

Call-in Request

I and the other members of the C&YP Committee below would like to call-in the recent decision regarding the closure of Fort Hill School in Basingstoke. The reasons for call in are summarised below, please let me now if there is anything further I should do in initiating this call in.

1. The decision has been based on in-complete or absent data, for example, data which would show:

- That the school is improving i.e. the 2016 exam results
- That there has been a failure to correlate low pupil numbers to the low pupil numbers in the feeder schools & the effect of when these numbers go up from next year.
- Fort Hill's standards are not, "poor", as is suggested by the report as referred to in
- That schools outside of the borough are deliberately marketing to Basingstoke parents
- Pupil numbers in local feeder schools show a rise from next year
- That several new housing developments in close proximity to Fort Hill are either being built or are proposed (eg, Worting, Manydown) these developments will need a local secondary school

2. The decision has not adequately taken into consideration a number of non-quantifiable. albeit vital issues for example:

- The amalgamation will adversely affect not only the exam results of current students, but also their mental health and wellbeing.
- While the proposal is to fund transport from Fort Hill to CBEC for current students for 2 years, what happens after this?
- A 2016 survey by Winklebury Community Action Group found that around 1 in 5 families have limited, or no, access to a car. These low income families will not be able to afford to fund bus fares for their children- how will this affect truancy rates when pupils are faced with an hour-long, dark, possibly rainy, walk to school in winter?

3. Serious concern has been raised throughout the process that the governing body were in effect given a fait accompli. Although the report suggested that the governing body had asked for the consultation on amalgamation, the facts remain that the governing body were given limited options (effectively-move to consultation or county would close the school) and limited time (20 minutes max) to discuss and arrive at their decision. Other governing bodies of schools in similar situations were given a range of options to consider. It is vital that this aspect is examined in closer detail.

4. Finally, the proposed decision did not benefit from pre-decision scrutiny by members and interested parties, had it done so, it would no doubt have improved the

decision. Because of the lack of this pre-decision scrutiny then serious consideration should be given to post-decision scrutiny to ensure the proper democratic functions are followed.

We would propose that the committee formulates appropriate recommendations firstly in relation to the specific issues involving Fort Hill but secondly to the wider, generic issues of how situations like this can be avoided in the future.