



Building schools for the future

GUIDANCE FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES ON REVISING AND RESUBMITTING EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST FOR PROJECTS IN WAVES 7 TO 15 OF BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE

September 2008



department for
children, schools and families

CONTENTS

	Page
Section 1: General	
- Audience and purpose of guidance	3
- Background information	4
- Consultation	5
- Summary of invitation to revise	6
- Prioritisation of the national programme	7
Section 2: Applications	
- General guidance notes	11
- Submission arrangements	14
Annexes:	
Word pro-forma	A
Excel pro-forma	B
Guidance on Excel pro-forma	C
Sources of further information	D

SECTION 1: GENERAL

Audience and purpose of guidance

1. This guidance is for local authorities in England which have Building Schools for the Future (BSF) projects prioritised in waves 7 to 15 of the programme as announced in the national programme in early 2005. It gives information on how to revise or resubmit expressions of interest (EoI) for inclusion in the programme.
2. It is for all authorities with second and subsequent projects as well as those starting in the programme. It is not for authorities which have completed their full BSF investment in waves 1 to 6a. This guidance will also be of interest to diocesan, other voluntary aided and other representative bodies so that they can advise local authorities.
3. It has been prepared in close collaboration with Partnerships for Schools (PfS), which has been set up to deliver the BSF programme for the Department by working with local authorities as they procure BSF investment.
4. This guidance sets out how local authorities can revise the EoI they submitted to the Department in 2003. Authorities may not wish to change their original proposals where they are in line with this guidance, but will need to resubmit them in the form requested, and confirm that the scope of their BSF plans and the prioritisation of their school projects reflect the latest guidance on national education priorities.
5. This guidance reflects our public consultation on “The Management of Building Schools for the Future waves 7 to 15” which ran from 9 April to 4 July; and the responses received to the consultation. We aim shortly to publish the results of this consultation.
6. All expressions of interest must be received electronically by PfS in the form requested no later than 17:00 on 30 November 2008. We will then prioritise projects as explained below in this guidance. We aim to announce the new national programme in early 2009, which will provide authorities with an indication on when they can expect to join the programme. PfS will then invite authorities with the highest prioritisation scores to provide evidence that they are ready to deliver before entering them into the programme. In due course, all other authorities will also need to demonstrate readiness before they join.
7. To be clear, we are not at this time asking for any evidence of readiness to deliver. What we are asking for is details on the order and scope of your proposed projects. This is not a bidding round, although authorities may offer indications as to when they expect their projects to be ready to start. Further guidance on readiness to deliver will be made available at the appropriate time, but in the meantime, authorities may wish to consider the current guidelines available through www.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/documents/BSF_Guidance_Documents/ReadinessToDeliverJuly2006.pdf. We do, of course, encourage authorities who

are eager for an early start to develop their readiness to deliver, but they should be aware that we cannot guarantee a time of entry for any project into the programme.

Background information

Aims of BSF

8. Building Schools for the Future was launched in February 2003 following wide consultation which was strongly supportive of the need for and aims of the programme. BSF aims at educational transformation, through providing all secondary school pupils and teachers in England with 21st century buildings and facilities which support innovative teaching and learning and the aims of the Children's Plan.

9. Through Building Schools for the Future, we want to have school buildings that:

- a. drive reform of the secondary system and improvements in educational standards;
- b. are world class places for teachers to teach and pupils to learn, supported fully by ICT;
- c. are 21st century schools which support the aims of the Children's Plan; which increase choice and diversity; are well used by the community; offer extended services and collocation of other services where appropriate;
- d. are well and sustainably designed, built on time and at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer, and are properly maintained over their lives.

10. In 2003, we invited all authorities to submit expressions of interest for inclusion in the programme, and also those authorities who felt ready to proceed with a project, to propose it for an early wave.

11. Expressions of interest included:

- a. a short statement of educational strategy in their area
- b. the grouping of schools into geographically coherent projects, with certain details about the schools.

12. For authorities proposing an early project we also required additional information relating to their readiness to deliver.

13. BSF was prioritised on the average social and educational need of the groupings of schools proposed by authorities. Eligibility for free school meals was used as proxy for social need, and GCSE results for educational need. In 2004 we announced the first authorities to start in the programme. In early 2005, we gave all authorities an indication of where all their projects were prioritised in the national programme. Further waves were subsequently launched, most recently in June 2008, when 8 authorities joined the programme in an interim wave 6a, selected on readiness to deliver criteria

from those prioritised in waves 7 to 9.

14. There are now 80 authorities in the programme, and by April 2009, we expect the number of new BSF schools opened to have risen to 46, with another 115 opening in 2009-10 and 165 opening in 2010-11.

Consultation

15. In April 2008, we published a consultation on management of waves 7 to 15 of BSF, which ran until 4 July. The proposals in the consultation reflected the learning from the early waves and our aim to ensure delivery of the programme through flexible management.

16. Options discussed in this consultation included:

- a. setting additional prioritisation criteria, but retaining educational and social need as a tie-breaker;
- b. starting all authorities not already in the programme with a priority project as soon as practicable;
- c. revising project sizes to make the programme flexible;
- d. emphasising readiness to deliver as the factor which will start projects in the programme.

17. Overall, support for our proposals was strong and this guidance reflects the responses to the consultation. Details of the responses will be published shortly and will be available through www.dcsf.gov.uk/consultations.

18. Following consideration of the responses to the consultation, Ministers have agreed that local needs could be reflected in how authorities propose projects, and that social and educational need will remain criteria in how the programme is prioritised, as well as in readiness to deliver.

19. Projects must therefore have educational transformation at their heart, and should ensure that they consider the following criteria in prioritising their schools in their revised expressions of interest (in no particular order):

- a. social and educational need, including:
 - i) National Challenge schools;
 - ii) less well performing schools;
 - iii) areas of deprivation;
- b. building need, (suitability and/or condition);
- c. contributing to local or regional regeneration, including opportunities for collocation with other public services;
- d. school reorganisation;
- e. sustainable communities, and new housing and population growth.

Summary of invitation to revise expressions of interest

20. We invite all authorities which have not started in BSF by wave 6a to propose an initial priority project with a capital value of up to £80 million. To be clear, we do not count as having started in BSF, authorities which have had a One School Pathfinder offer, or an academy project not delivered as a BSF project – only those authorities which have full projects in waves 1 to 6a. Authorities should use the BSF funding allocation model available at www.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/documents/BSF_Guidance_Documents/FundingAllocationModel.xls to calculate the value of the project. This is unlikely to include more than five schools, which need **not** be in a geographically coherent group. Authorities may choose to propose larger projects where they wish to contribute additional funding from other sources. Once invited to join the programme, authorities will need to describe, through the Strategy for Change process, how this sits within an authority-wide strategic approach to pupil place planning.

21. Criteria for this initial project include:

- a. the project must aim for educational transformation and be an integral part of an overarching strategy for change for all the secondary schools (mainstream and special) in the authority;
- b. local prioritisation of the initial project can be on one or more of the criteria set out in paragraph 19 above, and authorities will be required to give their reasons for choosing the schools they do against these priorities;
- c. there are clear strategic benefits in proposing geographically coherent groups of schools. However, for this initial project, authorities may propose non-geographically coherent groups which reflect the criteria above;
- d. standard BSF procurement criteria will apply.

22. Further, we ask all authorities to propose follow-on projects. To be clear, this includes authorities already started in BSF in waves 1 to 6a (except where their BSF programme is completed in these waves), and also those which are proposing an initial project. Please propose projects which:

- a. are coherent with the authority's earlier project and complement the authority-wide drive for transformation;
- b. are of a capital value of from £80 to £100 million. There is some flexibility around this range, to ensure a sensible flow of work for the LEP. Authorities should use the BSF funding allocation model available at www.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/documents/BSF_Guidance_Documents/FundingAllocationModel.xls to calculate the value of each project;
- c. are for geographically coherent groups of schools;
- d. taken with any previous project, in total include all the secondary schools in the authority which are eligible for BSF investment.

23. Where there is more than one follow-on project, authorities are asked to show the order in which they wish these projects to be started. Their prioritisation should reflect the priorities set out in paragraph 19 above, and authorities will be required to explain the rationale for their prioritisation.

24. The closing date for both these proposals is 30 November 2008.

25. Further information of what detail is required in these proposals are set out in Section 2 below.

Prioritisation of the national programme.

26. When authorities return their expressions of interest, the Department will have two lists for:

- a. initial projects from authorities not yet in the programme;
- b. follow-on projects from all authorities which have not yet completed their programme.

Initial projects

27. Ministers aim to start off all projects in this list as soon as is practicable. This will of course be subject to affordability. To this end, the list will be prioritised on the average social and educational need of the schools in the groups proposed by each authority – the rationale for this is in the box following paragraph 30. To be assessed as ready to deliver, proposals will need to show, amongst other readiness evidence, that projects address the relevant prioritisation criteria.

28. This prioritisation will be announced in early 2009. PfS will then invite a number of authorities with highest prioritisation to demonstrate they are ready to deliver. The information that will be requested will be much the same as that requested from authorities for wave 6a, and will include reassurance that the priorities claimed for the project are being addressed, and that its delivery is part of a robust strategy for change for all the schools in the authority.

29. The number of authorities invited to provide this information will be determined by:

- a. prudent expectations on the allocation to BSF investment in the next spending review period from 2011-12, when the first new projects can start to spend;
- b. the balance of follow on projects which may be started in order to ensure continuity of work for established LEPs and to ensure a manageable flow of work for larger authorities.

30. However, to be clear, no project will formally start until PfS is content that the authority is ready to deliver it and that its project meets the aims and priorities that are claimed for it. This could mean that where an authority cannot provide satisfactory readiness evidence, it may lose its opportunity to enter the programme until a subsequent funding opportunity. PfS will manage this process rigorously to ensure timely delivery of the programme.

Prioritisation on educational and social need

Our BSF consultation included a number of additional prioritisation criteria, and responses to the consultation supported all of them to different degrees and also suggested further ones. Clearly, there is a large range of local needs, some of which are of high importance to some authorities but not to all.

There was, for instance, high support for building need as a criterion. However, collecting, validating and moderating reliable building data for fair prioritisation on comparative need would impose a heavy burden. To use other priorities in a transparent and fair manner could mean similar verification and evaluation difficulties. There would be further complications in determining fair relative weightings for needs that are not general.

Whilst recognising these local needs, Ministers wish the focus of prioritisation to remain on social and educational need. There was positive support in the consultation for continued use of these needs for prioritisation, including as tie-breakers where projects were otherwise evenly balanced. These factors underlie several of the other criteria, including National Challenge and regeneration areas.

Therefore, our proposals support authorities using local needs in how they model projects and propose their prioritisation. The criteria which Ministers have agreed are appropriate to reflect local need are set out in paragraph 19 above. This additional flexibility for authorities will enable projects to be prioritised in specific areas of need rather than the authority-wide approach of the 2004 prioritisation.

However, where the Department prioritises which authorities will be asked to provide evidence of readiness to deliver, we will use the average social and educational need of the schools within each project. Data to do this is already available, and is statistically reliable.

Thus, for instance, authorities with initial projects will be invited to demonstrate readiness to deliver in the order of the ranking on average social and educational need of the schools in the project. This may mean that an initial project for, say, a group of schools with high building need but with high attainment and low social need will be towards the end of this queue, but it will:

- reflect local need and prioritisation (including making non-geographically coherent groups eligible);
- be more tightly targeted than previously; and
- enter BSF earlier than it would under the current prioritisation.

For educational need, we will use as proxy the most recent data on the percentage of pupils in each school receiving 5A*-C GCSEs including English and Maths. For social need, we will now use the Tax Credit Indicator (TCI) rating for the school. This responds to several comments that the previous proxy, eligibility for Free School Meals, often does not, for local and cultural reasons, fully reflect social deprivation. TCI was not available at the previous prioritisation, but has now been used for other programmes, including allocation of Dedicated Schools Grant and in the Primary Capital Programme.

Follow-on projects

31. Local authorities are invited to prioritise their follow-on projects in line with local need. We will follow the prioritisation of projects proposed by each authority within its overall programme. There will therefore be several lists of follow-on projects within this category – second projects, third projects, fourth projects, and so on. All authorities with second projects will be invited to demonstrate that they are ready to start the project; and then all those with third projects, and so on.

32. There will be large numbers of authorities with second and even third projects. In line with the management of initial projects, each list will be prioritised on educational and social need, as discussed in the text box above, for the order in which authorities will be asked to provide evidence of readiness to deliver. Again, this may mean that where an authority proposes, for example, a third project which includes relatively highly performing schools, it may be further down the third project list than projects which are addressing needs at poorly performing schools. But it will be offered the opportunity to start its third project before any authority is offered a fourth project.

33. All authorities with second or subsequent projects will of course by definition already have engaged with PfS. However, they will still have to demonstrate that they are ready to deliver a follow-on project. This will include, as well as evidence of adequate resources to deliver the second project and maintain activity on the first, that the projects will address the prioritisation criteria that are claimed for it, and that it is in line with the strategy for change that has already been agreed.

34. It is possible, therefore, that an authority with strong and effective delivery of BSF projects, may start in the programme with its third project before an authority which has not progressed its first project in a timely way, is able to start its second project. PfS will manage this process rigorously to ensure timely delivery of the programme.

35. The rate at which follow-on projects are started in BSF will be dependent on the amount of funding allocated to the programme in future public spending review settlements, and the balance between starting off all authorities with a new project as soon as is practicable and the need to maintain work continuity for already-operational LEAs.

36. The national programme for follow-on projects might look something like:

	First follow-on project list	Second follow-on project list	Third follow-on project list	Fourth follow-on project list
Prioritisation of authorities within each list	1. Authority A 2. Authority B 3. Authority C 4. Authority D 5. Authority E 6. Authority F 7. etc	1. Authority C 2. Authority E 3. Authority B 4. Authority F 5. Authority D	1. Authority D 2. Authority B 3. Authority E	1. Authority B

Should you revise your expression of interest?

Have you significantly developed your strategy for the delivery of education in your area since 2003, to reflect government priorities and local circumstances? Does the way you grouped your schools in 2003 still support your strategy? Or can you now propose more effective projects?

Have the circumstances of your schools changed – has there been sudden change in demographics, or have some schools moved sharply in the rankings?

If you revised your groups of schools, with particular regards to Ministerial priorities as detailed in paragraph 19, and the proposal for smaller projects, would you be able to propose groupings where the neediest have improved chance of getting investment earlier? For instance, do you have schools in the National Challenge?

Are some of your 2003 projects well outside the new size guidelines?

If your response to any of these questions is “yes” we suggest that it may be in your interests to revise your expression of interest in line with this guidance.

Even if you are content with your 2003 expression of interest, you will still need to submit an expression of interest in the required format, to ensure that we can understand how your prioritisation meets the criteria explained in this guidance.

SECTION 2: APPLICATIONS

General guidance notes on submitting revised expressions of interest

1. The overriding objective should be to use BSF capital investment strategically to deliver transformational change including much higher standards of education. The starting point will be a “Strategy for Change” to meet the diverse needs and aspirations of young people for many years to come. For example, BSF investment should be the opportunity to remove or replace weak and failing schools; to make changes to school size – perhaps expanding successful and popular schools, removing surplus places or promoting a more diverse range of schools focused on particular communities and their needs; to give all schools a specialism; or to rethink sixth forms and post-16 provision. BSF is the chance to strengthen weak schools through the establishment of Academies and Trusts.
2. Proposals should particularly reflect the aims of the Children’s Plan, to think about the needs of children and families, and putting schools at the centre of the wider community, with extended school provision and the collocation of other appropriate services on schools sites.
3. All changes should be judged by the yardsticks of educational standards and opportunity. All authorities who wish to benefit from BSF investment should already be working to the challenges in the “Strategy for Change” – guidance on which is available through www.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/programme/process_sfc.jsp . Whilst we are not at this time asking all authorities to submit a Strategy for Change, a necessary condition for progressing in BSF is for authorities to have developed a robust one.

Groupings of schools

4. Building Schools for the Future projects are for groups of schools so that transformation is delivered on an area wide basis, and also this provides procurement packages which are commercially attractive. For initial projects, we are now dropping a requirement of geographical coherence where authorities wish to prioritise need in schools that may not be in the same area. Authorities will need to be sure that this does not adversely affect the strategic benefits of their projects, and proposals will need to take an area-wide approach to strategic pupil place planning.
5. All maintained secondary schools (mainstream and special) are eligible for BSF funding, including voluntary aided and controlled schools and all schools or units which teach secondary pupils, including middle-deemed-secondary schools, pupil referral units, non-maintained special schools and schools which are or are becoming academies where funding is not provided directly by the Department. BSF projects can also include special schools where all or the majority of pupils are of secondary age. Authorities should also consider the needs of hospital schools in their areas.

Prioritisation Criteria

6. The needs criteria which authorities may consider are set out in paragraph 19 of Section One. They mainly reflect the Government's aim of tackling disadvantage and underperformance, but also reflect local needs in the responses to our consultation.

7. When considering how to group their schools, authorities should balance their local needs against the over-arching government aims of educational transformation and tackling social deprivation and underperformance. The processes of prioritisation of projects within BSF set out in this guidance should help authorities consider how best to get funding for their neediest projects.

8. Where authorities have schools in the National Challenge, we expect them to have considered the needs of these schools carefully in their proposals, and be clear how the lever of capital investment can help them to improve. For projects to proceed in BSF, they will need to demonstrate that they satisfy the national agenda on choice, diversity and access.

Size of Projects

9. For initial projects we are suggesting a capital value of up to £80 million and for follow-on projects somewhere between £80 million and £100 million. These are based on the experience from early waves of what is manageable by authorities to ensure timely delivery and is attractive to the market. These are not fixed limits, but we would expect good reasons for supporting projects which are smaller or larger, depending on circumstances. This means that initial projects will usually include up to five schools and follow-on projects up to seven, and will include new build, and major and minor refurbishment. Authorities may use the BSF funding allocation model (available from http://www.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/documents/BSF_Guidance_Documents/FundingAllocationModel.xls) to model funding options.

10. We encourage cross boundary working, including in the procurement of Local Educational Partnerships, where the natural catchment area/demographics suggest that this makes most sense (for instance providing a grouping of schools with high social need); or where there is a strong rationale for school improvement; or where one-wave single-authority projects may be too small to attract the market. We encourage authorities to submit joint projects where this is the case, including using an existing LEP where this is possible. The BSF programme now has successful models for cross border working, PfS will be able to share lessons learned with authorities and 4ps is producing guidance on issues to address in joint procurement.

11. Lessons from the early waves suggest that the LEP model is more likely to be appropriate for authorities with an overall BSF programme (not individual project) capital value of at least £150 million. So where authorities' total capital value - not just the initial priority project - is less than this, the optimal value for money procurement route may be through the PfS national

framework (or other local/regional frameworks). However, we do expect smaller authorities to consider procuring a LEP jointly with other local authorities to enable a higher value, more sustainable proposition to be put to the market.

12. Effective consultation and agreement with all stakeholders, including with schools, is of course essential as you develop your plans. Diocesan and other voluntary aided bodies must be fully consulted, and it will be of benefit if this is done early. Projects which in time are appraised for readiness to deliver, but which do not show appropriate and effective local consultation and agreement, will not be able to proceed.

13. The BSF funding allocation model gives an indication of the envelope of funding that will be available for each project, including funding for ICT. The investment that each school needs will vary considerably depending on the level of building need and other need each has, and its location. Investment may range from a few hundred thousand pounds for relatively minor improvements and refurbishment or ICT needs, to £20 million to £25 million for value for money complete rebuilding of an obsolescent/uneconomic school.

14. Since we launched BSF, the Department has published several important design guides for secondary schools. Details of these are given in the sources at the end of this guidance.

15. In total, these design guides set out a blueprint for how we see schools being transformed to support the delivery of high-class 21st century education. This means creating inspirational buildings that are:

- a. appropriate for new educational developments and new technologies, but adaptable enough to cater for the changing needs of the future;
- b. a resource for the whole community offering where school facilities can be shared, and which can offer a range of collocated facilities such as childcare, health and social services and adult training;
- c. inclusive, providing appropriate provision for the individual learning needs of all pupils; and
- d. high-quality, attractive, buildings of individual character that are fit for purpose, sustainable, flexible and adaptable.

16. These schools should provide pleasant and appropriate spaces for all school users; spaces in which all pupils, including those with special educational needs and disabilities, feel that their needs are respected, and which enable all members of the school workforce to work, rest and socialise. When you join the programme, a PfS design manager and education ICT adviser will help you to develop your thinking in these areas. In the meantime, guidance is available from the PfS website.

Submission arrangements

17. We require electronic submission of expressions of interest. Each one will include a short Word document based on the template provided, setting out details of the groupings of schools and reasons for prioritisation; and also an Excel file that will show each project in prioritised order and include the details of the schools in each project. Templates for these submissions are attached at Annexes A and B below. Further details about filling in the Excel file are attached at Annex C

18. Please e-mail an electronic copy of your revised expression of interest to eoipartnerships@schools.org.uk by 5 pm on **30 November 2008**.

19. You will receive an e-mail acknowledgement of your expression of interest within a week of the deadline.

20. The information requested is intended to be light-touch, so that it can be completed, where authorities wish, by their own officers.

**LOCAL AUTHORITY EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR INCLUSION IN
THE BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE PROGRAMME,
November 2008**

Local authority Name	
Local authority number	

Contact details

Name	Address	Telephone number	e-mail address

Introduction

1. Short background to whole-authority education estate – numbers and types of schools

Strategic education plans:

2. For authorities not yet in the programme, your strategic plans for the delivery of secondary education transformation in your area, and what, if any, consultation you have done on these plans. (Up to two pages A4); or
3. For those authorities with a project in waves 1 to 6a, a single page A4 setting out how your revised expression of interest strengthens your strategy for change and complements the area-wide transformation aspirations of your earlier project.
4. All Local authorities should provide an authority-wide map which shows the location of all secondary schools. This should include the prioritisation of each project. For completeness, please list separately and show in the maps schools in each geographical area which are not to receive investment – for instance, recently built schools.

Rationale for local prioritisation decision

5. All authorities should explain the methodology they have used to prioritise their schools and should demonstrate how their plans support the ministerial prioritisation criteria included in this guidance.
6. All authorities must complete the Excel pro-forma (attached at Annex B), to show the local prioritisation of schools into groups of around five schools for initial projects or seven for follow on projects. Data required include an initial projection of required pupil places and a view on the investment plans (combination of new build, remodelling and minor refurbishment) for each school.

Readiness to deliver

7. Authorities should be aware of readiness to deliver requirements, and may wish to highlight any readiness to deliver issues which either suggest they are ready, or explain any further work required to get ready. This is an opportunity for authorities to say when they expect to be ready to start in BSF. But this is **not** a bidding exercise, and we **do not** at this stage require substantiating evidence – only an indication of when the authority believes is the best timing for it to enter the programme.

8. Authorities are encouraged to be realistic about their state of readiness; the Department would prefer to be told of a preference for later entry if that is the case. This will not affect the assessment of other prioritisation criteria.

Completing the Data Sheets

9. There are two data sheets in the Excel file. Only “new” authorities, not yet started in the programme, should fill in the first sheet, which is for the initial priority project – all authorities will fill-in the second sheet which will list their follow-on projects, shown in descending order of your priority. For follow on projects, continuation sheets in the same excel format, may be added if required by copying and pasting the second sheet. If you do this, please be sure to change the heading of each group of schools to reflect your prioritisation of that group.

10. When completed, the data sheets show how you wish your schools grouped and prioritised. For initial priority projects there must be only one grouping of about five schools which have a capital value of about £80 million. For the follow-on projects, we have provided two project groupings in the data sheet, but larger authorities will of course require more: please add additional sheets as necessary as outlined above.

11. Similarly, we have provided five rows in each project: please add additional rows where you wish to include more than five schools in a project.

12. We have provided drop-down options for the investment proposal and school type columns.

13. The sum of initial project and follow-on data must include all existing schools not yet started in a BSF project and their data. The data used to prioritise projects will be that relating to all the pupils in existing schools, and therefore you must provide full details even where you are proposing to close or amalgamate a school.

14. Where you are proposing new additional schools, you do not of course have to provide details such as names, but you must show the planned size of the school.

Anonymising

15. We would prefer you to complete all details of all existing schools in each project. However we appreciate that there may be local sensitivities about school organisation proposals, particularly with regard to potential closures. We do not aim to publish details of expressions of interest, but we cannot guarantee that we could withhold information if requested.

16. Where an authority is aiming for early start on a project, we would expect reorganisation proposals to be already in the public domain as part of readiness to deliver. This may not apply to less urgent priorities.

17. Therefore, authorities may if they wish, provide information on their existing schools, but leave the columns relating to investment plans blank. This information will of course have to be available when authorities are asked to provide readiness to deliver information.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION, ASSISTANCE AND HELP

Questions about details of the guidance and completing returns:

eoipartnerships@partnershipsfor-schools.org.uk

Questions relating to schools capital policy

Shaw Warnock, Schools capital strategy unit, DCSF at
shaw.warnock@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk, phone 020 7925 6454

Written guidance

Information on schools capital policy, including funding programmes and design guidance, can be found through
www.teachernet.gov.uk/schoolscapital.

Guidance on all aspects of the BSF process, including lessons learned is available at www.partnershipsfor-schools.org.uk

In particular, authorities will wish to read “an introduction to Building Schools for the Future” – a joint publication from PfS and 4ps. This is available at www.partnershipsfor-schools.org.uk/documents/BSF_Guidance_Documents/BSF%20Introductory%20Guide%202008.pdf.

In the meantime 4ps, the local government partner in the programme, will be available to hold initial meetings with Authorities to provide background briefing on BSF and provide an opportunity for discussion and questions. (Contact: Juliet.Manuel@4ps.gov.uk)

School Design

Extensive guidance on space standards, innovative design for school buildings, facilities and grounds, on sustainability and health and safety considerations, and other matters relating to school buildings can be found through: www.teachernet.gov.uk/schoolbuildings.