which included a public meeting held on 7 January 2015 in Castlefield Primary School.

3.3 A consultation notice was placed in the East Kilbride News on 26 November 2014. The notice included a summary of the proposal, information on availability of the proposal document, how written representations could be made and also details of the public meeting.

3.4 A copy of the proposal document was issued on 28 November 2014 to the consultees listed in Appendix 1. It was published on the Council website and a copy made available from all libraries and Q and As.

3.5 A public meeting was held on 7 January 2015 in Castlefield Primary School. A summary of the oral representations made at this meeting is included as Appendix 2 in this report.

3.6 South Lanarkshire Council sent a copy of the proposal document to Education Scotland (formerly HMIe) on 28 November 2014 in their role as a statutory consultee. In addition, on 30th January 2015, Education Scotland was provided with a summary of all relevant written responses and oral representations made during the consultation period.

3.7 South Lanarkshire Council received a copy of Education Scotland’s report on 17 February 2015. A summary of this report and Education Resources’ response to the key points is included in Section 7 of this consultation report and a copy of the whole document is included as Appendix 3.
4. Distribution of proposal document and summary of responses

Consultation proposal documents totalling 503 were sent to statutory consultees and other stakeholders (1 document per household) with the document also being available on the council website, within libraries and Council Q and As.

The total number of responses that were received was 12.

**Analysis of physical responses received - total 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to proposal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Breakdown of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 4 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in favour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the comments received are included in Section 5. These are relatively unedited although any references to names have been removed to preserve anonymity.

For clarification, relevant statutory consultees are

- the Parent Councils of affected schools
- parents of pupils attending each affected school as well as the pupils themselves
- parents of pupils likely to attend an affected school
- staff at each affected school
- any trade union representative of those staff
- any other users whom the authority considers relevant
## 5. Summary of written responses and Education Resources' responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation (parent etc.)</th>
<th>Comment / issue raised</th>
<th>Council response / comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent – Crosshouse PS Not in favour of proposal</td>
<td>As looking at the enrolment figures. I personally think that AREA 1 should be moved to Castlefield catchment only and Area 2 can stay with both schools but to balance the pupil roll more effectively. Crosshouse should stop considering placing requests from other areas and stick to Area 2 for 2015. Area 1, according to the map provided is closer to CASTLEFIELD PRIMARY as well. I hope I have made my point of view clear.</td>
<td>The proposal is for both areas (1 and 2) to be rezoned to ensure that a sufficient reduction of pupil numbers is achieved in Crosshouse Primary School. Area 1 alone would not generate sufficient pupil numbers. Area 2 is currently aligned to Crosshouse Primary School only (not both schools) and the proposal is to realign to Castlefield Primary School. There is a legislative framework that governs how the Council treats placing requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of child due to attend affected school within 2 years In favour of proposal</td>
<td>High school provision will also require to be reviewed for future years.</td>
<td>School capacities across all sectors are under continual review by Education Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent – Castlefield PS In favour of proposal</td>
<td>Seems a logical recommendation.</td>
<td>This comment is supportive of the Council’s proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and on behalf of the Parent Council In favour of proposal</td>
<td>Initial concerns re siblings attending different schools but this has been addressed in the consultation proposal document. NURSERY Would also like to see confirmation given to any parents of children in their anti-pre school year at Crosshouse, who are in the catchment areas affected, i.e. due to start in Aug 2016. These parents have chosen to place their children in Crosshouse as they understood it was their catchment school.</td>
<td>As stressed at the Public Meeting, individual circumstances of parents / families would be taken into account and looked at sympathetically for those children already registered in Crosshouse Nursery Class if this proposal was implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation (parent etc.)</td>
<td>Comment / issue raised</td>
<td>Council response / comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Parent of child due to attend affected school within 2 years | Under the re-alignment, my address falls within Area 2, which will mean my child, who is currently enrolled/attends Crosshouse Pre-School Nursery, will not qualify in the catchment area to attend Crosshouse School. I was advised at the meeting had we been enrolling for Crosshouse Primary to commence August 2015, we would have been ok, but, under the re-alignment we will have to enrol for Castlefield Primary. It was pointed out that, at the moment, Pre-School Nursery Places do not automatically feed into the attached Primary School. However, surely, when awarding places at Pre-School Nursery, should there be an over subscription for places, there is currently a criterion to be followed: i.e. Is/will this child be attending the attached School? If yes; they would be awarded the placement before a child who is not??  
I moved my child from a Private Nursery to Crosshouse Pre-School Nursery to allow her to meet, grow and learn with children to whom she would be starting Primary Education with (not everyone's choosing, but it was mine). I fully understand the requirement for the re-alignment, I even agree with it, but, feel that consideration should be given to the Children that are currently in the process, whether it be School or Pre School Nursery and will be affected by the change. Quite rightly consideration has already been put in for siblings of attendees at Crosshouse Primary school, therefore, surely consideration / recommendations / caveat for the circumstances of my daughter could be built in to the proposed realignment? I'm unaware of any other children who may be in the same circumstances. Perhaps, now you have been made aware of this, the Head Teacher of Crosshouse Primary School should be contacted to find out the potential numbers of children involved? I trust you will treat this as a serious matter and give due consideration to my request? | As stressed at the Public Meeting, individual circumstances of parents / families would be taken into account and looked at sympathetically for those children already registered in Crosshouse Nursery Class if this proposal was implemented.  
We recognise that although nursery classes are not catchment related, parents may have made the choice based on their child’s future, local catchment primary school as in this example. Appropriate arrangements, wherever possible, will be made to support parents and families during the transition phase if the proposal is implemented. |
6. Pupil comments

Crosshouse Primary School, Curlew Drive, East Kilbride

Pupil Consultation Date: 26.1.15

Pupils views on the proposed re-alignment of the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools

Pupils Involved and Stage:
Crosshouse Primary Pupil Council P5-P7

Feedback from pupils on re-alignment proposal

• We have no space in school so it is a good idea.

• I live in area 1 and if I have any more brothers and sister then I would want them to go to Crosshouse. If I am at secondary then would my brothers/sisters be able to go to Crosshouse?

• The catchment area should remain the same. It is a great school and I want my brothers/sisters and neighbours to go to the same school.

• In Area 1 it is easier to walk to Crosshouse than Castlefield. It is dangerous walking to Castlefield because of the roads.

• It is an unfair idea because kids in your street could go to a different school.

• We should expand Crosshouse and let more children come. It is busy because we love it.

• It is a fair idea that brothers/sister can come up to 2021.

• I think it is a good idea because we will eventually run out of space and it is good for us to have different experiences.
Proposal
South Lanarkshire Council is seeking views on the following proposal, namely:

- To re-align the catchment areas for Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools

Feedback from pupils on the catchment re-alignment proposal

- I’d have more people to be friends with (P7)
- It would get me used to being in a bigger class, ready for high school (P7)
- We would have more people to help with buddying and monitoring (P7)
- They might be disrespectful or misbehave (P7)
- Get used to meeting new people, ready for high school (P7)
- I’ll have more people to play with (P6)
- They might be bullies (P6)
- It might be too crowded (P5)
- There might be too many groups for the teacher (P5)
- More people to sit next to at lunchtime (P5)
- More company (P4)
- It’ll be noisier in school (P4)
- We might not have enough jotters and books (P4)
- We’d need to teach them everything they’d missed (P3)
- We’d need to teach them how to behave in our school (P3)
- It will be harder for the teacher if there are more groups (P3)
- I’ll make more friends (P2)
- They might not be as nice as us (P2)
- You can have two friends (P2)
7. **Summary of issues raised by Education Scotland (formerly HMIe) and Education Resources responses**

7.1 As part of the statutory consultation process, Education Scotland prepared a report on the consultation proposal by South Lanarkshire Council, addressing educational aspects of the proposal. This report is attached as appendix 3.

7.2 Education Scotland reported that the proposal has a number of educational benefits to the children of both Crosshouse and Castlefield Primary Schools.

7.3 It was recognised that staff felt the retention of the ASN base within Crosshouse Primary School to be very important to the inclusive ethos of the school. It was noted that it would be helpful to further reinforce the intention not to close the base and to reassure staff and parents of children attending the base of this.

7.4 Education Scotland found, from its own discussions and the feedback provided by the Council, that almost all stakeholders widely accept the proposal as being the most reasonable solution.

7.5 **Response**

South Lanarkshire Council welcomes the very positive report and the recognition of the sound educational benefits for children arising from the proposal.
8. Review of proposals by South Lanarkshire Council

8.1 The Council has reviewed the proposals having regard (in particular) to any relevant written representations received by the Council during the consultation, and representations made at the public meeting, and Education Scotland’s report.

8.2 Feedback indicates that almost all stakeholders are in favour of the proposal.

8.3 A positive report from Education Scotland corroborates the educational and social benefits of the proposal.

8.4 After review, the proposal to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools with effect from August 2015 is recommended.

8.5 Consideration will be given to individual cases for children who are currently already registered in Crosshouse Nursery Class to allow transition into Crosshouse Primary School until August 2016, if this is currently their catchment school.

9. Resource, risk and policy implications

9.1 Resource implications

In addressing the capacity issue at Crosshouse Primary School by maximising the use of existing spare accommodation within Castlefield Primary School, this proposal represents best value and an efficient use of resources both financial and physical.

In terms of employee resources, this will continue to be provided in each school by means of existing process e.g. annual class configuration protocols and agreed management allocations.

9.2 Risk implications

The Council has a duty to conduct risk assessments under the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulation 1999. Any current risk assessments at the schools would be reviewed if the proposal is implemented.

9.3 Policy implications

9.3.1 Strategy
This report supports Education Resources’ priorities for raising educational achievement and attainment and achieving efficient and effective use of resources.

9.3.2 Consultation
This report describes the outcome of the statutory consultation process with all key stakeholders. Further consultation with pupils, staff, parents, Trade Unions and other stakeholders would continue if the proposals are approved.
Appendix 1  Distribution of consultation proposals document

A copy of the proposal document was provided to the following consultees:

• The Parent Council of the affected schools
• The parents of the pupils at the affected schools
• Parents who have children who are expected to attend the affected schools within 2 years of the publication of this proposal document. To achieve this, a copy of the proposal was provided to Early Years Establishments in the local area.
• The pupils at the affected schools and their pupil committees and councils
• All South Lanarkshire Council employees at the affected schools
• Trade union representatives
• Community Councils within the affected locality
• Local churches
• All relevant users of the affected schools
• South Lanarkshire Community Planning Partners

A copy of this proposal document was also made available to:

• All Elected Members of South Lanarkshire Council
• South Lanarkshire Youth Council
• Education Scotland (formerly Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Education, HMie)
• The Constituency MSP of the affected schools
• List MSP for the area of the affected schools
• The MP of the affected schools
• Police Commander for Lanarkshire Division of Police Scotland
• Chief Executive, NHS Lanarkshire
• Chief Executive, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport
• Area Commander, Scottish Fire and Rescue Services
• Care Inspectorate

The steps listed below were also taken to ensure that the proposal document was widely available.

• Notice of the proposals and of publication of the proposal document was placed within the East Kilbride News.
• The proposal document was also published on the South Lanarkshire Council website: www.southlanarkshire.gov.uk.
• This document could also be made available in alternative forms or translated by contacting Education Resources on 01698 454102 or at: education@southlanarkshire.gov.uk
• The proposal document was also available at the following locations:
  a. Council Offices, Education Resources, Almada Street, Hamilton, ML3 0AA. Phone 01698 454102
  b. All libraries in South Lanarkshire
  c. All South Lanarkshire Council Q and A Offices
  d. The schools affected by the proposals
The following is a summary note of the above meeting that took views on the proposal to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools with effect from August 2015.

The contents of this note of the public meeting are not direct quotations but are as close a representation of what was said as the scribes were able to achieve while taking handwritten notes during the meeting. These should be regarded as paraphrased comments and they have been included to indicate the feelings and expressions of contributors as closely as possible.

Lynn Sherry (LS), Head of Education (Schools Modernisation, Finance and Personnel), opened the meeting at 6.05pm and thanked everyone for attending. She introduced the panel and summarised the reason for the meeting and background to the proposal as stated in the Consultation Proposal Document issued to all interested parties and made available via the Council’s website, the School office, local libraries and Q and As.

LS. Part of the statutory process is to hold a public meeting and this is why we are all here tonight. A note of tonight’s meeting will be taken and will be published as part of a final consultation report.

Panel Members
LS  Lynn Sherry (Chair)  Head of Education (Schools Modernisation, Finance and Personnel)
CM  Clare Martis  Quality Improvement Officer
AR  Anne Rooney  Head of Education Area (East Kilbride)
DH  David Hinshelwood  Support Services Manager
VS  Vance Sinclair  Partnership Development Manager

The proposal is to realign two areas from the catchment of Crosshouse Primary School to Castlefield Primary School to help alleviate capacity pressures within Crosshouse Primary School and make use of available capacity within Castlefield Primary School.

There is no statutory requirement to consult on the number of classes within a school, either mainstream or specialist provision. However, we feel it is appropriate to also discuss a second part of our plans to tackle capacity pressures is to phase a reduction in the number of classes within the Crosshouse Primary School Additional Support Needs (ASN) Base and increase provision in the future at Greenhills Primary School. This solution does not involve the relocation of any children currently attending Crosshouse Primary School. Any child currently at Crosshouse Primary School will remain there.

We have already received a couple of emails from parents of children in the Crosshouse Primary School ASN Base. We will of course enter into dialogue and have further discussion and answer questions from all parents of pupils currently attending the base, but that does not form part of the statutory part of tonight’s proceedings. An opportunity for a separate meeting has been extended to those parents. If there is time after answering questions regarding the catchment re-alignment proposal, we will of course try to answer questions regarding the base.

Alternative options to deal with the current capacity problem were considered and it may be helpful to share these:

1. Build an extension to Crosshouse Primary School. This would compromise the space available currently for the existing playground and parking. Also there would be significant costs associated that would not demonstrate Best Value especially considering a neighbouring school has spare capacity.
2. Rezoning of catchment area. As siblings could continue to attend Crosshouse Primary School, the shift in population that would occur after such a catchment re-alignment would not happen overnight. As it is predicted that additional accommodation is required for August 2015, a further solution in addition to this is required.

3. Removal of nursery provision at Crosshouse Primary School and increase the nursery provision at Castlefield Primary School. This would have involved significant costs in changing the accommodation around in both schools to make it fit for purpose. It would also mean moving nursery age children between establishments.

4. Phase a reduction in the number of classes currently in the Crosshouse Primary School ASN base. This would involve no displacement of children and limited adaptation costs. By providing increased capacity in Greenhills Primary School, this would ensure that there was sufficient provision for pupils with additional support needs in the East Kilbride area although our specialist support provision is across the authority and has no defined catchment areas.

The statutory element of the consultation is the proposed rezoning of two areas currently in the Crosshouse Primary School catchment area to Castlefield Primary School.

LS opened it up to the floor for questions.

Parent at Crosshouse – I agree with what’s happening. My concern is the length of time to do anything strategic. Does this strategic direction solve the problem? Your forecasting model seems flawed and this is a retrospective fix. It has to be done – agreed. But it is not a positive thing.

LS answer - The figures we operate with are always slightly behind. For example, Castlefield was opened early 2007 and Crosshouse early 2008. Schools take approximately 1 year – 18 months to build with a design period of around a year prior to that. This means that decisions on the size of a school must be taken nearly 3 years in advance using estimated housing figures and pupil census information held at that time, figures that can be a year old once verified. It may appear that the school was built too small and filled up very quickly. I accept what you are saying and we are trying to react now.

AR answer – In addition, housing growth has exceeded expectation.

Resident – I am a resident in the new build area and I don’t think you answered the question. There is more housing planned to the south of Lindsayfield. What will you do when they are built?

LS answer – Perhaps David, you could explain how we use the information available to forecast pupil numbers?

DH answer – We have analysed the average intake over the last 3 years including placing requests. Birth rates and nursery information is used to make predictions. We also consider the denominational and non-denominational split. For the secondary school sector it is easier as we can consider seven years of data. For the primary sector we can only reasonably forecast three years. The added factor is that by the time we get census data it is already one year out of date. Parents have different reasons for sending pupils to schools that are not their catchment school. We also use information from planning colleagues on possible future housing developments. Although the information we have is quite robust, parental choice in terms of what school they choose to send their child / children to or which denomination of school they choose is harder to predict and can significantly change pupil numbers.
VS answer – We now have a new process with the Planning department to discuss early on any significant developments such as the proposed development at Shields Road that you may be aware of. This will allow the Council to build in the need for such considerations as developer contributions to help with any additional accommodation needed for the new children that may come. The Lyndsayfield area gained planning approval well in advance of this process being put in place.

Councillor Jim Docherty – Am I right to highlight that there will be a new school for the Jackton area? Once this new school is built, this should take some pressure off other schools in the East Kilbride South area.

VS answer – You are right Councillor. This has planning permission in principle. Negotiations have been ongoing with the developer here for some time and this school should be funded through developer contributions.

Parent question – My daughter has just started Crosshouse Nursery and I live in one of the areas affected by the proposed catchment change. What school would she have to attend starting August 2016?

DH answer – This year at P1 enrolment for children starting school in August 2015, parents could choose to send their child to either Crosshouse or Castlefield Primary Schools. As of next year, children living in either affected area would require to attend Castlefield Primary School or parents would require to make a placing request.

Same Parent – my specific situation where I have only just removed my child from private nursery and chose the nursery at Crosshouse Primary School nursery because this would be her catchment school for P1. Now with this proposed change, she would be expected to go to Castlefield Primary instead. This would be another change and unsettling for my daughter. What am I meant to do now? Surely it would be of benefit to keep my child in one school. Curriculum for Excellence promotes the school working with the nursery and P1 transition.

AR answer – I understand your issue. Perhaps transfer to Castlefield Nursery or make a placing request to Crosshouse Primary School for P1?

Same Parent – I chose that nursery because her catchment school is Crosshouse. I want continuity from my child. It is wrong to disrupt my child’s education.

Parent comment – If she moved her child and the catchment didn’t change, she would have disrupted her child for nothing.

Original parent comment – I must not be the only parent in this situation.

DH answer – We will consider this as part of the consultation and look at the current nursery population as this may affect other families.

Grandparent question – When will we know the decision on this consultation?

LS answer – the end of the consultation period is 23 January 2015. We share all the feedback received tonight and through written responses received with Education Scotland who will also speak with the schools affected and may make contact with parents to seek more views. We then have to prepare a final consultation report, which will include our recommendation, and publish this for 3 weeks before the Council can make a formal decision. We anticipate that the Executive Committee of the Council will consider our recommendation at the end of April 2015. We will keep parents up to date on these timescales via the schools.

Same parent – What would I have to do if I wanted my daughter to go to Castlefield?
**DH answer** – that option is there for you. There is space within Castlefield Nursery. You could also discuss with any other parents that you know are in a similar position.

**Penny, Head Teacher of Castlefield Primary School** – I have been here at Castlefield Primary School for 7 years now and our school has around a 50/50 split of children that come from our own nursery class and those that come from other nurseries. This is not an issue and we have a fantastic transition programme that ensures a smooth change for children. I have no worry about that.

**Same parent comment** – I have no criticism of this school or the nursery at all. I just don’t want the upheaval.

---

**Parent question** – My question is about placing requests. Parents look round different schools and facilities available and make a choice based on that. How will this work for a parent of a future P1 pupil wanting them to attend the Crosshouse base?

**AR answer** – There is a separate, legislative process that deals with placing requests that we would have to consider. However, the recommendation on the most appropriate placement for a child is via specialist professionals. Placements into specialist provision as a result of parental placing requests are the exception rather than the norm.

**Parent question** – Is it taken off the list to allow P1s in the base?

**AR answer** – We have made it quite clear we are trying to reduce the numbers of children and the easiest way to do this is to restrict the intake into the Crosshouse base at P1.

---

**Parent comment** - I’m a parent of children at Greenhills Primary School and there’s no space there.

**Parent question** – What will happen to our children that are there just now?

**VS answer** – We are working up a design to use the accommodation currently known as the Cedarwood Centre adjoining Greenhills Primary School.

**Parent comment** – You’re separating children.

**Parent question** - Will children with autism be put in the Cedarwood building?

**Parent comment** – You can’t have more than 6 pupils in a class. How can you do that?

**AR answer** – We have been and will continue to discuss the use of the accommodation in the Cedarwood building with the Head Teacher. There will be a mix of mainstream classes and base classes. You want to be able to use the available accommodation flexibly. You might want, for example, to take P4/5 mainstream and base children into that building if there were some children in that particular year group(s) who would benefit from a more sheltered environment, away from the noise / bustle of a busy mainstream school. The Head Teacher would decide this each year based on the needs of the children.

**Parent of child at Greenhills** – Why have we not been sent a copy of the consultation document? We should have been consulted.
LS answer – the statutory element of the consultation is the catchment re-alignment of Crosshouse and Castlefield Primary Schools. That is the proposal contained in the consultation document issued to parents of both Crosshouse and Castlefield Primary School pupils. The increased number of classes in Greenhills Primary is not something the Council requires to consult on in the same way. We are still working on our plans and considering what to do with this. Discussion with parents through the Head Teacher will happen at a later date and communication will be ongoing.

Parent question – would any new children in this building get to use the playground?
LS answer – Yes.

Parent comment – Having children in two separate buildings will make them think they’re different.

AR answer – As I mentioned, there will be ongoing discussion in conjunction with the Head Teacher and other educationalists to identify the best mix of accommodation within this part of the building to ensure appropriate inclusion for pupils where required.

VS answer – We are at the very early stages of design development.

Parent comment – Doesn’t sound very inclusive to me.

Cllr Jim Docherty comment – The decision on the final design of the new accommodation has not been made. We’re trying to balance the needs of all children - I can guarantee that everything will be done to ensure the needs of all children are met. Any problems at all, myself and Councillor Buchanan who is also here tonight can guarantee that and all the officers on the panel are committed to that too.

CM answer – It is not in the interest of anyone involved in the education of your children to make pupils feel ‘excluded’ from the rest of the school. We have many models across the authority and schools work incredibly hard to ensure that all pupils whether in mainstream or specialist provision feel included and part of the whole school regardless of where they are accommodated.

LS comment – The questions and feedback you have given tonight has been very helpful and this is why we are here. It seems that the catchment area re-alignment is accepted as being needed.

Parent question – Instead of moving children from Crosshouse could you not have a base in Castlefield? Have you considered this?

LS answer – We are not looking to displace any children but looking to increase provision at Greenhills Primary School where there is already a base meeting the needs of children with a variety of additional support needs. There are a number of ways we could use accommodation. We have to ensure catchment pupils and the capacity pressures are met first. Relocating education staff from the Cedarwood Centre currently adjacent to Greenhills Primary School into office accommodation rather than moving children seems most appropriate.

Parent comment - I can’t believe you are closing down such a fantastic base in an excellent school with excellent staff. This affects people’s lives and people’s jobs.

AR answer – We are looking to reduce the capacity of the base to two classes. We are not closing the base.

Same parent follow up – You said you were not taking in any primary 1s. That means eventually there will be no children left.
**AR answer** – Sorry, that’s not what I meant. To allow us to reduce the numbers appropriately to meet the reduced capacity, we would need to limit the intake only for a temporary period of time. We would have to make sensible class groupings in the base. It is a very complex process. The numbers of children, the class composition and groupings will be looked at and consideration will be made to make the right decision for children and offer them the most appropriate placement. The proposal does not involve closing the base.

**Parent question** – Why don’t you reduce P1 across the board in Crosshouse rather than just the base?

**LS** – Do you mean mainstream?

**Same Parent** – Yes.

**LS answer** – the base is not catchment but the primary school has a defined catchment area and we have to provide space for catchment pupils.

**Parent comment** – The base classes are too small – you can’t put a full class of children in them.

**VS answer** – We have to look at the available space. It may be that smaller, composite classes can be used or they may be used for other purposes such as break out, general purpose.

**AR answer** – We are looking at using the accommodation we have the best we can. We are very proud of the facilities and the huge investment that has been made in our schools. We are trying to do the best for all children.

**Grandparent and Resident** – I remember reading somewhere about something being changed at the access to the school on Lickprivick Road?

**VS answer** – We will liaise with the Roads department who will advise on any necessary improvements.

**LS answer** – I think you are referring to a quote from Councillor Docherty regarding road safety? We will pick this up.

**VS comment** – due to the significant changes and additional accommodation being created in the former Cedarwood Centre, we would follow the normal process and have a parent / resident roadshow to share plans prior to planning permissions or building warrants being applied for.

**Parent question** - I don’t think you answered my question earlier. If I put a placing request in for my child to attend the base in Crosshouse Primary School in August 2015, will it be considered?

**AR answer** – Apologies, I thought I had answered that question. Yes, it would be considered as separate legislation governs this. However, the process for identifying the most appropriate placement for a child with additional support needs is a complex one and many factors are taken into account as I highlighted earlier.

**Parent question** – Will there be any P1s going into the Crosshouse Base in August 2015?
AR answer – This would be dependent upon overall numbers and the requirements that come through the forum. We would hope not to take in any primary 1 stage pupils into the ASN base for a temporary period of time to reach the level of reduction we require as discussed earlier. We have no plans to close the ASN Base within Crosshouse Primary School. If this was ever considered, a formal, statutory consultation would be required to be undertaken. The Council would not be able to make that decision without following the same process as we are currently following for this catchment change.

LS closed the meeting at 7.10pm. Updates on the next steps will be provided through the schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of those attending (total 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Parents including Parent Council / PTA representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Staff including 1 spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Representative of Linda Fabiani, MSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Local Residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3  Report by Education Scotland

Report by Education Scotland addressing educational aspects of the proposal by South Lanarkshire Council to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools.

1. Introduction

1.1 This report from Education Scotland has been prepared by HM Inspectors in accordance with the terms of the 
*Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the amendments contained in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*. The purpose of the report is to provide an independent and impartial consideration of South Lanarkshire Council's proposal to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools. Section 2 of the report sets out brief details of the consultation process. Section 3 of the report sets out HM Inspectors' consideration of the educational aspects of the proposal, including significant views expressed by consultees. Section 4 summarises HM Inspectors' overall view of the proposal. Upon receipt of this report, the Act requires the council to consider it and then prepare its final consultation report. The council's final consultation report should include a copy of this report and must contain an explanation of how, in finalising the proposal, it has reviewed the initial proposal, including a summary of points raised during the consultation process and the council's response to them. The council has to publish its final consultation report three weeks before it takes its final decision. Where a council is proposing to close a school, it needs to follow all legislative obligations set out in the 2010 Act, including notifying Ministers within six working days of making its final decision and explaining to consultees the opportunity they have to make representations to Ministers.

1.2 HM Inspectors considered:

- the likely effects of the proposal for children and young people of the school; any other users; children likely to become pupils within two years of the date of publication of the proposal paper; and other children and young people in the council area;

- any other likely effects of the proposal;

- how the council intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects that may arise from the proposal; and

- the educational benefits the council believes will result from implementation of the proposal, and the council's reasons for coming to these beliefs.

1.3 In preparing this report, HM Inspectors undertook the following activities:

- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written and oral submissions from parents and others; and

- visits to the site of Castlefield Primary School and Crosshouse Primary School, including discussion with relevant consultees.
2. Consultation Process

2.1 South Lanarkshire Council undertook the consultation on its proposal with reference to the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the amendments in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*. The council proposes to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools.

2.2 South Lanarkshire Council formally consulted stakeholders between Monday 1 December 2014 and Friday 23 January 2015. A public meeting was held on Wednesday 7 January 2015 in Castlefield Primary School. The council issued 503 consultation proposal documents. The council received 12 written responses by the close of the formal consultation period. Ten of the 12 stakeholders were in favour of the proposal. Pupils in both schools were given the opportunity to contribute their views during the formal consultation period. The council received less than 20 responses from pupils.

2.3 South Lanarkshire’s proposal document also makes reference to its plans to tackle capacity issues through a phased reduction in the number of classes in the Crosshouse Primary School Additional Support Needs (ASN) Base and to increase provision in the future at Greenhills Primary School.

3. Educational Aspects of Proposal

3.1 South Lanarkshire Council’s proposal to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools has a number of educational benefits. The school roll of Crosshouse Primary School has increased significantly since it opened in 2008. The roll has risen from 191 to 304 in session 2014/15. This situation has put considerable pressure on the available teaching spaces within the school building. Castlefield Primary School opened in 2007 with a roll of 190 and the roll is currently 162. Should the proposal go ahead there is available accommodation in Castlefield Primary School which could be used to reduce the pressure on accommodation in Crosshouse Primary School. Pupils in Crosshouse Primary School would benefit from regaining access to specialised facilities such as the library and more space to play and learn outside. There would be less crowding in the dining areas and timetabling of the gymnasium would be easier thus allowing staff more flexibility to deliver physical education in line with Curriculum for Excellence.

3.2 The proposal also has some educational benefits for the pupils in Castlefield Primary School. The potential to increase the pupil population could result in the creation of an additional management post within the staffing allocation. This would allow the headteacher more flexibility within her allocation of teaching staff to support children’s learning. The proposal would allow children living in streets nearer the school to take up places in Castlefield Primary School rather than traveling further to Crosshouse Primary School.

3.3 Almost all parents, children and staff from Castlefield Primary School who met with HM Inspectors were entirely supportive of the proposal. Staff agreed that there was a need to re-align the catchment areas to ease the growing pressure on the accommodation at Crosshouse Primary School. Pupils were looking forward to welcoming new friends to their school and parents felt it made sense for children and families who live close to the school would be included in the catchment area for Castlefield Primary School.

3.4 Parents, children and staff from Crosshouse Primary School were mostly positive about the proposal. Staff agreed the growth in the school roll had placed demands on the existing accommodation. Staff had concerns that the council plan to reduce the number of classes in the Crosshouse Primary School ASN base would have a detrimental impact on the highly inclusive ethos which is considered a real strength of the school. The council has made it clear to stakeholders they do not intend to close the ASN base.
It would be helpful to further reinforce this intention and reassure staff and parents of children who attend the base. The parents of children from mainstream classes and children who met with HM Inspectors agreed that the proposal would bring benefits to the school. Pupils wanted to have more space to play and learn and to regain access to the specialised rooms that are currently being used as classrooms.

4. Summary

South Lanarkshire Council’s proposal to re-align the catchment areas of Castlefield and Crosshouse Primary Schools has clear educational benefits for the pupils of both schools. The proposal is widely accepted by almost all stakeholders as the most reasonable solution. Current and future cohorts of pupils in Crosshouse Primary School will benefit from more flexible learning spaces and regaining regular access to specialised facilities within their school building. Pupils at Castlefield Primary School will also benefit from this proposal. Almost all stakeholders support the proposal. South Lanarkshire Council have outlined clearly the implementation arrangements for the school session starting in August 2015. It would be helpful if the council further reassured staff from the Crosshouse Primary School ASN base and parents of children who attend the ASN base about the future of the ASN base classes.

HM Inspectors
Education Scotland
February 2015