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The following schools are affected by this Consultation Report:

- Sandwick Junior High School
- Anderson High School

This Consultation Report has been issued by Shetland Islands Council Children’s Services in accordance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.
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1. Summary of Process for this Consultation Report

1.1 Notice of Consultation

A Notice of Consultation for this Proposal was provided to the consultees listed under Distribution List 1.10. This Notice provided full details of how to access the Proposal Paper. The Proposal Paper was available in affected schools, Hayfield House and Shetland Library. It was also published on the Council’s website, www.shetland.gov.uk

1.2 Advertisement in Local Media

A Notice of Consultation was published in local media on Friday 7 February 2014.

1.3 Length of Consultation Period

The Consultation Period for the Proposal ran from Thursday 13 February 2014 until Friday 28 March 2014. This period allowed for the statutory minimum of 30 school days.

1.4 Public meetings

Public meetings were held on:

Tuesday 04 March 2014
at Sandwick Junior High School
Sandwick
ZE2 9HH
from 7.00pm to 9.00pm

and

Wednesday 05 March 2014
at Anderson High School
Lerwick
ZE1 0JH
from 7.00pm to 9.00pm

A note was taken at the meetings of questions and views. These notes are published on the Shetland Islands Council website, and a copy will be made available on request.

1.5 Involvement of Education Scotland (previously Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Education)

Shetland Islands Council provided Education Scotland with a copy of the Proposal Paper on the date of publication. Education Scotland also received a copy of all relevant written representations received by Shetland Islands Council from any person during the Consultation Period. Education Scotland has also received a summary of all oral representations made to Shetland Islands Council at the public meetings that were held. Education Scotland has prepared a report on the educational aspects of the Proposal. In preparation of their report, Education Scotland have visited the affected schools and made such reasonable enquiries of
such people there as they considered appropriate and have made such reasonable enquiries of such other people as they consider appropriate.

1.6 **Preparation of this Consultation Report**

Shetland Islands Council has reviewed the Proposal having regard to Education Scotland’s report, the written representations that it has received and the oral representations made to it by any person at the public meetings. Children’s Services has, on behalf of Shetland Islands Council, prepared this Consultation Report.

This Consultation Report is published in electronic and printed formats. It is available on the Shetland Islands Council website, from Hayfield House, Shetland Library, as well as the affected schools, free of charge from **19 May 2014**.

Anyone who made written responses during the Consultation Period has been informed about the publication of this Report. This Report includes a record of the total number of written representations made during the consultation period, a summary of the written representations, a summary of the oral representations made at the public meetings, Shetland Islands Council’s response to Education Scotland’s Report as well as any written or oral representations it has received, together with a copy of Education Scotland’s Report and all other relevant information, including details of any alleged inaccuracies and how these have been handled.

This Consultation Report also contains a statement explaining how it complied with the requirement to review the Proposal in light of Education Scotland’s Report and representations (both written and oral) that it received.

This Consultation Report was published on 19 May 2014 and is available for further consideration for a period of three weeks. The intention is that interested parties should have time to see and digest the contents of this Consultation Report and also have time, if they so wish, to voice concerns and approach and lobby the Councillors who will be deciding on the Proposal.

1.7 **Decision**

This Consultation Report, together with any other relevant documentation, will be considered by Shetland Islands Council, Education and Families Committee on **9 June 2014**. This decision is then subject to Shetland Islands Council approval on **9 June 2014**.

1.8 **Scottish Ministers Call-in**

As set out in The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, Shetland Islands Council is required to notify the Scottish Ministers of its decision and provide them with a copy of the Proposal Paper and Consultation Report.

The Scottish Ministers have a six week period from the date of that final decision on 9 June 2014 to decide if they will call-in the proposal. Within the first three weeks of that six-week period, the Scottish Ministers will take account of any relevant representations made to them by any person. Until the outcome of the six-week call-in process has been notified to Shetland Islands Council, they will not proceed to implement the Proposal approved at Stage 1.7 above. If the Scottish Ministers
call-in the Proposal they may refuse to consent to the Proposal or grant their consent to the Proposal subject to conditions or unconditionally. Until the outcome of the call-in has been notified to Shetland Islands Council, they are unable to proceed to implement the Proposal.

1.9 **Note on Corrections**

If any inaccuracy or omission is discovered in the Proposal Paper either by Shetland Islands Council or any person, Shetland Islands Council will determine if relevant information has been omitted or, there has been an inaccuracy. It will then take appropriate action which may include the issue of a correction or the reissuing of the Proposal Paper or the revision of the timescale for the Consultation Period if appropriate. In that event, relevant consultees and Education Scotland would have been advised. The Consultation Report highlights the actions taken and why.

1.10 **Distribution**

A copy of this Consultation Report is available on the Shetland Islands Council website: www.shetland.gov.uk.

Copies are also available free of charge from Hayfield House, affected schools and the Shetland Library.

The list of Consultees are:

- the Parent Councils of the affected schools;
- the parents of the pupils of the affected schools;
- the parents of any children expected by Children’s Services to attend any of the affected schools within two years of the date of the publication of the Proposal Paper;
- the pupils at the affected school in so far as Children's Services considers them to be of a suitable age and maturity;
- the staff (teaching and other) at any affected school;
- any trade union which is a representative of the staff;
- the Community Councils of the affected areas;
- the Community Planning Partnership;
- any other users of the affected schools that Schools Service considers relevant;
- the constituency Member of the Scottish Parliament;
- the constituency Member of Parliament;
- the list Members of the Scottish Parliament.
Copies of this Consultation Report are also available on request from:

Children’s Services
Hayfield House
Hayfield Lane
Lerwick
Shetland
ZE1 0QD

Or by email: schoolconsultations@shetland.gov.uk

This Consultation Report is available in alternative formats or in translated form for readers whose first language is not English. Please apply to the above address.
2. Introduction

2.1 This is a Consultation Report prepared in compliance with The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 on the following Proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That subject to the outcome of this proposal exercise and statutory consultation process as set out in the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, namely Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 be discontinued with effect from 03 July 2015, or as soon as possible thereafter;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 pupils of Sandwick Junior High School continue their education at Anderson High School from 17 August 2015, or as soon as possible thereafter; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the catchment area for Anderson High School for Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 pupils be altered to include the current catchment area for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 pupils.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 The purpose of the Consultation Report is to:

- provide a record of the total number of written representations (responses) made during the Statutory Consultation Period;
- provide a summary of the written representations (responses);
- provide a summary of oral representations made at the public meetings held on 04 March 2014 and 05 March 2014, and the additional meeting held with current parents of Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School, held on 19 February 2014;
- provide a statement of Children’s Services response to those written and oral representations;
- provide the full text of Education Scotland’s Report and a statement of Children’s Service’s response to this Report;
- state how Shetland Islands Council reviewed the above Proposal following the representations received during the Statutory Consultation Period and the Report from Education Scotland;
- provide details of any omission from, or inaccuracy in, the Proposal Paper and state how Shetland Islands Council acted upon it;
- state how Shetland Islands Council has complied with Section 12 of The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 when reviewing the above Proposal;
- provide an explanation of how representations can be made to the Scottish Ministers in terms of Section 15(4) of The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.
3. **Background**

3.1 In February 2012, following on from the original work to develop a Blueprint for Education in Shetland which commenced in 2007, Councillors asked Children’s Services to “undertake a refresh of the Blueprint for Education using existing information, taking account of the outcome of the Commission on the Delivery of Rural School Education deliberations and guidance, when available, considering the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence, the Senior Phase, the National Qualifications range and links with further education/other learning settings and based on the underpinning principles of the Blueprint for Education project of equality, quality and value for money, and taking account all new learning methods and Information Communication Technology links and facilities”.


**Shetland Islands Council’s Statement for Education 2012-2017 is:**

“We will ensure the best quality education for all our pupils to enable them to become successful learners, who are confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens. We will achieve this through the highest standard of teaching and learning delivered in modern, well-equipped school buildings which are financially sustainable”.

Shetland Islands Council’s Commitments for Education 2012-2017, which took account of the Principles of Education agreed by Councillors in March 2009, are:

- Primary Education: we will provide primary education in all our remote isles with pre-school provision as and when required. We will organise primary education in establishments which are viable both educationally and financially sustainable.
- Secondary Education: we will organise education to provide the breadth of curriculum to best develop a young person’s skills and particular interests in viable establishments/schools.
- Childcare: it will be developed in line with the Childcare Strategy. We will work with voluntary and private sector providers to secure more integrated and flexible services that meet local need.
- Youth Strategy: we will develop a Youth Strategy for Shetland which encapsulates activities children and young people are involved in across Shetland.
- Catchment Areas: we will consult on any change to a school’s catchment area as part of any future statutory consultation process.
- Travel Times: we will organise transport to ensure that, as far as possible, pupils will not travel for longer than the current maximum single journey time in 2011/12.
- Transport: we will ensure School Transport is given high priority.
- Community involvement in Schools: we will work to ensure that: children’s community identity is protected, opportunities are put in place for them to be participating in any new school community they are part of and the Youth Strategy is developed to enhance young people’s participation in the communities they are part of.
Use of Buildings: we will ensure that the potential use of school buildings will be part of the statutory consultation process.

Shetland Islands Council’s agreed Plan for Delivering Education 2012-2017 was as follows:

**Phase 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closure Proposal</th>
<th>Receiving School</th>
<th>Statutory Consultation</th>
<th>Proposed Transfer Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aith Junior High School Secondary Department</td>
<td>Anderson High School</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skerries School Secondary Department</td>
<td>Anderson High School</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olnafirth Primary School</td>
<td>Brae High School Primary Department</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department</td>
<td>Anderson High School</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closure Proposal</th>
<th>Receiving School</th>
<th>Statutory Consultation</th>
<th>Proposed Transfer Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burravoe Primary School</td>
<td>Mid Yell Junior High School Primary Department</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Roe Primary School</td>
<td>Ollaberry Primary School</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urafirth Primary School</td>
<td>Ollaberry Primary School</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urafirth Primary School Nursery Department</td>
<td>Ollaberry Primary School</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closure Proposal</th>
<th>Receiving School</th>
<th>Statutory Consultation</th>
<th>Proposed Transfer Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whalsay School Secondary Department</td>
<td>Anderson High School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandness Primary School</td>
<td>Happyhansel Primary School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The statutory consultation regarding the proposed closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department was moved from Phase 3 to Phase 1 following requests from Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council. This was approved by
Education and Families Committee on 23 January 2013 and Shetland Islands Council on 18 February 2013.

3.3 On 20 September 2012, the Medium Term Financial Plan was also approved by Shetland Islands Council. This included an identified saving of £3.268 million to be found from Children’s Services. An updated Medium Term Financial Plan was subsequently approved by Shetland Islands Council on 28 August 2013 and the Budget Book for 2014/15 was then agreed by Shetland Islands Council on 11 December 2013. No change has been made to the level of savings Children’s Services has to find over the next three years.

3.4 As a result of the development of the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence and community concerns about the agreed proposals, Children’s Services put forward amendments to the secondary proposals agreed in the Blueprint for Education 2012-2017, to Education and Families Committee, and a special meeting of Shetland Islands Council on 11 September 2013. These proposed changes: The Next Steps, were put forward to avoid transitions between schools during a child’s secondary education, if at all possible and, where they were inevitable, manage them carefully. The proposals set out below were recommended as the Next Steps option.

- Skerries School Secondary Department proposed closure consultation should progress as planned with the aim of transferring pupils in August 2014 depending on the outcome of the consultation.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department closure consultation should progress as planned with the aim of transferring pupils to the Anderson High School in August 2016 depending on the outcome of the consultation. If the Anderson High School can accommodate the additional pupils from Sandwick earlier than 2016 that should be supported.

- Aith Junior High School Secondary Department proposed closure consultation should progress as planned with the aim of transferring pupils to the Anderson High School in August 2014 depending on the outcome of the consultation.

- Whalsay School Secondary Department should provide Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 education with pupils transferring to the Anderson High School at the beginning of Secondary 4. Similarly, provision of Secondary 4 education should be discontinued at Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School, with pupils transferring to the Anderson High School at the start of the Senior Phase. Consultations on the proposed changes should take place during 2014 with the aim of enacting the changes from August 2015. The timescale of transferring pupils to the Anderson High School could be amended from 2016 if it proves possible to absorb the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department pupils earlier than the planned 2016 schedule depending on the outcome of the consultation on Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. Pupils who could realistically travel daily to Brae High School from Yell within the current maximum journey time of 65 minutes should be offered the opportunity to do so.

- The inevitable transition required for the pupils from Whalsay, Mid Yell and Baltasound would comprise small numbers. This means that individual
transition arrangements could be developed to ensure progression pathways were achieved. It would not be possible to do that for a large number of pupils. The current projected numbers in Secondary 4 from Whalsay, Yell and Unst average 12, 11 and 5 respectively over the next three years. Given the educational imperative to minimise transitions, pupils from Whalsay, Yell, Unst and the Westside (outwith travelling distance) for whom placing requests to the Anderson High School are successfully made prior to Secondary 4, should in future, have their Halls of Residence fees waived.

- The principle of secondary pupils not having to travel more than 65 minutes for a single journey will be adhered to. Pupils from Yell who can travel to Brae within that timescale will be given the option to either travel daily to Brae High School or attend the Anderson High School and be accommodated in the Halls of Residence. Options to offer pupils who reside in the Halls of Residence more opportunities to go home will be explored. For example, it should be possible to ensure that all Westside pupils who are outwith the 65 minute travel distance leave home on Monday mornings, travel home for one night mid-week (e.g. Wednesday night) and return home again on Friday evenings. They would therefore be away from home three nights per week rather than the anticipated five.

3.5 It was very important that those pupils living in Whalsay, Yell and Unst who have to make a secondary school transition due to geographical reasons were not disadvantaged. This would require work to ensure the remaining junior high schools are adequately resourced with appropriate opportunities for teaching staff to retain skills in order to promote recruitment and retention. Critically, Shetland-wide clarity on prior learning is required to avoid transition difficulties.

3.6 However, on 11 September 2013, Shetland Islands Council resolved to postpone a decision on the proposed revisions to the Education Blueprint regarding Whalsay School Secondary Department, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department in order to allow five alternative options outlined at the Education and Families Committee meeting on 11 September 2013, to be investigated.” These options were:

- the extant Blueprint recommendations (including revisiting the motions made in September 2012);
- the “Blueprint Next Steps” recommendations;
- a Telepresence driven model, where some teaching time could be replaced by having a teacher transmit lessons to a number of sites;
- a Hub and Spoke model (setting out the options for both one and two hubs); and
- retaining the status quo for the secondary school estate within the Medium Term Financial Plan.

In addition, clarification would also be provided on a federated schools model.
Between 11 September 2013 and 13 November 2013, the detail of each of these potential options for the delivery of secondary education in Shetland was developed. This work included the following for each option:

- a detailed description of how the option would work;
- the staffing implications of the option;
- the transport implications of the option;
- the potential community impacts of the option;
- the findings of an Integrated Impact Assessment on the option are presented;
- the impact the option will have for the school estate;
- legal implications of the option;
- informal consultation feedback relevant to each option;
- the advantages and disadvantages of each option;
- the identified risks to Children’s Services of implementing the option;
- and information on implementation timelines.

In addition, and also at the request of councillors, an independent educational expert was engaged to recommend a way forward, taking account of all the information which had been gathered on each option. This was Professor Don Ledingham.

The outcome of this work was a comprehensive report on a Strategy for Secondary Education in Shetland presented to Education and Families Committee and Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013. The recommendations in the report were from Professor Don Ledingham, and were as follows:

a) Create an ambitious partnership between Shetland High Schools and the Further and Higher Education sector in Shetland. The Council delegates to the Chief Executive the co-ordination of this element of the Strategy for Secondary Education with the implementation of the Shetland Tertiary Education Research and Training Project. The Chief Executive will present enabling reports in due course.

Actions:
- Align the implementation of the partnership between Shetland High Schools and the Further and Higher Education sector in Shetland with the current proposals relating to tertiary education;
- Explore appropriate governance arrangements to maximise the learning opportunities for Shetland’s learners;
- Shetland High Schools will retain their identities and continue to have Parent Forums/Councils;
- Align curricular models and timetabling and staffing arrangements across the High Schools and the Further Education Sector in Shetland to maximise the opportunities for young people in Shetland;
- Link employers to the curriculum developments for the Senior Phase to enable the development of vocationally related courses.

b) Create a Shetland Learning Campus. The Council delegates the implementation of these resolutions to the Director of Children’s Services.
Actions:
- Align the curriculum at all secondary schools in Shetland to ensure common content, progressions and ease of transitions;
- Develop on-line access to all curricular learning materials;
- Develop and implement an independent learning programme for all students to enable them to access learning opportunities on offer in Shetland and elsewhere;
- Provide independent learning time within all student timetables to enable personal learning to take place;
- Develop and implement a professional development programme for all education staff in Shetland relating to open on-line learning;
- Enable all qualifications delivered through secondary school or college to be undertaken by adult learners – either via on-line materials or through face-to-face attendance in classes.

c) Rationalise secondary education provision in Shetland as set out below. The Council delegates the implementation of these resolutions to the Director of Children’s Services.

Actions:
- Children’s Services progresses statutory consultation on the proposed closure of Aith Junior High School Secondary Department according to existing Shetland Islands Council policy with a proposed transfer date for pupils of August 2014;
- Children’s Services progresses with statutory consultation on the proposed closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department according to existing Shetland Islands Council policy with a proposed transfer date for pupils of August 2016 or earlier if the existing Anderson High School can absorb the pupils;
- Children’s Services undertakes statutory consultation during 2014 on the discontinuation of stages of education in Whalsay School Secondary Department, namely Secondary 3 and Secondary 4, with transfer of pupils to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2; to take effect from the start of the school session 2015/16 onwards;
- Children’s Services undertakes statutory consultation during 2014 on the discontinuation of stages of education in Mid Yell Junior High School Secondary Department, namely Secondary 3 and Secondary 4, with transfer of pupils to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2; to take effect from the start of the school session 2015/16 onwards;
- Children’s Services undertakes statutory consultation during 2014 on the discontinuation of stages of education in Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department, namely Secondary 3 and Secondary 4, with transfer of pupils to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2; to take effect from the start of the school session 2015/16 onwards.

3.10 On 13 November 2013, Shetland Islands Council agreed to create an ambitious partnership between Shetland High Schools and the Further and Higher Education sector in Shetland, and they agreed to create a Shetland Learning Campus. However they did not agree to the proposed programme of rationalisation of secondary education as presented.
3.11 Instead of approving statutory consultation on the proposed closure of Aith Junior High School Secondary Department and Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, they instructed Children’s Services to consult on the discontinuation of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 in these secondary departments as well as in Whalsay School, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School.

3.12 This proposal to discontinue the provision of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School therefore, is the first proposal Children’s Services is putting forward for statutory consultation as part of the decision on 13 November 2013.

4. Consultation Process

4.1 The requirements for consulting on proposed school closures are set out in The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

- The Proposal Paper was issued on 13 February 2014. This is attached as Appendix A. A copy of this document or information on the Proposal was provided free of charge to the consultees listed within the document. Copies were also available at the affected schools, Hayfield House and at Shetland Library.
- A Public Notice ran in the Shetland Times newspaper on Friday 7 February 2014. A Notice of Consultation appeared on www.shetnews.co.uk and remained for the duration of the consultation. Details of the consultation also ran on local radio.
- Two Public Meetings were held on 04 March 2014 at Sandwick Junior High School and 05 March 2014 in Anderson High School.
- At the request of Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council an additional meeting with the parents of current Secondary 2 pupils at Sandwick Junior High School was also held. This meeting took place on 19 February 2014.
- A meeting was held with Sandwick Junior High School staff on 27 February 2014, and was led by the Executive Manager, Quality Improvement.
- Two drop-in sessions were held with Anderson High School staff on 14 March 2014 and 17 March 2014.
- The Quality Improvement Officer for Sandwick Junior High School supported by the head teacher of Sandwick Junior High School consulted with pupils of Sandwick Junior High School.
- The Quality Improvement Officer for Anderson High School consulted Anderson High School Student Representative Council.
- The Consultation Period ended on Friday 28 March 2014.
- A copy of the Proposal Paper was sent to Education Scotland. They visited Sandwick Junior High School and the Anderson High School and spoke to relevant consultees. They also received a copy of all written representations (responses). They then prepared a Report on the educational aspects of the Proposal. This is attached as Appendix B.

4.2 This Consultation Report is Children’s Services response to the issues raised during the Consultation Period including a response to identified inaccuracies in the Proposal Paper.

4.3 This Consultation Report will be published three weeks before a final decision is taken by Shetland Islands Council.
5. **Representations**

5.1 Seventy-six people attended the Public Meeting held in Sandwick Junior High School on 04 March 2014. The minute of this public meeting is attached as Appendix C. Six people attended the additional Public Meeting held at the Anderson High School on 05 March 2014. The minute of this public meeting is attached as Appendix D. An additional meeting was held with parents of current Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department on 19 February 2014. This meeting was held at the request of Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council. The minute of this meeting is attached as Appendix E.

5.2 The total number of written responses received during the Consultation Period was three hundred and sixteen. The detail of how each respondent described their interest is set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Resident</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent / Carer</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Person</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Councils</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Pupil</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not stated</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>316</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Summary of the Written Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of written consultation responses received</th>
<th>316</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed with the Proposal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreed with the Proposal in favour of no change to provision at Sandwick Junior High School</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>78.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreed with the Proposal in favour of closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did not indicate an opinion or request further information</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 5 who agreed with the Proposal, the most often stated reasons were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Education</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>60.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Distance/Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 247 who disagreed with the Proposal in favour of no change to provision at Sandwick Junior High School, the most often stated reasons were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Education</th>
<th>184</th>
<th>77.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Concerns</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Considerations</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Distance/time</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Issues</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 12 who disagreed with the Proposal in favour of closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, the most often stated reasons were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Education</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>54.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Considerations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Implications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Capacity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Summary of Oral Representations made at the Statutory Public Meeting held at Sandwick Junior High School on Tuesday 04 March 2014

- As a parent of a current Secondary 2 child at Sandwick Junior High School, can you please explain to me the advantages for my child of this proposal as they will have to move at the end of Secondary 3?

- Surely the current Secondary 2 group at Sandwick Junior High School should be allowed to stay here until the end of Secondary 4?

- The consultation period does not allow for enough time for consideration of these important issues.

- Parents of Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School are being forced to make a decision about the future of their child's education. The timing of this consultation is dreadful with parents not knowing the outcome of the process until after the timetables change for the new school year. They must decide whether to put in a placing request to the Anderson High School to ensure their child does not have a transition at the end of Secondary 3 without knowing whether this proposal will be accepted or not.

- The proposal indicates that the end of Secondary 3 would be the worst time to transfer, so this does not give any parents confidence that even with a year to prepare for it, that this would be a good time.

- If the consultation period had started in August then we would not be facing this issue for any year group.

- One third of the population of Mainland Shetland is served by Sandwick Junior High School. I cannot believe that you want to disenfranchise one third of the population of Mainland Shetland for some cost cutting exercise.

- If junior highs don't fit the new system with Curriculum for Excellence then surely they must all be upgrade to Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 schools.

- If Curriculum for Excellence is Secondary 1 to Secondary 3, then Secondary 4 to Secondary 6, then sure the proposal should be for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to be Secondary 1 to Secondary 3?

- If Secondary 3 is not deemed to be the best time to transfer then why are some of our children being asked to do it?

- What was the educational advantage of transferring at the end of Secondary 3? I think I missed it. The point of there being no
disadvantage to children is not demonstrating an educational benefit. Damage prevention is not educational benefit.

- Our children should be allowed to excel. This group of children should be allowed to stay on at Sandwick Junior High School.

- At the meeting call by Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council with Secondary 2 parents, some reassurance was given that if enough responses indicated that parents of Secondary 2 children wished their children to stay on at Sandwick Junior High School, then that could be looked at.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department has an excellent reputation and this is reflected in the attainment results of the children. This was one of the reasons I moved to the area. What are the educational advantages going to be for my son in transferring to a school where he will be travelling for two hours per day, and where he will be in a class of 33 instead of 17?

- Teachers cannot give the same amount of support when they are teaching larger classes.

- The Anderson High School is a very good school but Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is an excellent school.

- What is the saving from this proposal?

- I have been to a lot of meetings and I do not remember Curriculum for Excellence being brought up as a reason for these school closures. I think there is a lot of criticism in the press and a lot of teachers with concerns around Curriculum for Excellence. We cannot base our education system around that.

- I am worried about our children who will find the move to a large school difficult. What will be done if they can’t cope? Will there be extra pastoral care put in place? Will more children end up being home schooled.

- I would quite like to see evidence of the Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department not having an effect on the children. I would like to see it documented as well.

- Where do the views expressed tonight end up?

- One of the things that struck me from the proposal paper was that the results for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and the results for the Anderson High School are quite different. The results for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department are better than the Anderson High School over a longer sustained period. It is difficult for me to understand why you want to get rid of the best parts of the
organisation that are performing better and expand the one that is not expanding so well, particularly for me as my children are going to have to be travelling over an hour on a bus to get it.

- If you look at the attainment data and compare it across other local authorities in Scotland you match that again, it is that type of catchment area, which is done in respect of free school meals. What you find is Anderson High School sits pretty much where it is expected to sit, and Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department sits significantly higher. That is quite surprising given it actually expects Anderson High School to outperform Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department given its catchment area. Those comments are also referred to in the Education Scotland Inspection Report for Anderson High School where it says that the Anderson High School performs at its expected level in catchment area or above. I know it’s a long time ago but the HMIe report for Sandwick which is also on the Education Scotland website refers to performing significantly higher. It is even higher than the national average, and the wording is quite different. The Secondary 4 results are quite startlingly different in each year and so it sustains a large difference. I accept that things will go up and down. You would expect Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department’s results to be volatile, but every year they are outstripping it by a significant amount.

- This proposal is all about money and the proposed savings are only £223,000. You are planning to cause all this disruption for this small amount of savings. It is a ridiculously small amount when you consider the amount of money Shetland Islands Council has wasted over the years on projects like the Bressay Bridge, Smyril Line, the new Anderson High School and many others.

- You all keep speaking about the Medium Term Financial Plan when you should be looking at the long term finances. A great deal of money will come into Shetland Islands Council from developments at Sullom Voe Oil Terminal. This will make £223,000 a nonsense amount of money.

- There is actually far more money around in Shetland Islands Council than there was. Things are better. I believe education is under spent this year. Is this not the case?

- You keep speaking about the Medium Term Financial Plan. I am speaking about the long term sustainability of our rural communities and our children’s education. Has the extra £1.8 million which will come from the Sullom Voe Oil Terminal been taken into consideration?

- I could not get my electronic response form submitted and was told to send it by post.
• If this proposal only saves £223,000 where will the rest of the required savings come from?

• Other proposals to cut things like instrumental instruction and reduce teaching staff further are just scaremongering.

• How is my son spending two hours on a bus each day educational advantage?

• How many things will my son now not be able to join in with after school?

• The staff at Sandwick Junior High School have been amazing through this. It has been a very difficult situation for them to deal with, but they have continued to deliver the excellent service they have always done.

• How is a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model going to work? With the numbers in Sandwick Junior High Secondary Department I can’t see that teachers will be spending much time in the school. I am concerned that we are going to end up with the Hub and Spoke model.

• Every secondary child in Shetland is going to be affected by these proposals except those who attend Brae High School. For some reason they seem to be immune despite the fact that if Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department had an Secondary 5 and Secondary 6, it would be a bigger school than Brae High School.

• £223,000 is not much savings for all the upset this proposal is going to cause our children and this lovely school.

• The costs of the central service are £1.5 million. So a large part of your £3.26 million savings could be made by cutting that. It seems like you are looking after your own and cutting the service to our children which is very disappointing. The Director of Children’s Services is one of the highest earners in Shetland Islands Council, so you could start there.

• We are going to be stressed if we think during our Secondary 3 year that we are going to have to move schools. This will affect our school work.

• Teachers will look for other jobs if this Proposal is implemented.

• It will be impossible for my child who has additional support needs to travel for such a long time each morning, then sit with different children, have different teachers and a whole new learning environment, then travel home. He just wouldn’t cope. It would be far too much for him. With bigger classes teachers will just not be able to give him the help he needs.

• The budget for children with additional support needs has been cut. Schools are having to bid for resources for children. The budget has
been cut and cut in schools but I have spent £350 of my own money in my class over the past few years, so I have saved you that amount.

- We are affluent in Shetland and we should be able to spend a bit more money on education if we want to. Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is more efficient on costs per child than most other schools in Shetland.

- Sandwick operates on the national average of child to teacher ratios, while the child to teacher ratio in Brae High School is much higher.

- The proposal does not tell us how the education of my child will be improved with a move to the Anderson High School.

- Closing Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department removes a choice for secondary education for all parents in the South Mainland.

- I can’t see how making a transition at the end of Secondary 2 is going to improve everything for everybody.

- If councillors gave you enough money you would not have to make these choices. We have an excellent education system and you are going to decimate it to save a few pennies.

- The recommendations in the Professor Don Ledingham report were around £1 million short of the £3.268 required savings target. The amendment I put forward, which was agreed added another £1 million to that shortfall. However part of the amendment was also that a report should come back to Shetland Islands Council indicating what the shortfall was, and it would be for councillors to decide where that money should be found from. It was not that it has to come from Children’s Services and I am disappointed that this is what is being suggested still.

- The reasons why Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 were not considered viable options was because there is a degree of prior learning required with the decision which has been taken that children should study for seven National Qualifications in Secondary 4. I think when communities rejected Secondary 3, it was as opposed to Secondary 4. There are two main reasons in the proposal paper why Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 is not viable, one is the flexible Higher. How many children are doing flexible Highers this year, and if there are not many, when do you envisage this taking effect?

- The other main educational benefit was around wider achievement. I would like to understand what from wider achievement like Duke of Edinburgh and volunteering cannot be achieved in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.
I hear your aspiration that no child should have a transition during their secondary education. However, as a parent of a child in Dunrossness, all I see is that this proposal adds in another transition for my child at the end of Secondary 2, so I struggle to see the educational benefit. My child would come to Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department for two years, and then would move again to the Anderson High School. They would move to the Anderson High School at an age younger than I hoped they would. I am not happy for my child to have two transitions. The only alternative would be for my child to go to the Anderson High School after Primary 7 which is a scary prospect.

How can people not see that Shetland Islands Council is losing credibility over proposals like these?

I am concerned, as a bus driver, about all the younger children who have not chosen to travel to Anderson High School to carry on with their education. They are not as motivated and are more likely to be disruptive. These are long journeys and the bus driver can’t control this.

We were only told about this Proposal at the end of January. Now we face an impossible decision about our future education if we are in Secondary 2. We will have to decide whether or not to move to the Anderson High School when we don’t know the outcome of this Proposal.

What is the minimum number for this school to remain viable as a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school? Some parents will not put their children to a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school and just move them right to the Anderson High School.

If the savings are not made, will we be sitting here next year with a proposal to close Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 as well?

Have there been costings for the extra buses which will be required? Have there been costings for an escort to travel on the buses?

At present the bus I drive with South Mainland children also is a public service so anyone can get on it.

I can’t keep an eye on all the children and keep my eyes on the road. This situation is made even worse in bad weather. If a school is going on a school trip during the school day there is a ratio of adult to child supervision which has to be adhered to.

There is a shortage of bus drivers at the moment with all the oil related developments in Sullom Voe.

The extra buses required and the extra drivers will eat into your savings of £223,000.
I found the transition to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 4 difficult. Ideally I would like to see Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department as a Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 school but that is not going to happen. I think the prospect of Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 is a scary one as the children will have to move here then move again.

Are things like instrumental going to still be slashed anyway if we were to give up the secondary department here?

I have a friend who moved to the Anderson High School after Primary 7 and got on fine there. I think if we have to move then the end of Secondary 2 is better than the end of Secondary 4, as you have begun sitting all your exams then.

Will transport be provided to extra-curricular activities?

I cannot argue with what has been said about Shetland Islands Council wasting money in the past. However it is not just about money which has been wasted on capital projects, it is also about the money which Shetland Islands Council has been taking from its reserves to pay for the services it has built up. We have to work to a Medium Term Financial Plan to sort this out. We hope that money will come in again in the next few years from the now oil developments. However, we have an immediate problem to deal with. A number of councillors wanted to prioritise services better but what we inherited was an across the board cut. We want to prioritise education more but we have not managed that look across all services, and that is part of the problem. I took the view that Professor Ledingham’s recommendations for Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 might not be perfect, but that this would be better than a closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. If it were to close it would not open again, but with the economy on the up, if we kept some secondary provision, then we may be able to develop this further in the future.

If we lose the secondary department here or part of it, it will never re-open.

This is a big decision for a small amount of money.
8. Summary of Oral Representations made at the additional public meeting held at the Anderson High School on Wednesday 05 March 2014

- We are concerned to hear how the flow through Curriculum for Excellence will be managed through to the Senior Phase. We want reassurance that no child will be disadvantaged if they are coming into the Anderson High School for the start of Secondary 3, or if they have been at the Anderson High School all the way through.

- Some parents of the Anderson High School are concerned that with more teachers moving between schools, this may affect choice of subjects available at the Anderson High School. Choice is already being limited in the Senior Phase.

- We know that more teachers are now being shared between schools and this is raising concerns about how information is passed between teachers who are not in one school for the whole week. We want to know how much more of this is likely to happen under this proposal.

- We are concerned with this proposal that parents will bypass their local junior high school and send their children straight to the Anderson High School. Up until now the local authority has not had to refuse any placing requests. This may not continue to be the case, and leaves uncertainty about the numbers in the Anderson High School.

- We are concerned about class sizes increasing and about the pressure on social areas and facilities. Our concern is whether the existing Anderson High School can accommodate children if they are moving before the new Anderson High School has been completed. We think the timing should be adjusted to take place when the new Anderson High School has opened.

- Some parents have expressed concerns about children coming from the outer isles to the hostel at a younger age. Staff at the Anderson High School and the Janet Courtney hall of Residence have been very reassuring about this.

- The Anderson High School Parent Council is very aware of the budget position that Shetland Islands Council is facing. The Anderson High School serves children from all areas of Shetland. These proposals do not make the level of savings required. If they are not agreed then decisions on further alternative savings will have to be made. We hope this will not have a disproportionate impact on the Anderson High School.
• Are you not going to lose a lot of teachers with this proposal through lack of career opportunities? Is it not the case that they will be doing a job which can be done by primary teachers? Is this an efficient use of staff, quite apart from the disruption of them travelling all over the place?

• I am concerned with using teacher in different schools each year, that my children will face having different teachers through their six year career. A two-year school would be quite stable compared to the changes which could come to a Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 school with these arrangements.

• Are staff at the Anderson High School currently timetabled on their maximum class contact?

• Staffing in secondary across the school estate is capable of delivering more capacity, so the proposals here may not lead to any less efficiency than we have in the current system.

• Can you remind us of the difference in savings from this proposal and the proposal recommended to Shetland Islands Council to have two six year secondary schools and some smaller schools in the North Isles?

• If this proposal goes ahead, will Children’s Services make the level of savings it is required to make under the terms of the Medium Term Financial Plan?

• If this proposal is thrown out will we be sitting here in a few months debating closure?

• If the new legislation goes through, is the five year embargo on anything to do with that particular school or the same proposal on that particular school?

• We are discussing this expensive unworkable proposal at the same time as we are cutting funding to Shetland College. This is not joined up Shetland learning.

• Sandwick Junior High School has not been able to discuss Curriculum for Excellence. It has been so taken up with closure. Our teachers don’t even know if they will be implementing Curriculum for Excellence. A wider view needs to be taken of what our children and our school is going through. For a minimal saving we will lose an efficient school with excellent exam results.

• We have more schools in Shetland than we can afford which is why secondary education should be concentrated in Brae and Lerwick.

• As the Anderson High School Parent Council we try to avoid commenting on the decisions which affect other schools and focus on the impact a
decision may have on the Anderson High School. We try to find common ground when we meet with other parent councils.

- The public meeting in Sandwick Junior High School was very well attended and one of the most emotional I have attended. We are trying to save £223,000 by removing two years of very successful education at Sandwick Junior High School. I am not sure we can put a price on good education.

- We hear from all meetings we have attended that parents and children do not wish to see Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department close. The three South Mainland councillors are listening and are united.

- What proportion of the Sandwick parents in the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department catchment area attend Sandwick Junior High Secondary Department, and what proportion have opted to come to the Anderson High School?

- There are 151 children in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and there have been 13 placing requests in 2013/14 and 19 the year before. Some of these children don’t attend their catchment area primary either.

- Even with the threat of closure only two Primary 7 children from my son’s class at Dunrossness Primary School did not go on to attend Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. Even the current Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department who find themselves in a difficult position, their preferred option is to remain in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

- I wonder if there are any education documents which would justify the inclusion of ‘independent study time’ or is this just convenience as all the teachers will be driving around.

- What will be the arrangements in bad weather if you can’t get the children home?

- The Anderson High School is special in that children come to it from all areas of Shetland. As a teacher in the school it is a privilege to teach all of these children from all areas of Shetland together. I hope in years to come you, and equivalent people from out West will join and strengthen the Anderson High School Parent Council. There are children in the Anderson High School from every ward in Shetland and what affects this school affects them.
9. **Summary of Oral Representations made at an additional meeting of parents of current Secondary 2 pupils of Sandwick Junior High School hosted by Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council.** This meeting was held at the Sandwick Junior High School on Wednesday 19 February 2014.

- In terms of transition, what would be different if this proposal were agreed and this group of children, because of the timing of the Proposal, would move after Secondary 3 having undertaken their personalisation?

- The transition may be difficult for parents due to the lack of continuity.

- Parents are looking for some certainty which is dependent on the decision made by Shetland Islands Council. Meanwhile the current Secondary 2 group are caught in the middle. Parents who have already submitted placing requests to the Anderson High School, or who may do so in the future, need some sort of certainty that this is possible.

- The feedback from Secondary 2 children is that they do not want to move, but we must do what is best for them in the longer term.

- If parents put in a placing request for their child when will they be choosing courses and when will they be starting Secondary 3? Is there an upper limit on the number of placing requests which can be accepted?

- If all 36 families of the current Secondary 2 year group put in placing requests, would they be accepted?

- Would there be a need for additional teaching staff at the Anderson High School?

- If enough children who wanted to go to the Anderson High School this year, is there scope for making a proper plan for this transition?

- If children transferred as a result of placing requests, would transport be provided?

- Would it be possible for the current Secondary 2 year group to complete Secondary 4 of their Senior Phase at Sandwick Junior High School, rather than transferring at the end of Secondary 3?

- This has all been badly planned for this year group and all of this is too late.

- I would be concerned about the number of children who would now be using the bus. There is currently a lack of buses and bus drivers in Shetland to provide the required transport. There should also be escorts on buses as it is difficult for the driver to concentrate on driving and keeping everyone safe and deal with any potential behaviour issues.

- The children travelling on buses which are shared public services will now be younger with this proposal. The issue of whether children pay on the buses
will also have to be resolved. At present this situation is confused.

- There are broader issues which result from longer travel times. Children will have less time to participate in activities in their local areas, which is really important to thirteen and fourteen year olds.

- It would be really helpful if some idea was given of what a transition would look like.

- If a child in Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School takes forward a group of choices for personalisation, is there a guarantee that they will be able to carry on with these subjects in the Anderson High School?

- How many transitions do you expect a child to have to make? There will be another transition added into all of this for the children, which is a transition from the old Anderson High School to the new Anderson High School. Why not leave the children at Sandwick Junior High School and let them make one transition to the new Anderson High School?

- We had no knowledge of the changed dates for the Proposal until the Proposal Paper was published.

- Why was Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department chosen to be first among the secondary proposals?

- The timing of the Aith Junior High School Secondary Department proposal will allow the right amount of time to plan transition.

- Is there a cut off time for making a placing request?

- Could a placing request be submitted in May 2014?

- Could placing requests be made in a group?

- The proposal together with the new Curriculum for Excellence makes the whole process difficult.

- There are a lot of children saying that if they have to go, they might as well go now, and then if Shetland Islands Council decides to keep Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 then they could have stayed.

- Are there more choices for the personalisation in Secondary 3 at the Anderson High School than at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department?

- Children who do not do a subject in Secondary 3 but who then start it in Secondary 4 would have to complete all the work in one year.

- Children could be disadvantaged if fellow children had taken a subject since Secondary 3 and they started it in Secondary 4.
• Will the personalisation link with the Anderson High School?

• Has an exercise been taken to see if subjects will mesh with the Anderson High School? What happens if there are no spaces in classes at the Anderson High School?

• Children should be offered the same choices and this could be resourced accordingly.

• There might end up only being a few children left at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department? At what point do they have to the move to the Anderson High School?

• What are the chances of children staying in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to Secondary 4?

• If the decision was to reject the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 proposal for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, Children’s Services would very soon come forward with a further proposal.

• Most of the children in the Secondary 2 year group want to stay on and finish Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

• What would happen to the years behind?

• Can Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department provide a range of subjects to match Anderson High School?

• If Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department was left with six children, would it still offer the same range of courses?

• It may be a gamble if personalisations are made in May when we get to August?

• When would the report go before Shetland Islands Council for decision?

• If placing requests were made, can they be withdrawn?

• How can parents influence what decision is made?

• If Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council canvass parents for their view, is this acceptable?

• The view of the parents at this meeting is that this group of children should remain until the end of Secondary 4. Approximately 30 parents agreed.

• Would the legislation which will bring in a five year moratorium on a closure proposal happening again to a school which has been through a statutory consultation on a closure proposal affect this Proposal on Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department?

• Children’s Services has a responsibility to this entire year group, to ensure
they are treated properly. This is the only Secondary 2 and Secondary 3 year they will ever get.

- There is a worry that some parents will just move their children after Primary 7, resulting in a declining roll and a fear that the school will close.

- The travel time to Sumburgh from this Proposal is a concern.

- Following a Parent Council meeting in Dunrossness the group there felt they wanted to retain Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, but they would be supportive of Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, due to the learning environment which Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department provides. This group represents about 40% of parents of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

- We may lose teaching staff as a result of this proposal if they do not want to teach just Secondary 1 to Secondary 2.

- What would happen if a child was being bullied at the Anderson High School? What would be their options?
10. Children’s Services Responses to those written and oral representations

10.1 This section details the relevant points raised in the written submissions and at the public meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue: Travelling Distance/Travelling Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points Made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If this Proposal goes forward, children from the South Mainland will have longer travel times and be unable to take part in activities and clubs in their local area.
- This Proposal will lead to unacceptable travel times for some children under 16 and unacceptable stress for children with additional support needs.
- I very much hope this Proposal is not successful, however if children from the Ness and Quendale do end up being bussed to Lerwick, measures must be taken to reduce the travel time. A direct route from Ness and Quendale should be put in place; the offer of one or two nights’ accommodation a week at the hostel might also help some families.
- Long bus journeys will result from the Proposal. This will disadvantage children in the South Mainland. Travel times should be minimised. There is no detail in the Proposal that this has been done. Opportunities to access after-school activities are compromised.
- Children travelling long distances, especially in winter in poor travelling conditions.
- Transport times created by the proposal are unreasonable; it will have a detrimental impact on young people and will limit their access to extra-curricular activities.
- There are reasonable travel times at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. Travel to Anderson High School will create long journeys and tired children.
- I am unhappy at the journey time this Proposal creates for my son.
- My child has additional support needs. He would not cope in a large unfamiliar school and would not cope with the daily journey to school.
- Travelling times need to be kept to a minimum. The furthest away children suffer the most.
- Travelling times which result from this Proposal are a worry for children living in Dunrossness.
- Children with additional support needs will have long travelling times.
- It is unfair for young children to have to travel 25 miles by public transport in order
to access education.

- Travel times for the proposed bus routes to Lerwick could exceed 65 minutes each way for some children, which is unacceptable for children of this age.

- It is unreasonable for children in the South Mainland to have to travel 50 miles per day and spend two hours or more on public buses. This is ten hours per week wasted time for our children, which could otherwise be used to enjoy clubs and sports, and to complete homework.

- The journey would be only slightly more to Lerwick from Cunningsburgh than to Sandwick, but for some children there will potentially be two hours spent on a bus each day.

- Sending Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children to Anderson High School will involve them in abnormally high commuting times which will disrupt their lives.

- Long hours commuting each week will affect children's ability to concentrate in the classroom and will adversely affect their education.

- The extra travel time in all weather conditions will affect their educational and social needs.

- More time will be required for travelling to and from school, time which could be used more effectively than sitting on a bus.

- Longer travel times are not healthier and take away the opportunity to walk/cycle to school. This shows that Shetland Islands Council does not care about our children.

- Children, tired from unnecessary travelling, lose their vibrancy.

- Is this really the best education we can offer the young folk of Shetland? Sitting on a bus for long periods every day in all weathers? In short, no. The health and wellbeing of children must be seriously taken into consideration. There is research both nationally and internationally which shows the negative impact long journeys to school have. I am concerned they will be sitting for long periods on a bus unsupervised. I am also concerned about how travel will affect mental health and behaviour, particularly as the week goes on and the number of hours spent sedentary increases.

- I know it is not historical that children from Quarff attend Sandwick Junior High School. For them, travelling to the Anderson High School or Sandwick Junior High School is about the same time difference. However for people who live in the far South Mainland it is a very different situation.

- School based activities will be replaced with time sitting on a bus.

- A major concern of parents, particularly further south in the South Mainland, is the ability of children and young people to participate, given long travel times.
• All parents are concerned about the impact of increased travel on their children and, with rates of obesity increasing across Shetland, we see it as imperative to increase levels of physical activity rather than removing opportunities.

• Travelling 25 miles to get to school and spending an hour on a public bus will mean the children are not well prepared for the start of the school day. A similar problem would occur at the end of the school day.

• The additional travel time which would be incurred from our home in Quendale to Lerwick concerns me. I would question the 65 minutes envisaged for this. I think it will take longer, especially on a cold, dark, wintry morning. How many folk would undertake this length of time of journey to travel to work every day? Why should our children endure it to travel to a school twice the distance away from the perfectly adequate current school?

• I have a concern about the impact on children who are required to travel by bus each day, spending eight to ten hours per week travelling.

• Children will miss out on studying when they are travelling. Efforts need to be made to mitigate these impacts and effort needs to be imaginative, innovative, wide ranging and well resourced. Some consideration could be given to, for example, occasional nights in the hostel for children who have to commute more than 90 minutes per day. Consideration should also be given to an asymmetrical week, to occasional teaching and learning from a different location. The opportunity for a shorter lunch hour should also be considered to shorten the day at either end.

• Bus drivers have expressed concerns for the safety of children being transported long distances on public buses.

• I do not believe spending an hour on a public bus twice a day is in the best educational interests of children.

• This Proposal discriminates against rural children because it adds the requirement of excessive daily travel which will have a negative impact on their educational achievement.

• Long travel times and hostelling is unacceptable for under 16 year olds.

• Lengthy bus journeys from the far south to Lerwick, meaning young people spending time on a bus when they could be learning.

• Journey times will be larger if the proposal goes ahead. The effect of this will be worse in winter when the children will have to travel to and from school in the dark and risks are higher due to cuts to gritting routes and fewer gritters.

• Increased travel times for children will educationally disadvantage children. Increased travel times for teachers means less actual teaching time and more fuel costs.

• Children will have to endure long bus journeys, perhaps not able to take part in after
school activities or hobbies before reaching Boddam and other places is the far south of the Shetland Mainland.

- People learn best when they are happy and engaged in the process. I am unclear how a child's motivation and enthusiasm will be greater at a school further away after having to take a bus journey they currently are not required to make. Travel times will make their school day unnecessarily longer.

- I like to cycle to school but will not be able to do that all the way to Lerwick. I do not think long bus journeys to the Anderson High School will be very healthy.

- I do not want my children sitting on a bus to Lerwick. At the moment they can cycle or walk to school. Healthy lifestyles equal healthy minds. Sitting on a bus will impact on education and health of the children.

- I do not think I will be able to keep doing my volunteering after school as I will need to get the bus home and won't get home in time.

- Children in the southern most part of the current catchment area for Sandwick Junior High School, will, if this proposal is implemented, experience the maximum agreed journey time for secondary aged children in Shetland. Shetland Islands Council should be minimising journey times for children travelling to school and encouraging children to walk or cycle to school. Long journey times do not benefit a child’s education. Beginning the day at 6.30 am is likely to lead a sleep deprivation which could impact on children’s learning, behaviour and attainment.

- The transport routes proposed are on existing routes for Secondary 5 and Secondary 6 children, but with additional stops creating additional travel time of 20-25 minutes. This means that children younger than Secondary 5 and Secondary 6 age will be being asked to travel for longer than the Secondary 5 and Secondary 6 children do currently.

- Journey times will be increased beyond the maximum agreed time when travel is being undertaken in bad weather.

- The extra distance from school will increase costs for families who wish their children to participate in social and extra-curricular activities.

**Response**

The maximum travelling time for a secondary child of 65 minutes for a single journey was agreed at Shetland Islands Council on 20 September 2012. This figure was put forward as it reflects some existing journey times for secondary aged children travelling to school in Shetland. Most notably this journey exists for children who live in North Nesting where the Anderson High School is their catchment area secondary school from Secondary 1.

Children’s Services do acknowledge the concerns which have been raised by parents in relation to the increased travel times incurred by their children, particularly in relation to healthy lifestyles. However those young people may benefit from having a greater range of opportunities available to them in regards to social groups, clubs and teams. It is
acknowledged however, that this Proposal may not allow for children from the South Mainland to cycle to school.

The South Mainland enjoys a very good public bus service which should help facilitate children affected by this Proposal continuing their involvement in after school activities. Similarly, this should assist any children currently undertaking volunteering in their communities. If it does not however, then staff within Children’s Services will assist with finding alternative volunteering opportunities and extra-curricular activities. Community Development staff will be keen to engage with the community as a whole to ensure as far as possible that steps are taken to maintain groups/activities/events which currently run in Sandwick.

There is no evidence to suggest that children are disadvantaged educationally by travelling on school transport.

Shetland Islands Council has given a commitment that, as far as is possible, no secondary aged child will travel for longer than 65 minutes for any single journey.

What is being proposed are the most direct, economic routes:

- Bus 1: Quendale – Scousburgh – Bigton – Quarff;
- Bus 2: Dunrossness – Levenwick – Gulberwick;
- Bus 3: Sandwick – Cunningsburgh.

Providing the transport in this configuration reduces the number of stops required.

Children with additional support needs have their needs regularly assessed and where dedicated transport is required, we try to ensure that it is as flexible as possible in its delivery. Some children with additional support needs travel from as far afield as North Roe and Whalsay to Lerwick on a daily basis to access their education.

All school transport routes are gritted in advance of that transport using those routes. Adverse weather can mean days lost for children but the presumption made is always against closure unless all the advice available to Children’s Services would indicate that children could not be transported to, and from, school safely. In those circumstances, any individual head teacher may take the decision to close their school, or, if the weather conditions dictate, the Executive Manager. Schools may take the decision to issue a blanket closure instruction.

The Anderson High School enrolment form, which is used for all children attending there, has a section that asks for one of the contacts provided to be listed as a snow closure contact. However, it is many years now since the school has had to make use of these contacts for this purpose.

Since October 2001, all new coaches and minibuses have had to be fitted with seat belts. A forward facing seat fitted with a minimum of a lap belt must be available to every child. New regulations introduced in September 2008, requires all seated passengers aged 14 years and above to use seat belts when they are fitted in all buses and coaches. The Government have recently announced the intention to legislate to make seatbelts a requirement on all dedicated school transport in Scotland. This is planned for implementation in 2018 for primary children, and 2021 for secondary children. However, Shetland Islands Council already has these measures in place for all of its school transport contracts and so this latest announcement will not result in additional expense for the local
Drivers employed are professional drivers, suitably qualified for the job. The operators are licensed, and the vehicles require to be licensed and tested as Public Service Vehicles. The School Transport Policy requires bus operators to have contingency plans in place, to deal with vehicle failures, adverse weather and the emergency closure of schools. There is no statutory requirement for education authorities to provide supervisors on school transport provided under the Education (Scotland) Act 1980.

Risk assessments in respect of pick up/drop off points will be the responsibility of the local authority in future, as opposed to the transport operator. All such risk assessments will be carried out before the start of the new academic year, in August 2014. Additional Road Safety Audits will be carried out where the authority deems them necessary, or where requested by parents. Once this work is complete and pick up/drop off points designated, all parents will be made aware of the route and pick up/drop of point pertinent for their child(ren).

An asymmetric week has been considered in the past and may well be considered in future as we explore options for delivery of the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence. Elements of e-learning are also being taken forward under the auspices of the Shetland Learning Partnership Project. Similarly, the length of the lunch break may also be considered in future, as the new Anderson High School will provide the opportunity for a range of serving points to be set up to better cater for the different meal options on offer to children.

Increased travel time for teachers will result in additional mileage costs for the authority where that travel happens during the working day. Careful timetabling will ensure that this is kept to a minimum. Such staff sharing arrangements do allow for the most effective use of teacher contact time.

### Issue: Transport Cost

**Points Made**

- Have up-to-date transport costs been used?
- The financial savings in the current Proposal do not make any sense: saving £470,000 in teachers but spending £270,000 more on transport.
- The proposal takes money out of the education budget and puts it into the transport budget. This is not a good use of resources.
- Extra costs of transport have not been looked at thoroughly enough.
- Where do school transport costs sit? The implication is that it comes from the budget for school education, but Councillor Robinson says it comes from the transport budget and is not recharged.
- I do not believe significant savings will come from this proposal, as transport costs are high and will continue to rise when the wearing seatbelts is mandatory.
- Transport costs were questioned by bus drivers at the public meeting.
• This proposal takes us back in time. When Sandwick Junior High School new building was built it was to save on hostel costs and transport costs.

• Transport costs have been underestimated.

• There are no figures to show transport costs.

• It is doubtful if there would be any financial benefits to having Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 junior high schools considering the additional transport costs incurred.

• The budget allocated to buses is massive. Is this a wise use of our education budget?

• Transport costs are only going to go up and up, any small savings will be overcome by this.

• How can the extra bus runs needed not be a huge factor and cost? How much will the Council actually be saving?

• The cost of extra travel arrangements needs to be considered. The logistics of getting the children to and from Lerwick will come at a significant cost.

• As transport has not been tendered for a long time, there is a good chance that these figures will be altered given the substantial need for more transport to ferry workers to Sullom Voe not to mention fuel prices which only ever go in one direction. New proposal for seatbelts to be included in all school transport will also need to be taken into account.

• £270,000 in transport costs. It is nonsensical to remove investment from front line teaching to put into buses.

• What real savings could be achieved doing this? Any savings will be used on transport costs.

• Will there be seats on public transport made available for children who are placing requests to the Anderson High School?

• I am seriously concerned about the level of bus provision which will be required, the absence of enough drivers and buses, and lack of extra supervisory staff on buses. The impact on local public transport is bound to be significant, and the impact on our roads.

• Increasing the reliability for operating the school estate through increasing the number of children who are bussed to school does not demonstrate a strategic vision for the future when oil prices are rising, the capital costs of buses are increasing and the salaries paid to the drivers.

• The transport costs in the proposal have been costed without an uplift for 2015/16 prices so the actual costs will be higher.

• The new bus contracts will be introduced in August 2014. They will not include the
extra journeys and extra children which will result from this Proposal.

- Placing request children to the Anderson High School may not be included in the predicted figures for bus usage so there will be an underestimate of bus costs.

**Response**

The Proposal Paper clearly states the amount we estimate will be required to provide the additional transport; notwithstanding, the savings arising from the Proposal are significant at £223,530.

The costs stated in respect of the additional transport required reflect the current cost of transport provision, aligned with the individual locations of each child affected by the proposal. Although routes have not been tendered until very recently, a financial uplift has been applied to each contract year on year, to include Retail Price Index (RPI) and local fuel price fluctuations.

Competitive prices have been achieved for all school transport routes, as evidenced by the recent tendering exercise – awarding contracts for five years, as opposed to three, has made these contracts more attractive to the local bus operators.

The recent tender exercise in respect of school and public transport routes did not include the extra journeys required under this Proposal; however, separate contracts will be tendered and awarded if necessary once a decision is made.

The budget for school transport sits within the Transport Planning Service which is part of the Development Department. A budgetary transfer would be required from Children’s Services to the Transport Planning Service and this is clearly factored in to all such proposals.

It is standard practice across Scotland for authorities to make maximum use of public bus services to convey children between home and school where it is cost effective to do so. The Scottish Government has commissioned a number of studies into school transport in recent years in this respect and the issue of risk arising from children travelling on public buses has not been highlighted in any of these studies. Consequently there is nothing to suggest that the approach adopted by Shetland Islands Council is unreasonable or unsafe.

There would be no impact on the public transport network as this proposal factors in a similar number of children who already access public transport. In fact, the number would reduce slightly from 20 to 18. All children will have bus passes for the start of the new academic year so those not in receipt of passes will not be entitled to use the designated transport. The Council will ensure capacity exists for all those children who have been issued with bus passes.

If, as a result of a placing request, any child is attending a school other than their catchment area school, then there is no entitlement to free school transport; responsibility lies with the parent(s). Those children may take up any vacant seats on existing school transport, with the agreement of the Executive Manager, Schools, or avail themselves of seats on public transport routes, but any such children will not be taken into account when specifying the number of seats required for any bus contracts.
Issue: Quality of Education

Points Made

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 has been an excellent model of education. Exam results demonstrate this.

- It is a recognised fact that larger class sizes lead to poorer attainment levels as can be seen when comparing Anderson High School and Sandwick Junior High School's attainment levels. This is an educational disadvantage, not a benefit.

- Educational benefit should be the cornerstone of any argument to close a school but on this occasion this cannot be made on any level. In terms of academic achievement Sandwick Junior High School is consistently way ahead of the Anderson High School as your own tables of results show. This simply cannot be dismissed and with the Shetland Islands Council investing very little into the South Mainland the paltry savings being quoted is a small price to pay for a better education for our children. As we see from the following figures:

  - Percentage of the Secondary 4 year group achieving five or more awards at Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Level 3 (Standard Grade, Foundation Level or equivalent) or better, Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department has an average of 97.9% compared to the Anderson High School 94.4%;

  - Percentage of the Secondary 4 year group achieving five or more awards of Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Level 4 (Standard Grade, General Level or equivalent) or better, Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department has an average over the years of 92.1% compared to the Anderson High School 88.9%;

  - Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Level 5 (Standard Grade, Credit Level or equivalent) or better, Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department has an average over the years of 55.7% compared to the Anderson High School 43.6%. In addition to the academic achievement, Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department children consistently overachieve in other areas such as sport and music.

- The Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education report on the closure of Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department in 2010 made the following observation at Para 3.4: "The Council's proposal... does not provide sufficient detail of the educational benefits that will accrue for young people from the implementation of the proposal". Exactly the same criticism should apply to this consultation document. The paper offers no clear educational benefits of moving from the current model to Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department with Secondary 3 to Secondary 4 transferring to Anderson High school. Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department currently achieves consistently higher grades than Anderson High School (Proposal Paper, Paragraphs 4.11-4.13 and 4.45-4.47) and no evidence is submitted that moving to
the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model would either maintain or improve results. Parents will not support a move to a model that would almost certainly see their children’s results reducing at Secondary 3 to Secondary 4.

- Removing Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 from the junior high schools is a bad idea as it will damage a system that works very well. With children being moved in a very sensitive time in their education and life, when they should be supported by teachers who have known them for years. The rural schools have excellent levels of attainment and children benefit by being in their own communities.

- Sandwick Junior High School has excellent exam results and other junior high school results contribute to the success of the Anderson High School Higher exam results no doubt.

- Good education is provided in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department so why close it?

- Sandwick Junior High School performs better than the Anderson High School.

- Sandwick Junior High School provides a good standard of education and results have been consistently better than the Anderson High School.

- Sandwick Junior High School is highly successful with excellent grades for Secondary 4, consistently superior to both the Shetland average and the Anderson High School.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department has good attainment that must be attributable to good staff and modest class sizes.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department achieves better attainment results than the Anderson High School and has an excellent reputation.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department’s attainment is higher than the Anderson High School’s. If the Anderson High School is supposed to be better, please justify this.

- There is an exceptional standard of education and support at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. A large school like the Anderson High School in an island community cannot provide this kind of support.

- Sandwick Junior High School has excellent links with employers.

- This proposal has the potential to reverse the positive impact of the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence.

- This Proposal will lead to more sharing of staff. Staff who are already doing it are finding this a challenge. They are concerned they will fail children in one or both establishments.

- Teacher contact time is already being lost through shared staff. This Proposal
makes that worse.

- Already some classes at the Anderson High School are getting two teachers for a subject due to the sharing of staff. This is not good and more of this would result from this Proposal if it went ahead.

- A more extensive curriculum can be offered where numbers are high.

- This Proposal will lead to a poorer quality of education for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department children and the children of other rural secondaries, than the children who attend Brae High School and the Anderson High School.

- Travel is possible from the South Mainland but children will benefit from a better education if they are educated in a smaller school.

- There is no guarantee of the quality of staff at the Anderson High School.

- National 5 prelim results were disastrous which suggests Nationals were introduced too soon.

- How does Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 fit with Curriculum for Excellence? The proposal paper does not use this as any benchmark.

- This Proposal has no educational merit or benefit.

- There is no educational benefit in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school.

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School would set precedent for all junior highs and it is not a good model of education.

- A school which does not teach up to qualifications is not an attractive model for staff and children.

- We are repeatedly told that the closure of Secondary 3 to Secondary 4 is not so much to do with money as it is to do with this Curriculum for Excellence nonsense.

- I am concerned that the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model will result in the extensive movement of staff, weakening the educational experience of children at the Anderson High School, especially those who are there for six years.

- A flexible approach to undertaking courses in the Senior Phase is being used to justify this Proposal, yet it is not far advanced yet in our own schools.

- It is inaccurate to say the Proposal will lead to children being able to access courses over a variable timeframe. Then are no plans to introduce this so it is misleading.

- I am not convinced that Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 cannot work.

- I do not understand flexible courses in the Senior Phase. To start a Higher early, a child would have to complete their National 5 in six months or study for Higher level
before Secondary 5.

- The Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model is educationally disadvantaging rural children.
- A Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will be a negative experience for children.
- I do not believe that the removal of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 from Sandwick Junior High School will be beneficial, especially for the remaining children who are in Secondary 1 and Secondary 2. These children will also have reduced contact with specialist teachers who give support both during and outside class.
- Many of the benefits listed with changing exist now; there is no educational benefit in discontinuing Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School. The evidence provided is weak and not credible.
- Schools across Shetland are already delivering Curriculum for Excellence successfully. To remove Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 children from Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 runs counter to this proven Curriculum for Excellence progression model.
- Curriculum for Excellence is not new. It has been in our schools for years, the only thing that is new is the qualifications. All schools to have delivered Standard Grades are well placed to deliver the new qualifications. Sandwick is well placed to deliver the new qualifications and has the track record to prove it. We should be proud of our high achieving schools across Shetland, not trying to close them.
- It is very important to maintain the quality of secondary education.
- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is a happy, successful school with excellent staff, a positive ethos and a well maintained building.
- There is good subject choice at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.
- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is providing Curriculum for Excellence to all its children three to sixteen.
- Sandwick Junior High School’s reputation played a large part in my decision to move to Shetland.
- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is smaller than the Anderson High School and as a result children’s educational needs are better met.
- Moving children at the same time as implementing Curriculum for Excellence is seriously disadvantaging them.
- The quality of education available in Sandwick Junior High School as a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will be weakened as there will be fewer specialist teachers teaching there.
• How will the specific needs of vulnerable children be met if key staff are not in the school all of the time.

• Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is providing excellent education currently. I do not therefore see what the educational benefits of this Proposal. Staff at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department form very positive relationships with children. This is more difficult in a larger school like the Anderson High School. My child has received an excellent secondary education in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Secondary 1 to Secondary 4, due to the excellent support of the staff.

• I am concerned about my child at the Anderson High School having two or three teachers for a subject each week due to the sharing of staff. If teachers are constantly moving between schools they will not get to know any of the children. How will parents be able to contact staff urgently if they are not based in one school? The Anderson High School staff will have to support these other staff as well to teach higher/advanced Higher, as well as teach their own classes. It is not fair on them.

• Sharing of classes raises concerns about report writing, attendance at parents’ nights and monitoring of children’s progress.

• Better pastoral care will be available at a smaller school than the Anderson High School. It is easier to deliver the Senior Phase if it is only offered in two schools, as a wider range of subjects can be offered.

• Parents will in due course vote with their feet to avoid a fractured education.

• Travelling staff will disrupt the flow of work and attainment will be lowered.

• Staff have already suffered from cuts made. Is this being ignored and we are being asked to prop up an unworkable system?

• Education attainment is not a reason to change Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to Secondary 1 to Secondary 2. This then, only learns a financial incentive. This is not acceptable.

• There are no convincing educational benefits in this proposal.

• Implementing Curriculum for Excellence should be our focus not closure proposals. Staff and children have unmanageable workloads and this should be alleviated.

• I am concerned that the sharing of teachers will limit subject choice, which has already been impacted in at the Senior Phase.

• I am concerned that shared teachers will change child/teacher relationships.

• One of the educational benefits stated of the proposal is that children can study for qualifications in different timeframes. At the public meeting it was clear this was not
- Children get more individual attention at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

- The quieter more shy children will, I fear, not achieve the results they could have in a school with smaller class sizes and teachers with more time to encourage.

- Some children find a large setting like the Anderson High School daunting.

- Children do not get as much support and there is less consultation with parents at the Anderson High School.

- The impact of Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 on junior highs will be immense with the dismantling of schools’ ethos and the diminution of support for children.

- I am concerned about the impact this proposal will have on my child's education at the Anderson High School.

- The Secondary 2 Pupil Council representatives at Sandwick Junior High School reported that 80% of their year group would go to the Anderson High School if Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department became a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school.

- If there has to be Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 then children should be taught by secondary specialists and not primary teachers.

- Nothing is more important than our children’s education.

- A new common curriculum would require a great deal of planning and time across all secondary departments, which is in short supply with these rushed consultations.

- It has been suggested that all secondary schools across Shetland will have a common curriculum in line with Shetland Islands Council policy. Who will oversee this? Online learning has proved to be challenging in many schools because current Information Technology provision is unreliable and needs considerable upgrade before extra demands are placed on it. The centralised Information and Communications Technology service is already buckling under pressure. Given the specialised demands of using Information Technology in education there would be a need for increased training of staff and education specific support on the ground in schools. The current financial constraints could prove a barrier to this.

- Given the Scottish Government’s "Getting It Right For Every Child" (GIRFEC) policy, will there be dedicated Pupil Support teachers or Principal Teachers of guidance in each school? If a Principal Teacher has a 0.5 full-time equivalent teaching commitment how can they deal with the pastoral issues which may arise during a school day?

- Although composite classes do occur in primary schools, this is not normal practice for Secondary 1 to Secondary 2. Would combining Secondary 1 and Secondary 2
classes have the educational advantages alluded to?

- How would a common curriculum work?
- Sharing classes can be challenging for staff and children in one school never mind between schools. Post-it notes or emails to colleagues are not acceptable ways of working. It is difficult to see what the educational benefits would be. Research has shown that children’s achievement is enhanced by contact with fewest teachers possible for each subject.
- It will be educationally disruptive for the Anderson High School children having an influx of so many children at Secondary 2.
- More detail is required on the educational benefit to Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and Anderson High School children. Open consultation with educationalists’ comments on Secondary 1 to Secondary 2, which have been submitted, being part of the report.
- Due to the lack of certainty of where a teacher will be next term, teachers and children will not get the continuity they require.
- More detail required as to how children will be accommodated in option selection.
- The benefits listed for Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 would be the same whether the Proposal goes ahead or not.
- Teachers would travel more between schools. This leads to no continuity for the children and teachers, and poor morale. This is an educational disadvantage, not a benefit.
- There is no evidence to show the closure of Sandwick Junior High School will benefit my children.
- I am aware of school closures being looked at across the country and have recently followed a news story in Dumfries and Galloway where four high schools were to be amalgamated into a ‘super’ school. I note that this idea was quashed because the four schools in question were already high achieving schools - Sandwick is the same. A very high achieving school which meets the needs of those on the South Mainland of Shetland exceptionally well. I feel very strongly that to tamper with the system which works so well could jeopardise the reputation which Shetland has for providing good education for all.
- This seems to have been done purely as an accounts exercise. It certainly does not strike me as being of educational benefit. This seems to be a far cry from what was expected of Curriculum for Excellence where all through schools were highlighted as good practice. That is Sandwick Junior High School - children can attend from Nursery, Primary and Secondary until they reach legal school leaving age.
- The size of academic achievements of our schools was a major factor in our staying here in Shetland when things were difficult, and now our children and grandchildren
Para 5.57 in the Proposal Paper states that this proposal would make further education/higher education opportunities available to children moving from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, but it is not clear that these are not already available to Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department children. Children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department already benefit from opportunities to access Vocational Pathways courses and work experience. Moreover, there are numerous opportunities for children to achieve in a wider sense, including Award Scheme Development and Accreditation Network, John Muir and the Saltire Awards.

Sandwick Junior High School currently provides a curriculum which is relevant, challenging and meaningful for our children up to Secondary 4, in line with Curriculum for Excellence. Moving to the Anderson High School may have access to additional subject choice, but no assurances are given. Paragraph 5.40 in the proposal paper states that the staff group at Anderson High School has the capacity to generate a wider variety of team and collaborative experiences, but the paper also talks about cross school working and the Shetland Learning Campus, so there is no reason why this should not happen whatever the model of delivery. Paragraph 5.40 contradicts Paragraph 5.2.5 where teachers were going to interact, sharing good practice, learning projects, coordinated teaching and assessment activities. If this can happen under the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model, it can also happen under a Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 model.

Teachers at Sandwick Junior High School already share good practice and develop learning materials collaboratively with colleagues in other schools, and aligning the curriculum in all secondary schools is at odds with a leading aspiration of Curriculum for Excellence, which is to build local community resources into topics, units and learning experiences in every school.

I am a parent of two boys who attend Dunrossness Primary School. One of my sons has additional support needs. He currently receives this personalised support from great staff at Dunrossness and I think this would continue in the smaller classes and school of Sandwick Junior High School. I truly think this would be lost in the proposed super school of Anderson High School with its predicted 1000+ children.

There will be negative impacts on the continuity of teaching, school ethos, staff morale, communication between staff and children’s learning. Sandwick Junior High School would become a skeleton school.

Communication between staff is difficult when working between schools, and the proposal allows no protected time for staff liaison. This impacts on children’s learning.

Currently in Shetland teachers cannot resource the new Curriculum for Excellence courses with textbooks, papers, pencils, Information and Communications Technology, practical demonstrations. Shetland children deserve and have the right
to a good education with the correct resources. Children have a right and are entitled to a large range of curricular choices to help them reach their full potential and chosen career paths for the future. If councillors insist on the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 models (which is not financially viable) then instead of investing money into increasing options for children and enriching their experiences, councillors will be investing in skeleton schools.

- Sandwick Junior High School should either retain Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 or close completely. The option of Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model is not ensuring the best possible outcome for Shetland children.

- Keeping all Shetland junior high schools open will spread our once high achieving education so thinly that ultimately children will suffer.

- Teachers travelling between schools means less support for children, less extra-curricular activities, a negative ethos and loss of identity for the school as it will become a skeleton school. Instead of inter-disciplinary learning, teachers will be driving past each other.

- Curriculum for Excellence requires lots of internal assessments and coursework. Teachers will not be able to offer additional support to children if they are teaching in different schools.

- Councillors must ensure that education in Shetland evolves. Why have a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 satellite school when these children could join together with their older siblings and friends at a high school? Why stay at a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school with drive through teachers when you could be part of a school system that ensured excellent support and extra-curricular activities?

- I oppose the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model as educationally disadvantaging rural children.

- The evidence from inspections suggests the junior high school model is successful in Shetland.

- Sandwick Junior High School has set the foundations for successful achievements and future children should have those opportunities.

- The personal and emotional support children can get in Sandwick Junior High School would be hard to replicate in a busy high school.

- Senior children at Sandwick Junior High School are proud to represent their school. The school is unique in its approach to developing talented, confident young people who represent the best of their community.

- Sandwick Junior High School is an excellent school, well able to deliver Curriculum for Excellence from Nursery to Secondary 4. The Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 proposal has almost no support.

- Changing from a very successful Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 junior high school
model and "through school" at Sandwick Junior High School to the very risky Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model is not worth the upheaval.

- Transferring at the end of Secondary 4 has proved to be the best time in terms of a young person's educational and emotional development.

- I do not believe anyone genuinely thinks having a school staffed by part-time, shared teachers will provide educational benefit.

- Please think again. I am a young person really looking forward to secondary school in my home village.

- The quality of teaching in junior high schools would suffer long term from a move to Secondary 1 to Secondary 2.

- Children might end up being taught by teachers who are not necessarily qualified at the level they would be in the Anderson High School.

- Sandwick Junior High School has a really friendly atmosphere and all the teachers are friendly and nice. Everyone talks. Sandwick Junior High School has achieved so much throughout the school it should not be put to a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school nor shut.

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 is the best model for education as children can be at the same school from nursery to 16 years of age.

- Junior high schools with Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 give an exemplary standard of education. To reduce this to two years would have a devastating effect on children, the teachers and their communities.

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 schools will lose their identity as teachers would not be teaching through to exam level in Secondary 4 and therefore not have the same incentive as before.

- This proposal will be bad for the junior high schools as both the primary and secondary children benefit from the present system with sharing of resources and teachers.

- ‘Building the Curriculum 3’, as stated in the proposal paper entitles children to "a curriculum which is coherent from age 3 to 18". The Council does not as yet have an education strategy that embraces the requirements of Curriculum for Excellence. Furthermore, ‘Building the Curriculum 3’ sets at the Broad General Education Levels Three and Four follow through from Secondary 1 to Secondary 3. Transition after Secondary 2 will disadvantage children who are also entitled to "a Broad General Education... from early years through to Secondary 3". Why is it proposed to disrupt this entitlement by forcing a transition between Secondary 2 and Secondary 3?

- To discontinue Secondary 3 to Secondary 4 will inevitably lose the school's identity. The teachers will have low morale due to not teaching children through to exam
level. Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 schools will find recruitment of staff difficult. The education as it stands is exceptional and this will have a huge impact on the children, the staff and the community.

- Is this a race to the bottom? There will only be one comparative (much smaller) school in the whole in the whole of Shetland. Where is the incentive to improve the current quality of education?

- Should the Anderson High School not be looking at where the problems lie within their current provision, and why they are not producing the same level of results as Sandwick Junior High School at Secondary 4 level?

- The ethos of Sandwick Junior High School has improved tenfold since the last school inspection. There should be another inspection to look at the huge improvements the current head teacher, staff and children have made.

- Respect, responsibility, cooperation and communication sit at the heart of Sandwick Junior High School, producing confident individuals, responsible citizens, successful learners and effective contributors.

- The Proposal will not save the money needed and will result in a much poorer educational standard for many of our children.

- I am a young person at Sandwick Junior High School. In the past I struggled but the staff here have helped me to become confident and my learning has improved. I do not think I could have done this in a large school like the Anderson High School.

- I am a resident of Sandwick for 50 years. I went to the old Sandwick School. My two sons went to Sandwick Junior High School and three of my grandchildren go to Sandwick Junior High School. Two more will be going in a couple of years. I am happy with the education my sons got and the great education my grandchildren get. I do not think that it can be good for a child’s ability to learn in big classes like at the Anderson High School. I would much rather class sizes were smaller, like in Sandwick Junior High School.

- Bigger child teacher ratio means poorer education for both sets of children.

- Junior highs across Shetland have been unable to prepare adequately for Curriculum for Excellence because of closure proposals. Education officials are unable to prepare adequately for Curriculum for Excellence owing to closure schedule.

- Sandwick Junior High School has an excellent ethos and is a Rights Respecting School. Younger children in the school benefit from the presence of older children in the school.

- Sandwick Junior High School makes excellent provision for ‘special needs’ children [children with additional support needs]. In order to stay with their peer group they would also need to transfer at the end of Secondary 2.
There is little or no educational benefit in the proposal. Parents are unconvinced of the arguments put forward and believe that Curriculum for Excellence can be successfully delivered in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 school. It is the model which is most sustainable and most beneficial to the children. Curriculum for Excellence continues to follow the model of two years of education followed Level 4 or Level 5 qualifications. This is then followed by one year for Highers. Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council has failed to find examples of mainland schools carrying out restructuring of the timing of their courses. The majority of children will continue on the type of pathways which are there at present.

The statement that children may have in the future access to study for Highers over variable timeframes is misleading. Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council has not been able to find examples of schools on the mainland incorporating this option. It may be possible for a small number of children in the future.

Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council have been unable to find any evidence that children would benefit from better access to further education opportunities if they attended the Anderson High School instead of Sandwick Junior High School. Places at Shetland College are gained on merit.

The School Reconfiguration Project has been particularly detrimental to the delivery of the new National 4 and National 5 qualifications this year, and is therefore affecting children now.

Sandwick Junior High School has a good reputation nationally as children have been successful in maths challenges and in debating.

It is not clear in the Proposal what the relevance of common curriculum has specifically to this proposal and no detail was given as to how this would operate in practice.

The Shetland Learning Campus is a welcome development but is not dependent on the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 proposal. It could also take place if the school remained a Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 school. Again there is no detail in the Proposal as to how this would operate.

There is a concern among parents that this Proposal will lead to teachers being paid to travel between schools instead of teaching in the classroom.

It is not clear why independent learning is put forward as a benefit as this could be applied to any model of secondary education in Shetland.

There are advantages of a greater peer group to mix at the Anderson High School for Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children, but also the disadvantage of a decrease in tailored learning needs.

**Response**

There are two points to be made in relation to the comments on attainment at Sandwick Junior High School as against the Anderson High School. These fall under two related
headings. First, there are the changed requirements under Curriculum for Excellence regarding qualifications. Second, there is the altered way in which the Scottish Government will from August 2014 be reporting on achievement in the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence.

Regarding the changed requirements for qualifications under Curriculum for Excellence, it is the case that Sandwick Junior High School has historically performed strongly in terms of Standard Grade or equivalent. However, as the Proposal Paper makes clear, the landscape is changing in terms of formal qualifications and achievement generally within the school sector; and transition for Sandwick children to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2 fits better with this new approach and should therefore allow Sandwick Junior High School secondary children to at the very least continue to achieve their potential.

Children sitting the new National qualifications at the end of Secondary 4 now do so after one year’s study of the qualification rather than the two allocated under Standard Grade. Secondary 3 is intended to be a year during which there is increased personalisation and choice leading to final choice of Scottish Qualifications Authority courses by the end of Secondary 3. It is therefore an important transitional year. As the Proposal Paper makes clear (for example, at Paragraph 5.55), transfer to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2 means that children will have more time to settle into their new school and make their choices before taking their qualifications. This will ensure the best possible preparation for the Senior Phase.

The other important factor looking to the future is the new way in which the Scottish Government is from August 2014, reporting on achievement in the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence. The statistics in the Proposal Paper are based on analysing the percentage attainment of Secondary 4 candidates in terms of the various levels of Standard Grade or equivalent. Under Curriculum for Excellence, however, achievement from August 2014 will be analysed in terms of four indicators which cover a wider picture than this. The indicators are:

- **Percentage of Leavers Attaining Numeracy and Literacy (Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Levels 4 and 5);**

- **Average Total Tariff Score**
  (Each course level and award has a number of points associated with it which is termed the ‘tariff’. The average total tariff score of a child is calculated by adding together all the tariff points accumulated from all the different course levels and awards he/she attains and averaging that by the number of course levels and awards.);

- **Percentage of Leavers in a Positive Destination;**

- **Attainment Versus Deprivation.**

The analysis tool being developed by the Scottish Government for this work has been released to local authorities and contains data covering the years 2010 to 2013. Analysis of the data for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and Anderson High School shows a strong performance in all four indicators for the Anderson High School which is matched in three of the four indicators by Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. This indicates that the Anderson High School will be able to provide a high-quality education for the children transitioning from Sandwick Junior High
School.

Education Scotland, in their report on the Anderson High School published on 28 February 2012, made the following statement in relation to attainment at the Anderson High School:

“At S4 to S6, young people’s results in national examinations have been consistently above national averages over a number of years. Results are in line with or above those in schools which serve young people with similar needs and backgrounds.”

Sandwick Junior High School’s results are excellent at Secondary 4, but so are the Anderson High School’s.

Many respondents felt that the educational benefits of the proposal were not clear, or felt that there were none. Children’s Services articulated the educational benefits of the proposal in the Proposal Paper on Pages 27-37, but for the avoidance of doubt, these are explained here again as follows.

There are two sets of educational benefits to consider in this Proposal:

1. The educational benefits for children who would attend Sandwick Junior High School as a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 Department;
2. The educational benefits for children of Sandwick Junior High School of a transition to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2.

Firstly, the educational benefits to Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department are as follows:

- Children who attend Sandwick Junior High School, Primary Department, would be able to continue to be educated in their local community up to the end of Secondary 2, which retains all of the benefits of walking and cycling to school, and the freedom to attend after-school clubs and activities with no transport constraints;
- Children who attend Dunrossness Primary School, Sandwick Junior High School Primary Department and Cunningsburgh Primary School would have no change to their associated secondary department up to the end of Secondary 2. These children would feel that their family home continued to be relatively near to the school, helping them to feel secure, which in turn, helps them to be ready to learn;
- Those children who live in Sandwick will have the benefit of using the opportunities of their local environment and local community to support skills development and to make learning relevant;
- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department provides a very good physical environment for learning, with spacious classrooms, including a suitable range of specialist rooms. These very good facilities would continue to provide educational benefit to Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children.

Secondly, the educational benefits for children of Sandwick Junior High School of a transition to the Anderson High School at the start of Secondary 3 are as follows:

- In line with the expectations of Curriculum for Excellence, secondary education is
delivered in two phases, the Broad General Education from Secondary 1 to Secondary 3, and the Senior Phase from Secondary 4 to Secondary 6. In most secondary schools in Scotland children progress seamlessly through these phases, with their learning progressing in the same setting. There will be some degree of personalisation and choice at the end of Secondary 2, which maintains the breadth of the curriculum across the curricular areas. During Secondary 3 children will develop their profile (the Secondary 3 Profile). The resulting self reflection allows informed choices to be made regarding their subject choices for the National Qualifications they will take in the Senior Phase, Secondary 4 to Secondary 6. In this Proposal the benefit to children is that, if children must make a transition during their secondary education, the transfer point at the end of Secondary 2 allows them to develop their Secondary 3 Profile, and personalise their learning in Secondary 3 in a way that enables them to undertake some prior learning in Secondary 3 in preparation for their National Qualification courses that will be undertaken in Secondary 4 in the same school;

- A transition at the end of Secondary 2 also benefits those children who choose to undertake qualifications over different timeframes. For example, starting a Higher course in Secondary 4 and sitting a Higher exam in Secondary 5, as they will be in the same school for the whole of their Senior Phase;

- Children will be able to experience the whole of their Senior Phase education in one location, and so have access to wider opportunities offered, such as a range of vocational and academic qualifications, access to local tertiary education establishments, and access to businesses and voluntary organisations. This will enable them to develop a mixed programme of learning throughout their Senior Phase;

- Altering the transition point from Secondary 4 to Secondary 2 has the potential to encourage more children to stay at school beyond Secondary 4, as they will already be familiar with the Anderson High School and its range of qualifications and opportunities on offer throughout the Senior Phase. Progression to higher level courses will therefore be seamless, without being interrupted by a transition of schools and the disturbance that that may bring.

Many respondents, including a number of staff, were concerned that this Proposal would lead to an increase in the sharing of teaching staff. This was not desirable as the recent increase in shared staff had, in their view, created a number of issues.

Our system of junior highs was allowed to develop in the late 1980s and early 1990s to a broad curriculum so that children could remain in their junior high up to the end of Secondary 4. As the basis of the staffing required for a secondary department is the curriculum on offer, this led to an increase in staffing. Some of our junior highs, then and now, have a very small roll in the secondary, with numbers in year groups which do not create anywhere near a maximum class size. In addition, schools were not Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 so full-time member of staff, particularly those only qualified in one subject could never be fully deployed in a junior high. Timetables could be filled but this would be through having very small class sizes and splitting already small year groups; and staff being used to enhance the curriculum in the primary and nursery departments.

With the significant levels of savings required to be found by Children's services since 2012, Children's Services has been working hard to look at how efficiencies in secondary staffing can be made without impacting on the service offered in schools. In discussion with relevant
head teachers in 2012, it was agreed that where a full-time member of staff was employed in a school, but less than full-time was required, that head teachers would timetable the required classes for that member of staff over fewer days so their available time could be sensibly deployed into another school. We also agreed that there would be no splitting of classes unless the nationally set class size maximums were breached.

As a result of this work, in advance of the school session 2013/14 Children’s Services reduced the secondary teaching staffing complement by 13.4 full-time equivalents. This was achieved by supporting the voluntary exits of staff who wished to go and using the identified capacity to fill the required vacancies. This has been done as carefully as is possible. However there are drawbacks to current arrangements. Most significantly our schools, for a variety of reasons, some connected to school transport, do not have a common school day, so start times, finish times and lunchtimes do not match. As time is bunched up into blocks in a week it does lead then in some cases to classes being split. This is not ideal and due to our previous generous staffing levels in secondary is not a situation staff, parents and children are used to.

Children’s Services will continue to work with head teachers and the Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers on sharing arrangements, and through school working time agreements, ensure that appropriate time is allocated collegiate activities to each school who shares a particular teacher.

The claim that sharing staff between Sandwick Junior High School and Anderson High School, if Sandwick Junior High Secondary Department were a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 School, would make the sharing of staff worse is not true.

If this proposal was agreed, a planned coherent timetable would be agreed which married up the two schools’ requirements. Classes would then not be split. A teacher might have the Secondary 1 class on their timetable in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and their Secondary 3 class might be at the Anderson High School. The drawback with this however, is that inevitably to achieve this, staff will have to travel between the two schools on a daily basis. Travel time, in accordance with the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers comes out of teacher-contact time, which creates some inefficiency. However, this does not come close to the inefficiencies we still currently have in staffing in our secondary provision, where we have staff who cannot be fully utilised due to the logistics of where our schools are, and where the classes they do teach are still very small. In 2013/14 the average class size in our junior highs for non-practical subjects where the national maximums are 33 in Secondary 1 and Secondary 2, and 30 for Secondary 3 and up, ranged from four to 15 children.

Staff in particular, were also concerned that such arrangements would lead to low morale and difficulties in recruitment and retention of teachers. Sharing staff in a coherent planned way would ensure that all staff, if they wanted, had the opportunity to teach certificate classes. In many of our previous discussions with the teaching unions, they have articulated to us, how important it is for their members who are secondary qualified to be able to teach qualifications. This concern also brings us back to the Best Value argument, and our school estate. If it is critical to staffing our schools, that teachers only work in one setting, then the junior high system is not a system which can be supported any longer. With the inefficiencies it creates in staffing, it cannot deliver Best Value for Children’s Services and for Shetland Islands Council. In the past Shetland Islands Council had the resources to support these arrangements. It doesn’t any longer.

In March 2013 our Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers, agreed jointly A Transfer Agreement for teachers. The introduction to the joint Agreement makes the following
Both the Council and recognised trade unions are committed to maintaining sustainable teaching posts across Shetland’s schools...” Local authorities in Scotland have no appetite with pursuing compulsory redundancies for teachers, as they are aware that teachers will strike if this policy is pursued. As a result local authorities, including Shetland Islands Council works very hard to manage any required reductions in staffing through voluntary means. The down-side of this position, is that where there is not full-time work any longer and we have a full-time member of staff, is that there is a risk they will be subject to transfer for part of their working week. With Children’s Services facing the requirement to find a further £3.268 million of savings by March 2017, it must demonstrate Best Value as far as is possible in its use of resources.

Planned staffing arrangements for a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will include a non-teaching head teacher and at least one principal teacher with 0.5 full-time equivalent management time. Sandwick Junior High School would have two. These would be fixed permanent members of staff who are in Sandwick Junior High School all of the week. The secondary roll for Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 in Sandwick Junior High School in 2015-16 is estimated to be 65 children. This number is small enough for each child to be known well to one of these key staff, who will be able to provide them with any support required.

Additional Support Needs staff for a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will continue to be allocated on a needs basis, and any child with additional support needs will continue to have the support they need for their learning and their health and wellbeing whatever school they attend.

Shared staff will not affect subject choice. This will remain in place in all our schools in line with the principles and entitlements of Curriculum for Excellence. There has been a recent difficult debate locally about the number of Nationals which most children will study for in Secondary 4 in Shetland. Up until 2013, our children studied for eight Standard Grades. However, the challenge in discussing the change to National Qualifications locally lies in the change from two-year Standard Grade courses to one year National Qualification courses. This issue has been exacerbated by our schools delivering some of the National course content in Secondary 3 to our current cohort of Secondary 4 children this year so that most could be presented for eight Nationals. This approach has to be modified to take full account of the requirements of the Broad General Education Secondary 1 to Secondary 3, and to ensure throughout the Senior Phase that young people have opportunities for wider achievement built into their curricular opportunities. Studying for eight Nationals is not a sustainable position and at present Children’s Services has agreed seven with its secondary head teachers. This position will be kept under review as we continue to work with other local authorities to see how the Senior Phase develops. For example, some local authorities have most young people studying for a maximum of six National Qualifications in Secondary 4.

There are no plans to reduce the number of classes taught by specialist teachers in Sandwick Junior High School if it were to become a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school. There was discussion in Professor Don Ledingham’s Report presented to Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013, about in the future the use of primary teachers to deliver aspects of the Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 curriculum. The report by the Commission on the Delivery of Rural Education also recommends that this is developed in the future to secure the sustainability of small rural secondary schools. Children’s Services will continue to explore this with the General Teaching Council for Scotland over the coming years, but at present their position is quite clear and is as follows:

“The Requirements for Teachers (Scotland) Regulations 2005 confirm the need for education authorities to employ Registered Teachers and emphasise the view of the
Government and of the General Teaching Council that such teachers should have 'the appropriate professional skills and knowledge required' to teach.

Some readers have assumed that this clause can allow registered teachers to teach subjects outwith their area of subject or sector qualification. GTC Scotland does not share this view. We believe that it is professionally undesirable for teachers to be employed to teach a subject (or in a sector) in which they are not registered and that unqualified teaching could be educationally damaging to children.

Of course, opportunities might be provided to allow a teacher to acquire or develop the 'appropriate professional skills and knowledge required' to teach. This would require continuing professional development and space and time to work together with colleagues to develop suitable expertise and confidence. One mechanism to achieve this might be the Council’s Framework for Professional Registration which allows a teacher to gain registration in an additional subject or for another educational sector.

http://www.gtcs.org.uk/registration/professional-registration.aspx

The related but different area of Professional Recognition provides an acknowledgement of specific work undertaken by a teacher in one part of the curriculum or of its assessment.

Finally, GTC Scotland does recognise that emerging curriculum plans have encouraged teachers to engage in cross curricular learning programmes in some schools; and we accept that, where well-planned, these changes can provide benefits to pupils. Indeed, we are aware of schools in which some teachers, with careful planning and appropriate support, have agreed to become involved in the teaching of integrated or project-based units in, for example, the Broad General Education phase of learning. The extent to which this approach might be acceptable would however depend on the qualifications of teachers in that school, the training offered for new course components and the level at which teachers are asked to teach. In general, the more subject specific the content of a course, the more necessary it is that a teacher has suitable qualifications within that specific area.

In summary, therefore, GTC Scotland believes that teachers should be qualified and registered for the sectors and subjects they are teaching. We are pleased to confirm that employers also recognise the need to deploy suitably qualified staff who will normally have a relevant teaching qualification and/or have attained professional recognition or additional registration. These qualifications will provide an assurance to parents and the wider public that teachers have the 'appropriate professional skills and knowledge required' in the subject being taught.

You will find further information on this and the GTC Scotland viewpoint at the following link to our website: http://www.gtcs.org.uk/Registration/Curriculum-for-excellence.aspx

A number of respondents are concerned that the case for a Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 school not be viable any longer with the inception of Curriculum for Excellence has not been made.

In the Proposal Paper on Page 35 at 5.57 as part of the Educational Benefits Statement Children’s Services states: “Pupils would have attended a High School for a year before they formally begin their national qualifications courses. Children would then have access to a wide range of courses that are available in the High School. This would include the opportunity in the future to study for Higher qualifications over one, one and a half, or two school sessions. Additionally, children would have access to opportunities offered by the
Further and Higher Education sector in Shetland.”

Children’s Services agrees that this case is not made strongly enough here, so for absolute clarity now provides the following additional information.

In 2011 the Management Board of Curriculum for Excellence issued a statement of its vision for the future of the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence. The full statement is published on the Education Scotland website. The following extract is the relevant part:

“One of the key aims of Curriculum for Excellence is to reduce the quantity of assessment which pupils undertake, particularly in the senior phase. Many schools are planning for the senior phase as a 2 or 3 year experience. The majority of pupils are staying on to at least S5, so it is no longer appropriate to view S4 in isolation or to see presentation for qualifications in S4 as a “given” for each learner in each subject. Schools may well take the opportunity this provides to offer National Courses over 2 years. Bypassing qualifications at National 4 and moving straight to National 5 or Higher is likely to become increasingly common, although this may be a gradual process. It will also be important to ensure that those young people who choose to leave school at the end of S4 or at Christmas of S5 are appropriately catered for in terms of qualifications.”

Curriculum for Excellence Briefing Paper 8, Progression for the Broad General Education to the Senior Phase, published in 2013 and also available on Education Scotland’s website, reiterates these requirements, and outlines how some schools have begun to tackle these aspirations as follows:

“Schools are also changing the way they deliver qualifications in order to provide the flexibility to meet personalisation and choice, for example by:

• designing the Senior Phase as a three-year experience rather than planning each year separately, so that individuals can gain more qualifications at higher levels, opening up more routes into post school destinations;
• delivering qualifications over a variable timeframe in response to young people’s needs and prior achievement, for example through programmes which lead to qualifications over one or two years, thereby creating space for more in-depth learning;
• when they are clear that the learner is securely at the level of the intended qualification, developing pathways for able learners which by-pass qualifications at lower levels to allow more time to be spent on more challenging learning at higher levels, while covering necessary knowledge and skills from the lower levels;
• providing appropriate, specific programmes which maximise achievement and attainment for young people planning to leave school after S4;
• ensuring all young people are aware of, and have the opportunity to meet entry requirements for post-school destinations, including college and university, and also have the qualifications and skills to enable them to progress to further training/and/or employment as appropriate;
• designing pathways which both ensure young people gain the qualifications they need, and improve their achievement of a wide range of important personal skills including those gained through the qualifications.”

Staff from Children’s Services, including two head teachers, attended a Senior Phase Leadership event in March 2014, hosted and funded by Education Scotland. The key messages from that day were:

• looking forward we see Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 planned together as one coherent programme;
• this year we are still seeing a distinctive Secondary 4 year, however a lot of schools have plans to change;

• we want to encourage the bypassing of lower level qualifications as an option for some children;

• we want to consider how progression in the Broad General Education is being secured;

• We want to see increasing work with partners to deliver a Senior Phase which meets the needs of all learners.

So, a Secondary 4 this year, 2013/14, which looks mostly like Secondary 4 in previous years, is a common feature for many schools in Scotland but this is not the future landscape. There are clear expectations from Education Scotland that Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 will not be seen as three separate years, that lower level qualifications will be bypassed to minimise the burden of assessment for learners and that further meaningful work will be undertaken with partners like colleges and other learning providers to secure opportunities are provided to all young people which best meets their individual needs.

The Anderson High School is quite clear that it cannot progress to fully develop these requirements whilst it continues to have children coming in at the end of Secondary 4 for Secondary 5. This creates a barrier to ever being able to consider Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 as a coherent whole, and limits the opportunities therefore to all children who attend the Anderson High School, including those who have been there from Secondary 1.

As well as this, if Secondary 4 remains a transition point, then the opportunities to assess the appropriateness of bypassing lower level qualifications for individual children is not feasible. If a child is considered able enough at the end of Secondary 3 to start studying for a Higher, and they are in a junior high school, where would they go?

We are aware that most parents do not conceive of a future different to the one they are experiencing now for the children currently in Secondary 4, but Education Scotland leave us in no doubt that this is not the future world of Curriculum for Excellence. Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 schools, however well the community of Shetland feel they have served us in the past, are not the viable into the future. Such a system with a transition at the end of Secondary 4 cannot deliver a young people’s full entitlement to a Senior Phase. In addition, it puts in an artificial barrier for the Anderson High School which will inhibit them in delivering the full entitlement to a Senior Phase to all its children.

Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council has also pointed out in their response that at present it believes all young people have equal access to further education opportunities in Shetland, and the point made in the Proposal Paper that implementing this proposal would increase those opportunities is wrong. There is a misunderstanding here of the points made in the Proposal Paper. A fully developed Senior Phase will have access to further education opportunities built into Secondary 4, Secondary 5 and Secondary 6, as appropriate. This cannot be achieved equally for all children with our current system of junior highs, but could be workable if our Senior Phase provision was consolidated in one or two settings.

The point itself is wrongly made as well, as currently young people leaving school in places like Unst find it very difficult to access a course at Shetland College compared to someone living in Lerwick, as there is no accommodation available for them, so there is
not equality of opportunity at present.

A number of respondents expressed concern about the level of support children would receive in a large school like the Anderson High School, and that they felt Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department provided excellent levels of support to their children due to friendly environment and small class sizes. In 2013/14 the average class size in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department for a non-practical subject is 15 children and for a practical subject it is 13. Comparable numbers for the Anderson High School are 19 for a non-practical subject and 16 for a practical subject. Class sizes overall are not significantly bigger.

With respect to support available for children, all aspects of the Anderson High School’s care and support of all its children were praised in their Education Scotland report which was published on 28 February 2012 as follows:

“Young people learn and achieve very well, including those with additional support needs. They are highly motivated and enthusiastic about their work.”

Young people enjoy very good relationships with each other and with staff across the school. They feel safe and well cared for in school, including those accommodated in the halls of residence. Young people from Scalloway Junior High School feel included and able to progress their learning in their new school.”

“Young people are achieving very well and successfully developing important skills in leadership, teamwork and creativity through cultural, sport and volunteering activities.”

“Young people, including those in the ASN department, are making good to very good progress across the curriculum at S1/S2. At S4 to S6, young people’s results in national examinations have been consistently above national averages over a number of years. Results are in line with or above those in schools which serve young people with similar needs and backgrounds. Young people at risk of missing out and those requiring additional support are making very good progress. Many achieve success and certification in a range of awards including Award Scheme Development and Accreditation Network (ASDAN) awards. Almost all young people leave school to enter employment, training, further or higher education.”

“Young people, including those in the ASN department are very well supported by the school. Most teachers pitch tasks and activities well to meet individual needs. Many build effectively on young people’s prior learning at the associated primary and junior high schools. Teachers make effective use of information and communication technologies to enhance learning. The highly skilled pupil support team and support for learning staff identify young people’s learning, social and behavioural needs very well. They provide very useful information to class teachers to help them support young people’s learning. ASN staff, including support assistants, work well with young people throughout the school. Very effective additional support is provided to young people and their families through effective partnerships with staff from partner agencies. As a result of these successful approaches, those who require support are making very good progress and achieve well.”

“This inspection of your school found the following key strengths.
• Well-behaved, responsible young people who are keen to learn and actively support their school and community.
• A safe, caring, supportive and inclusive environment for all young people.
**High-quality support from specialist staff for young people with particular learning needs.**
**Staff’s enthusiasm and dedication to enhancing experiences for young people.**
**The strong lead and direction from the headteacher, ably supported by the depute headteachers.**

As verified by external scrutiny, the Anderson High School delivers very high quality education, additional support and pastoral care to all children who attend school there. As required by the Additional support for Learning Act 2004, the additional support needs of all children are assessed and met on an individual basis. This is required by law and is the approach of all our schools including the Anderson High School and Sandwick Junior High School.

Some respondents were concerned that children from Sandwick Junior High School, and its feeder primaries would find a move to the Anderson High School daunting as they will have come from a smaller setting and be moving into a large secondary school with a roll of almost 900. Children’s Services would like to allay fears of any parent or child about this issue by pointing out that the Anderson High School High School staff are very experienced in managing transitions. Each year they manage the transition of Primary 7 children from up to eleven feeder primaries, and they also manage the transition of Secondary 4 children coming in from up to six junior high settings to study in Secondary 5. As well as this respondents should remember that the Anderson High School is the associated secondary for our remote isles primaries and now also for some of our small primaries on the Shetland mainland. For example in August 2013, they took in one Primary 7 child from two of our remote isles primaries; one of their mainland associated primaries provided them with only two children; and another with only five.

A few respondents were concerned about option selection at the Anderson High School if this proposal is implemented. The Anderson High School has annual experience of treating Secondary 4 children from Anderson High School and 6 junior highs equally. This is co-ordinated by one of the Depute Heads and Pupil Support teachers in all schools, on a timeline established at the start of each year.

Given that children going into Secondary 3 now specialise in eleven and not eight subjects, some children from the Anderson High School, including some children there by placing request have had to re-choose some options to make the timetable best fit.

The current teacher child ratio in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is 8.74 children per teacher; and in the Anderson High School it is 10.91 children per teacher. This information is taken from the national school census information for 2013.

Children’s Services has not been aware of schools not being able to resource Curriculum for Excellence appropriately. School operating budget have been reduced, but for the financial year 2013/14 none of our schools were overspent in this area of their budgets.

Some respondents were concerned that this proposal means teachers will be being paid to travel and not to teach. The estimated total **teacher contact time which would be lost if this proposal were to be implemented** is calculated as 1.85 full-time equivalent teachers which equates to £83,692.

All our secondary teaching staff no matter which secondary setting they teach in are required to be appropriately qualified and have full registration with the General Teaching Council for Scotland.
Some respondents were concerned that the Proposal was unclear about how the Shetland Learning Partnership Project would fit with the proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 provision at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, and they did not feel that Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department had to be a Secondary 1 to Secondary provision only for children to benefit from the aims of the Shetland Learning Partnership.

The vision and aims for the Shetland Learning Partnership will be shared with all our secondary departments and schools; Shetland College and the North Atlantic Fisheries College; and Parent Council Chairs between May and July 2014.

The aims of the project are as follows:

- create a new future for secondary education in Shetland;
- help every learner, of every age, achieve their full potential;
- make sure every young person in Shetland gets the same opportunities no matter where they go to school;
- schools working closely with Colleges, potential employers and the voluntary sector to help learners plan their future, and give them the right support to meet their goals;
- create a virtual ‘Learning Campus’. This will bring together every opportunity – academic, vocational, work experience or voluntary – to make sure any learner can access what they need easily, at the right time, and in the right way;
- ensuring, through checking back with young people, parents, teachers and local industry that what we’re doing is ‘fit for purpose’ for Shetland.

The final desired outcomes of the Project are:

- to develop an education sector that meets the needs of Shetland in the future;
- to develop an education system for Senior Phase young people and other learners that maximises opportunities including qualifications both academic and vocational;
- to help prepare all learners for future employment or study.

For children it will mean that if a child has to move schools, they will have had a similar Broad General Education experience as all their peers before they start their Senior Phase. High School and College timetables will be co-ordinated and drawn up together to ensure that opportunities can be maximised. There will be much closer links with further and higher education as well as potential future employers. The emphasis on academic qualifications will be as rigorous as ever, but in future vocational training will be as highly valued; and if young people choose a vocational path either in addition to, or instead of, a challenging academic programme they will be fully supported.

Learning to learn will be championed throughout every child’s education. During the Broad General Education the emphasis will be on developing these skills so that young people can take advantage of all sorts of learning opportunities during their Senior Phase whether in the classroom, online, in workplace experiences, volunteering or attending College. It will develop the use of online learning to support the courses being studied by providing more in depth knowledge or support to study a course not available in school. Staff will be
appropriately trained and supported to deliver teaching in these new ways.

As a first step, by Summer 2015 some Secondary 4 children attending the Anderson High School and Brae High School will have the chance to undertake a blended learning course which combines academic study, a Higher National Certificate college course, complementary work place and volunteering experiences.

Initially, the focus of the Project will be on secondary aged children, especially on those undertaking the Senior Phase, but the Shetland Learning Campus will also be developed to help adults who want to return to learning. In time employers will also benefit as learners will be supported in a way that helps their employment opportunities.

Changes will start taking place from August 2014 and onwards over the next two years. The first key change will be that secondary school curriculums and timetables will be aligned with each other and local colleges.

There will be some aspects of the project which would benefit children no matter the structure of secondary education in Shetland. However the key aim of the Shetland Learning Partnership is to maximise learning opportunities for our young people during the Senior Phase, by creating opportunities during it for learning provided by Shetland College, volunteering and work experience. These aspirations cannot be met in full if our current system of delivering the Senior Phase in a fractured way, over seven establishments continues.

Lastly some respondents raised the issue of proving that the Scalloway children who transferred to the Anderson High School were not affected by the move. There is clear evidence in Education Scotland’s report on the Anderson High School which was published on 28 February 2012, that they felt that the children who had transferred from Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department were happy and settled. They made the following comment in the Report: “Young people from Scalloway Junior High School feel included and able to progress their learning in their new school.”

Children’s Services also examined closely the attainment of the young people who had transferred from Scalloway Junior High School in 2012, when they first cohort of children from that move sat their Standard Grades at the Anderson High School. The results are set out in the tables below. SCQF is the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework. Level 3 is Foundation Level in Standard Grade, Level 4 is General Level in Standard Grade and Level 5 is Credit Level in Standard Grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson High School</th>
<th>Total Secondary 4 Pupils</th>
<th>Exam Results 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson High</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>S4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anderson High School
Ex-Scalloway Secondary 4 Pupils
Exam Results 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>5+ SCQF Level 3 or Better</th>
<th>5+ SCQF Level 4 or Better</th>
<th>5+ SCQF Level 5 or Better</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Maths</th>
<th>English &amp; Maths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Scalloway S4</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
<td>93.10%</td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all the measures the ex-Scalloway Junior High School children did better than the Secondary 4 group they were part of at the Anderson High School, overall. In the measure of 5 or more Credit grade passes (SCQF Level 5), they performed almost 10% better.

**Issue: Child Safety**

**Points Made**

- Adverse weather will lead to school days being lost for children.
- The final report should include a safety audit of every child's walking route to new designated pick up points.
- I am concerned about the impact of younger teenagers travelling on school transport, when it is not their choice. Currently Secondary 5 and Secondary 6 children attending the Anderson High School from the South Mainland have done so by choice. There are safety concerns arising from this with the potential for the driver to be distracted by disruptive children they can do nothing about.
- What happens if the bus gets stuck part way through a journey due to accident or snow?
- We are concerned about the timing of this consultation and the capacity of the Anderson High School to accommodate children in respect of toilets, social spaces and condition of building. We would want a reassurance of no adverse impact on the current Anderson High School if more children, up to 80 came as a result of this proposal.
- Canteen space in Sandwick Junior High School is very good and canteen staff provide high quality meals in an enriching environment. The Anderson High School canteen is overcrowded meaning many children choose to shop on "the street". The Anderson High School does not have a smart card system as Sandwick, meaning parents have no assurance that dinner money is spent on nutritious food. The Proposal would remove the means by which children are encouraged to eat healthily and contribute to a decline in long term health and wellbeing.

**Response**

All school transport routes are gritted in advance of that transport using those routes. Adverse weather can mean days lost for children but the presumption made is always against closure unless all the advice available to Children’s Services would indicate that
children could not be transported to, and from, school safely. In those circumstances, any individual head teacher may take the decision to close their school, or, if the weather conditions dictate, the Executive Manager. Schools may take the decision to issue a blanket closure instruction.

The Anderson High School enrolment form, which is used for all children attending there, has a section that asks for one of the contacts provided to be listed as a snow closure contact. However, it is many years now since the school has had to make use of these contacts for this purpose.

Since October 2001, all new coaches and minibuses have had to be fitted with seat belts. A forward facing seat fitted with a minimum of a lap belt must be available to every child. New regulations introduced in September 2008, requires all seated passengers aged 14 years and above to use seat belts when they are fitted in all buses and coaches. The Government have recently announced the intention to legislate to make seatbelts a requirement on all dedicated school transport in Scotland. This is planned for implementation in 2018 for primary children, and 2021 for secondary children. However, Shetland Islands Council already has these measures in place for all of its school transport contracts and so this latest announcement will not result in additional expense for the local authority.

Drivers employed are professional drivers, suitably qualified for the job. The operators are licensed, and the vehicles require to be licensed and tested as Public Service Vehicles. The School Transport Policy requires bus operators to have contingency plans in place, to deal with vehicle failures, adverse weather and the emergency closure of schools. There is no statutory requirement for education authorities to provide supervisors on school transport provided under the Education (Scotland) Act 1980.

Risk assessments in respect of pick up/drop off points will be the responsibility of the local authority in future, as opposed to the transport operator. All such risk assessments will be carried out before the start of the new academic year, in August 2014. Additional Road Safety Audits will be carried out where the authority deems them necessary, or where requested by parents. Once this work is complete and pick up/drop off points designated, all parents will be made aware of the route and pick up/drop of point pertinent for their child(ren).

The Anderson High School has carefully managed arrangements to ensure all children who wish it can have a lunch choice from the school canteen, which operates to the exactly the same nutritional standards as all other school canteens including Sandwick Junior High School. The Anderson High School operates a four-way staggered lunchtime, to ensure all year groups get fed. The school monitored the length of queues over the winter. The longest queues were on Thursdays, with some older children waiting up to 15 minutes for their fish and chips choice (other choices were served more quickly). This still allowed for 30 minutes to sit and eat. The school monitored the number of choices still available at the end of lunchtime sales. The catering and school management staff are satisfied that even if you arrive very late for lunch, a choice is available.

In response to concerns about adding a further additional 80 children into the existing Anderson High School building, and to ensure children do not have to make two transitions: one to the existing Anderson High School in 2015, and then a further one to the new Anderson High School in August 2016, Children’s Services will be recommending for this Proposal that the implementation date is moved to August 2016 or as soon as possible thereafter, when the new Anderson High School has been opened. This would also allow the
existing Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to complete Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School before transferring to the Anderson High School.

**Issue: Out of School Activities**

**Points Made**

- Sandwick Junior High School provides a huge range of clubs and after-school activities for the children.

- Fewer children will participate in team sports as a result of this proposal as competition for places will be fiercer. This occurred after the Scalloway Junior High School closure.

- Children will no longer be able to attend after school activities if this proposal goes forward, as they will have to catch the bus home.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department staff offer a wider range of wider achievement opportunities. It is wrong to say this needs larger groups of children to be sustainable.

- Transport times created by the Proposal are unreasonable. It will have a detrimental impact on young people and will limit their access to extra-curricular activities.

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 at home is better as children can still access after school activities.

- How can after-school activities be maintained if teacher workload increases?

- After-school activities will be affected by this proposal. Children will not be home in time for them to attend.

- Volunteering, employability skills opportunities would be lost if Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department became Secondary 1 to Secondary 2.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department staff offer a huge variety of after-school activities, school trips and clubs out of their own time.

- If Secondary 3 to Secondary 4 children are removed from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department then I hope the Anderson High School can take on the coaching.

- Children will no longer be able to walk or cycle to school.

- The small numbers at the school will restrict extra-curricular activities such as sports, music tuition and school trips.

- Sending Secondary 3 to Secondary 4 children to Anderson High School will involve them in abnormally high commuting times which will disrupt their lives and prevent them from taking part in sport, social and family involvement at an important and impressionable time of their lives. At present they have all types of sporting
activities in the local leisure centres and this will cease.

- Many of these activities will be lost with the extra travel.
- These children will have reduced opportunities resulting from the reduction in teaching staff, including reduced activities available at lunchtime and after school.
- Teachers travelling between schools means less support for children, fewer extra-curricular activities, a negative ethos and loss of identity for the school as it will become a skeleton school. Instead of inter-disciplinary learning, teachers will be driving past each other.
- Councillors must ensure that education in Shetland evolves. Why have a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 satellite school when these children could join together with their older siblings and friends at a high school? Why stay at a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school with drive through teachers when you could be part of a school system that ensured excellent support and extra-curricular activities?
- Children will miss out on socialising/playing sports/sleeping when they are travelling.
- There are more clubs at Sandwick Junior High School than at the Anderson High School.
- Out of school activities will decline if the young people are not there.
- There is good access to out of school activities in junior high schools/their surrounding communities. This will be lost if they have to transfer to the Anderson High School as it will limit home time. Also after school jobs, for example, work on family crofts and fishing, will be much affected by this proposal to end Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 in the junior high schools.
- I like to cycle to school but will not be able to do that all the way to Lerwick. I do not think long bus journeys to the Anderson High School will be very healthy.

Response

Sandwick Junior High School provides a wide range of extra-curricular activities. The Anderson High School also provides a wide range of extra-curricular activities. These include a large number of opportunities offered at lunchtimes and after-school, which range from music activities, to sporting activities, to craft clubs, and revision and study opportunities. Some activities are provided by Active Schools. The current list is set out below.

- Netball
- Badminton
- Trampoline
- Dance Mats
- Beach Volleyball
• Dodgeball
• Football
• Fitness Suite
• Enhanced Transition Group
• Revision Clubs
• Additional Study time
• Books and Banter
• Library, including activities run in there
• Games, Activities and Puzzles
• Duke of Edinburgh Award
• Chess Club
• Internet
• Chess Club
• Scripture Union
• Saturday Morning Music Club
• Senior Strings
• Fiddle Finale
• Tunester
• Hansel
• Junior Singing Group
• No strings Attached
• Shetland Youth Jazz Band
• Shetland Youth Wind Band
• Junior Strings
• Rock School Guitar

The majority of Anderson High School activities take place at lunchtime. This is because a large number of current Anderson High School children require school transport to get to and from school. Children who attend activities which are after school at the Anderson High School can get service buses home and the school will pay for the bus ticket out of School Fund. Active Schools activities take this into account too.
If Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department were to become a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school it is likely that with fewer children and fewer staff that looking forward the number of opportunities for wider achievement would be fewer. Whereas, the Anderson High School, with larger numbers of staff and children would be able to continue to provide a wide range of opportunities to enhance learning in the Broad General Education and in the Senior Phase.

The Anderson High School does not have any evidence to support the claim that fewer children participated in sporting activities after the Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department closed. Some of the Scalloway girls were some of the best netball players in the Anderson High School and they gained places in the school team. As a result they participated in a national competition unavailable to children at Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department. Netball training at the Anderson High School is at lunchtimes, and teams in the after school league, are not selected on ability. They are open to all who want to go along.

**Issue: Class Sizes**

**Points Made**

- Keeping Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department open for Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 with year groups of numbers like 36 leads to very inefficient use of staff. This has to be two groups for non-practical subjects as the maximum for a class is 33. Join with the Anderson high School and more efficient use of staff can be made.

- This Proposal will lead to larger class sizes at the Anderson High School.

- I am concerned about the impact larger class sizes at the Anderson High School will have on my child's education.

- Centralising education in Lerwick will also not benefit Lerwick children as it will lead to larger class sizes and unhappy children.

- This Proposal will lead to larger class sizes, thus disadvantaging the Anderson High School children as well.

- What the Proposal means for numbers coming into the Anderson High School is not clear - uncertainty over number of children would be disruptive to current children at the Anderson High School.

- Class sizes at the Anderson High School will increase further; some are already at a maximum of 33, or 20 or 30 for Secondary 4 to Secondary 6.

- This Proposal will create larger class sizes at the Anderson High School and classes at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department are currently not undersized.

- This Proposal should not be looked at in isolation but alongside the other which will
impact on class sizes at the Anderson High School.

- The more vulnerable children in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department would be overlooked in a large school like the Anderson High School.
- My child has additional support needs. They would not cope in a large unfamiliar school and would not cope with the daily journey to school.
- Bigger class sizes will affect children’s educational and social needs.
- Sandwick Junior High School children will move from small class sizes to capacity class sizes. Anderson High School children will move from large class sizes to capacity class sizes.
- I am concerned about the class sizes at Anderson High School.
- Sandwick Junior High School will become a "skeleton" school with reduction of twenty staff. Parents will vote with their feet and placing requests to Anderson High School will increase. Increase in placing requests will mean an increase in class sizes.
- The Anderson High School will again not receive the equality of provision that is spoken of. Children at the Anderson High School will not see their teachers for all lessons in a subject as the teacher will be elsewhere. With the tightening of staffing, class sizes will move to national maximum sizes, up to 30 in a class, whereas in the junior high school system, the classes will be much smaller and with access to more resources.
- Large class sizes, up to 33 children, would mean children would have, on average, just over a minute of dialogue with their teachers.
- Although 33 children is the possible number of children in non-practical class groups it is not desirable but will probably be the norm in the Anderson High School.
- If the proposal goes ahead the class sizes of the Anderson High School will be larger which will have a bad effect on both the existing children and incoming children meaning less confident children could get less support.
- The classes I teach at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department have 20 to 25 children in them. Big classes are not the way forward.

Response
In 2013-14 the average class size in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department for a non-practical subject is 15 children and for a practical subject it is 13. Comparable numbers for the Anderson High School are 19 for a non-practical subject and 16 for a practical subject. If the proposal is implemented it is estimated that an additional 2.5 full-time equivalent staff would be deployed to the Anderson High School. There may some small increase in class sizes, but all would of course remain within the nationally agreed maximum class sizes.
In 2013/14 in the Anderson High School the maximum class size of a practical class is, in some cases, at the national maximum of 20. In Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department in 2013/14 the largest practical class has 19 children in it. For non practical subjects the largest class size at the Anderson High School is currently 31 and in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department it is 25.

**Issue: Community Concerns**

**Points Made**

- Sandwick Junior High School is adjacent to Sandwick Leisure Centre and the school and its outdoor areas provide excellent facilities for a range of sporting activities.

- Children in the area have won awards through the school for local volunteering. This would be more difficult to do if they attended a school outwith their local area.

- The partial closure of Sandwick Junior High School will lead to depopulation. In the period 2001-2011 the population in the Dunrossness area has fallen, particularly the number of residents aged 25 and under. Already service provision in the area has been reduced with, for example, the loss of the police station and the mobile dentist.

- Planned growth at Sumburgh airport over the next few years will lead to more jobs in the area, which should increase the population. A local secondary school will encourage people to move to the area.

- A full socio-economic impact assessment should have been carried out for this proposal.

- Folk will start to choose not to live in the South Mainland, as it will be too far away from their children’s education.

- Children from Sandwick Junior High School will still lose affinity with their community despite being there for Secondary 1 to Secondary 2.

- This Proposal will lead to the depopulation of rural areas.

- Asking people in other communities about these proposals sets one community against another.

- This Proposal will have an adverse effect on community.

- It is better for children to be educated in their local community for as long as possible.

- The local school is a focus for community cohesion.

- This Proposal does not reflect how the community feel in Sandwick and how partnership working supports the learning in the school.
• Sandwick is a growing community.
• Shetland needs families to live in the South Mainland. Closing Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department would lead to centralisation and the South Mainland community would die.
• The Proposal reflects a disregard for Shetland's communities and its people.
• The Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 Proposal in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department will be detrimental to the school community. Parents will move their children to avoid another transition after Secondary 2 and the school will lose children leading to it gradually diminishing. If this is the scenario then it is better that Shetland Islands Council just close it.
• Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is held in high regard by the Sandwick community.
• This Proposal, if it goes forward, will lead to the eventual closure of the secondary department, as parents especially in Dunrossness and Cunningsburgh will not put their children to a school for only two years then have to transfer again.
• This Proposal, if implemented, would lead to more children simply leaving and the secondary department would close altogether.
• I am fed up with Shetland Islands Council’s lack of support for rural areas.
• Parents from Sandwick will end up sending their children to the Anderson High School and we will be left paying for Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department with hardly any children there.
• I realise there is a saving in this Proposal, but this is not good long term planning as Sandwick is a growing community.
• I have real concerns for the future of Shetland’s rural areas under these proposals resulting in de-population.
• The local crofting communities will be badly affected if the young people don't return to their homes.
• This plan will have a detrimental effect on the community of the South Mainland. It will affect the local economy and community identity.
• This will cause significant damage to our local community.
• The partial or complete closure of the school is likely to lead to depopulation in the Dunrossness area leading to detrimental effects on the local economy.
• The school is a fundamental part of the South Mainland community and this helps and supports children in their learning.
• Our children are our future and they should all get the same opportunity for high
quality education in their local area. Please leave our rural communities alone.

- Shetland's excellent standard of education has been one of the significant elements in attracting people to move into and return to work in our islands with their families. I am a general practitioner and colleagues have left because of the changes in and uncertainty around the provision of secondary education. This has had the knock-on effect of creating difficulties in providing an obstetric service on the islands, and a knock-on effect on an already pressurised Lerwick Health Centre. The failure to continue to provide education within rural communities means it will become even more difficult to recruit in many professions in these more rural areas. Why would anyone choose to move their family into an area which puts that kind of travelling strain on children when it is not necessary?

- Removing Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children from their rural communities will have an adverse effect on their communities. Because of the long commuting times, children will be too tired, have homework to do, and will not be able to take part in any community activities during the week,

- Many young people wish to stay in their local area.

- Many rural children have many pastimes which help them to interact socially, and helps keep the island way of life alive.

- If employees are not redeployed, the Sandwick community will be poorer, leading to less use of amenities and in turn, loss of amenities.

- Forcing children away from their own communities is not supporting to either children or parents.

- Nowhere is safer for a child than their own community, where everyone takes an interest in their welfare.

- To remove Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School makes no sense. The only positive thing about it being that it is better than closing the secondary department entirely. This would be a backwards step and one that would cost the South Mainland dearly.

- If our children are not in our communities, what is the point in staying?

- The damage to the economics of the South Mainland must be considered.

- To remove children from time spent in communities and with families is potentially devastating to rural areas.

- The projected savings are not enough to justify the damage that will be done to the community and may not be realised.

- This is all essential to the basic infrastructure of Shetland, that people stay, do well and contribute to keep essential services going, and their children stay too. All that makes Shetland unique, keeps people here, but it is not just the views, wildlife or
music. It is far more the education and opportunities for their children that will make people stay.

- The 2009 Scottish Government document "Building Better Schools: Investing in Scotland's Future" requires local authorities to take account of the following aspirations in planning changes to the school estate: 'schools are integral parts of the communities they serve, with children making use of community facilities and communities accessing school facilities.' (Paragraph 5.6). It is not clear how this would be achieved under the proposed model.

- I think the proposed closures, especially if Dunrossness Primary School is targeted, will definitely have a detrimental effect on the local community. Folk will just move to the town or central mainland areas. Local shops and amenities will close as there will be no people left in the community to use them. Another nail in the coffin for our rural communities.

- Natural Secondary 4 leavers form approximately half of the school population. To introduce a transition at the end of Secondary 2 would be stressful, unnecessary and opposing the Curriculum for Excellence.

- The change would lead to depopulation. This would lead to a reduction in the diversity of the community as families in particular would choose to live elsewhere.

- There does not seem to be value placed on rural communities. Family life will decline as children will be too tired to engage in family life, communities will ultimately decline.

- The centralisation of secondary education will damage the long term viability of rural communities.

- Please think again. I am a young person really looking forward to secondary school in my home village.

- This proposal will have an effect on the wider community. Centralisation is negative on both the rural and the town communities. The rural areas will become depopulated and the town will lack resources to accommodate the increase in people wanting to be near their children.

- Children will have less time at home. People will not be so keen to move to outlying areas if their children will have to travel, so areas could become depopulated.

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 in junior high schools works well, as children do not have to move schools and can be educated from 3 to 16 years in a familiar environment within their community.

- The Proposal will remove the youth from the community during and after school and they won't have so much family time, after school jobs and community clubs.

- Centralisation resulting from this proposal undermines the Council's approved strategy for development set out in the Shetland Local Development Plan; it will
continue to threaten the very interconnectivity that keeps smaller communities together and allows rural areas to prosper.

- Stop centralisation now as hostelling and transporting children will ruin our rural communities. Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 years are years when our young people need to be nurtured in their own families and supported by their local community. It would have a huge impact on quality of family and community life. If we do not have sustainable rural communities the future for Shetland as a whole is bleak.

- Children should be allowed to undertake paid work, volunteering or hobbies within their own community and have more time at home.

- The Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence should allow flexibility and choice to meet individual learners' needs. I feel if more children are being educated in one community i.e. Lerwick then all opportunities for work experience, College study, volunteering, and other educational options will have to exist in Lerwick. Young people will lose the opportunity to access learning centres, employers and community and voluntary groups which allow them to contribute to their communities in a way which retains their sense of belonging and identity.

- People will choose not to live in rural areas and this will put increasing pressure on services in the Central Mainland for example housing services, general practitioner practices, and water and sewage systems.

- There is a mutual advantage for smaller communities to contribute to the Senior Phase: local people and employers can provide opportunities to young people who are the future local employees and next generation councillors, community councillors, parents or public hall, youth club, sports club volunteers. This would support the Shetland Islands Council policies on sustaining fragile communities and retain the traditions and folklore which make Shetland such a unique and individual place.

- If the school stops at Secondary 3 then all the children will start drifting away from their community as I think they will become more focused on Lerwick. This will make it difficult for the community clubs to remain open. It will have a very bad impact on the community.

- Sandwick Junior High School is the hub of our community. Removing Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 will ultimately mean the closure of our secondary department.

- Currently only Sandwick based children remain in Sandwick for their Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 education. All other children are currently travelling out of their community to attend secondary school Secondary 1 to Secondary 4.

- The shop might close as we use it a lot.
Response

The principal requirement of the local education authority is to provide adequate and efficient education and it must ensure that this education is directed to the development of the personality, talents and mental and physical abilities of the child or young person to their fullest potential.

The Report of the Commission on the Delivery of Rural Education, published on 17 April 2013, gives consideration to the impact on rural communities of school closures, and makes the following points (Page 30):

“No impact on the local community is often a significant part of objections to school closure. The village school can be an important part of the symbolic capital of a community and schools are often referred to as “the heart of the community”. Both incomers who have invested in living in rural places and local people are often very opposed to closure. Closure of schools (or threats to do so) can significantly reduce the sense of community wellbeing. The Commission encountered strongly held views that school closure would have a very debilitating effect on the local community.”

“It is important to recognise that a school’s primary function is to provide pupils with the best possible educational experience. However, given the value and importance for their long-term future that communities place on retaining a school, it is correct that any rural school closure proposal should be subject to a thorough community impact assessment.”

“A key point which has been considered by the Commission is the degree to which the presence of a school is essential to the sustainability of a rural community.”

“In some of the communities the Commission visited, it found evidence that while a school closure had been resisted and closure still took place, the impact had been less than was feared, with communities adjusting to different school provision and community focus continuing in individual villages. Rural communities and their economic base vary widely, as does their remoteness, and this will affect their resilience to school change.”

Furthermore, the Report goes on to say, on Page 32:

“A school alone cannot sustain a rural community. The Commission noted that other issues are likely to be as critical to maintaining a working age population. The Commission received a strong message on its visits to communities that while they place great value on a school in their community, the two most important factors in sustaining the community are jobs and housing. Without employment opportunities and affordable housing, families can neither move to an area nor remain there. While local schools are strongly desirable in a similar way to local healthcare and a local post office, it seems likely that rural communities do generally manage to tolerate travelling a further distance to school. This finding is consistent with other Scottish rural studies.”

Children’s Services, in recognition of the deep concerns rural communities in Shetland have about any proposal to close a rural school, now always commission a socio-economic impact study on each closure proposal it carries out. The socio-economic study for the proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 was carried out by Steve Westbrook, Economist, in partnership with Sandy Anderson. The full text of their study is attached to this Consultation Report as Appendix H. The main conclusions are in summary that:
• The net annual savings from discontinuing the S3 and S4 stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School are estimated by Shetland Islands Council to be £223,530;

• There are 1,407 resident households in the secondary department’s catchment area - 638 in the Dunrossness area, 388 in Sandwick and 388 in Cunningsburgh;

• The catchment area includes areas that have had the strongest population growth in Shetland over the last 10 years, but it also includes areas around Dunrossness with modest population growth or decline;

• The availability of social housing is below the Shetland average in the catchment area, especially around Dunrossness and Cunningsburgh;

• Growth in housing availability has centred on the communities to the north of the catchment area, especially Sandwick;

• Sandwick is identified in SIC’s Local Plan as the “area of best fit”, where any significant housing development should take place;

• The majority of the population of the South Mainland who are in employment travel outside the area for work (principally Lerwick);

• The major employers in the catchment area are the Council (mainly in education at the Sandwick Junior High School and its feeder primary schools and in social care at Overtonlea Care Centre), at Sumburgh Airport (HIAL and other companies based there), and in tourism at Sumburgh Hotel. There are also a number of employers in retail, knitwear and other sectors;

• Employment opportunities at Sumburgh Airport are expanding and this could put some pressure on housing in the Dunrossness area. Companies would be keen to recruit locally (subject to skills being available), but some will employ weekly commuters if necessary;

• Self-employment is an important feature of the local economy – through agriculture, crofting, tourism and other home based businesses;

• Total annual household income in the catchment area is estimated at some £54 million;

• The direct impact of discontinuing the S3 and S4 stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School would be the loss of teaching and support staff at the school. These employment reductions would be offset within Shetland to an extent by additional posts at Anderson High School in Lerwick and through the additional costs of school transport;

• There is also likely to be an impact on retail turnover, especially in the shop and bakery at Sandwick, from reduced spending by pupils and their parents;

• Whilst we found little evidence that families would leave the area in the short term if
the proposed changes to secondary education at Sandwick are implemented, there is some concern that the loss of S3 and S4 education at Sandwick would make the area less attractive for families moving to or within Shetland and promote a drift towards Lerwick;

- It is possible that homes, especially in the Dunrossness area, will increasingly be occupied by older people and by workers at Sumburgh Airport who rent while maintaining a family home elsewhere rather than relocating their families;

- There is wide concern about young people becoming disengaged from their local community at a younger age and the effects this would have on community cohesion;

- The school building will still be heavily used for educational provision and there appears to be limited scope to extend its use for community benefit;

- Overall, the proposal to discontinue stages S3 and S4 of secondary education at Sandwick Junior High School is likely to make the South Mainland a less attractive place to live for some families, but the other factors which will continue to attract people to live there may, on balance, outweigh the impetus to move away.

The new Community Plan for Shetland 2013-2020 was also agreed in August 2013. This describes how the public sector will work together with the private and third sector to improve the communities in Shetland. There are commitments in the Plan which are important to securing a sustainable future for all areas of Shetland, and these will be important to any community in Shetland in securing a positive viable future. Outcome 1 is: “Shetland has sustainable economic growth with good employment opportunities”: and Outcome 11 is: “We have a strong voluntary sector and social enterprises, encouraging community enterprise and co-operatives, with increased capacity to deliver services based on needs and aspirations of local communities.” Within these there are clear objectives: to increase sustainable economic growth; increase the number of business start-ups; secure population growth; increase the role of community enterprise; improve the sustainability of community groups; and involve communities in deciding what is needed to improve their area.

Shetland Islands Council’s updated Corporate Plan agreed by Shetland Islands Council on 26 March 2014 also has as one its Priorities: Encouraging Strong Communities. The text of this priority is: “Successful places depend on individuals, families, third sector organisations, community groups, public bodies and businesses all working together to find the best way to do things, their own solutions to problems and the new ideas to help their communities adapt and stay strong and vibrant in a changing world.”

Children’s Services, from its experience of considering school closures in the past, is very aware of the fear communities have of the impact of a local rural school closure. This proposal is not a school closure. All the facilities Sandwick Junior High School has in place will remain available for community use. The children will remain educated in Sandwick Junior High School until the end of Secondary 2. This proposal only suggests the removal of two stages of education. The South Mainland has excellent transport links so many residents already travel out of the area for work. The area also has Shetland’s main airport. This already provides employment for the area, and there are developments planned there which may actually increase employment opportunities.
Sandwick Junior High School will continue to provide education for pre-school, primary, Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children. Other community users of the school will continue to have access to the all of the current facilities. The removal of two stages in the secondary department would potentially provide some additional space for community use.

The Development Directorate and Children’s Services will engage with the community to assess how the existing use of the school could be utilised to meet community needs. Sandwick has a public hall, a swimming pool (with leisure facilities) and a well-equipped games hall. They are all significant community assets. The school currently makes good use of the games hall and the swimming pool and will continue to do so if the secondary department is reduced by two year group stages.

The majority of existing employment opportunities, with the exception of some secondary teachers and some support staff will remain as the school will continue to provide pre-school, primary and early secondary education. All secondary children from the area including Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children would be transported home each night and would be able to remain in their local communities and attend local leisure facilities, clubs and events.

### Issue: Transition Issues

**Points Made**

- Parents disagreed that transitions in secondary education are a bad thing and should be avoided. Well managed transitions can be highly positive and equip children for life.

- The consultation process has been fundamentally compromised by the issue of the existing Secondary 2 year group. The position this has put this group of parents in due to the timing of the proposed implementation of the Proposal. This situation has, in effect, led to the dismantling of Sandwick Junior High School.

- With the timing of the proposed implementation of this Proposal the current Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School would have to move at the end of Secondary 3. This is the time the Children’s Services have said is not the best time to move, and a time which was rejected in the informal consultation in September 2013.

- Parents of current Secondary 2 children in Sandwick Junior High School feel they have been forced into making placing requests. This would have been avoided if the consultation had been carried out after the summer holidays 2014.

- Children who plan to leave school at the end of Secondary 4 have an extra transition under this Proposal.

- Children in Sandwick Junior High School affected by this Proposal will have two transitions to deal with, to the old Anderson High School and then a year later to the new Anderson High School.

- The timing of the proposed transition is not good.
• Moving children part way through their secondary education will be disruptive.

• One of my children transferred to Anderson High School for Secondary 5, from Scalloway Junior High School; my other child went for Secondary 1 onwards. This is much better as teachers have time to get to know children.

• I am concerned about the impact this Proposal, if implemented, will have on current Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department as they will have to transfer at the end of Secondary 3.

• The timescale of this Proposal, if implemented, should be considered for implementation in August 2016, due to the need to move a year group of children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department between Secondary 3 and Secondary 4.

• There are no provisions made for children who cannot make the transition to a larger school.

• The current Secondary 2 group at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department will be adversely affected by the timing of this Proposal, with no time to make alternative arrangements for their children. Transfer at the end of Secondary 3 was universally disliked, so Secondary 4 current Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department end up having to transfer at the end of Secondary 3. This does not give them equal opportunity and they will be disadvantaged with respect to their counterparts from other areas of Shetland.

• Children who do not intend to stay on to Secondary 5 will get little from transferring at the end of Secondary 2.

• I will be able to settle into the Anderson High School before I have to study for my exams.

• Please can the current Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department continue at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department until the end of Secondary 4?

• It would be daunting to move from a primary of 100 children straight to the Anderson, so some secondary provision should be retained at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

• I am concerned that if the Anderson High School does not have control over what is taught in Secondary 1 and Secondary 2, material will have to be re-taught in Secondary 3 and Secondary 4.

• Parents will in due course vote with their feet to avoid a fractured education.

• Should placing requests to the Anderson High School for Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 be refused if a Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 model is the right one for our junior highs?
• My child has not been able to get preferred subjects for personalisation at Anderson High School. This is contrary to what was said at a meeting.

• If the Proposal does go ahead, can it not wait until 2016 when the new Anderson High School is open to save children making two transitions?

• All junior highs should be made primaries or high schools. The junior high system does not encourage ambition in children and almost encourage them not to carry on with their education.

• Move children at the end of Primary 7 so there is no disruption to their secondary education.

• This Proposal may provide easier transition point for children already at Sandwick Junior High School, but not for those from Cunningsburgh. It adds in another transition point for them.

• I have put in a placing request for my child who is in Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department as I do not think her interests will be best served with a move at the end of Secondary 3.

• Where will children go who do not fit in, at the Anderson High School? Will they go to Brae High School?

• Implementing Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 puts in an unnecessary transition during the Broad General Education.

• Educational benefit has not been proven. It is wrong then to move children at such a crucial time in their education.

• I have concerns about children coming to the hostel at Secondary 3 and the impact this will have on those children. This point is less relevant to the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Proposal.

• Some children will find the transition to the Anderson High School overwhelming, and this will affect their attainment.

• Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department helped me grow in confidence to enable me to go on and attend a larger school. This would not have happened if I had had to transfer at a younger age.

• Staying to Secondary 4 allows children to sit their Nationals before having to move schools.

• This Proposal has not been thought through for the current Secondary 2. They will experience two transitions in exam years - to old Anderson High School, then to new Anderson High School.

• The current Secondary 2 year group should be allowed to remain in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to finish Secondary 4 and complete their
Nationals.

- It is better for children to move at the start of Secondary 1.
- It would be better if schools could stay open Secondary 1 to Secondary 4. Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 is just a way of appeasing communities.
- The end of Secondary 2 is not a good time to transfer as this year group will have already gelled.
- It will not benefit children to move schools in the final year of their schooling. Children in this position should be allowed to remain in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department until the end of Secondary 4.
- I want my child who is in Secondary 2 to stay in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department until end of Secondary 4.
- A transition at the end of Secondary 3 has not been thought through for those particularly affected by this.
- Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 should be at the same school.
- I would prefer my child to stay at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department until the end of Secondary 4.
- The structure of the curriculum does not lend itself well to transfer at the end of Secondary 3. My son is in Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and he will have to transfer at the end of Secondary 3 if this Proposal goes forward. Children in Secondary 2 should be allowed to remain in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department until the end of Secondary 4.
- Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 would not work in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department as parents would not want their children making another transition so soon after moving to Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.
- Transition at the end of Secondary 4 means children are more mature.
- If anything less than Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 is offered Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department will have no children.
- Where will our children go if Anderson High School is not a good school, they do not like it and Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is shut?
- The children will only have two years at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department before they have another transition. The transition at the end of Secondary 4 may have been difficult for some children in the past, but we believe that the new National 5 qualifications should make the step up to Higher less of a big change. Our older son was ready for, and enjoyed, a transition at this stage. There is no provision for children in Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 who cannot cope
with or fit in at the Anderson High School. There will be no realistic alternative.

- Shetland Islands Council has not provided any evidence as to why there is any problem with transition at end of Secondary 4. There are no children in Shetland studying Highers over two years. Secondary 2 children have been put in an intolerable position.

- This consultation has been fundamentally compromised by the situation in which it has placed Secondary 2 parents and children.

- Transition at the end of Secondary 4 will continue to be a suitable point for most children, with those wishing to access college/online learning able to do so at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. Any children wishing to study for two-year Higher courses could be given the option to transfer to do so at Anderson High School. The numbers are likely to be minimal.

- It seems there is no good reason why transition is better at Secondary 2 than at Secondary 4. Transition is never easy: at Primary 7, end of Secondary 2, Secondary 3 or Secondary 4. Children find doing it together helpful, and current Proposal will drive families to make different decisions.

- Many children have an ambition to leave school at end of Secondary 4 and find a job. These children do not wish to continue with an academic career and have no desire to go to the Anderson High School. Some of these children will not achieve in a bigger school and will be there to ‘fill in time’ and will possibly be more disruptive in class. Children moving at the end of Secondary 2 is the very worst time for any child to undertake a transition. At that age they lack both the confidence and maturity to undergo such a transition.

- Rural schools provide an environment which suits many children as many do not want to go to the Anderson High School.

- It is highly disruptive for children of 13-14 years of age having to move schools, enter new classes, cope with a new environment, cope with meeting new people, and adjust to new teachers on top of deciding perhaps even which career path they want to follow. It is too much to ask of the children and it would be detrimental to their education. It is nonsense to take them halfway through their secondary education at Sandwick Junior High School then expect them to merrily go to Lerwick after only two years.

- The Proposal introduces an additional transition halfway through a natural Secondary 4 leaver’s school life. This creates a transition at a vulnerable social and emotional developmental stage.

- The legal school leaving age is the right time to be making choices, not two years earlier.

- During the eight years that we were involved with Sandwick Junior High School as parents, we saw some significant changes in the length of time students stayed at
the school. It had been the ‘culture’ of the school that the able students went to Anderson High School after Secondary 2, and those less academically able and likely to leave at 16 stayed at Sandwick. This created a pre- and post- Secondary 2 divisive negative atmosphere for the school for teachers and children alike. Parents and teachers worked hard to change this, and over the years more able students began to stay on at Sandwick resulting in the whole academic ethos of the school improving. The Anderson High School told us that those who went there after Secondary 4 did very well, as they had made a positive decision to do Highers and knew how to work hard. I find it literally tragic that all that has been built up at Sandwick Junior High School is to now be dismantled to the great detriment of both children and the communities they come from.

- The school has a tremendous positive ethos that has translated to my two children who attend the school. There is a friendly atmosphere with children of all ages interacting without the cliques and bitchiness that is apparent from speaking to my children who attend the Anderson High School. My fear is that this positive vibe will be undermined by closing the upper half of the secondary department and that parents will simply send their children to the Anderson High School after they finish primary to save an additional transition.

- The revised Blueprint for Education made much of the need to reduce transitions for children. The proposed model has not assessed the impact of moving from a primary school to Sandwick Junior High School for Secondary 1 and Secondary 2, then on to the Anderson High school for Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 and then potentially on again after Secondary 4, depending on the routes chosen at that time. Children should have their first qualifications under their belt before moving to the Anderson High School or an alternative destination.

- Parents will lose faith in Sandwick Junior High School and put children to Anderson High School at Secondary 1.

- Transition stage at end of Secondary 2 does not agree with the Curriculum for Excellence model of Broad General Education from Secondary 1 to Secondary 3. Continuity of Curriculum for Excellence would be disrupted and have a negative impact on children and classes before transition at Sandwick Junior High School and after at Anderson High School.

- Transfer at end of Secondary 2 and start of Secondary 3 goes against Broad General Education in Curriculum for Excellence.

- Natural Secondary 4 leavers form approximately half of the school population. To introduce a transition at the end of Secondary 2 would be stressful, unnecessary and opposing the Curriculum for Excellence.

- Secondary 2 is a critical time in a young person’s education. Moving schools at this stage would be disruptive and detrimental to their education.

- Whilst a school move cannot be avoided at the end of Secondary 4 due to the existing school’s configuration, four year junior high model has provided a
consistent, high quality education at Sandwick Junior High School and this has proved advantageous to our children. Why change an excellent system if it is not broken?

- Under the proposed changes some children will move to the Anderson High School on the existing site at the end of Secondary 2 and then move again within maybe twelve months to the new building. The lack of forward planning will prove very disruptive to the children who get caught up in the changes.

- The end of Secondary 4 is the natural break for the majority of children after their first certificate exams.

- Secondary 2 is not a good time to interrupt education. What is being proposed might as well be closure as parents will make placing requests to the Anderson High School, leaving Sandwick Junior High School a shadow of its former self.

- Transferring at the end of Secondary 4 has proved to be the best time in terms of a young person's educational and emotional development.

- Transition at the end of Secondary 4 is the best time for change.

- A Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school in Sandwick Junior High School would result in fewer numbers using Sandwick Junior High School as children prefer one transition.

- Curriculum for Excellence has been used to justify transferring children at the end of Secondary 2. The evidence does not support that.

- Sixteen is a better age to deal with a big transition.

- Children will have to make crucial decisions about their education, subject choices, vocational learning, in a new school with new staff. This is not very settling or productive.

- Removing Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 from the junior high schools is a bad idea as it will damage a system that works very well, with children being moved in a very sensitive time in their education and life, when they should be supported by teachers who have known them for years. The rural schools have excellent levels of attainment and children benefit by being in their own communities.

- The change from a smaller community school to the huge Anderson High School will be very daunting for children and they will need time to settle in. They will have an extra transition which to a child who intends on leaving at 16 years old could be damaging, making the Proposal to stop Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 in junior high schools an unacceptable proposal.

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 in junior high schools works well, as children do not have to move schools and can be educated from 3 to 16 years in a familiar environment within their community.
‘Building the Curriculum 3’, as stated in the proposal paper, entitles children to "a curriculum which is coherent from age 3 to 18". Shetland Islands Council does not as yet have an education strategy that embraces the requirements of Curriculum for Excellence. Furthermore, ‘Building the Curriculum 3’ states that the Broad General Education Levels Three and Four follow through from Secondary 1 to Secondary 3; transition after Secondary 2 will disadvantage children who are also entitled to "a Broad General Education... from early years through to Secondary 3". Why is it proposed to disrupt this entitlement by forcing a transition between Secondary 2 and Secondary 3?

Some of the children will only be 13 years old: this for some is a very vulnerable time and may be unhappy to leave their school/community and may find the Anderson High School very daunting and hard to adjust to. What happens if they cannot ‘hack the pace’? There is no old Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 to return to.

Increased subject choice may be a benefit to children but young people will have no real educational choice should they not settle in the busier environment of the Anderson High School.

The history of Sandwick Junior High School as the first junior high school in Shetland arose in response to an acknowledgement by parents, children and teachers back in the early 1980s that young people wanted to stay closer to home up to the statutory leaving age of 16 years old to be educated. The school catchment area remains the same as it was then except that most children from Quarff chose to attend Sandwick Junior High School. It prevented young people from making a transition in their education when they did not feel emotionally ready. Appendix 1 of the September 1992 Schools Report highlights how, in the space of four years, this was viewed as so successful that only a very small number of parents, if any, chose to put their child to the Anderson High School for their secondary education from Primary 7 or Secondary 2.

If a child does not settle at the Anderson High School parents will be forced into home educating.

As we know children in Shetland will now be presented for seven National Qualifications. If children are not to be given the opportunity to remain in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 school, then the preferred transition point should be, if at all, the end of Secondary 2. This will enable children to undertake the appropriate level of prior learning in the same school, which will be their presenting school for National Qualifications.

The potential limitations of schools using different methods/approaches to profiling may only become evident once children transfer to a different setting at the end of Secondary 3. This has the potential to cause further stress for children at a sensitive and difficult period in their learning and development. Effective transitions should promote continuity and progressions across all aspects of learning and development. The extent to which learners are involved is highly significant; one of the How Good is Our School quality indicators cites "learner engagement" as being
a crucial factor in assuring a successful profiling outcome. It would seem ironic to place such emphasis on learner engagement, yet offer such little accountability to young people about how their achievements and aspirations will be managed if they are to transition at the end of Secondary 3.

- I worry about the effect transition at the end of Secondary 2 would have on children with additional support needs or others who could not cope with life in a much bigger setting; there is no alternative for them if they still want to get qualifications.

- Placing requests from this year group should not be used as an argument for closure. Recordings of Secondary 2 parent meetings demonstrate parents wish to continue children's education at Sandwick Junior High School up until Secondary 4.

- Impossible decision having to be made by me as a current Secondary 2 child.

- Children will have to make crucial decisions in relation to their education including subject choices in a building which only has two years remaining. This will mean two transitions for children.

**Response**

There were two main areas of concern from respondents about transitions with respect to the Proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. One of these was the particular position the current group of Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School, and their parents, felt Children’s Services had placed them in with the timing of the proposal; and the other is the more general debate about which time during a child’s secondary education is most suitable for children to make a transition.

Children’s Services would like to make it very clear that Curriculum for Excellence was designed for secondary schools which are Secondary 1 to Secondary 6. Almost all young people in Scotland experience their secondary education in one establishment. Our system of junior highs is not a system which can be found in other local authorities in Scotland. There are only a few examples still of schools which deliver either Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 or Secondary 1 to Secondary 4, scattered across Scotland, but no other local authority has such a system as the mainstay of their policy for delivering the secondary curriculum. As previously discussed in the Quality of Education section of this Consultation Report, in 2011 the Management Board of Curriculum for Excellence issued a statement of its vision for the future of the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence. The full statement is published on the Education Scotland website. The following extract is relevant:

“One of the key aims of Curriculum for Excellence is to reduce the quantity of assessment which pupils undertake, particularly in the senior phase. Many schools are planning for the senior phase as a 2 or 3 year experience. The majority of pupils are staying on to at least S5, so it is no longer appropriate to view S4 in isolation or to see presentation for qualifications in S4 as a "given" for each learner in each subject. Schools may well take the opportunity this provides to offer National Courses over 2 years. Bypassing qualifications at National 4 and moving straight to National 5 or Higher is likely to become increasingly common, although this may be a gradual process. It will also be important to ensure that those young people who choose to leave school at the end of S4 or at Christmas of S5 are appropriately catered for in terms of qualifications.”
Children’s Services’ aspirations for the young people of Shetland since before we closed Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department was to have our secondary aged children educated in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 school wherever it was feasible to do so. This thread can be traced through all the proposals we have put forward for consideration. However, we absolutely also recognise that this is not feasible everywhere in Shetland due to our geography, the spread of the population, and the budget that we now have available to spend on education.

On 20 September 2012, we put forward a set of proposals for the secondary school estate which reflected these aspirations where we proposed the closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, Aith Junior High School Secondary Department and Whalsay School Secondary Department with transfer to the Anderson High School; and we proposed the closure of Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department with transfer to Mid Yell Junior High School. On 20 September 2012 an amendment successfully removed Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department from the proposals.

In September 2013, to address the anomaly which Children’s Services was left with from 20 September 2012, and in response to the developing Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence, Children’s Services returned to Education and Families Committee with a fresh set of proposals for the secondary school estate: The Next Steps. This included proposals to retain secondary provision Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 in Whalsay School, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School. This would have meant children remained in their junior high school until the end of the Broad General Education, transferring with their completed Secondary 3 profile to the Anderson High School for their Senior Phase. Education and Families Committee recommended to Shetland Islands Council that these proposals were deferred and instead Children’s Services was instructed to explore five alternative options for the future strategy for secondary education in Shetland: the existing Blueprint for Education proposals; the Next Steps proposals; a Hub and Spoke model; a Tele-presence model and Maintaining the Status Quo within the Medium Term Financial Plan. As part of this work Children’s Services was asked to carry out informal consultation and to engage an educational expert.

Our informal consultation took place in October 2013, and the Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 proposed model was roundly rejected by communities and by staff. The main reasons for this was that parents wanted children to remain in their communities for as long as possible, and preferred the existing transition point as it was a point at which children could leave school if they wished; and because in Secondary 3 children had started already started studying for their National courses and it was wrong then to make them move schools at this time.

Children from 2014/15 will not be studying for Nationals in Secondary 3 but will be personalising their learning in preparation for choosing their Nationals at the end of Secondary 3.

However in response to these concerns, Professor Don Ledingham, the educational expert engaged to make the recommendations for the Strategy for Secondary Education in Shetland Report, put forward proposals for Whalsay School Secondary Department, Mid Yell Junior High School Secondary Department and Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department, that transfer could be at the end of Secondary 2. This was to ensure children who would have to stay in the hostel, as well as go to a new school, would have time to settle in to their new surroundings and make friends prior to embarking on their Senior Phase.
Professor Ledingham did not recommend Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. This proposal was given to Children’s Services as a result of a successful amendment at Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013. As children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department do not have to board if they attend the Anderson High School, the key educational benefits left for this proposal is the opportunity for children to continue to be educated in their local area for longer; their continued access to an excellent learning environment; and the opportunity to make a seamless transition into the Senior Phase, having had time to settle into the Anderson High School in advance of choosing their subjects for their National Qualifications.

Children’s Services published the proposal paper for the discontinuation of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department on 13 February 2014, with a proposed transfer date of August 2015, should the proposal be accepted. The timing of the publication of this proposal paper was due to be in January 2014, however we were asked to carry out a informal conversations with particular groups including parents councils in the South Mainland on our proposed model for a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school model prior to commencing statutory consultation.

Upon publication of the Proposal, Children’s Services quickly had concerns raised with them about the implications of this proposal on the current Secondary 2 group at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. These were raised on their behalf by Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council. As a result, representatives from Children’s Services attended a meeting with parents of Secondary 2 children and some of the children themselves on 19 February 2014. A summary of the points raised at this meeting is included in this Consultation Report and the full note of the meeting is Appendix E. Their main concerns were that the implementation date for this Proposal would mean that their children would have to make a transition at the end of Secondary 3, a time which had been deemed unsuitable through the informal consultation in October 2013. In addition, the date of the publication of the proposal paper meant that the timeline for a decision on the proposal would be after the timetable change at the Anderson High School for the session 2014/15, so parents were faced with having to make a decision as to whether to put in a placing request for their child to attend the Anderson High after the end of Secondary 2, without knowing the future of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

Children’s Services is sympathetic with parents concerns on this matter, but is unclear why parents were quite so anxious about the implementation date. Their children would have a whole year to be prepared to make the change. This timescale is similar to that in the Additional Support for Learning Act 2004, for any child with additional support needs to make a transition to a new setting. A number of these parents wished their child to be able to remain in Sandwick Junior High School until the end of Secondary 4 and transfer then. As Children’s Services has previously outlined in this Report, the end of Secondary 4 is not a suitable time for transfer either, but we accept that it is the point of transfer that our current parents of children in junior highs are comfortable with.

A number of parents of children in Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School have as a result of this concern, put in placing requests for their children to attend the Anderson High School. These have all been agreed in line with our existing processes and a transition morning was organised for this group of children by the Anderson High School senior management.

In line with all other placing requests, the parents of this group of children are responsible for their transport. Children’s Services will not be providing transport for them to access education at the Anderson High School.
The work undertaken between Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department and the Anderson High School to effect the smooth transition of all the children from the Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department when it closed in June 2011 was also shared with Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council during the statutory consultation period. This was done to give an example of how the process of transition can be handled successfully.

This transition, of all the children in all the year groups, was arranged and put into place over a three-month period. The decision to close Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department was called-in by the Scottish Government in January 2011, and it was only in March 2011 that we were told the decision could stand. The information we shared is set out here.

**Transition of Secondary 3 children from Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department to Anderson High School, March to June 2011.**

1. **Curriculum Issues**
   a. This transition took place halfway through certificate courses (not of course the case with the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department proposal) and so the individual needs of each Secondary 3 child in terms of coursework were key to the whole process. Secondary 3 children stayed in Scalloway until 30 June 2011 and transferred to the Anderson High School in August 2011. This was to give time to help ensure that work done by Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department children dovetailed into the classwork done by Anderson High children. Staff in both schools worked hard to ensure this happened. For example, each department had contact with their counterpart department, either through a Scalloway Junior High School class coming to the Anderson High School to join a class or for the Anderson High School teacher visiting the class in Scalloway Junior High School. The intention was that every department would have real contact before the summer break.

   b. Prelims were an issue because the Anderson High School Secondary 4 prelims are in November and this was earlier than Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department children were used to. Points considered to mitigate this problem were: prelim could be done later; extra tuition could be offered; possibly two different papers could be set; or do two prelims.

   c. Matching Secondary 3 children into existing classes. This was looked at in terms of the following three options:
      i. Scalloway Junior High School class remains completely separate for some classes;
      ii. Some would match, but this will make the class too big, but give some capacity for integration;
      iii. Some classes (which had low numbers) could be joined completely.

   d. Vocational Pathways courses were worked on, as each school had a slightly different way of doing this. The same was done for work experience.

   e. It was agreed that the school would transfer children’s work and not ask the children to do any of this.
2. Transition Activities
   a. The Anderson High School opened on an Anderson High School occasional holiday in April 2011 to let the children visit when it was quiet. Staff were available in every department. Scalloway Junior High School arranged the transport and the Anderson High School arranged a tuck-shop (free for the one day).

   b. Secondary 3 children thereafter visited on their own in June.

3. Instrumental Instruction
   a. It was arranged that if at all possible Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department children would have the same instrumental instructors after transferring.

4. Learner Tracking
   a. For the first year, the Quality Improvement Officer for the Anderson High School made a particular point each term of asking about Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department children's progress when on quality assurance visits. The Quality Improvement Officers for both schools monitored the exam results closely in August 2011 and August 2012.

5. Ongoing Pastoral Support
   a. Parents were reassured that a careful eye would be kept on individual young people through Pupil Support.

   b. A Parents' Evening for Scalloway Junior High School parents only was organised in September 2011.

   c. On 3 June 2011, the consensus was that the transfer activities and integration of the new Secondary 3 children "had gone well". From the minute: "Existing pupils had been welcoming and there was an exciting and positive atmosphere. [The Scalloway Junior High School Pupil Support Teacher] thought that the transition days had helped towards this."

This information is provided as an example of the kind of arrangements which can be put in place to support the move of a group of children to a new school. The most important principle is that the Transition Group which is set up once a decision on a school closure is final, listens carefully to the particular concerns of the particular group of parents and children who are affected, and then work is planned in response to specific issues. There is no blanket approach.

There are also concerns that this particular issue of transition has undermined the statutory consultation process. Any statutory consultation process on a school closure proposal leads to concerns by parents about the future of their children's education, however we have carried out this process in line with all our other previous statutory consultation procedures.

### Issue: Relationships/Friends and Family Life

#### Points Made

- The consultation process is distressing for children and is putting a huge strain on friendships which is not needed.
• The Anderson High School will give me a larger group from which to make suitable friends from.

• Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department children may be treated as outsiders by established Lerwick children and this may result in bullying.

• This proposal is having an impact on children’s relationships.

• A Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will not give enough time to make friends.

• The community is strengthened by children and families building up friendships within their area, rather than from the other end of the isles making it difficult to maintain other than within Lerwick; and this is important at early teens age particularly.

• Family units will be broken and parents will lose influence over their children at an important time of their lives.

• It is highly disruptive for children of 13-14 years of age having to cope with meeting new people.

• Councillors must ensure that education in Shetland evolves. Why have a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 satellite school when these children could join together with their older siblings and friends at a high school? Why stay at a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school with drive through teachers when you could be part of a school system that ensured excellent support and extra-curricular activities?

• Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 buddy systems are extremely inspiring. Children in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school would not have the opportunity to see older role models. Is this creating a successful learning environment for students?

• If you have made friend groups in Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 then you will have to make new ones in Secondary 3 to Secondary 6.

• The removal of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 from Sandwick Junior High School will damage the ethos of the school. There will be less of a buzz due to fewer students being spread out across the department and there will be fewer teachers. Children currently have really good relationships with their teachers as they often meet their teachers out in the community at events and activities. This connection will be lost.

Response

The Anderson High School is incredibly experienced at supporting the transition of children into their school from a wide variety of different sized schools at the end of Primary 7, and also at the end of Secondary 4. Like all schools in Shetland, the Anderson High School has an anti-bullying policy in place. All incidents of alleged bullying are treated seriously and appropriate action is taken as required.
**Issue: School Capacity**

**Points Made**

- This Proposal makes the use of space at Sandwick Junior High School even more inefficient.

- Placing requests from Sandwick Junior High School to the Anderson High School are low considering the proximity of the north end of the catchment area to Lerwick. Many of the placing requests involve children who have not attended a feeder primary for Sandwick Junior High School.

- The Anderson High School’s roll is low enough that it would easily cope with 151 children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is only operating at 44% capacity. This is not a sustainable position.

- The last thing the current Anderson High School needs at present is more children in its antiquated buildings.

- The issues around the flow of children around the current Anderson High School need to be resolved before further large numbers of children come in.

- Further social space would be required at the current Anderson High School to take a large additional number of children.

- An additional food station and preparation space would be required at the existing Anderson High School if the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children were added.

- Two classrooms in the Anderson High School currently not in use will have to be reinstated, incurring additional costs.

- The number of toilets available for children at the current Anderson High School will have to be considered.

- I have heard that even currently the Anderson High School canteen cannot cope with demand at lunchtime.

- There is only one big social space in the new Anderson High School not a range of social spaces as the proposal paper claims.

- We are concerned about the timing of this consultation and the capacity of the current Anderson High School to accommodate children in respect of toilets, social spaces and condition of building. We would want a reassurance of no adverse impact on the current Anderson High School if more children, up to 80 came as a result of this Proposal.

- The current Anderson High School building is overcrowded. Often dinners have run out before children get to the front of the queue. More detail required as to how children will be accommodated in social areas. Fire evacuation procedures need to be made public and cover the new amount of children.
• The Anderson High school capacity to support children will be less than a junior high school. Sandwick Junior High School can offer support for physical and learning needs for children with additional support needs and keep them in mainstream education.

• Disabled spaces in Sandwick Junior High School are very good.

• Social spaces at the existing Anderson High School are currently overcrowded.

• Fewer children will eat a school meal as a result of this proposal. This occurred after the Scalloway Junior High School closure.

• The Anderson High School is in a state of flux with the new build.

• With Hjaltland Housing’s plans to build 200-300 houses and the continuing developments in the oil and gas industry and in renewable, there is a concern that the Anderson High School will not be large enough to cope.

Response

A number of issues regarding the capacity of the existing Anderson High School to accommodate an additional approximately 80 children were raised during the statutory consultation period. These centred around: the availability of social space; the flows of children between lessons and at break-times and lunchtimes; and the availability of facilities. All concerned understand that there is classroom space available.

Children’s Services has already begun working with the management of the Anderson High School to look at how these concerns could be alleviated and this work has led to us to consider that should this proposal be implemented that the transfer date for children should be amended to August 2016, or as soon as possible thereafter when the new Anderson High School is open.

This would also address concerns expressed by Secondary 2 parents and would avoid all children who affected by this Proposal from having to move to the old Anderson High School one year, and then the new one the following year.

For clarity around concerns about the current ability of the Anderson High School to provide the lunches required by its existing children the following information is provided.

The Anderson High School has carefully managed arrangements to ensure that all children who wish it, can have a lunch choice from the school canteen, which operates to exactly the same nutritional standards as all other school canteens including Sandwick Junior High School’s canteen. The Anderson High School operates a four-way staggered lunchtime, to ensure all year groups get fed. The school monitored the length of queues over the winter. The longest queues were on Thursdays, with some older children waiting up to 15 minutes for their fish and chips choice (other choices were served more quickly). This still allowed for 30 minutes to sit and eat. The school monitored the number of choices still available at the end of lunchtime sales. The catering and school management staff are satisfied that even if you arrive very late for lunch, a choice is available.

Currently 20% of the children who could attend Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, attend the Anderson High School instead, by way of placing requests.
Issue: Condition of Building

Points Made

- Sandwick Junior High School is Suitability Core fact A and the Anderson High School is Suitability Core Fact B. This suggests you are proposing to move the children to a worse building.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is a happy, successful school with excellent staff and a well maintained building.

- The current building of the Anderson High School is not fit for purpose, so why are we considering moving children before the new school is ready?

- The existing Anderson High School building is no longer fit for service, as recognised by the Shetland Islands Council. It is nonsense to load the school with more children before the new building is completed and occupied.

- Under this Proposal, children would move initially to the existing Anderson High School, a building which was deemed by the last school inspection report to be not fit for purpose and not conducive to modern teaching practice.

- While the new Anderson High School is at planning stage, the building work has not yet commenced so initially children would be moving to a much poorer quality learning environment. There is a new school in the pipeline, but there has been a new school ‘in the pipeline’ for twenty years and still not a brick to show for it.

- Canteen space in Sandwick Junior High School is very good and canteen staff provide high quality meals in an enriching environment. The Anderson High School canteen is overcrowded meaning many children choose to shop on "the street". The Anderson High School does not have a smart card system as Sandwick Junior High School, meaning parents have no assurance that dinner money is spent on nutritious food. The Proposal would remove the means by which children are encouraged to eat healthily and contribute to a decline in long term health and wellbeing.

- Parents of children at Sandwick Junior High School do not support a move of their children from a Category A school to a school building which had some parts of it designated as Category C.

- Parents of children at Sandwick Junior High School are concerned that the design of the new Anderson High School has no designated outdoor social spaces.

- Parents of children at Sandwick Junior High School are concerned that the design of the new Anderson High School does not specify internal social spaces. This is a key factor in the Scottish Government’s Suitability factor (25%) so is very concerning.

- The new Anderson High School should be being designed to be Category A in terms of suitability when £43 million is being spent on it.
Response

The new Anderson High School will be built according to all required building standards and Scottish Government advice. The design of the new building will take into account best practice in the design of school buildings which are fit for purpose to deliver the requirements of Curriculum for Excellence at the start of the 21st Century. As a result it will be Suitability Core Fact A.

In response to concerns about adding a further additional 80 children into the existing Anderson High School building, and to ensure children do not have to make two transitions: one to the existing Anderson High School in 2015, and then a further one to the new Anderson High School in August 2016, Children’s Services will be recommending, for this Proposal, that the implementation date is moved to August 2016 or as soon as possible thereafter, when the new Anderson High School has been opened. This would also allow the existing Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to complete Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School before transferring to the Anderson High School.
Points Made

- This Proposal would lead to more sharing of teaching staff which is not the best way to secure high quality education.

- Staff need to have their wishes and aspirations listened to.

- This Proposal will spread staff too thinly, increasing staff absences and leading to an impact on continuity for children.

- Staff at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department feel undervalued as a result of this Proposal.

- An additional supervisory assistant will be required at the Anderson High School if the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children are added to the existing Anderson High School.

- Additional canteen staff would be required at the Anderson High School if the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children are added to the existing Anderson High School.

- Staff transfers will have to be managed in good time for the Anderson High School timetable to begin efficiently.

- This Proposal gives uncertainty to staff.

- Anderson High School teachers should be made to travel as well as Sandwick Junior High School teachers. If all teachers are travelling anyway then Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 can be left at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department with children only needing to transfer for the Senior Phase at Secondary 5 and Secondary 6. This would stop disruption to family and community life and save on transport costs.

- There are considerable cost implications caused by the large number of teachers moving between school both in terms of lost teaching time and travelling expense and the administration of the latter.

- The model does not explore the possibility that some staff members would be happy to work purely in a Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 setting, teaching several subjects, which would reduce wasted costs in time and travel.

- There is a lack of accurate figures for the cost of teacher travel and the loss of teaching time for staff travelling between Lerwick and Sandwick. If the proposals for this model are repeated throughout Shetland, the costs would increase dramatically as the distance from Lerwick increases.

- Failure to access staffing needs will lead to less subject choice and impact on future career choices.
- We are concerned about the impact shared teachers would have on the Anderson High School. It is not working well at the moment and there is a concern about the impact on attainment.

- We are concerned that the sharing of teachers will limit subject choice, which has already been impacted in at the Senior Phase.

- I want an assurance that teacher workloads would be monitored and reported back to Shetland Islands Council.

- Travelling for staff, and workload will increase; the added pressure will lead to increased sickness and staff leaving.

- How will continuing professional development and subject development work be organised if colleagues cannot meet?

- If Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is left with only Secondary 1 to Secondary 2, it will not be able to attract staff.

- Children’s relationships with their teachers will be poorer through this model with teachers having to move around.

- Support for children will have to be provided by the head teachers or a principal teacher.

- Staff moving around will make communication and consultation with other staff difficult.

- Classes might have two teachers for a subject.

- The lack of staff around at break times and lunchtimes will be detrimental to school ethos.

- Class cover will be more difficult with staff working between schools.

- Whole staff meetings will be more difficult if a school has a number of staff who are shared with another school.

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department will not attract sufficient specialist staff to deliver a quality curriculum.

- Quality teachers will not want to teach in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school.

- Transferring teachers is a terrible idea. Shetland Islands Council will have to pay them mileage and they will lose their connection with the school.

- I am concerned about the impact on teachers' well being for those who have to work in two different schools.

- Children and staff at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department are all unhappy about the Proposal.
Teaching staff who are currently working between schools are exhausted. Having teachers travel means teaching time is lost.

If there has to be Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 then children should be taught by secondary specialists and not primary teachers.

Travelling teachers will not get time to support children through their exams.

The small number of children will mean very limited staffing levels in the school. It will be difficult to recruit teachers and there will inevitably be disruptions/changes throughout the working week. This will affect the children at the Anderson High school too. It will effectively be the "hub and spoke" model and will be very difficult to timetable effectively.

This will create an unacceptable work burden endured by staff teaching in more than one school. Educational Institute for Scotland members who are already teaching on more than one site are finding that their workload and associated stress levels have increased exponentially. If larger numbers of staff are subject to these conditions then it could be deemed that Shetland Islands Council would be neglecting their duty of care to these employees.

The term ‘suitably qualified’ has been used in the Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 documents. Does this mean subject specialists?

If there is only one Principal Teacher in a school, would they be Principal Teacher for Curriculum or Pastoral Care? There needs to be equity for different sized schools. Guidance staff will need to be trained. Will a Principal Teacher deputise for a Depute Head Teacher?

Given the number of variables surrounding timetabling there could be real problems organising timetables of staff moving between schools.

Subject Development Groups are already stretched to the limit developing national courses, which should be taking priority at this time over developing a common curriculum.

Children’s Services needs to speak to staff who are already moving between schools about the difficulties they are facing.

Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 works on the premise that all staff members work across at least two settings to enable them to be involved in delivering exam courses. It does not explore the possibility that some staff members would be happy to work purely in a Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 setting, teaching several subjects, which would be beneficial for the continuity for children, and also in reducing wasted costs in time and travel.

More detail is required about the increase in staffing.

Staff working in more than one school is a major worry. Negative impacts on the continuity of teaching, staff morale, communication between staff due to time
• Issues with staff working in more than one school such as constantly planning and reporting children’s progress. This has a very negative effect on school ethos, which is detrimental to both staff and children.

• Which teacher takes responsibility for children’s reports, parents' nights?

• Staff working between schools does not benefit children as they lose continuity with staff which impacts on their learning.

• Communication between staff is difficult when working between schools, and the Proposal allows no protected time for staff liaison. This impacts on children’s learning.

• Sandwick Junior High School will become a shadow of the current school. Parents may choose to have only one transition so the children outwith Sandwick area may transfer directly at Secondary 1 to the Anderson High School. It becomes more difficult to recruit and retain staff. Many staff are currently applying for jobs on the Scottish Mainland. Career progression is stagnant.

• The Anderson High School will again not receive the equality of provision that is spoken of. Children at the Anderson High School will not see their teachers for all lessons in a subject as the teacher will be elsewhere. With the tightening of staffing, class sizes will move to national maximum sizes, up to 30 in a class, whereas in the junior high school system, the classes will be much smaller and will have access to more resources.

• Curriculum for Excellence requires lots of internal assessments and coursework. Teachers will not be able to offer additional support to young people if they are teaching in different schools.

• The recruitment and retention of good staff will prove extremely challenging in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school. Teaching is more than a job and teachers believe that the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model, for Sandwick Junior High School, will not ensure the best possible outcome for learners. Parents already know this and that is why there is already an increase in placing requests to the Anderson High School.

• If parents could be assured of a core staff at Sandwick Junior High School which could provide continuity and strong child/teacher working relationships then the Proposal could work.

• The plan to have a travelling rota of staff would be problematic and expensive.

• Children might end up being taught by teachers who are not necessarily qualified at the level they would be in the Anderson High School.

• Teachers will have to teach more children. Teachers in Sandwick Junior High School might have to work part time in another school.
• Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 schools will lose their identity as teachers would not be teaching through to exam level in Secondary 4 and therefore not have the same incentive as before.

• It will be bad for the junior high schools as both the primary and secondary children benefit from the present system with sharing of resources and teachers.

• Increased travel times for teachers means less actual teaching time and more fuel costs.

• To discontinue Secondary 3 to Secondary 4 will inevitably lose the school's identity. The teachers will have low morale due to not teaching children through to exam level. Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 schools will find recruitment of staff difficult. The education as it stands is exceptional and this will have a huge impact on the children, the staff and the community.

• Teachers currently work collaboratively across subject teams, allowing good practice to be shared.

• The benefit to teachers working across schools would seem less than ideal for both children and staff. My understanding of the consultation process is that should Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 be removed from Sandwick Junior High School then the focus would be on the educational benefit to the learner and not on the teachers. Teachers are currently dealing with constant change in the delivery of education. I think this needs time to bed in before making unnecessary changes. There is a risk of losing high quality teaching staff during this process and thus reducing the overall quality of education provision.

• Staff travelling between schools is already proving difficult and demoralising and this would get worse. Timetabling would prove difficult.

• This Proposal will have a detrimental effect on staff morale. Staff in Sandwick Junior High School currently go the extra mile because they feel like they "belong"; this Proposal if operating in a number of schools in the authority, the sense of belonging to a school will be lost.

• Children will have reduced access to teachers outwith class for support in study and pastoral matters.

• It is not possible to have teachers who teach in a junior high school to also teach senior classes in a high school and not have to share classes. Two of the three may be possible, with some impact on timetable flexibility and therefore subject choice, but it is not possible to have all three.

• It is very inefficient for teaching staff to have to take time out of their teaching to travel to and from junior high schools and it will also be expensive. It is unfortunate that some staff have to move between schools at present, but nobody would deliberately design a system where staff are required to travel when they do not have to.
- Staff morale is at an all-time low as a result of this Proposal.
- What impact are these proposals going to have on number of teaching posts? Staff numbers have already been reduced by voluntary redundancy and early retirement. If there were to be further reductions how would this be achieved?
- Temporary contracts bring no security for teachers. Good staff will be looking for other jobs with better secure prospects, most probably outwith Shetland.

**Response**

Our system of junior highs was allowed to develop in the late 1980s and early 1990s to offer a broad curriculum so that children could remain in their junior high up to the end of Secondary 4. As the basis of the staffing required for a secondary department is the curriculum on offer, this led to an increase in staffing. Some of our junior highs, then and now, have a very small roll in the secondary, with numbers in year groups which do not create anywhere near a maximum class size. In addition, schools were not Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 so full-time members of staff, particularly those only qualified in one subject could never be fully deployed in a junior high. Timetables could be filled but this would be through having very small class sizes and splitting already small year groups; and staff being used to enhance the curriculum in the primary and nursery departments.

With the significant levels of savings required to be found by Children’s Services since 2012, Children’s Services has been working hard to look at how efficiencies in secondary staffing can be made without impacting on the service offered in schools. In discussion with relevant head teachers in 2012, it was agreed that where a full-time member of staff was employed in a school, but less than full-time was required, that head teachers would timetable the required classes for that member of staff over fewer days so their available time could be sensibly deployed in another school. We also agreed that there would be no splitting of classes unless the nationally set class size maximums were breached.

As a result of this work, in advance of the school session 2013/14 Children’s Services reduced the secondary teaching staffing complement by 13.4 full-time equivalents. This was achieved by supporting the voluntary exits of staff who wished to go and using the identified capacity to fill the required vacancies. This has been done as carefully as is possible. However there are drawbacks to current arrangements. Most significantly our schools, for a variety of reasons, some connected to school transport, do not have a common school day, so start times, finish times and lunchtimes do not match. As time is bunched up into blocks in a week it does lead then in some cases to classes being split. This is not ideal and due to our previous generous staffing levels in secondary is not a situation staff, parents and children are used to.

Children’s Services will continue to work with head teachers and the Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers on sharing arrangements, and through school working time agreements, ensure that appropriate time is allocated to collegiate activities to each school who shares a particular teacher.

The claim that sharing staff between Sandwick Junior High School and Anderson High School, if Sandwick Junior High Secondary Department were a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 School, would make the sharing of staff worse is not true.

If this Proposal was agreed, a planned coherent timetable would be agreed which married up the two schools’ requirements. Classes would then not be split. A teacher might have the
Secondary 1 class on their timetable in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and their Secondary 3 class might be at the Anderson High School. The drawback with this however, is that inevitably to achieve it, staff will have to travel between the two schools on a daily basis. Travel time, in accordance with the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers comes out of teacher-contact time, which creates some inefficiency. However, this does not come close to the inefficiencies we still currently have in staffing in our secondary provision, where we have staff who cannot be fully utilised due to the logistics of where our schools are, and where the classes they do teach are still very small. In 2013/14 the average class size in our junior highs for non-practical subjects where the national maximums are 33 in Secondary 1 and Secondary 2, and 30 for Secondary 3 and up, ranged from four to 15 children.

Staff in particular, were also concerned that such arrangements would lead to low morale and difficulties in recruitment and retention of teachers. Sharing staff in a coherent planned way would ensure that all staff, if they wanted, had the opportunity to teach certificate classes. In many of our previous discussions with the teaching unions, they have articulated to us, how important it is for their members who are secondary qualified to be able to teach qualifications. This concern also brings us back to the Best Value argument, and our school estate. If it is critical to staffing our schools, that teachers only work in one setting, then the junior high system is not a system which can be supported any longer. With the inefficiencies it creates in staffing, it cannot deliver Best Value for Children’s Services and for Shetland Islands Council. In the past Shetland Islands Council had the resources to support these arrangements. It does not have these resources any longer.

In March 2013 our Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers, agreed jointly A Transfer Agreement for teachers. The introduction to the joint Agreement makes the following statement: “Both the Council and recognised trade unions are committed to maintaining sustainable teaching posts across Shetland’s schools...” Local authorities in Scotland have no appetite with pursuing compulsory redundancies for teachers, as they are aware that teachers will strike if this policy is pursued. As a result local authorities, including Shetland Islands Council works very hard to manage any required reductions in staffing through voluntary means. The downside of this position, is that where there is not full-time work any longer and we have a full-time member of staff, is that there is a risk they will be subject to transfer for part of their working week. With Children’s Services facing the requirement to find a further £3.268 million of savings by March 2017, it must demonstrate Best Value as far as is possible in its use of resources.

Planned staffing arrangements for a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will include a non-teaching head teacher and at least one principal teacher with 0.5 full-time equivalent management time. Sandwick Junior High School would have two. These would be fixed permanent members of staff who are in Sandwick Junior High School all of the week. The secondary roll for Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 in Sandwick Junior High School in 2015/16 is estimated to be 65 children. This number is small enough for each child to be known well to one of these key staff, who will be able to provide them with any support required.

Where a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 department is big enough, like Sandwick Junior High School, one Principal Teacher would be responsible for pastoral care and the other would be responsible for the curriculum. In a smaller setting with one principal teacher it would for the head teacher, in consultation with the central service, to decide which of the two roles the head teacher took responsibility for, and which would then fall to the principal teacher.

Additional Support Needs staff for a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will continue to be allocated on a needs basis, and any child with additional support needs will continue to have the support they need for their learning and their health and wellbeing.
Shared staff will not affect subject choice. This will remain in place in all our schools in line with the principles and entitlements of Curriculum for Excellence. There has been a recent difficult debate locally about the number of Nationals which most children will study for in Secondary 4 in Shetland. Up until 2013, our children studied for eight Standard Grades. However, the challenge in discussing the change to National Qualifications locally, lies in the change from two-year Standard Grade courses to one year National Qualification courses. This issue has been exacerbated by our schools delivering some of the National course content in Secondary 3 to our current cohort of Secondary 4 children this year so that most could be presented for eight Nationals. This approach has to be modified to take full account of the requirements of the Broad General Education Secondary 1 to Secondary 3, and to ensure throughout the Senior Phase that young people have opportunities for wider achievement built into their curricular opportunities. Studying for eight Nationals is not a sustainable position and at present Children’s Services has agreed seven with its secondary head teachers. This position will be kept under review as we continue to work with other local authorities to see how the Senior Phase develops. For example, some local authorities have most young people in Secondary 4 studying only up to six subjects.

There are no plans to reduce the number of classes taught by specialist teachers in Sandwick Junior High School if it were to become a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school. There was discussion in Professor Don Ledingham’s Report presented to Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013, about in the future the use of primary teachers to deliver aspects of the Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 curriculum. The report by the Commission on the Delivery of Rural Education also recommends that this is developed in the future to secure the sustainability of small rural secondary schools. Children’s Services will continue to explore this with the General Teaching Council for Scotland over the coming years, but at present their position is quite clear and is as follows:

“The Requirements for Teachers (Scotland) Regulations 2005 confirm the need for education authorities to employ Registered Teachers and emphasise the view of the Government and of the General Teaching Council that such teachers should have ‘the appropriate professional skills and knowledge required’ to teach.

Some readers have assumed that this clause can allow registered teachers to teach subjects outwith their area of subject or sector qualification. GTC Scotland does not share this view. We believe that it is professionally undesirable for teachers to be employed to teach a subject (or in a sector) in which they are not registered and that unqualified teaching could be educationally damaging to children.

Of course, opportunities might be provided to allow a teacher to acquire or develop the ‘appropriate professional skills and knowledge required’ to teach. This would require continuing professional development and space and time to work together with colleagues to develop suitable expertise and confidence. One mechanism to achieve this might be the Council’s Framework for Professional Registration which allows a teacher to gain registration in an additional subject or for another educational sector. http://www.gtcs.org.uk/registration/professional-registration.aspx

The related but different area of Professional Recognition provides an acknowledgement of specific work undertaken by a teacher in one part of the curriculum or of its assessment.

Finally, GTC Scotland does recognise that emerging curriculum plans have encouraged teachers to engage in cross curricular learning programmes in some schools; and we accept that, where well-planned, these changes can provide benefits to pupils. Indeed, we
are aware of schools in which some teachers, with careful planning and appropriate support, have agreed to become involved in the teaching of integrated or project-based units in, for example, the Broad General Education phase of learning. The extent to which this approach might be acceptable would however depend on the qualifications of teachers in that school, the training offered for new course components and the level at which teachers are asked to teach. In general, the more subject specific the content of a course, the more necessary it is that a teacher has suitable qualifications within that specific area.

In summary, therefore, GTC Scotland believes that teachers should be qualified and registered for the sectors and subjects they are teaching. We are pleased to confirm that employers also recognise the need to deploy suitably qualified staff who will normally have a relevant teaching qualification and/or have attained professional recognition or additional registration. These qualifications will provide an assurance to parents and the wider public that teachers have the ‘appropriate professional skills and knowledge required’ in the subject being taught.

You will find further information on this and the GTC Scotland viewpoint at the following link to our website: http://www.gtcs.org.uk/Registration/Curriculum-for-excellence.aspx

The costs of teacher travel time in this proposal are calculated as 1.85 full-time equivalent teachers which costs £83,692. This is the contact time lost from teachers travelling during the school day. Then a calculation for mileage which was calculated as 50 return journeys between the Anderson High School and Sandwick. This is 14 miles for 39 weeks per year at 53.65p per mile which amounts to £29,293. The total costs here are therefore £112,985.

There is no evidence at present to suggest that existing sharing of staff arrangements have led to an increase in staff absences. Children’s Services has spoken to two members of staff who are being shared and listened to their concerns. We do realise we will have to continue to focus on these arrangements to improve how they are working. The developments in the Shetland Learning Partnership will go a way to resolving some of these issues with the introduction of a common school day, aligned timetables and a common curriculum across all secondary departments and schools.

If further reductions in secondary teaching staff are required then these will be achieved in the same way as before where we look for interested staff to volunteer to exit, either through voluntary redundancy or early retirement.

As there is a position of no compulsory redundancies taken by teaching unions in Scotland and local authorities respect that, in order to keep some fluidity in the system to enable posts to be found for displaced established staff, we make use of temporary contracts. This is not well liked but it is to give security for all.

**Issue: Timescale of the Programme**

**Points Made**
- Being aware of the extra pressure the Secondary 4 children and their teachers are under with Curriculum for Excellence, I am disappointed and angry that they have not the support I feel they should have had from Children’s Services. Instead of spending an inordinate amount of time and effort trying to close good schools unnecessarily, would it not have been better to shelve all of that for two to four
years at least, in order to concentrate on getting all phases of Curriculum for Excellence off to a solid start and giving support to the whole school community.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department should only be considered for closure when the new Anderson High School has opened.
- This Proposal, if implemented, should be considered for implementation in August 2016, due to the need to move a year group of children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department between Secondary 3 and Secondary 4.
- This Proposal should be shelved until the new Anderson High School has been built; and until the difference in learning and study between Secondary 4 and Secondary 5 are clear.
- The timing of consultation is unfair to current Secondary 2 children. Families are being forced to make placing requests as a result. If the Proposal is not agreed, these families will have transferred their children unnecessarily. This means this consultation is seriously undermined and flawed.
- My son is due to start Secondary 3 in 2016. I trust the new Anderson High School will be ready by then.
- The whole process should be halted until the new Anderson High School is built.
- If the Proposal had been put forward a few months sooner, issues for Secondary 2 would have been avoided.
- Short timescales of the Proposal will impact on children’s attainment at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department this year.
- The status quo of Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 must be maintained until the new legislation on the provision of rural education is through.
- We are concerned about the timing of this consultation and the capacity of the current Anderson High School to accommodate children in respect of toilets, social spaces and condition of building. We would want a reassurance of no adverse impact on the current Anderson High School if more children, up to 80 came as a result of this proposal.
- If the Proposal is accepted then the transition time should be August 2016 or when the new Anderson High School is completed.
- This Proposal has not been thought through for the current Secondary 2. They will experience two transitions in exam years - to old Anderson High School, then to new Anderson High School.
- The timing of this consultation is poor. All junior highs should be consulted on at the same time as the Proposal is a change to that whole system.
- Wait until Curriculum for Excellence is bedded in.
• Wait until the new Anderson High School is built.

• The Proposal should not have been put forward until the new Anderson High School has been built.

• My son is in Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. I would want him to stay in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department until the end of Secondary 4.

• Time is in short supply with these rushed consultations.

• You must not and cannot continue with a timetable of change without being aware of the detrimental impact a rushed decision could have.

• The timing has caused a great deal of uncertainty and anxiety for Secondary 2 children and parents who are left in the position of having to make important decisions about their future schooling without access to the outcome of the consultation.

• The timing of the closure of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 seems entirely driven by money rather than for educational reasons. Leaving the current situation in place while we work out Curriculum for Excellence and at least build a new school seems like common sense.

• I cannot understand the timing of these proposed changes, when there is as yet no fit for purpose Anderson High School in Lerwick. If there is no hope of keeping the junior high schools, if this consultation is purely statutory box ticking, at least wait until the new Anderson High School is up and running and problems ironed out, before making such huge changes for children.

• Under the proposed changes some children will move to the Anderson High School on the existing site at the end of Secondary 2 and then move again within maybe twelve months to the new building. The lack of forward planning will prove very disruptive to the children who get caught up in the changes.

• The existing Anderson High School building is no longer fit for service, as recognised by the Shetland Islands Council. It is nonsense to load the school with more children before the new building is completed and occupied.

• The timing of consultation with regard to current Secondary 2 year group has undermined this consultation and compromised future consultations.

• The timing of the implementation of the Proposal is unclear. The Anderson High School starts its new school year in June and currently there is talk that this might be moved forward to the end of the Spring Break. This would make the time spent in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school not viable.
**Response**

In response to concerns about adding a further additional 80 children into the existing Anderson High School building, and to ensure children do not have to make two transitions: one to the existing Anderson High School in 2015, and then a further one to the new Anderson High School in August 2016, Children’s Services will be recommending for this Proposal that the implementation date is moved to August 2016 or as soon as possible thereafter, when the new Anderson High School has been opened. This would also allow the existing Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to complete Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School before transferring to the Anderson High School. This would ensure children making the transition to the Anderson High School do not have to make two transitions, and this would also alleviate concerns about the social space, dining facilities and circulation space at the existing Anderson High School, if an additional estimated 80 children were added.

Discussions are taking place amongst secondary departments and schools about moving the timetable change forward for a new Secondary 3 group to start their Secondary 3 year approximately two weeks after the end of the Spring Holidays. For this group this would be at the start of the exam diet period, rather than at the end of it.

**Issue: Democratic/Decision making Process**

**Points Made**

- Sandwick Junior High School was first put forward for closure then this was modified to the Proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4. This has had a negative impact on the children, staff and parents of Sandwick Junior High School and their morale.

- The Proposal has had a negative impact on Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council and taken them away from the duties a parent council ought to be involved in, like school activities and fundraising.

- Parents would like to see an end to the uncertainty.

- Parents have lost confidence in the management abilities of Children’s Services.

- Parents have lost faith in the consultation process. Repeated consultations have produced different models and ones which are contradictory to the views of parents, children and teachers.

- The Schools Reconfiguration Project is detracting from the new Anderson High School Project and the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence. Staff should be allowed to get on with this important work.

- Disappointed the proposal doesn’t go far enough. The proposal should be for closure of the whole secondary department at Sandwick Junior High School.

- These proposals are to justify the new Anderson High School.

- People in Shetland are scunnered with the indecision of councillors.

- Many believe this Proposal will lead to closure by stealth of Sandwick Junior High
School, as due to the ongoing uncertainty of the school's future, parents will not put their children there.

- Sandwick Junior High School, like many schools in Shetland, has been through lengthy periods of uncertainty. This has to stop and a final decision made on the future of Sandwick Junior High School.

- We must not continue with a timetable of change without major questions having been answered.

- Leave Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department as it is or close it completely.

- If Sandwick Junior High School Secondary department has to close then close the Dunrossness Primary School and Cunningsburgh Primary School as well and put the children to Sandwick Junior High School.

- It is inaccurate to say there are no placing requests into Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. There is one.

- There is a proposal to bring the start of the school year further forward than June, giving children even less time in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. This point needs clarification.

- Attainment information should be provided in a suitable form. At the public meeting it was pointed out that the Anderson High School attainment figures were based on the total roll of the Anderson High School, which includes children with additional support needs. Since then it has become clear that the Sandwick Junior High School results also include children with additional support needs.

- Consultation is a farce as the new Anderson High School is being built to hold all the secondary children in Shetland.

- There is a risk that this Proposal will lead to the closure of Cunningsburgh and Dunrossness primary schools.

- Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 would be a second best option over losing the whole of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

- Consultation, both formal and informal, has been poorly thought out and executed.

- If is unfair to target particular schools when Brae High School with a smaller Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 roll than Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is left untouched.

- Parents have fallen into the trap set by Shetland Islands Council and have put in placing requests to the Anderson High School.

- Other ideas should be looked at before school closure proposals. Once a closure is done, it cannot be undone.
It has taken so long to get all the information into a booklet, that people are numb and apathetic about responding.

Millions of pounds generated through energy sector. Questions need to be asked why education department are still being targeted so heavily when over £5 million has been saved by them in the last five years.

We must not continue with a timetable of change without major questions on educational benefit, transport, children's welfare being answered.

This Proposal is purely motivated by money.

This consultation has been conducted with a threat to parents of a rapid move to a full closure consultation if the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 proposal is rejected. There is also the possibility of a subsequent threat to close two out of three of the South Mainland primary schools. It has been very difficult to compare Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 with the current model with these threats lying ahead.

Educational Institute for Scotland members in Shetland urge the education service to make councillors aware of the shortcomings in the Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 model and advise them to reconsider this flawed proposal.

I think there should be a further look at how cuts are made across different departments.

There must be other places in Shetland Islands Council where savings could be found, such as the unexpected £1.6 million which has come from Ports and Harbours this year when they were expecting no income.

I know times are difficult and savings need to be made but there are far more serious wastes of money going on in Shetland Islands Council, which should be addressed. Leave our children alone and stop expecting them to pick up the pieces after this and previous administrations have made a mess of things.

By insisting on placing requests, this is prejudging, by contaminating, the Report. False consultation driven placements being included, must add an explanatory comment.

More detail of Children's Services budgets should be made available to councillors as an alternative source of savings e.g. Islesburgh. Figures are not transparent as required by the consultation procedures.

My wish is for the Shetland Islands Council to retain Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 in all junior high schools in Shetland.

Shetland Islands Council does not care about our children.

Any decision must be made as a matter of urgency because the uncertainty for the children is far more harmful than either of the options and this causes me alarm. This must be quite unsettling for the teachers which will have a knock-on effect on
• I strongly hope all concerned with making the decision on the future of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department will be careful that the successful education system, which was afforded and supported long before any oil money flowed into Shetland, is not damaged as it will have a long lasting impact on Shetland as whole.

• These proposals could threaten the viability of a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 secondary department and lead to closure by default if more parents decide to make placing requests.

• The educational benefit to children is much more important than financial savings and it is essential that the education of the affected children does not suffer as a result of decisions made following the consultation.

• It is clear that this Proposal is purely based on the need to save money and we cannot support it.

• If Shetland Islands Council was not so incompetent they would not be in the situation they are now. It might be a better idea to take a look at how many council employees are sitting in new offices achieving nothing and getting paid over inflated salaries.

• I am against the proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School or at any other junior high schools in Shetland.

• I am extremely concerned about the proposed Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model of education for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. If money was vast and the Scottish curriculum had not changed I believe Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department should stay open as one of the best schools in Shetland. However, money is restricted and the Scottish curriculum has changed radically and I believe that Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department should close and not be a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 department as proposed. Councillors must make tough decisions to ensure the best possible outcome for Shetland's children, for now and in the future.

• Councillors must ensure that education in Shetland evolves. Why have a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 satellite school when these children could join together with their older siblings and friends at a high school? Why stay at a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school with drive through teachers when you could be part of a school system that ensured excellent support and extra-curricular activities?

• I truly believe that mainland junior high schools should close but due to the ferries isles junior high schools should be Secondary 1 to Secondary 2.

• Stop the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 consultation on Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and start the closure consultation.

• Shetland Islands Council has not listened to communities. Look again at a multi-
campus junior high school with shared management, and creative use of ICT.

- Does the most remote and rural area of Scotland want to be exposed as the one that destroys its own rural communities?

- I don't think any child's education should have to suffer because past councils have failed to balance the books. It is yet to be seen if the current plans materialise as we have been down this route before. The decision taken around the consultation proposal has wide reaching effect across all rural education, not just in Shetland. Is stripping local communities across Scotland really what the Scottish Government planned with the Curriculum for Excellence? I hope not. All for just £223,500 of savings.

- I agree that Shetland Islands Council needs to save money, however this needs to be done in a planned manner with regard for the effect savings will potentially have on services. Education seems to be the only service which is being dismantled by cuts. The dismantling and centralising of schooling from Secondary 3 and up, and leaving junior high schools devoid of their own staff, would be comparable to closing all rural care centres and transferring residents to a more efficiently run central unit; or to removing one of the two ferries on Yell Sound. The difference with these services is that in future a new ferry can be bought, or a care centre re-staffed and brought out of mothballing. A school, once closed, will likely never re-open. It is clear that the cuts have been distributed in a less than ideal way. Councillors need to realise the cuts are having disproportionate effects on certain services and to review them to achieve a better balance.

- About 25 years ago, Shetland Islands Council had about 2500 employees and services operated to an acceptable level. That has since grown to around 3500 employees. It is these 1000 posts that should be looked at to consider which of them are essential, given they were not required in the 1980s. Very few of these additional 1000 employees are teachers. Junior high schools had been in operation for at least two decades at this time. They were paid for and functioned well before Shetland Islands Council had any oil reserve fund to dip in to. Let's get our priorities right. We could always afford to educate our children well and communities do not want to see this lost.

- Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 will not make schools sustainable. This will promote closure of secondary departments.

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, like many schools in Shetland has been through lengthy periods of uncertainty. This has to stop and a final decision made on the future of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

- The catchment areas for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department should change and Quarff should become part of the catchment area for the Anderson High School as it is nearer. If not, this Proposal will lead to more placing requests from Quarff and possibly Cunningsburgh.
Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council does not believe Children’s Services engaged properly with parents on the proposal. The meeting stuck rigidly to a two hour timescale which was not enough. Discussion was lacking and parents were asked to submit their points in writing.

Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council submitted a number of written questions to Children’s Services which were not answered until time ran out. Had Children’s Services responded in a more timely fashion there could have been a much more effective dialogue with Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council.

Some parents will support the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model as they see it as an alternative to closure. Others see that supporting such a model will, in the end, just lead to closure.

Response

The decision to move from a proposal to close Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to a proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education was a political decision taken on 13 November 2013. Children’s Services have been consistent in recommending the closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

Children’s Services would also like to see stability in its school estate and is working hard to achieve this. It has to marry up the requirements of Curriculum for Excellence, Shetland’s geography and the budget available to use for school education, to secure a long-term sustainable provision which best serves all our young people. We are sorry respondents have lost faith in Children’s Services. With respect to the future of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department we have been consistent throughout all our proposals. Political decisions have required us to change direction, and we must follow instructions given to us by Shetland Islands Council.

These proposals are not to justify the new Anderson High School. The provision of a new Anderson High School has been an aspiration of Shetland Islands Council for over twenty years, and pre-dates any proposals to change secondary provision in other schools. The funding for the new Anderson High School is also being provided by the Scottish Government on a like-for-like basis based on the existing capacity of the current school.

Children’s Services cannot predict the decisions of future councils. We work with the policy which is agreed and we have to implement. Currently there is no policy which would mean a further proposal in the future for the closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, and there are no proposals to close Dunrossness Primary School and Cunningsburgh Primary School.

There are no placing requests into Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council thinks that there is. Sometimes the local authority places a child in a particular school outwith their catchment area to support other arrangements put in place by Children and Families Social Work. As well as this, in line with placing request legislation, if a child attends a primary school by placing request, if they then want to go on and attend secondary provision which is outwith their catchment area their parents must submit a further placing request. Children’s Services will not go into the specific circumstances of individuals, but would like Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council to note these points.
Discussions are taking place amongst secondary departments and schools about moving the timetable change forward for a new Secondary 3 group to start their Secondary 3 year approximately two weeks after the end of the Spring Holidays. For this group this would be at the start of the exam diet period, rather than at the end of it.

The point about attainment information for the Anderson High School including the attainment of children with additional support needs is this. The Anderson High School makes provision in its Gressy Loan base for secondary aged children from across the length and breadth of Shetland who have severe and complex additional support needs. All our secondary departments include children with additional support needs from their catchment area. The Anderson High School has this additional provision, which adds a dimension to their statistics which other secondary departments do not have. The Anderson High School is immensely proud of the achievements of all the children who attend their school including those of children with additional support needs.

The statutory consultation process for this Proposal has been followed in exactly the same way as it has been for all other closure proposals. If the statutory consultation process is not followed correctly, the Proposal will be called-in by the Scottish Government.

An updated Medium Term Financial Plan was approved by Shetland Islands Council on 28 August 2013 and the Budget Book for 2014/15 was then agreed by Shetland Islands Council on 11 December 2013. No change has been made to the level of savings Children’s Services has to find over the next three years. The savings we have to find are £3.268 million. If this is to change there has to be a change made to this amount through agreement by Shetland Islands Council. The package of closure proposals Children’s Services has to work through over the next two years, along with some further efficiency projects will leave a shortfall in the £3.268 million required. Children’s Services have been instructed to put forward a report on the expected shortfall at the end of this period, and it will then be up to Shetland Islands Council to decide where that money should come from.

With respect to the number of employees Shetland Islands Council has, and the possibility of looking there for savings, the following information is provided. The Staffing Watch information which is gathered monthly by Shetland Islands Council demonstrates that in March 2001 Shetland Islands Council employed 2217 full-time equivalents. This rose as far as 2854 full-time equivalents in December 2010. In December 2013, the figure had fallen again to 2338.5 full-time equivalents, a reduction of 515.5 full-time equivalents in three years.

The figures for teachers tell us that in April 2001 we employed 386. This reached a high point of 419 in February 2011, and in December 2013 had fallen to 348. This is a reduction of 71 teachers in less than three years.

There are no 1000 additional posts to look for savings in. Posts have been cut across Shetland Islands Council particularly in the past three years, to meet the required budget savings.

Children’s Services has conducted the statutory consultation on the proposed closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department in the same way it has carried out all previous statutory consultations. At the statutory public meeting held in Sandwick, people drifted in late, right up until 7.20 pm.

We responded to the written questions submitted by Sandwick Junior High School Parent
Council as quickly as we could. They submitted a substantial number of questions, some of which we had to get advice from our Legal Services on, as they were not admissible under Freedom of Information legislation. In response to requests to have as much information as we had collected as soon as possible, Children’s Services sent a partially completed response four days in advance of the Freedom of Information deadline for the request. It then sent the full response on the deadline. We are disappointed then, that Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council has chosen to attach the incomplete response to their submission, suggesting we did not comply correctly with their request. We did, and we did it in the time required. In response to their concerns about the timescale for receiving the information, we also offered to accept a late response from the Parent Council.

**Issue: Centralisation**

**Points Made**

- Do not sacrifice Sandwick Junior High School to justify building a new Anderson High School.
- This Proposal will lead to centralisation of secondary education provision for Shetland in Lerwick and there are no educational advantages to this.
- Rural communities are thriving. Centralising secondary education will lead to depopulation of rural areas.
- This Proposal will lead to further centralisation and impact adversely on rural development.
- This Proposal will lead to young people remaining in the town.
- Removing Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 from junior highs will lead to depopulation of rural areas in Shetland.
- Centralising education in Lerwick will also not benefit Lerwick children as it will lead to larger class sizes, and unhappy children.
- This Proposal will centralise education in Lerwick to the detriment of rural areas.
- Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 Sandwick Junior High School would set precedent for all junior highs and it is not a good model of education.
- Maintain Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. Give parents a choice as to which school their children attend. Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 would be preferable to complete closure of the secondary department.
- Shetland needs families to live in the South Mainland; closing Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department would lead to centralisation and the South Mainland community would die.
- This process supports centralisation. Shetland Islands Council should be investing
in education in our rural areas, now that Shetland's economy is booming.

- It is very important to maintain choice for the children of the South Mainland.
- Does centralisation equal de-population?
- Unhappy parents move closer to their children's school, making their old community unsustainable. This Proposal flies in the face of the Council's policy for decentralisation.

I am concerned about the centralisation of education in Shetland. This will mean that there is no choice for children if travelling to the Anderson High School for whatever reason does not work for them. Living on an island means that you cannot just go to another school nearby. To take away choice when one size never fits all is not a situation I would like to see Shetland in. Brae High School is simply not a viable alternative for someone who lives in the far south of the mainland.

- There is a good reason why there is a junior high school in the South Mainland - geography, and that cannot be changed and I hope that children who live in the more remote areas of Shetland are not going to be penalised for doing so.

- Education should be centralised to Lerwick.
- The Proposal removes choice for parents.
- Shetland Islands Council likely has a plan to use the top of the Staney Hill as an airport then all services will be central.

- The centralisation of secondary education will damage the long term viability of rural communities.

- This Proposal will have an effect on the wider community. Centralisation is negative on both the rural and the town communities. The rural areas will become depopulated and the town will lack resources to accommodate the increase in people wanting to be near their children.

- Centralisation resulting from this Proposal undermines the Council's approved strategy for development set out in the Shetland Local Development Plan. It will continue to threaten the very interconnectivity that keeps smaller communities together and allows rural areas to prosper.

- Stop centralisation now as hostelling and transporting children will ruin our rural communities. Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 years are years when our young people need to be nurtured in their own families and supported by their local community. It would have a huge impact on quality of family and community life. If we do not have sustainable rural communities the future for Shetland as a whole is bleak.

- Children attending school in Lerwick are more likely to live there afterwards.
• The Proposal will cause a drift of people towards Lerwick.
• The removal of secondary education from rural Shetland does not help attract professionals to come to live and work in Shetland.

Response

The principal requirement of the local education authority is to provide adequate and efficient education and it must ensure that this education is directed to the development of the personality, talents and mental and physical abilities of the child or young person to their fullest potential.

The Report of the Commission on the Delivery of Rural Education, published on 17 April 2013, gives consideration to the impact on rural communities of school closures, and makes the following points (Page 30):

“The impact on the local community is often a significant part of objections to school closure. The village school can be an important part of the symbolic capital of a community and schools are often referred to as “the heart of the community”. Both incomers who have invested in living in rural places and local people are often very opposed to closure. Closure of schools (or threats to do so) can significantly reduce the sense of community wellbeing. The Commission encountered strongly held views that school closure would have a very debilitating effect on the local community.”

“It is important to recognise that a school’s primary function is to provide pupils with the best possible educational experience. However, given the value and importance for their long-term future that communities place on retaining a school, it is correct that any rural school closure proposal should be subject to a thorough community impact assessment.”

“A key point which has been considered by the Commission is the degree to which the presence of a school is essential to the sustainability of a rural community.”

“In some of the communities the Commission visited, it found evidence that while a school closure had been resisted and closure still took place, the impact had been less than was feared, with communities adjusting to different school provision and community focus continuing in individual villages. Rural communities and their economic base vary widely, as does their remoteness, and this will affect their resilience to school change.”

Furthermore, the Report goes on to say, on Page 32:

“A school alone cannot sustain a rural community. The Commission noted that other issues are likely to be as critical to maintaining a working age population. The Commission received a strong message on its visits to communities that while they place great value on a school in their community, the two most important factors in sustaining the community are jobs and housing. Without employment opportunities and affordable housing, families can neither move to an area nor remain there. While local schools are strongly desirable in a similar way to local healthcare and a local post office, it seems likely that rural communities do generally manage to tolerate travelling a further distance to school. This finding is consistent with other Scottish rural studies.”

Children’s Services in recognition of the deep concerns rural communities in Shetland have about any proposal to close a rural school, now always commission a socio-
economic impact study on each closure proposal it carries out. The socio-economic study for the proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 was carried out by Steve Westbrook, Economist, in partnership with Sandy Anderson. The full text of their study is attached to this Consultation Report as Appendix H. The main conclusions are in summary that:

- The net annual savings from discontinuing the S3 and S4 stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School are estimated by Shetland Islands Council to be £223,530;
- There are 1,407 resident households in the secondary department’s catchment area - 638 in the Dunrossness area, 388 in Sandwick and 388 in Cunningsburgh;
- The catchment area includes areas that have had the strongest population growth in Shetland over the last 10 years, but it also includes areas around Dunrossness with modest population growth or decline;
- The availability of social housing is below the Shetland average in the catchment area, especially around Dunrossness and Cunningsburgh;
- Growth in housing availability has centred on the communities to the north of the catchment area, especially Sandwick;
- Sandwick is identified in SIC’s Local Plan as the “area of best fit”, where any significant housing development should take place;
- The majority of the population of the South Mainland who are in employment travel outside the area for work (principally Lerwick);
- The major employers in the catchment area are the Council (mainly in education at the Sandwick Junior High School and its feeder primary schools and in social care at Overtonlea Care Centre), at Sumburgh Airport (HIAL and other companies based there), and in tourism at Sumburgh Hotel. There are also a number of employers in retail, knitwear and other sectors;
- Employment opportunities at Sumburgh Airport are expanding and this could put some pressure on housing in the Dunrossness area. Companies would be keen to recruit locally (subject to skills being available), but some will employ weekly commuters if necessary;
- Self-employment is an important feature of the local economy – through agriculture, crofting, tourism and other home based businesses;
- Total annual household income in the catchment area is estimated at some £54 million;
- The direct impact of discontinuing the S3 and S4 stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School would be the loss of teaching and support staff at the school. These employment reductions would be offset within Shetland to an extent by additional posts at Anderson High School in Lerwick and through the additional costs of school transport;
• There is also likely to be an impact on retail turnover, especially in the shop and bakery at Sandwick, from reduced spending by pupils and their parents;

• Whilst we found little evidence that families would leave the area in the short term if the proposed changes to secondary education at Sandwick are implemented, there is some concern that the loss of S3 and S4 education at Sandwick would make the area less attractive for families moving to or within Shetland and promote a drift towards Lerwick;

• It is possible that homes, especially in the Dunrossness area, will increasingly be occupied by older people and by workers at Sumburgh Airport who rent while maintaining a family home elsewhere rather than relocating their families;

• There is wide concern about young people becoming disengaged from their local community at a younger age and the effects this would have on community cohesion;

• The school building will still be heavily used for educational provision and there appears to be limited scope to extend its use for community benefit;

• Overall, the proposal to discontinue stages S3 and S4 of secondary education at Sandwick Junior High School is likely to make the South Mainland a less attractive place to live for some families, but the other factors which will continue to attract people to live there may, on balance, outweigh the impetus to move away.

The new Community Plan for Shetland 2013-2020 was also agreed in August 2013. This describes how the public sector will work together with the private and third sector to improve the communities in Shetland. There are commitments in the Plan which are important to securing a sustainable future for all areas of Shetland, and these will be important to any community in Shetland in securing a positive viable future. Outcome 1 is: “Shetland has sustainable economic growth with good employment opportunities”; and Outcome 11 is: “We have a strong voluntary sector and social enterprises, encouraging community enterprise and co-operatives, with increased capacity to deliver services based on needs and aspirations of local communities.” Within these there are clear objectives: to increase sustainable economic growth; increase the number of business start-ups; secure population growth; increase the role of community enterprise; improve the sustainability of community groups; and involve communities in deciding what is needed to improve their area.

Shetland Islands Council’s updated Corporate Plan agreed by Shetland Islands Council on 26 March 2014 also has as one its Priorities: **Encouraging Strong Communities.** The text of this priority is: “Successful places depend on individuals, families, third sector organisations, community groups, public bodies and businesses all working together to find the best way to do things, their own solutions to problems and the new ideas to help their communities adapt and stay strong and vibrant in a changing world.”

Children’s Services, from its experience of considering school closures in the past, is very aware of the fear communities have of the impact of a local rural school closure. This Proposal is not a school closure. All the facilities Sandwick Junior High School has in place will remain available for community use. The children will remain educated in Sandwick Junior High School until the end of Secondary 2. This Proposal only suggests the removal of two stages of education. The South Mainland has excellent transport links
so many residents already travel out of the area for work. This already provides employment for the area, and there are developments planned there which may actually increase employment opportunities.

Sandwick Junior High School will continue to provide education for pre-school, primary, Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children. Other community users of the school will continue to have access to the all of the current facilities. The removal of two stages in the secondary department would potentially provide some additional space for community use.

The Development Directorate and Children’s Services will engage with the community to assess how the existing use of the school could be utilised to meet community needs. Sandwick has a public hall, a swimming pool (with leisure facilities) and a well-equipped games hall. They are all significant community assets. The school currently makes use of the games hall and the swimming pool and will continue to do so if the secondary department is reduced by two year group stages.

The majority of existing employment opportunities, with the exception of some secondary teachers and some support staff will remain as the school will continue to provide pre-school, primary and early secondary education. All secondary children from the area including Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children would be transported home each night and would be able to remain in their local communities and attend local leisure facilities, clubs and events.

**Issue: Financial**

**Points Made**

- Proposal falls short of the required amount to ensure Children’s Services meets its savings target.
- This Proposal does not go far enough. Close the whole secondary department at Sandwick Junior High School and make educational savings.
- Shetland Islands Council cannot afford the education system it currently has, so tough decisions have to be made, and now is the time to do that with the new Anderson High School being built.
- The savings figures are not credible. They have been manipulated to make Children’s Services look better.
- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department would offer more value for Shetland’s money as a Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 school.
- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 children will be taught by primary teachers on the cheap rather than qualified secondary teachers.
- The savings are unbelievable. The school will still have to run as it did as a Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 school.
Savings can be found elsewhere. We know this.

Stop wasting money on consultations, unnecessary paperwork and the new Anderson High School and keep rural secondaries open instead.

Savings are minimal for the disruption caused.

This is clearly about money and not about education. Our children should not be made to suffer as a result of Shetland Islands Council's overspending.

Staff have already suffered from cuts made. Is this being ignored and we are being asked to prop up an unworkable system?

Instead of pursing proposals like this to reduce educational provision and save money, can the Council not pursue new revenue streams from the gas plant? Sandwick is a vibrant community currently and this proposal makes it a less attractive place to live.

How can Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School save any money?

We will be paying staff to travel not teach.

Enough cuts have been made already in education, and these have affected the morale of staff.

This Proposal is financially driven and does not deliver significant savings.

I want to see that efficiencies gained from sharing of staff out through the disadvantages of losing teacher time to travel.

Shetland Islands Council officials have wasted millions of pounds in the past.

Savings will not be realised and with the economy on the up, they will not be needed.

£223,000 savings are not enough to justify the impact on the community. Savings should be found from looking at savings from deleting jobs across Shetland Islands Council.

The Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model has not been properly costed regarding additional transport costs. Teachers' mileage against lost time driving between sites.

The financial savings do not outweigh the educational disadvantages. There are very little savings in this Proposal, for the amount our children's education will suffer. The proposed savings might not be achieved anyway.

Savings for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department have been reduced from £900,000, down to £223,500, which would be further reduced once up to date transport figures are factored in. An amount of money that does not justify
destroying the junior high school model.

- The savings in this Proposal are not significant for the level of disruption caused.
- Finance the junior high school model appropriately or close Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department completely.
- The financial savings in the current Proposal do not make any sense: saving £470,000 in teachers but spending £270,000 more on transport.
- This Proposal is financially driven for what seems like a relatively small sum of money in the scheme of the entire Shetland Islands Council budget. It appears very short sighted to limit a fabulous facility for relatively minor savings with no guarantee of maintaining or improving the other services e.g. swimming, instrumental tuition and extra-curricular activities which are threatened with cuts if savings are supposedly not found from school closures.
- It is doubtful if there would be any financial benefits to having Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 junior high schools considering the lost teaching time.
- How can a half empty school be cost effective? To be cost effective surely every classroom should be full of children learning.
- More detail is required about the costs of catering.
- Looking at the proposed savings. The majority of savings are employee costs. If these employees are redeployed, there are no savings.
- I am concerned that the closure of Sandwick Junior High School will fail to deliver the required savings.
- I am concerned about the amount of savings in these proposals.
- The projected savings are not enough to justify the damage that will be done to the community and may not be realised.
- I find it totally ridiculous that this is even being considered; putting the future of our children at risk to save so little.
- The costs of a common curriculum for Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 throughout Shetland - how much will it cost to ensure all schools are equally resourced to ensure all children throughout Shetland have a common experience?
- When Shetland had lots of money for education and the old curriculum was in place, Sandwick Junior High School was a model of an excellent junior high school. However, the junior high school model does not work under the new models required for Curriculum for Excellence and we do not have the financial support to sustain all the junior high schools in Shetland.
- I am extremely concerned about the proposed Secondary 1 to Secondary model of education for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. If money was
vast and the Scottish curriculum had not changed I believe Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department should stay open as one of the best schools in Shetland. However, money is restricted and the Scottish curriculum has changed radically and I believe that Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department should close and not be a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 department as proposed. Councillors must make tough decisions to ensure the best possible outcome for Shetland's children, for now and in the future.

- This Proposal appears to be primarily driven by Shetland Islands Council cost control measures, after a period of many years of wasteful spending.
- The Proposal does not offer the best value for money.
- Children's Services has already reached its savings targets for the last five years and should not be forced into a position of creating a two tier education system.
- What real savings could be achieved doing this? Any savings will be used on transport costs.
- I appreciate that savings have to be made in the short term to secure the future wealth of Shetland, but front line services should be preserved at all costs. Thirty years ago we did not have a huge team of administrators and advisers to education. We had a head of education, who supported head teachers in delivering a high quality education within Shetland, and a couple of advisers on specialisms such as physical education and music.
- The Proposal will not save the money required and will result in a much poorer educational standard for many of our children.
- The expected savings of £223,500 do not justify dismantling a system with a track record of delivering strong education, a supportive learning environment and excellent attainment rates.
- The new model will not, as I understand it, save anything like the initially estimated amount of money.
- Where is the money made in Shetland? It is made in Sullom Voe, Sumburgh Airport, salmon farms and the fishing industry. All of these are located in the country, but Children's Services is hell bent on ruining the rural education system. Find the money you need within overstuffed Shetland Islands Council departments.
- Last year the Shetland Islands Council Ports and Harbours income was an additional £1.8million. That extra income could keep Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department open for eight years. The Shetland economy is in the middle of a boom due to oil and gas investment. It is strange that the Shetland Islands Council cannot look ahead further than the "medium term".
- The Proposal is motivated by the need to save money only.
- The additional cost of transferring teachers under the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2
policy would be £500,000.

- The Proposal takes money out of the education budget and puts it into the transport budget. This is not a good use of resources.

- There are no relocation costs for teachers or early retirement costs which distort the figures in favour of closure.

- There are no salary conservation figures included in the costs which distorts the savings figures.

- Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council is keen to work with Shetland Islands Council to find alternative ways to save money. For example implementing the agreed policy of composite classes in Lerwick primaries.

- We are concerned about the impact financial savings across the school estate will have on the Anderson High School. We do not want Anderson High School children disadvantaged as children from all across Shetland attend the Anderson High School for Secondary 5 and Secondary 6.

- This Proposal undermines many of the strengths of the current junior high system, and it does not make the level of savings required, so it will lead to other savings having to be made.

- The only benefits to the Proposal are financial as Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department’s exam results are better than the Anderson High School’s. This can only be detrimental to the children’s education.

- Savings will be minimal. Taxiing teachers between schools will be expensive.

- This Proposal is about financial savings, not about educational benefit.

- The actual financial savings from this Proposal are minimal, estimated at around £200,000, especially when viewed against the current news that gains on the stock market have taken Shetland Islands Council reserves to around £200 million.

**Response**

Within the Council’s approved Medium Term Financial Plan 2013-2018, Children’s Services is required to find ongoing revenue savings of £3.268m over the next three financial years. This Proposal is part of a package of savings that will go some way towards meeting the total savings required to be delivered. Savings need to be achieved in order to restrict the draw on reserves and enable the Council to become financially sustainable.

Children’s Services continues to review its budgets in order to identify other areas where financial savings can be made to meet any savings shortfall, including across the remaining school estate.

Work is ongoing across the Council to achieve savings, including the deletion of posts, in order to ensure the targets within the Medium Term Financial Plan are met.
Estimated income streams from, for example, the gas plant, have been built into projections of self-sustainability within the Medium Term Financial Plan.

Provisional outturn figures indicate that Children’s Services is £1.3 million underspent in 2013/14.

It is acknowledged that money has been spent in the past which has not had the intended benefit to Shetland or its residents. However, these have been one-off items of expenditure. The main issue is the level of overspending on day-to-day services, which run down the reserves year-in year-out.

Shetland Islands Council cannot afford to maintain the existing junior high school model, or enhance it within the requirements of Curriculum for Excellence. This is now being addressed within the Strategy for Secondary Education.

The estimated savings of £223,530 which could be achieved from this Proposal have been calculated taking account of the proposed staffing of the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model at Sandwick Junior High School along with costs transferring to the Anderson High School, additional teacher travel time and mileage costs, and school transport costs.

The teaching time lost by staff travelling between schools is more than offset by the efficiencies gained by the sharing of staff under this Proposal.

The reduction in employee costs is offset by an increase in travel time, mileage and transport costs. These items have all been included in the estimated savings of £223,530.

It is anticipated that 1.16 full-time equivalent catering staff would transfer to the Anderson High School under this proposal. This has been built into the estimated savings of £223,530.

The Common Curriculum is currently being developed through workstreams in the Shetland Learning Partnership. How much if anything, this will cost, will become apparent once it is embedded across all secondary schools in Shetland. What is clear is that to maintain junior high schools Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 is no longer educationally viable or financially affordable.

In order to provide the range of subjects required to deliver the secondary curriculum under Curriculum for Excellence, it is not possible to have every classroom full in any of our secondary schools. Currently our secondary estate is operating at 41% under capacity.

Sandwick Junior High School has the second lowest cost per child in Shetland, only the Anderson High School is lower. However, the Shetland cost per child is significantly higher than the national average.

Secondary and primary teachers are both paid the same. This is on a nationally agreed scale.

Any staff redeployed as a result of this Proposal would be moved into posts which are vacant or occupied by a temporary member of staff. These posts would already be budgeted for within the Council’s establishment, and therefore savings would be realised. The number of Quality Improvement Officers, Education Development Officers and
Administrative staff have all been reduced considerably over the last few years.

At present Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department costs £1.2 million.

The original proposal to close the whole secondary department at Sandwick Junior High School would achieve savings in the region of £750,000.

This Proposal achieves savings and provides at least the same quality of education, therefore is better value for money than the current model.

There will be no reduction in property costs as the secondary department will still occupy the building. Savings will be achieved primarily by a reduction in employee costs. This is shown in the table on page 55 of the Proposal Paper which is attached as Appendix A.

This Proposal would result in a net reduction in employee costs of £359,000 after additional teacher travel time and mileage are taken into account.

Additional transport costs have been taken into account in calculating the savings to be achieved from this proposal.

Retirement and relocation costs cannot be calculated at this stage in the consultation process, in line with Convention of Scottish Local Authorities guidance. The bulk of these costs are one-off or short term, which would be met from the Council’s budgeted contingency for this purpose.

Salary conservation costs cannot be calculated at this stage in the consultation process, but would only impact a few members of staff. Any entitlement to salary conservation would be for three years.

Sound Primary School and Bell's Brae Primary Schools do not have composite classes for the following reasons. In 2010 they were allocated one additional teacher to meet the Scottish Government aspirations to reduce class sizes in Primary 1, Primary 2 and Primary 3. This policy has not changed. In preparing the Admissions Policy Children’s Services monitored the numbers of children moving in and out of Bell's Brae Primary School during one term. The numbers moving into the catchment area and out of the catchment area in one eight week block would have meant, had the classes been composites, the recompositing of classes several times. This would not be acceptable to the provision of education in the school, and would quite rightly not be acceptable to parents. By compositing the relatively large numbers in a stage at Bell’s Brae Primary School or Sound Primary School, you would create one very large composite class, and at each side of it one single stage class which would also be very large, leaving little flexibility for children moving in and out of the school catchment areas.

### Issue: Untested Model of Provision

**Points Made**

- A Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model has not been proven to be of educational benefit.
- Changing from a very successful Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 junior high school
model and through school at Sandwick to the very risky Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model is not worth the upheaval.

- Should schools become Secondary 1 to Secondary 2, children will have no alternative but to move to the Anderson High School; if they do not enjoy their move or find the change unsuitable, where can they go? There is no alternative.

- I oppose the Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model as being educationally unproven.

- The Shetland Learning Campus does not currently exist. This has yet to be developed to allow children to access the flexibility of the Senior Phase of the Curriculum for Excellence. How can something be considered an educational benefit before it is tried and tested?

- Independent learning time can be put on any timetable regardless of location.

- Developing skills around accessing online resources for learning can happen at any location, including at home. I do not see how this is an educational benefit of the Proposal. Surely these are transferable skills they will use throughout their lives?

- The suggestion that new qualifications e.g. Baccalaureates are developed is positive but I see this as being part of the Shetland Learning Campus; this should not be considered an educational benefit until it is tried and tested.

- Trying to make such drastic local changes to the structure of the education department at the same time as the education system is being restructured nationally, seems like too much at once. I feel Curriculum for Excellence should be allowed to bed in whilst work around what the Shetland Learning Campus would look like is prioritised over the removal of secondary provision in rural communities.

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 is not desirable. It fails to achieve popularity with parents, children and staff.

Response

Children’s Services aspirations for the young people of Shetland since before we closed Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department was to have our secondary aged children educated in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 school wherever it was feasible to do so. This thread can be traced through all the proposals we have put forward for consideration. However, we absolutely also recognise that this is not feasible everywhere in Shetland due to our geography, the spread of the population, and the budget that we now have available to spend on education.

On 20 September 2012, we put forward a set of proposals for the secondary school estate which reflected these aspirations where we proposed the closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, Aith Junior High School Secondary Department and Whalsay School Secondary Department with transfer to the Anderson High School; and we proposed the closure of Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department with transfer to Mid Yell Junior High School. On 20 September 2012 an amendment successfully removed Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department from the proposals.
In September 2013, to address the anomaly which Children’s Services was left with from 20 September 2012, and in response to the developing Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence, Children’s Services returned to Education and Families Committee with a fresh set of proposals for the secondary school estate: The Next Steps. This included proposals to retain secondary provision Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 in Whalsay School, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School. This would have meant children remained in their junior high school until the end of the Broad General Education, transferring with their completed Secondary 3 profile to the Anderson High School for their Senior Phase. Education and Families Committee recommended to Shetland Islands Council that these proposals were deferred and instead Children’s Services were instructed to explore five alternative options for the future strategy for secondary education in Shetland: the existing Blueprint for Education proposals; the Next Steps proposals; a Hub and Spoke model; a Tele-presence model and Maintaining the Status Quo within the Medium Term Financial Plan. As part of this work we were asked to carry out informal consultation and to engage an educational expert.

Our informal consultation took place in October 2013, and the proposed transition point at the end of Secondary 3 as set out in the Next Steps proposals was almost universally disliked as respondents considered it was too difficult to expect children to move schools nine months before their first qualification exams. It was also seen as detrimental for natural Secondary 4 leavers to be expected to move schools, and in some cases, live in the Halls of Residence for their last year of school. Most people preferred a transition at the end of Secondary 4 although a few respondents suggested the end of Secondary 2.

However in response to these concerns, Professor Don Ledingham, the educational expert engaged to make the recommendations for the Strategy for Secondary Education in Shetland Report put forward proposals for Whalsay School Secondary Department, Mid Yell Junior High School Secondary Department and Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department, that transfer could be at the end of Secondary 2. This was to ensure children who would have to stay in the hostel, as well as go to a new school, would have time to settle in to their new surroundings and make friends prior to embarking on their Senior Phase. Professor Ledingham did not recommend Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. This Proposal was given to Children’s Services as a result of a successful amendment at Shetland Islands Council. As children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department do not have to board if they attend the Anderson High School, the key educational benefits left for this proposal is the opportunity for children to continue to be educated in their local area for longer; their continued access to an excellent learning environment; and the opportunity to make a seamless transition into the Senior Phase, having had time to settle into the Anderson High School in advance of choosing their subjects for their National Qualifications.

This may be a model which is untested but the Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 model is not one which is tenable any longer if Shetland’s young people are to achieve their full entitlements in Curriculum for Excellence.
Issue: Environmental Issues

Points Made

- This Proposal is environmentally damaging. It goes against Scottish Government policy on carbon lowering policy making.

- "A sustainable school estate whose design, construction and operation is environmentally and energy efficient; contributes directly to delivering the year-on-year reductions in greenhouse gas emissions introduced by The Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009." (Paragraph 5.6). What is the impact of continuing to maintain and heat the Sandwick Junior High School building as well as the provision of additional buses and transport for teachers? Is any contribution being made towards the Climate Change Scotland Act?

Response

Shetland Islands Council as responsible Authority carried out under Section 8 of The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005, a Strategic Environmental Assessment Gateway screening of the Strategy for Secondary Education agreed proposals.

The determination by Shetland Islands Council under Section 8(1) of the Act is that the Strategy for Secondary Education proposals are unlikely to have significant environmental effects, and a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required.

Before making this determination, Shetland Islands Council sent a summary of its views as to whether or not the plan is likely to have significant environmental effects to Consultative Authorities (Scottish Natural Heritage, Historic Scotland and the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency) via the Strategic Environmental Assessment Gateway. Shetland Islands Council noted that the Consultation Authorities agreed with the view that the Strategy for Secondary Education proposals were was unlikely to have significant environmental effects and made the determination to that effect under Section 8 (1) of the Act. In making that determination Children’s Services applied criteria in Schedule 2 of the Act.

Issue: Equality of provision

Points Made

- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 school roll is bigger than Brae High School Secondary Department’s roll. Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council do not feel that Sandwick Junior High School is being treated equally.

- Why is Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department being closed when its Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 roll is greater than that at Brae High School?

- Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 is likely to be taught by primary teachers giving
children unequal access to specialist teachers.

- The perceived benefits of the Proposal will not benefit the current Secondary 2 group at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.
- Poorer families will not be able to allow their children to access after-school activities as they will have to pay the bus fare home.
- The Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 model is educationally disadvantaging rural children.
- The Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children will not be having an educational experience which is on a par with all children in Lerwick.
- It is very important to maintain the equality of provision and opportunity in education across Shetland.
- Anderson High School will again not receive the equality of provision that is spoken of. Children at the Anderson High School will not see their teachers for all lessons in a subject as the teacher will be elsewhere. With the tightening of staffing, class sizes will move to national maximum sizes, up to 30 in a class, whereas in the junior high school system, the classes will be much smaller and will have access to more resources.
- This Proposal discriminates against rural children because it adds the requirement of excessive daily travel which will have a negative impact on their educational achievement.
- Children might end up being taught by teachers who are not necessarily qualified at the level they would be in the Anderson High School.
- This Proposal does not provide equality as some children will be travelling in all weather for several hours per week, while others will have the health benefits of walking to school with their friends in a safe community.
- Children will be more tired compared to their peers who live in or nearer to Lerwick, which will disadvantage them in their learning.
- Our children are our future and they should all get the same opportunity for high quality education in their local area.
- Wealthier only in Lerwick and fairer for everyone as all children’s education would suffer from larger class sizes and lower attainment levels.
- Legislation, Paragraph 7.16. Equal Opportunities and Discrimination Act 2010: In junior high schools, children with learning difficulties are taught alongside the rest of the children thus teaching them how to interact with their peers and teaching their peers how to interact with them. This means they are not isolated, segregated, disadvantaged, or made to feel different. This does not happen at the Anderson High School, where these children are taught separately, causing a divide and
making everyone aware of their differences. This is far from equal opportunities and
has a negative impact on everyone’s lives.

- It is important to maintain quality of education and equality of provision and
  opportunity in education across Shetland.

Response

Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department is not being proposed for closure – the
removal of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 is proposed. Daily travel to the Anderson High
School is feasible for children from all areas of the current catchment area for Sandwick Junior
High School Secondary Department.

Brae High School currently provides the desired model for secondary education in Curriculum
for Excellence as it is Secondary 1 to Secondary 6. It would not be feasible for daily travel to
the Anderson High School for children who attend Brae High School from some parts of its
catchment area to be achieved within the agreed maximum daily single journey time of 65
minutes for a secondary-aged child.

Our current system of delivery of secondary education is unequal, with children who attend
Brae High School and the Anderson High School having a seamless provision of their Senior
Phase. Children who attend a junior high school at present have their Senior Phase
experience split.

All teachers teaching in secondary education in Scotland, whatever the type of provision must
be appropriately qualified to the same level and be registered with the General Teaching
Council for Scotland.

We do not have the resources in Shetland to provide a pattern of secondary education
provision in Shetland which eliminates the requirement to provide school transport. Some
secondary aged children at present are travelling 65 minutes each way to access secondary
education. They are not able to walk or cycle to school at present due to our current system.

There are no plans to reduce the number of classes taught by specialist teachers in junior
high schools if they were to become Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 schools. There was
discussion in Professor Don Ledingham’s Report presented to Shetland Islands Council on 13
November 2013, about in the future the use of primary teachers to deliver aspects of the
Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 curriculum. The report by the Commission on the Delivery of
Rural Education also recommends that this is developed in the future to secure the
sustainability of small rural secondary schools. Children’s Services will continue to explore
this with the General Teaching Council for Scotland over the coming years, but at present
their position is quite clear and is as follows:

“The Requirements for Teachers (Scotland) Regulations 2005 confirm the need for
education authorities to employ Registered Teachers and emphasise the view of the
Government and of the General Teaching Council that such teachers should have ‘the
appropriate professional skills and knowledge required’ to teach.

Some readers have assumed that this clause can allow registered teachers to teach
subjects outwith their area of subject or sector qualification. GTC Scotland does not share
this view. We believe that it is professionally undesirable for teachers to be employed to
teach a subject (or in a sector) in which they are not registered and that unqualified
teaching could be educationally damaging to children.

Of course, opportunities might be provided to allow a teacher to acquire or develop the 'appropriate professional skills and knowledge required' to teach. This would require continuing professional development and space and time to work together with colleagues to develop suitable expertise and confidence. One mechanism to achieve this might be the Council’s Framework for Professional Registration which allows a teacher to gain registration in an additional subject or for another educational sector. http://www.gtcs.org.uk/registration/professional-registration.aspx

The related but different area of Professional Recognition provides an acknowledgement of specific work undertaken by a teacher in one part of the curriculum or of its assessment.

Finally, GTC Scotland does recognise that emerging curriculum plans have encouraged teachers to engage in cross curricular learning programmes in some schools; and we accept that, where well-planned, these changes can provide benefits to pupils. Indeed, we are aware of schools in which some teachers, with careful planning and appropriate support, have agreed to become involved in the teaching of integrated or project-based units in, for example, the Broad General Education phase of learning. The extent to which this approach might be acceptable would however depend on the qualifications of teachers in that school, the training offered for new course components and the level at which teachers are asked to teach. In general, the more subject specific the content of a course, the more necessary it is that a teacher has suitable qualifications within that specific area.

In summary, therefore, GTC Scotland believes that teachers should be qualified and registered for the sectors and subjects they are teaching. We are pleased to confirm that employers also recognise the need to deploy suitably qualified staff who will normally have a relevant teaching qualification and/or have attained professional recognition or additional registration. These qualifications will provide an assurance to parents and the wider public that teachers have the 'appropriate professional skills and knowledge required' in the subject being taught.

You will find further information on this and the GTC Scotland viewpoint at the following link to our website: http://www.gtcs.org.uk/Registration/Curriculum-for-excellence.aspx

---

**Issue: Removal of Choice**

**Points Made**

- The removal of choice is detrimental academically and socially to children.

- If children do not like the Anderson High School they will no longer have the choice to remain at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. Not everyone likes the Anderson High School.

- If Sandwick Junior High School were to close for Secondary 1 to Secondary 4, and if a child did not adjust to the Anderson High School, the only choice would be Brae High School or home schooling. That is no choice - travelling to Brae from the South Mainland would be ridiculous.

- Previously children could return to a junior high school if they could not cope with
high school and set an equally high standard. This choice will go.

- Should schools become Secondary 1 to Secondary 2, children will have no alternative but to move to the Anderson High School and if they do not enjoy their move or find the change unsuitable, what/where can they go? There is no alternative.

- Some of the children will only be 13 years old - this for some is a very vulnerable time and may be unhappy to leave their school/community and may find the Anderson High School very daunting and hard to adjust to. What happens if they cannot hack the pace? There is no old Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 to return to.

- If a child does not settle at the Anderson High School parents will be forced into home educating.

- This Proposal would increase travel times and leave no choice of education establishment within reasonable travelling distance.

- I worry about the effect transition at the end of Secondary 2 would have on children with additional support needs or others who could not cope with life in a much bigger setting. There is no alternative for them if they still want to get qualifications.

- It is very important to maintain choice in secondary education for children in the South Mainland.

Response

The principal requirement of the local education authority is to provide adequate and efficient education and it must ensure that this education is directed to the development of the personality, talents and mental and physical abilities of the child or young person to their fullest potential.

There is no requirement on an education authority to provide a choice of schools.

In the same way as transitions are planned properly from Primary 7 to Secondary 1 and children do not return to their primary school, transition arrangements will be carefully planned to secure success from Secondary 2 into Secondary 3 in a new setting. Children’s Services already has experience of this type of situation with the support given to children coming from remote isles to access secondary education at the Anderson High School. There is no option for children from the remote isles to return home so particular arrangements are put in place to identify early those who may struggle to make the move, and extra help and support is provided on an individual basis.

Issue: Learning Resources

Points Made

- There are already concerns over capacity of ICT resources and network speed at Anderson High School.
- It is inaccurate to say the Proposal would give children access to further and higher education. Everyone in Shetland has this access now.

- Currently in Shetland teachers cannot resource Curriculum for Excellence courses with textbooks, papers, pencils, ICT and practical demonstrations. Shetland children deserve and have the right to a good education with the correct resources.

- It will be bad for the junior high schools as both the primary and secondary children benefit from the present system with sharing of resources and teachers.

- I fail to see how resources can be shared more than they are now. There will still be the same number of children to educate with a desire to move all resources towards electronic resources locally, nationally and internationally sharing resources becomes much easier.

- If a Common Curriculum is going to be brought in, it must be resourced properly.

**Response**

Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council pointed out in their response that at present they believe all young people have equal access to further education opportunities in Shetland, and that the point made in the Proposal Paper that implementing this Proposal would increase those opportunities is wrong. There is a misunderstanding here of the points made in the Proposal Paper. A fully developed Senior Phase will have access to further education opportunities **built into** Secondary 4, Secondary 5 and Secondary 6, as appropriate. This cannot be achieved equally for all children with our current system of junior highs, but could be workable if our Senior Phase provision was consolidated in one or two settings.

The point itself is wrongly made as well, as currently young people leaving school in places like Unst find it very difficult to access a course at Shetland College compared to someone living in Lerwick, as there is no accommodation available for them.

Children’s Services has not been aware of schools not being able to resource Curriculum for Excellence appropriately. School operating budgets have been reduced, but for the financial year 2013/14 none of our schools were overspent in this area of their budgets.

Children’s Services is not now recommending implementation of this Proposal should it be agreed, until August 2016 or as soon as possible thereafter when the new Anderson High School is open, so the issue raised here about the speed of ICT links in the current Anderson High School is not relevant.
11. Summary of Consultation with Children

Consultation with Sandwick Junior High School Pupils

Points Made

- Generally speaking, most children felt very strongly that Sandwick Junior High School should not change to be a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 department. Some reasons given were that the school would be empty and might shut itself as more children would choose to go straight to the Anderson High School after Primary 7.

- Some children thought that this Proposal would not save money, while others believed that it would. They recognised that additional transport means additional costs and extra time spent on buses, and some were worried about the capacity of the buses.

- A substantial number of children mentioned that the costs of heating the secondary department will remain whether it was Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 or Secondary 1 to Secondary 4.

- A substantial number of children would prefer the complete closure of the secondary department at Sandwick Junior High School rather than see a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 department, and others suggested waiting until the new Anderson High School was built.

- Some children recognised that Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 is a unit and Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 is a unit, so Secondary 3 could be used as a settling in year, and so agree with the Proposal.

- There were questions around the lack of space in general at the current Anderson High School, as well as the lack of canteen space and social space.

- Some children felt that the qualifications results at the current Sandwick secondary department are very good and would be adversely affected. Some stated that Sandwick Junior High School had the best results in Shetland.

- There were some concerns about the losing employment at the Sandwick and at the local shop, and the effects on the community.

- Many children expressed anxieties with regard to making a transition into a bigger school with bigger classes and new teachers with different teaching styles. Many were worried about finding their way around the school.

- Some children expressed concerns that there would be an increased amount of bullying at the Anderson High School compared to Sandwick Junior High School.
Some children wanted to know if they would continue to get the same curriculum and variety of lessons, and wanted at least the same opportunities as at present, including extra-curricular activities.

Some were worried that the amount of additional support would reduce.

Children at both schools were worried about the effects of shared staff. There were some children who felt that many secondary teachers would leave, and that Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 would be taught by primary teachers.

A number of the current Secondary 2 children stated that they would rather move to the Anderson High School now, before any decision is made, than wait until they are at the end of Secondary 3, as they believed that to be a worse time to make the transition.

Some children felt that the closure of these stages of education would lead to fewer resources and poorer equipment.

Several children mentioned that they felt that Shetland Islands Council had misspent its money on the new arts venue, Mareel, when it should be spending on keeping the school open as it is.

Some children felt that there would be less chance for school trips and outings at the Anderson High School compared to Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

Several children were worried about paying a bus fare to get to and from Lerwick.

A substantial number of children stated that they would not mind either way.

One child wanted to know what would happen to the remainder of the classrooms.

Primary 2 children stated that they enjoy being part of a Junior High School, and enjoy seeing secondary children and joining in with their activities.

Primary 3 and Primary 4 children were interested to know if the money being saved was to fund the new Anderson High School. If so, could a smaller Anderson High School be built, allowing the remaining junior high schools to remain as they are? If it is about money, could other departments make savings?

Could the current Anderson High School be sold to bring in money?

There are nine swimming pools in Shetland. Why can't they close some of them down? Schools are more important than swimming.

It might be helpful being at school in Lerwick because of people whose
parents work in town.

- Children are still going to get an education at the Anderson High School.

Response

We can assure everyone that if a child is entitled to school transport, then we must provide this, so there would not be an issue of children not getting on a bus to take them to school as there is no space. School transport is free.

This proposal does save Shetland Islands Council money. The savings are estimated to be £223,530 on an ongoing basis. We are unlikely to save much money on energy costs with this proposal though as the whole of the school building at Sandwick Junior High School would continue to be used.

We have thought carefully about all the concerns expressed about the social space, dining facilities and circulation space at the current Anderson High School. We have also considered concerns expressed about children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department having to make two transitions, one to the old Anderson High School building and then one to the new Anderson High School building only a year later. As a result we will recommend that if councillors agree to Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, that the change happens in August 2016, or as soon as possible after that when the new Anderson High School is open.

Sandwick Junior High School’s attainment results are excellent at Secondary 4, but so are the Anderson High School’s.

Education Scotland, in its report on the Anderson High School published on 28 February 2012, inspectors made the following statement in relation to attainment at the Anderson High School:

“At S4 to S6, young people’s results in national examinations have been consistently above national averages over a number of years. Results are in line with or above those in schools which serve young people with similar needs and backgrounds.”

Sandwick Junior High School will remain open and continue to provide education for pre-school, primary, Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children. Other community users of the school will continue to have access to the all of the current facilities. The removal of two stages in the secondary department would potentially provide some additional space for community use.

The Development Directorate and Children’s Services will engage with the community to assess how the existing use of the school could be utilised to meet community needs. Sandwick has a public hall, a swimming pool (with leisure facilities) and a well-equipped games hall. They are all significant community assets. The school currently makes use of the games hall and the swimming pool and will continue to do so if the secondary department is reduced by two year group stages.
The majority of existing employment opportunities, with the exception of some secondary teachers and some support staff will remain as the school will continue to provide pre-school, primary and early secondary education. All secondary children from the area including Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children would be transported home each night and would be able to remain in their local communities and attend local leisure facilities, clubs and events.

The Anderson High School staff are very experienced at supporting children to make a change and come to their school. They do this work every year for all their Primary 7 children becoming Secondary 1 children. Some of these children come to the Anderson High School from very small primaries. They also take Secondary 4 children in from all the junior highs each year for them to start Secondary 5. They know how to help children who are feeling overwhelmed or lost.

The Anderson High School has an anti-bullying policy. All reported incidents of bullying are treated seriously and are followed up.

Children’s Services are working with secondary head teachers to ensure the curriculum our secondary aged children experience is common across all schools. There is a very wide range of extra-curricular activities on offer at the Anderson High School with many of these taking place at lunchtime as a large number of existing children at the Anderson High School travel there daily on school transport.

Support for children with additional support needs is allocated to where children with needs are being educated. Enough support is provided whichever school they attend.

Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department would continue to be taught by qualified secondary teachers.

Transition whenever it takes place would be carefully planned. The Anderson High School is very experienced in making transitions work. They transferred all of the children from Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department successfully. This was done in three months and the children were all at different stages of their education.

All the resources required to deliver Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 education in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department will be left.

Two thirds of the money from the new Anderson High School is coming from a grant from the Scottish Government. Shetland Islands Council is funding the rest. This will be capital money which is different from revenue spending. Revenue spending is the money services receive each and every year to pay for what they do. Savings in schools means that the Council gives us less money to start with the following year to pay for everything as we have shown we need less.

If the existing Anderson High School was sold the money goes back to Shetland Islands Council to use for capital spending. It does not come back to Children’s Services to use for education.

Closing swimming pools can’t help Children’s Services as the swimming pools are run by Shetland Recreational Trust not by Shetland Islands Council.
If we made Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school then there would be proper planning of the sharing of staff. Staff would have to move around still, but the splitting of classes would be kept to a very minimum. More of this is happening just now as teachers are only freed up for blocks of time in a week, rather than regular parts of each day of each week.

Consultation with Anderson High School Pupils
Consultation took place with the Student Representative Council

Points Made:

- Computers and Laptop equipment in schools is very old and slow.
- How much bigger would the school get? The corridors are packed already. There is no space for break-times and lunchtimes at moment without adding more children.
- What is the sustainability of a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school?
- Parents would be more likely to put their children to the Anderson High School rather than put them to a Junior High School for two years.
- Will the new school be able to handle the numbers of all the Junior High School Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 children?
- We would not mind new children coming to the Anderson but the Secondary 2 year at the Anderson is a big year group, so adding more children it will make it really big classes.
- Don’t think it would be sense to do it now. They should wait until the new Anderson High is built and then there will be no problems with overcrowding.
- If they close schools, would we get our teachers back who have to move around?
- If teachers are shared it makes it difficult for children. If children do not understand want they are given to do they have to wait a whole week as some subject teachers are only in once a week.
- Children at the Anderson High School who had had the experience of moving from Scalloway Junior High School when it closed felt that it would have been better if they had mixed into the current classes at the Anderson High School rather than been allocated separate classes.
- It was better when the Shetland Islands Council was looking at actually closing schools because now they are looking at Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 schools parents are just putting in placing requests. It seems as if it has all backfired on Shetland Islands Council as the schools will close themselves.
Response

We have thought carefully about all the concerns expressed about the social space, dining facilities and circulation space at the current Anderson High School. We have also considered concerns expressed about children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department having to make two transitions, one to the old Anderson High School building and then one to the new Anderson High School building only a year later. As a result we will recommend that if councillors agree to Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, that the change happens in August 2016, or as soon as possible after that when the new Anderson High School is open.

If we made Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school then there would be proper planning of the sharing of staff. Staff would have to move around still, but the splitting of classes would be kept to a very minimum. More of this is happening just now as teachers are only freed up for blocks of time, rather than regular parts of each day of each week.

The timescale for the implementation of this Proposal would allow us to ensure that all children moving from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department could be properly integrated into the Anderson High School classes.

The Strategy for Secondary Education was agreed in November 2013, and as well as Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 as proposals for the future of our smaller junior highs, councillors asked us to give consideration to this way forward for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and Aith Junior High School Secondary Department as well.

12. Summary of Consultation with Staff

Meeting with Sandwick Junior High School Staff

Points Made

School Transport

- Will children wear seat belts on buses?

Staff Travel

- The proposed system is too complicated and a bureaucratic nightmare. You would need to minimise the number of staff in a department who have to travel. There is a big difference between one or two teachers travelling round to the vast majority travelling. The impact will be huge.
- This proposal will create a big increase in teachers’ travelling.

Relationships and Ethos

- You will rip the ethos out of the school.
- It will be very difficult to create positive relationships and ethos if teachers move from school to school. It will also be difficult to manage any bullying issues.
Quality of Education

- Are children who moved into Secondary 5 at the Anderson High School happy with their education?
- Senior Phase is a three-year programme with a menu of opportunities. Smaller schools can be more flexible and tailored than a bigger school.
- The documentation does not show the reality of how this would work. It just outlines benefits and not the negatives.
- The impact of big lumps of curriculum input in one subject twice a week, instead of little and often, will be felt by less able children.

Staffing

- This model could lead to major recruitment problems as it is not attractive to teachers. Teachers will also leave if workloads are too big.
- After school activities will be dropped as teachers will not be based here.
- Staff will become de-skilled.
- Staff will be rotated to high schools to allow them to teach qualifications. This will bring more teachers in.

Timetabling

- There will be fewer secondary teachers in junior high schools so primary teachers will teach up to Secondary 2, without the experience.
- More staff would be part-time in this model. How then, would communication, workload, and the feeling of belonging somewhere be managed?
- Timetabling will be very complicated with so many variables.

Transitions

- Two transitions are not acceptable for a child.
- There will be a Secondary 3 class which will have to move. Will there be meetings with staff and their peers at the Anderson High School?
- Can guidelines on transition be drawn up to prevent placing requests?

Finance

- This is proposing a huge change for half of a percent of the education budget. Surely that amount could be found from the education budget with less impact.
- How much of the money will be pulled back into the education budget from the sale of the Anderson High School or any closure? Money should go back into education.
- Is Shetland Islands Council going to provide extra money from the budget to pay for the shortfall of savings from this model, or is education expected to find the savings?
- The choices are: a lesser school Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 or the status quo. Savings will still be required from elsewhere as these are nowhere near what is required.
- The savings may not add up as expense of travelling teachers – difficult to work out. How will this save money if you still have the same staff?

Health and Wellbeing

- Lunch catering for the children is good at Sandwick Junior High School: plenty of space, quality of food, Smartcards, speed of service. At the Anderson High School it takes time to serve; there limited areas to eat, so children go to the street to eat junk food.
- Children will be at higher risk of obesity, Type 2 Diabetes. Long-term there is a potential health crisis with this Proposal.
- Children’s mental health is another issue. This change may have an impact on some children. Sandwick Junior High School is good at supporting children.
- I am worried about the process taking so long and affecting the health and wellbeing of central service staff and teachers.

General Points
- Lots of parents will put in placing requests out of Sandwick Junior High School and that might lead to the closure of the whole Secondary Department.
- Why was Brae High School chosen as a High School and not Sandwick Junior High School?
- Who planned the layout of the new Anderson High School? There is no staff room.
- Could the decision to go to Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 be reversed if it did not work?
- Is the reason why parents put in placing requests recorded? The reason is because there is uncertainty around the future of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.
- Why are we not waiting for new Anderson High School to be built, before making this Proposal?
- Time spent on talking about this and on staff moving round takes time away from teaching. We should be taking on new developments.

Response

The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment) (Number 2) Regulation 1996 (Statutory Instrument Number 1996/163) - require coaches and mini-buses to be fitted with seat belts when carrying three or more children, aged from 3 to under sixteen. A forward facing seat fitted with a minimum of a lap belt must be available to every child. Although there is no legal responsibility on the driver to ensure that belts are worn, Shetland Islands Council, within their terms and conditions for school transport require drivers to use their best endeavours to ensure that seatbelts are worn by children.

The number of staff who would have to travel is commensurate with the number of staff who we may have who are dual qualified, the number who work part-time, and the number who may wish to work all of their hours in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school.

Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department as a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will have key staff who are there all the time: the head teacher and two principal teachers.

We do not have any evidence to suggest that children who transfer after Secondary 4 to the Anderson High School are unhappy. Pupil Support teachers across Shetland have an established calendar of liaison to share information about children transferring to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 4. Thereafter, Anderson High School Pupil Support teachers monitor the progress of all Anderson High School children, and are the first point of contact for any child or parental concerns. All issues of concern raised by a child or a parent regarding the
education they are receiving is taken seriously by staff at the Anderson High School and dealt with appropriately. Evidence suggests that those who move into Anderson High School are no more likely to raise a concern than those children who have been in Anderson High School for four years.

Small secondary departments cannot be flexible in what they offer in the Senior Phase. They can only offer Scottish Qualifications Authority courses up to National 5, and they can only offer courses delivered over one year. Children cannot bypass lower level qualifications in a junior high set up.

Children’s Services has written a Proposal Paper for the proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 requires local authorities, in putting forward a proposal which fits under this Act, to explain what the educational benefits of the proposal are. In writing a proposal which has been agreed, the education authority must have a rationale for arguing to move forward with that proposal.

There are no plans to deliver the curriculum in lumps with this proposal. There will be a properly planned timetable put in place which allows delivery of the curriculum in the way it is done currently.

If the existing Anderson High School was sold the money goes back to Shetland Islands Council to use for capital spending. It does not come back to Children’s Services to use for education.

The savings outlined for the proposal include an estimated total for the teaching staff time lost through travel, which is approximately 1.8 full-time equivalents and also the mileage costs incurred.

There are no plans to reduce the number of classes taught by specialist teachers in junior high schools if they were to become Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 schools. There was discussion in Professor Don Ledingham’s Report presented to Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013, about in the future the use of primary teachers to deliver aspects of the Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 curriculum. The report by the Commission on the Delivery of Rural Education also recommends that this is developed in the future to secure the sustainability of small rural secondary schools. Children’s Services will continue to explore this with the General Teaching Council for Scotland over the coming years, but at present their position is quite clear and is as follows:

“The Requirements for Teachers (Scotland) Regulations 2005 confirm the need for education authorities to employ Registered Teachers and emphasise the view of the Government and of the General Teaching Council that such teachers should have ‘the appropriate professional skills and knowledge required’ to teach.

Some readers have assumed that this clause can allow registered teachers to teach subjects outwith their area of subject or sector qualification. GTC Scotland does not share this view. We believe that it is professionally undesirable for teachers to be employed to teach a subject (or in a sector) in which they are not registered and that unqualified teaching could be educationally damaging to children.

Of course, opportunities might be provided to allow a teacher to acquire or develop
the ‘appropriate professional skills and knowledge required’ to teach. This would require continuing professional development and space and time to work together with colleagues to develop suitable expertise and confidence. One mechanism to achieve this might be the Council’s Framework for Professional Registration which allows a teacher to gain registration in an additional subject or for another educational sector.  

http://www.gtcs.org.uk/registration/professional-registration.aspx  

The related but different area of Professional Recognition provides an acknowledgement of specific work undertaken by a teacher in one part of the curriculum or of its assessment.

Finally, GTC Scotland does recognise that emerging curriculum plans have encouraged teachers to engage in cross curricular learning programmes in some schools; and we accept that, where well-planned, these changes can provide benefits to pupils. Indeed, we are aware of schools in which some teachers, with careful planning and appropriate support, have agreed to become involved in the teaching of integrated or project-based units in, for example, the Broad General Education phase of learning. The extent to which this approach might be acceptable would however depend on the qualifications of teachers in that school, the training offered for new course components and the level at which teachers are asked to teach. In general, the more subject specific the content of a course, the more necessary it is that a teacher has suitable qualifications within that specific area.

In summary, therefore, GTC Scotland believes that teachers should be qualified and registered for the sectors and subjects they are teaching. We are pleased to confirm that employers also recognise the need to deploy suitably qualified staff who will normally have a relevant teaching qualification and/or have attained professional recognition or additional registration. These qualifications will provide an assurance to parents and the wider public that teachers have the ‘appropriate professional skills and knowledge required’ in the subject being taught.

You will find further information on this and the GTC Scotland viewpoint at the following link to our website: http://www.gtcs.org.uk/Registration/Curriculum-for-excellence.aspx

Issues around workload and communication for staff working across settings would have to be managed through a properly negotiated Working time Agreement. The Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers has a joint agreement on working time for peripatetic staff. In June 2013, the Executive Manager, Quality Improvement consulted the Joint Secretary for the Union Side of the Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers as to whether this Agreement was robust enough to deal with the new sharing arrangements we were putting in place. The feedback at that time was that it was fit for this purpose.

Timetabling will be complicated and would have to be done centrally for these arrangements to be most cost effective.

Two transitions in secondary is not desirable. Children’s Services would like to have none, and have wherever possible, secondary provision which is Secondary 1 to Secondary 6. If the proposal is accepted then a Transition Group would be set up immediately to plan appropriate transitions for all affected children. We have used this system in the past for schools which are closing and it works very well to
ensure the views of parents and children are listened to, and acted upon.

The proposals which came out of the Strategy for Education Report, plus the existing primary school closure proposals will leave us an estimated shortfall in our savings requirement of approximately £1.1 million. Children’s Services has been instructed to report on this shortfall once all the proposals are worked through. We will have to present options for how that shortfall can be met, and then it will be up to councillors to decide where it should be found from. This would include the option of looking outwith Children’s Services.

The Anderson High School has carefully managed arrangements to ensure all children who wish it can have a lunch choice from the school canteen, which operates to the exactly the same nutritional standards as all other school canteens including Sandwick Junior High School. The Anderson High School operates a four-way staggered lunchtime, to ensure all year groups get fed. The school monitored the length of queues over the winter. The longest queues were on Thursdays; with some older children waiting up to 15 minutes for their fish and chips choice (other choices were served more quickly). This still allowed for 30 minutes to sit and eat. The school monitored the number of choices still available at the end of lunchtime sales. The catering and school management staff are satisfied that even if you arrive very late for lunch, a choice is available.

We know that Sandwick Junior High School provides high quality support to the children who attend school there. So does the Anderson High School. The following is an extract from Education Scotland’s report on the Anderson High School published on 28 February 2012:

*The highly skilled pupil support team and support for learning staff identify young people’s learning, social and behavioural needs very well. They provide very useful information to class teachers to help them support young people’s learning. ASN staff, including support assistants, work well with young people throughout the school. Very effective additional support is provided to young people and their families through effective partnerships with staff from partner agencies. As a result of these successful approaches, those who require support are making very good progress and achieve well.”*

Brae High School became a Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 school in 1993, and this move was led by the head teacher of Brae Junior High School at the time, who argued successfully that it was the right way forward for Shetland. As far as we are aware no other junior high school at that time wished to expand their provision.

There is no staff room in the new Anderson High School as the consensus has been to provide department resource bases.

If there was a decision to implement Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 education in Sandwick Junior High School, this decision could be changed again in the future, through another statutory consultation process.

We now ask parents to put in the reasons why they have submitted a placing request. We cannot prevent parents from putting in placing requests. This parental choice is in legislation.

We have thought carefully about all the concerns expressed about the social space, dining facilities and circulation space at the current Anderson High School.
We have also considered concerns expressed about children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department having to make two transitions, one to the old Anderson High School building and then one to the new Anderson High School building only a year later. As a result we will recommend that if councillors agree to Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, that the change happens in August 2016, and as soon as possible after that when the new Anderson High School is open.

We appreciate the time and efforts staff have put into responding to this proposal. We know it is time consuming and causes a great deal of anxiety and uncertainty. There is a support service available to staff who need it, and head teachers have all the details of this. We have to go through these difficult processes to find a way forward for secondary education in Shetland. The current system we have cannot secure the fullest implementation of Curriculum for Excellence for all our young people and we must change that.

Meeting with Anderson High School Staff

Points Made

Staffing and Timetabling

- This is inefficient use of staff, with time lost for travelling.
- There is nothing in teachers’ contracts that says that they have to have a car and be able to drive.
- In the Western Isles there is a huge infrastructure in place for staff travel. There is not that level of support here.
- Experience shows that sharing staff does not work.
- What happens if a teacher cannot get to a school because, for example their car breaks down.
- Will staff need to travel in their lunch break?
- Where are the savings? Is it up for debate who travels?
- It takes a lot of travel time that could be used for extraordinary meetings.
- Who will travel to Yell and Unst?
- The continuity of teaching will be affected by travelling teachers.
- Who covers classes for maternity and sickness absence?
- Internal cover will be difficult to provide.
- This Proposal will affect staff recruitment.
- It is not possible to have those who teach senior classes (Secondary 5 and Secondary 6) to travel and not end up sharing classes because of timetable
constraints.

- Teaching time will be lost travelling between schools.
- Everybody will become a part-time teacher from an individual school’s point of view.
- You cannot make teaching staff redundant.
- More people might take voluntary redundancy this time.
- If the idea to make it fairer is to have staff moving between schools, that is horrific.
- Good young staff will look to work elsewhere.
- To quote: “All teachers should gain experience in delivering the full range of qualifications, from National 1 to Advanced Higher and Baccalaureates”. I think you’re playing a dangerous game here, and it is too important to be making things up.
- You should encourage teachers to have dual qualifications, but even if they do, they will still not be at the same school all week.
- Who leads decisions on which staff will travel?

Relationships and Ethos

- Schools would turn into an outpost where teachers come to deliver classes, not a school.
- Such arrangements will affect staff morale and the development of a school ethos.

Quality of Education

- If you take staff away from a high achieving school and put them into a small school elsewhere, this will affect education at Anderson High School.
- Who is responsible for the teaching at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department? Who is in charge? What happens as a Principal Teacher?
- The Anderson High School is a better school than the Nicolson Institute.
- Teachers want to take same children through Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 classes, and Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 because of National 4 and National 5 preparation work.
- This Proposal could have a destructive effect on the Anderson High School. The Anderson High School serves children from all over Shetland.
- You should consider staff from Brae High School sharing with Baltasound
Junior High School and Mid Yell Junior High School.

- It is difficult to discuss children’s progress with a member of staff who may be in a different school.

- All of the arguments that were made here, for the benefits of Secondary 1 to Secondary 2, apply equally, in fact, even more so, for a child at the end of Primary 7.

- Can you tell me that every child in Shetland doing a particular subject is being taught by a specialist in that subject?

- Where are the benefits to the children here? They will be lucky if they get the same teacher for two days a week, because everybody is running around everywhere. There is no stability. Think of the impact on learning.

- What about all the other problems, such as children coming in at lunchtime or after school to finish off assignments. You would be leaving Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to come up to the Anderson High School so you cannot chase that child up at lunchtime, or offer them extra help or support. That is a massive issue.

- How would parents’ evenings be scheduled?

- The current sharing model is worse even than this Proposal.

- What happens if a child or parent has a problem? Any issues could take days to resolve.

Extra Curricular Activities

- There will be no time for extracurricular activities.

- There will be no time for lunchtime support.

Community Concerns

- The only community this impacts on is Sandwick. Moving children from Cunningsburgh to Sandwick does not keep them in Cunningsburgh. This community thing is a nonsense.

Financial Issues

- There is no money to do anything at all. Practical subjects don’t have any equipment. There are no materials for demonstrations. We just have to show a video. I have a projector and screen, but it is just a glorified and very expensive overhead projector and that money could have been spent doing something else.

Health and Wellbeing

- Travelling between schools causes stress.
• We are being asked to do a job that has become so difficult, that there is masses of stress.

• This is not at all looking after the welfare of staff. If you look at the people currently travelling between schools, it is not working.

• The only reason we are not all off with stress is that teachers are thinking of children.

• It is as if we are a sausage factory, with an input and an output. We are people.

• What would happen if next year, all the teachers currently travelling between schools, who are finding horrifically hard to do that job, if they were to all go to the Council Welfare Officer and said that, for the sake of their mental health, they could not continue to do that job. If they all did that, would that be enough for the councillors to listen? I think that is where we are heading. I am just really concerned about the welfare of staff.

Council Decisions

• Shetland Islands Council just divvies up the savings without any thought to the impact on service. They should have thought about it.

• I cannot understand how this decision was passed in Chamber.

• Shetland Islands Council has the wrong starting point.

• Did the councillors just look at Professor Don Ledingham’s report and then make their own choices anyway?

• You do start to feel like it is a paper exercise, just another box to be ticked.

• What would it have taken for you to turn to councillors and say that there are no benefits to this and we cannot come up with any?

• Where is Brae High School in all of this? It should be included.

• It was wrong of Shetland Islands Council to demand this saving without looking at how it affects the service. It is not the norm in Scotland.

• Unfortunately councillors don’t understand how a school works. Our voice does not seem to get listened to.

• Over the last 25 years, the number of employees in Shetland Islands Council has grown by 1000. I would think we could function reasonably well if the bulk of those posts did not exist. We did before. I do not know how many of those have been in schools but I bet you there are no more teachers than there were.

• The solution is to close the junior high schools.
We are not ever allowed to speak. We are not allowed to express our views, because we are Shetland Islands Council employees.

We expressed all our views very, very clearly, and we could not believe this is what came out of it.

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to be consulted, but it doesn't feel like it will be taken on board.

Instead of writing up something like this, you could have asked the councillors who dreamt this up to sit down and discuss it rationally?

When will Children’s Services explain to councillors what impact this travelling between schools is having on staff and on the children?

Teachers are not here today because they are trying to catch up with kids preparing for assessments, just to survive.

They feel they are drowning in consultation.

Our experience is we have done so many consultations and never been listened to.

If, as looks likely, Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department parents vote with their feet and send their kids here, does there come a point where you think about closure again? What is the critical number?

I think that it represents an erosion of the service. Shetland education going down the tubes.

I imagine you will not have had a single positive comment about this model so far. You would hope with that wealth of information councillors will make the right decision.

I expect you have had 95% of responses disagreeing with this so surely with that level of feeling against it, that becomes the recommendation in the Consultation Report?

It is absolutely shocking that everyone’s time is being wasted.

And if councillors decide not to do this, how long then until they decide what to do next?

How big is Brae High School? It must be smaller than Sandwick Junior High School? It should be considered in the same way as other junior high schools.

Is this model happening elsewhere?

If I was a parent who lived in Quarff or Cunningsburgh, why would I send my child to Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department for two years?
• Children know what a teacher’s job is actually like, but obviously those who came up with this model don’t.

Equality of Provision and Class Sizes

• You will have junior high schools where a big class could be in single figures. That seems a bit unfair.

• In music, we’re now up to 33 in a first year class. If you have got 33 in a class, you cannot do Performance: for health and safety reasons and for noise levels. You cannot then prepare them for National 5 in Secondary 4. They cannot possibly get to the stage where they need to be, on two instruments.

• We are being told that we need to have minimum numbers for a course to run. Why does that only apply to our school?

• Parity seems to be a sort of one way system. All I was told was the eight was not enough for a Higher class.

• It comes down to this equality – everybody else is equal except us.

• This school has fought against it but from August 2014 we will move to a maximum class size of 33, and I don’t think the public are aware of that. That is for computing, PE, and music.

• If we have full size classes, and we have first years for just one period, on average you’ll be getting less than a minute and half per child.

• You are doing things like moving to maximum numbers on classes that are considered non-practical, having far more shared classes than there’s even been before. It is not good educationally.

• The ratio of teachers to children in junior high schools has become increasingly disparate from the ratio in this school. I think the difference in job between a teacher in a high school or a teacher in a junior high school has never been larger, because one of the biggest demands on us just now is the burden of internal assessment, which rises with the number of children.

• Can I just ask where the decision to go to maximum class sizes in classes like music came from? Why has it suddenly been implemented locally?

• Nowhere else is doing this, apart from Aberdeen, and Aberdeen are now in a situation where there are certain schools that just aren’t doing music at all.

• The other thing to consider is that this probably will not impact on Brae High School. It is only going to impact here, because Anderson High School is the only school big enough to be hit by it.

Timing of Proposal

• In music, we had practical exams last Friday, and all of last week, and the Music Festival to prepare for. I came here as quickly as I could, but I was
late because I was so busy. The two choices I was given clashed against Scottish Qualifications Authority final exams and preparation for the Festival.

- You can record that the teachers who were at the meeting made a monumental effort to attend.

School Capacity

- There is no more space in the current Anderson High School. Taking more children in will create a health and safety issue.

Other Points

- Who will be responsible for buying books?
- Where will Pupil Support be based?
- Could we have children enrolling this summer?

Response

Our system of junior highs was allowed to develop in the late 1980s and early 1990s to a broad curriculum so that children could remain in their junior high up to the end of Secondary 4. As the basis of the staffing required for a secondary department is the curriculum on offer, this led to an increase in staffing. Some of our junior highs, then and now, have a very small roll in the secondary, with numbers in year groups which do not create anywhere near a maximum class size. In addition, schools were not Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 so full-time members of staff, particularly those only qualified in one subject could never be fully deployed in a junior high. Timetables could be filled but this would be through having very small class sizes and splitting already small year groups; and being used to enhance the curriculum in the primary and nursery departments.

With the significant levels of savings required to be found by Children’s services since 2012, Children’s Services has been working hard to look at how efficiencies in secondary staffing can be made without impacting on the service offered in schools. In discussion with relevant head teachers in 2012, it was agreed that where a full-time member of staff was employed in a school, but less than full-time was required, that head teachers would timetable the required classes for that member of staff over fewer days so their available time could be sensibly deployed into another school. We also agreed that there would be no splitting of classes unless the nationally set class size maximums were breached.

As a result of this work, in advance of the school session 2013/14 Children’s Services reduced the secondary teaching staffing complement by 13.4 full-time equivalents. This was achieved by supporting the voluntary exits of staff who wished to go and using the identified capacity to fill the required vacancies. This has been done as carefully as is possible. However there are drawbacks to current arrangements. Most significantly our schools, for a variety of reasons, some connected to school transport, do not have a common school day, so start times, finish times and lunchtimes do not match. As time is bunched up into blocks in a week it does lead then in some cases
to classes being split. This is not ideal and due to our previous generous staffing levels in secondary is not a situation staff, parents and children are used to.

Children’s Services will continue to work with head teachers and the Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers on sharing arrangements, and through school working time agreements, ensure that appropriate time is allocated collegiate activities to each school who shares a particular teacher.

The claim that sharing staff between Sandwick Junior High School and Anderson High School, if Sandwick Junior High Secondary Department were a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 School, would make the sharing of staff worse is not true.

If this proposal was agreed, a planned coherent timetable would be agreed which married up the two schools’ requirements. Classes would then not be split. A teacher might have the Secondary 1 class on their timetable in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and their Secondary 3 class might be at the Anderson High School. The drawback with this however, is that inevitably to achieve this, staff will have to travel between the two schools on a daily basis. Travel time, in accordance with the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers comes out of teacher-contact time, which creates some inefficiency. However, this does not come close to the inefficiencies we still currently have in staffing in our secondary provision, where we have staff who cannot be fully utilised due to the logistics of where our schools are, and where the classes they do teach are still very small. In 2013/14 the average class size in our junior highs for non-practical subjects where the national maximums are 33 in Secondary 1 and Secondary 2, and 30 for Secondary 3 and up, ranged from four to 15 children.

Staff in particular, were also concerned that such arrangements would lead to low morale and difficulties in recruitment and retention of teachers. Sharing staff in a coherent planned way would ensure that all staff, if they wanted, had the opportunity to teach certificate classes. In many of our previous discussions with the teaching unions, they have articulated to us, how important it is for their members who are secondary qualified to be able to teach qualifications. This concern also brings us back to the Best Value argument, and our school estate. If it is critical to staffing our schools, that teachers only work in one setting, then the junior high system is not a system which can be supported any longer. With the inefficiencies it creates in staffing, it cannot deliver Best Value for Children’s Services and for Shetland Islands Council. In the past Shetland Islands Council had the resources to support these arrangements. It no longer has these resources.

In March 2013 our Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers, agreed jointly A Transfer Agreement for teachers. The introduction to the joint Agreement makes the following statement: “Both the Council and recognised trade unions are committed to maintaining sustainable teaching posts across Shetland’s schools...” Local authorities in Scotland have no appetite with pursuing compulsory redundancies for teachers, as they are aware that teachers will strike if this policy is pursued. As a result local authorities, including Shetland Islands Council works very hard to manage any required reductions in staffing through voluntary means. The down-side of this position, is that where there is not full-time work any longer and we have a full-time member of staff, is that there is a risk they will be subject to transfer for part of their working week. With Children’s Services facing the requirement to find a further £3.268 million of savings by March 2017, it must demonstrate Best Value as far as is possible in its use of resources.
Staff would not have to travel in their lunch break. In addition, the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers requires that teacher travel which occurs during the school day is counted as contact time, so if there was an occasion when this happened it would be a requirement to pay this time back out of overall contact time.

The savings in the proposal mostly derive from efficiencies in timetabling of staff despite the additional travel.

It is likely that timetabling will have to be co-ordinated centrally so that a partnership between head teachers and central staff will work out from year to year who travels.

Our junior highs achieve high quality results as well as the Anderson High School.

Planned staffing arrangements for a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school will include a non-teaching head teacher and at least one principal teacher with 0.5 full-time equivalent management time. Sandwick Junior High School would have two. These would be fixed permanent members of staff who are in Sandwick Junior High School all of the week. The secondary roll for Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 in Sandwick Junior High School in 2015/16 is estimated to be 65 children. This number is small enough for each child to be known well to one of these key staff, who will be able to provide them with any support required.

We endeavour to ensure all children in secondary education in Shetland are taught by suitably qualified staff. In some of our smaller remoter junior highs this is particularly difficult to maintain, as recruitment to posts is sometimes very difficult. This can have a particularly detrimental effect where we have single teacher departments.

Parents’ evenings would be planned according to working time guidelines. In a planned coherent timetable, teachers’ sharing classes will be kept to a minimum.

Children’s Services has not been aware of schools not being able to resource Curriculum for Excellence appropriately. School operating budgets have been reduced, but for the financial year 2013/14 none of our schools were overspent in this area of their budgets.

This decision was not a recommendation of the Strategy for Secondary Education Report which was put forward to Education and Families Committee and Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013. Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 was recommended for Whalsay School, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School only. An amendment put forward on 13 November 2013, instructed Children’s Services to progress this proposal for Aith Junior High School Secondary Department and Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

Officers can only advise councillors if they are asked to provide advice.

Brae High School is not being considered in these proposals currently as, like the Anderson High School, it provides the desired model for secondary education in Curriculum for Excellence as it is Secondary 1 to Secondary 6. It would not be feasible for daily travel to the Anderson High School for children who attend Brae High School from some parts of its catchment area to be achieved within the agreed maximum daily single journey time of 65 minutes for a secondary-aged child.
Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 schools is not the norm in Scotland, but neither are Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 schools. Children’s Services want, wherever possible to deliver secondary education in Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 schools. Anything else is a compromise which has to be justified on educational grounds.

With respect to the number of employees Shetland Islands Council has, and the possibility of looking there for savings, the following information is provided. The Staffing Watch information which is gathered monthly by Shetland Islands Council demonstrates that in March 2001 Shetland Islands Council employed 2217 full-time equivalents. This rose as far as 2854 full-time equivalents in December 2010. In December 2013, the figure had fallen again to 2338.5 full-time equivalents, a reduction of 515.5 full-time equivalents in three years.

The figures for teachers tell us that in April 2001 we employed 386. This reached a high point of 419 in February 2011, and in December 2013 had fallen to 348. This is a reduction of 71 teachers in less than three years.

There are no 1000 additional posts to look for savings in. Posts have been cut across Shetland Islands Council particularly in the past three years, to meet the required budget savings.

We do not have a critical number of children in a secondary school when closure would be considered. We currently provide secondary education to 20 children in Baltasound Junior High School. We put forward a proposal to go to statutory consultation on the closure of Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department on 20 September 2012. This was rejected by councillors.

Our agreed approaches to timetabling, and the organisation of classes applies to all schools and was issued in 2012. We must demonstrate most effective use of teaching staff who are a very important, expensive resource. If we are employing someone full-time we expect them to work full-time, in return for their full-time salary. We do not have the critical mass of children in our junior highs to make absolute best use of staff, which is why we have introduced more sharing, and it is one of the reasons why secondary education in Shetland is so expensive. And we have to address this.

The school which has the children gets the money for buying resources.

A number of issues regarding the capacity of the existing Anderson High School to accommodate an additional approximately 80 children were raised during the statutory consultation period. These centred around: the availability of social space; the flows of children between lessons and at break-times and lunchtimes; and the availability of facilities. All concerned understand that there is classroom space available.

Children’s Services has already begun working with the management of the Anderson High School to look at how these concerns could be alleviated and this work has led to us to consider that should this proposal be implemented that the transfer date for children should be amended to August 2016, or as soon as possible thereafter when the new Anderson High School is open.
13. **Education Scotland’s Report**

13.1 In line with the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, a Report was provided by Education Scotland on the educational aspects of the Proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education in Sandwick Junior High School. This Report is attached as Appendix B.

13.2 This section details the relevant points raised in the Report by Education Scotland and Children’s Services response to these points. Similar points made in different parts of the Education Scotland Report have been grouped together for ease of reference.

### Relevant Points

**A significant number of parents of children and young people at Sandwick Junior High School felt that the current proposal had not been sufficiently well considered by the council. They felt that there had been insufficient informal consultation around the current proposal. They were unclear as to why the proposal to discontinue with S3 and S4 over any other of the previous suggestions became the model taken forward for formal consultation.**

However, despite comprehensive consultation, it appears that the current proposal was unexpected and that the council did not undertake the same level of informal consultation as it had with other options. It is not clear to HM Inspectors that the current proposal is the most viable or reasonable option. In its final consultation report, the council will need to explain why it believes this to be the case.

However, in the consultation proposal, the council has not set out a convincing case that the discontinuation of S3 and S4 at Sandwick High School is the most reasonable and viable option and will deliver clear educational benefits for the children and young people directly affected by it.

*In taking forward the proposal, the council needs to explain clearly why it believes the current proposal is the most reasonable and viable option open to it.*

### Response

The current proposal for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department came forward as an amendment to the recommendations put forward in the Strategy for Secondary Education Report presented to Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013. The work done to prepare the Strategy for Secondary Education Report was undertaken between September and October 2013. Children’s Services were instructed to carry out detailed work on five alternative options for the future of secondary education in Shetland. These were:

- maintaining the current school estate but making the financial savings required within that provision;
- existing Blueprint proposals for secondary (with and without the inclusion of Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department);
• The Next Steps model, with transfer at the end of Secondary 3 for Whalsay School, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School;
• a Hub and Spoke model; and
• a Telepresence model.

The following extract is taken from the Recommendations section of the Strategy for Secondary Education Report, which was written by Professor Don Ledingham:

“Within a six-week period the options have been fleshed out, details and figures collated and checked and an extensive round of consultation meetings arranged with all stakeholders. In my experience this has exceeded the norm in other areas of Scotland.

As is always the case in consultation exercises there were concerns expressed about the number and location of events, but I would assert that it was very extensive.

Inevitably where proposals directly impact upon the possible closure of schools it is very difficult to remain objective. Communities in Shetland, in common with other areas of Scotland, are wary of any change to the status quo and tend to see it as the ‘thin end of the wedge’ in terms of community decay.

Nevertheless, the consultation exercise did highlight a number of areas where there was consistent consensus from all groups.

This consensus was particularly strong in relation to the aforementioned focus on ensuring that Shetland was able to offer a high quality education for all young people.

Local communities were strongly opposed to closure of their own school, although it was noticeable how few people from other areas expressed an opinion to keep schools from other areas open.

There was little support for the Telepresence option as described in the report, although there was recognition that digital access could have an important role in enhancing the delivery of education, if not replacing the current system.

There was a strong feeling from the majority of respondents that the transition at the end of Secondary 3 was not appropriate.

Respondents did not appear to fully engage with the financial reality of the current situation, or the future viability of delivery models. There was a feeling that money should be found from elsewhere in the Council’s budget, or to simply say that the savings should not be made in education.

Both of these responses, although understandable, ignore the underlying challenge facing the Council and also the potential damage that could arise by failing to take the necessary decisions to protect the long-term sustainability of education in Shetland.

Given the impossibility of ever reaching a consensus about the future of education
in Shetland it is necessary to make difficult decisions in the short-term in order to protect the quality of service in the long-term.

The recommendations made in this report recognises the value which local communities attach to their local schools. In that regard they support the notion of local primary education wherever possible. However, compromises must be made if the exciting vision described in the five scenarios is to be achieved.

This is the balance that must be borne in mind when making difficult decisions about the future. The status quo is quite clearly not an option and any half measures may only serve to put off the inevitable – but with systemic damage being inflicted in the intervening period. It is also worth reflecting upon the circumstances in other education authorities where the education budget has gone out of control. Within the last ten years a Council experienced an unexpected education overspend which went into millions of pounds. As a consequence, services and schools had to be removed, or closed without any public consultation. The fear exists throughout Scotland, that without planned and coherent schemes for reducing costs, that circumstances eventually overtake any properly managed process – and an ad hoc series of closures and changes have to be made – with no accompanying improvement in the quality of the service. “

The specific recommendations then follow with the following made for the secondary school estate, including the rationale for the proposed transfer at the end of Secondary 2:

“For the reasons outlined earlier in this section of the report it is necessary to rationalise the delivery of secondary education in Shetland to protect the future high quality outcomes for all of Shetland’s learners.

Another key question that has emerged as a consequence of the consultation process and consideration of the development of the senior phase curriculum has been the notion of the appropriate time for students to transfer from Junior High Schools to High Schools.

Section 6 in the preceding report highlights the advantages of a transfer at the end of Secondary 3 and, also considers the transfer at the end of Secondary 2.

The Howie Report (1992), which looked at the Secondary 5/Secondary 6 curriculum, highlighted the two term dash to Highers as ‘perhaps the most fundamental theme of all — the uneven gradient of difficulty throughout school education’. That steep gradient in Secondary 5 resulted in senior pupils and their teachers having to do too much too quickly and from an unsuitable starting point.

What is very apparent from evolving senior curricular structures in Scotland is that schools are being encouraged to enable their students to commence their Higher course either at the beginning of Secondary 4 or half-way through Secondary 4. This addresses one of the key concerns regarding Higher course delivery, namely that they deteriorate into the ‘two-term dash’. By extending the learning time the opportunities for students to maximise their potential is greatly increased.

As such, any notion of a transfer at the end of Secondary 4 would significantly disadvantage students taking the ‘gold standard’ qualification of Scottish education.
There was very little support for an end of Secondary 3 transfer from any of the consultation respondent groups and I would concur with that conclusion. For that reason I would recommend a transfer to the Anderson High School from Junior High Schools at the end of Secondary 2. The logic and advantages of such a transition are set out in the aforementioned section but the prime factor would be to enable young people to settle into the new learning environment prior to commencing the most important two years of their education in terms of high stakes qualifications.

Actions:

- Children’s Services progresses statutory consultation on the proposed closure of Aith Junior High School Secondary Department according to existing Shetland Islands Council policy with a proposed transfer date for pupils of August 2014;
- Children’s Services progresses with statutory consultation on the proposed closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department according to existing Shetland Islands Council policy with a proposed transfer date for pupils of August 2016 or earlier if the existing Anderson High School can absorb the pupils;
- Children’s Services undertakes statutory consultation during 2014 on the discontinuation of stages of education in Whalsay School Secondary Department, namely Secondary 3 and Secondary 4, with transfer of pupils to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2; to take effect from the start of the school session 2015/16 onwards;
- Children’s Services undertakes statutory consultation during 2014 on the discontinuation of stages of education in Mid Yell Junior High School Secondary Department, namely Secondary 3 and Secondary 4, with transfer of pupils to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2; to take effect from the start of the school session 2015/16 onwards;
- Children’s Services undertakes statutory consultation during 2014 on the discontinuation of stages of education in Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department, namely Secondary 3 and Secondary 4, with transfer of pupils to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2; to take effect from the start of the school session 2015/16 onwards.”

On 13 November 2013 a successful amendment put forward by councillors gave Children’s Services the additional proposals for Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 for Aith Junior High School Secondary Department and Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

Relevant Point

Some reported that a series of questions were submitted by parents in response to the formal consultation document. However, parents reported that the council had not responded in a timely manner which would allow parents to consider them fully prior to the close of the consultation period. Many of the council’s answers were deemed to be insufficient and it was reported that in some cases the council did not respond at all.
Response

We responded to the written questions submitted by Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council as quickly as we could, in keeping with Freedom of Information legislation. They submitted a substantial number of questions, some of which we had to get advice from Legal Services on, as they were not admissible under Freedom of Information legislation. In response to requests to have as much information as we had collected as soon as possible, Children’s Services sent a partially completed response four days in advance of the Freedom of Information deadline for the request. It then sent on the full response on the deadline. We are disappointed then, that Sandwick Junior High School Parent Council have chosen to attach the incomplete response to their submission, suggesting we did not comply correctly with their request. We did, and we did it in the time required. In response to their concerns about the timescale for receiving the information, we also offered to accept a late response from the Parent Council.

The requests for information were logged as Freedom of Information requests. They were responded to in line with this legislation. Among the requests, there were questions asking for subjective opinions, or points of view which are not admissible under Freedom of Information legislation. In line with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, these have been responded to in the Consultation Report.

Relevant Point

Many felt that the uncertainty about the future of the school over a prolonged period of time has led to a great deal of stress and a lowering of morale across the school.

Response

Children’s Services acknowledges this, and is keen to progress with agreed statutory consultations to ensure a future way forward for secondary education in Shetland is clear. Communities in Shetland have been very concerned about some of the proposed changes to secondary provision in the past. The decision making which has then followed on demonstrates that councillors have listened to community concerns and are trying to find a way forward which is acceptable to parents, staff, children and communities; and one which meets the requirements of Curriculum for Excellence.

Relevant Points

They [Parents] felt that the council has not made a case for the educational benefits for young people of the proposal.

More significantly it is not clear from the proposal that this arrangement will be of educational benefit and will be a viable and cost effective solution.

However, in the consultation proposal, the council has not set out a convincing case that the discontinuation of S3 and S4 at Sandwick High School is the most reasonable and viable option and will deliver clear educational benefits for the children and young people directly affected by it.
Response

Children’s Services articulated the educational benefits of the proposal in the Proposal Paper on Pages 27-37, but for the avoidance of doubt, these are explained here again as follows.

There are two sets of educational benefits to consider in this Proposal:

1. The educational benefits for children who would attend Sandwick Junior High School as a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 Department;
2. The educational benefits for children of Sandwick Junior High School of a transition to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2.

Firstly, the educational benefits to Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department are as follows.

- Children who attend Sandwick Junior High School, Primary Department, would be able to continue to be educated in their local community up to the end of Secondary 2, which retains all of the benefits of walking and cycling to school, and the freedom to attend after-school clubs and activities with no transport constraints.
- Children who attend Dunrossness Primary School, Sandwick Junior High School Primary Department and Cunningsburgh Primary School would have no change to their associated secondary department up to the end of Secondary 2. These children would feel that their family home continued to be relatively near to the school, helping them to feel secure, which in turn, helps them to be ready to learn.
- Those children who live in Sandwick will have the benefit of using the opportunities of their local environment and local community to support skills development and to make learning relevant.
- Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department provides a very good physical environment for learning, with spacious classrooms, and specialist rooms. These very good facilities would continue to provide educational benefit to Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 children.

Secondly, the educational benefits for children of Sandwick Junior High School of a transition to the Anderson High School at the start of Secondary 3 are as follows.

- In line with the expectations of Curriculum for Excellence, secondary education is delivered in two phases, the Broad General Education from Secondary 1 to Secondary 3, and the Senior Phase from Secondary 4 to Secondary 6. In most secondary schools in Scotland children progress seamlessly through these phases, with their learning progressing in the same setting. There will be some degree of personalisation and choice at the end of Secondary 2, which maintains the breadth of the curriculum across the curricular areas. During Secondary 3 children will develop their profile (the Secondary 3 Profile). The resulting self reflection allows
informed choices to be made regarding their subject choices for the National Qualifications they will take in the Senior Phase, Secondary 4 to Secondary 6. In this Proposal the benefit to children is that, if children must make a transition during their secondary education, the transfer point at the end of Secondary 2 allows them to develop their Secondary 3 Profile, and personalise their learning in Secondary 3 in a way that enables them to undertake some prior learning in Secondary 3 in preparation for their National Qualification courses that will be undertaken in Secondary 4 in the same school;

- A transition at the end of Secondary 2 also benefits those children who choose to undertake qualifications over different timeframes. For example, starting a Higher course in Secondary 4 and sitting a Higher exam in Secondary 5, as they will be in the same school for the whole of their Senior Phase.

- Children will be able to experience the whole of their Senior Phase education in one location, and so have access to wider opportunities offered, such as a range of vocational and academic qualifications, access to local tertiary education establishments, and access to businesses and voluntary organisations. This will enable them to develop a mixed programme of learning throughout their Senior Phase.

Altering the transition point from Secondary 4 to Secondary 2 has the potential to encourage more children to stay at school beyond Secondary 4, as they will already be familiar with the Anderson High School and its range of qualifications and opportunities on offer throughout the Senior Phase. Progression to higher level courses will therefore be seamless, without being interrupted by a transition of schools and the disturbance that that may bring.

**Relevant Points**

Although parents at Sandwick Junior High School recognised that the council has to make savings, they were not convinced that the savings outlined in the proposal are accurate as they believe that the council has not taken account of all possible factors. They felt that the perceived negative impacts of the proposal outweighed the estimated savings outlined in the proposal.

More significantly it is not clear from the proposal that this arrangement will be of educational benefit and will be a viable and cost effective solution.

The council needs to make the financial aspects of this specific proposal more transparent to enable a shared understanding of how this contributes to the overall business case.

The council needs to set out more clearly and transparently the financial case for the proposal and how the cost savings have been calculated.
Response

The 2014/15 approved budget has been used to calculate the estimated savings of this proposal. All financial factors have been taken into account when calculating the estimated savings that would be achieved from this proposal. These include:

- staffing of the new Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 model at Sandwick Junior High School;
- cost of maintaining the property occupied by Sandwick Junior High School secondary department;
- impact on the primary and nursery departments at Sandwick Junior High School;
- staffing and other costs and income which would transfer to Anderson High School;
- additional teacher travel time and mileage costs;
- additional school transport costs.

This financial information has been presented in the proposal paper in the same format that we have used for a number of school closure statutory consultations recently.

This Proposal achieves savings and provides at least the same quality of education, therefore is better value for money than the current model.

Relevant Points

Parents at Sandwick Junior High School were concerned about new travel arrangements which will need to be put in place. They felt that some young people would be travelling in excess of two hours each day and that this would have a negative impact on their ability to achieve their full academic potential. They felt that this would constrain their access to the range of out-of-class activities currently available to them. Many young people currently enjoy the experience of walking or cycling to school and parents feel that with new travel arrangements this will not be possible and will therefore have a negative impact on young people’s health and wellbeing.

Parents felt that the council had not made the new travel arrangements clear to them and are concerned that young people will be travelling to and from school without adequate adult supervision on public transport. They were unclear of the policies and procedures that will be in place to overcome potentially problematic situations. For example, what would happen if the public service bus is full to capacity as has happened in the past? Some expressed concerns about travel during adverse weather conditions.

The council needs to address the reasonable concerns of consultees on the travel arrangements it proposes.
Response

The proposal paper clearly states the amount we estimate will be required to provide the additional transport; notwithstanding, the savings arising from the Proposal are significant at £223,530.

The costs stated in respect of the additional transport required reflect the current cost of transport provision, aligned with the individual locations of each child affected by the Proposal. Although routes have not been tendered until very recently, a financial uplift has been applied to each contract year on year, to include Retail Price Index (RPI) and local fuel price fluctuations.

Competitive prices have been achieved for all school transport routes, as evidenced by the recent tendering exercise – awarding contracts for five years, as opposed to three, has made these contracts more attractive to the local bus operators.

The recent tender exercise in respect of school and public transport routes did not include the extra journeys required under this proposal; however, separate contracts will be tendered and awarded if necessary once a decision is made.

The budget for school transport sits within the Transport Planning Service which is part of the Development Department. A budgetary transfer would be required from Children’s Services to the Transport Planning Service and this is clearly factored in to all such proposals.

It is standard practice across Scotland for authorities to make maximum use of public bus services to convey children between home and school where it is cost effective to do so. The Scottish Government has commissioned a number of studies into school transport in recent years in this respect and the issue of risk arising from children travelling on public buses has not been highlighted in any of these studies. Consequently there is nothing to suggest that the approach adopted by Shetland Islands Council is unreasonable or unsafe.

There would be no impact on the public transport network as this Proposal factors in a similar number of children who already access public transport. In fact, the number would reduce slightly from 20 to 18. All children will have bus passes for the start of the new academic year so those not in receipt of passes will not be entitled to use the designated transport. The Council will ensure capacity exists for all those children who have been issued with bus passes.

If, as a result of a placing request, any child is attending a school other than their catchment area school, then there is no entitlement to free school transport; responsibility lies with the parent(s). Those children may take up any vacant seats on existing school transport, with the agreement of the Executive Manager, Schools, or avail themselves of seats on public transport routes, but any such children will not be taken into account when specifying the number of seats required for any bus contracts.

Children’s Services do acknowledge the concerns which have been raised by parents in relation to the increased travel times incurred by their children, particularly in relation to healthy lifestyles. However those young people may benefit from having a greater range of opportunities available to them in regards to
social groups, clubs and teams. It is acknowledged however, that this proposal may not allow for children from the South Mainland to cycle to school.

The South Mainland enjoys a very good public bus service which should help facilitate children affected by this proposal continuing their involvement in after school activities. Similarly, this should assist any children currently undertaking volunteering in their communities. If it does not however, then staff within Children’s Services will assist with finding alternative volunteering opportunities and extra-curricular activities. Community Development staff will be keen to engage with the community as a whole to ensure as far as possible that steps are taken to maintain groups/activities/events which currently run in Sandwick. There is no evidence to suggest that children are disadvantaged educationally by travelling on school transport.

Shetland Islands Council has given a commitment that, as far as is possible, no secondary aged child will travel for longer than 65 minutes for any single journey. What is being proposed are the most direct, economic routes:

- Bus 1: Quendale – Scousburgh – Bigton – Quarff;
- Bus 2: Dunrossness – Levenwick – Gulberwick;
- Bus 3: Sandwick – Cunningsburgh.

Providing the transport in this configuration reduces the number of stops required. Children with additional support needs have their needs regularly assessed and where dedicated transport is required, we try to ensure that it is as flexible as possible in its delivery. Some children with additional support needs travel from as far afield as North Roe and Whalsay to Lerwick on a daily basis to access their education.

All school transport routes are gritted in advance of that transport using those routes. Adverse weather can mean days lost for children but the presumption made is always against closure unless all the advice available to Children’s Services would indicate that children could not be transported to, and from, school safely. In those circumstances, any individual head teacher may take the decision to close their school, or, if the weather conditions dictate, the Executive Manager. Schools may take the decision to issue a blanket closure instruction.

The Anderson High School enrolment form, which is used for all children attending there, has a section that asks for one of the contacts provided to be listed as a snow closure contact. However, it is many years now since the school has had to make use of these contacts for this purpose.

Since October 2001, all new coaches and minibuses have had to be fitted with seat belts. A forward facing seat fitted with a minimum of a lap belt must be available to every child. New regulations introduced in September 2008, requires all seated passengers aged 14 years and above to use seat belts when they are fitted in all buses and coaches. The Government have recently announced the intention to legislate to make seatbelts a requirement on all dedicated school transport in Scotland. This is planned for implementation in 2018 for primary children, and 2021 for secondary children. However, Shetland Islands Council already has these measures in place for all of its school transport contracts and so
this latest announcement will not result in additional expense for the local authority. Drivers employed are professional drivers, suitably qualified for the job. The operators are licensed, and the vehicles require to be licensed and tested as Public Service Vehicles. The School Transport Policy requires bus operators to have contingency plans in place, to deal with vehicle failures, adverse weather and the emergency closure of schools.

There is no statutory requirement for education authorities to provide supervisors on school transport provided under the Education (Scotland) Act 1980. Risk assessments in respect of pick up/drop off points will be the responsibility of the local authority in future, as opposed to the transport operator. All such risk assessments will be carried out before the start of the new academic year, in August 2014. Additional Road Safety Audits will be carried out where the authority deems them necessary, or where requested by parents. Once this work is complete and pick up/drop off points designated, all parents will be made aware of the route and pick up/drop off point pertinent for their child(ren).

An asymmetric week has been considered in the past and may well be considered in future as we explore options for delivery of the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence. Elements of e-learning are also being taken forward under the auspices of the Shetland Learning Partnership Project. Similarly, the length of the lunch break may also be considered in future, as the new Anderson High School will provide the opportunity for a range of serving points to be set up to better cater for the different meal options on offer to children.

Increased travel time for teachers will result in additional mileage costs for the authority where that travel happens during the working day. Careful timetabling will ensure that this is kept to a minimum. Such staff sharing arrangements do allow for the most effective use of teacher contact time.

**Relevant Point**

*It is not clear how young people moving to the current Anderson High School before the new build will benefit from the current accommodation.*

**Response**

In response to concerns about adding a further additional 80 children into the existing Anderson High School building, and to ensure children do not have to make two transitions: one to the existing Anderson High School in 2015, and then a further one to the new Anderson High School in August 2016, Children’s Services will be recommending for this proposal that the implementation date is moved to August 2016 or as soon as possible thereafter, when the new Anderson High School has been opened. This would also allow the existing Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to complete Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School before transferring to the Anderson High School.
Relevant Point

Also, in the future, Anderson High School plans to move to the new Senior Phase timetable immediately after the Easter break and it is not clear that plans for transition from this point for S2 young people from Sandwick have been considered.

Response

Discussions are taking place amongst secondary departments and schools about moving the timetable change forward for a new Secondary 3 group to start their Secondary 3 year approximately two weeks after the end of the Spring Holidays. For this group this would be at the start of the exam diet period, rather than at the end of it.

Plans for Secondary 2 children making a transition at this point two weeks after the Easter Break have not yet been fully considered as plans to make this change have not been finalised. This would have to be given further consideration. It is important here to remember that this Proposal was not recommended for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department where there is an average cohort of 40 children in a year. It was intended for our smaller junior highs where year groups are sometimes as small as four children and average around 13 children. In these cases the Anderson High School was clear that bespoke arrangements could be put in place for these young people to transfer with communications between the Anderson High School and the local junior high starting from the beginning of Secondary 1. However, what is agreed, and is important to note is that, in line with the Broad General Education and Senior Phase transition, each child’s personal profile will be an essential document to inform the transition period.

Transitions will also be carefully planned with a common structure developed to ensure consistency for all pupils.

Relevant Point

In its final consultation report, the council needs to set out clearly the transitional arrangements to ensure that children and young people receive their entitlement to a broad general education and that there is continuity and progression in their learning. Part of this should be a consideration of the option to delay implementation of the proposal until August 2016 when the new Anderson High School is scheduled to be completed.

Response

In response to concerns about adding a further additional 80 children into the existing Anderson High School building, and to ensure children do not have to make two transitions: one to the existing Anderson High School in 2015, and then a further one to the new Anderson High School in August 2016, Children’s Services will be recommending for this Proposal that the implementation date is moved to August 2016 or as soon as possible thereafter, when the new Anderson High School has been opened. This would also allow the existing Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to complete Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School before transferring to the Anderson High School.
Plans for Secondary 2 children making a transition at this point two weeks after the Easter Break have not yet been fully considered as plans to make this change have not been finalised. This would have to be given further consideration.

It is important here to remember that this proposal was not recommended for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department where there is an average cohort of 40 children in a year. It was intended for our smaller junior highs where year groups are sometimes as small as four children and average around 13 children. In these cases the Anderson High School was clear that bespoke arrangements could be put in place for these young people to transfer with communications between the Anderson High School and the local junior high starting from the beginning of Secondary 1.

**Relevant Point**

*In its final consultation report, the council needs to define what it means by a common curriculum and how this will be achieved to enhance the transition process.*

**Response**

On 13 November 2013, Shetland Islands Council agreed to create a Shetland Learning Campus. Part of this development includes work to ensure that the curriculum at all secondary departments and schools in Shetland will be aligned to ensure common content, progressions and ease of transition by the 2015/16 school year.

Schools across Scotland usually provide education from Secondary 1 to Secondary 6, so that young people’s learning is able to progress seamlessly to meet their individual needs. They generally work on Level Three Learning Outcomes and Experiences from Curriculum for Excellence during Secondary 1 and Secondary 2. Towards the end of Secondary 2, young people will personalise their learning by choosing to select certain subjects within the areas of the curriculum to further their study, usually at Level Four of the Outcomes and Experiences of Curriculum for Excellence, during their Secondary 3 year.

This personalisation and choice of certain subjects helps their teachers to guide their learning in a way that prepares them for making their qualifications choices at the end of Secondary 3, and enables them to do some preparatory work for those subjects, should they wish to continue them to qualifications level. As these children will study in the same school, their teachers will be aware of their curriculum, their learning and their level of attainment, and can ensure that they progress smoothly in their education in their Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 years, which is the Senior Phase.

Should the proposal to deliver Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 at Sandwick Junior High School, and children transfer to the Anderson High School for Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 be accepted, the work that will be done to develop a common curriculum will benefit children in the following ways:
• secondary schools and departments across Shetland will focus on the same topics in Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 (the Broad General Education);
• teachers, who may work in more than one school, will be prepared for those topics;
• should the proposal be implemented, when children transfer at the end of Secondary 2, the teachers at the receiving school will be able to progress children’s learning, confident that common topics have been taught;
• children will be able to be supported well in the choices they make to personalise their curriculum in Secondary 3, as teachers will be able to discuss their previous topics, in the knowledge that all children will have followed the same curriculum;
• when children transfer, they will be able to integrate into existing classes were their peers have followed the same topics, thus aiding the transition process.

A transition point at any time during Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 between schools will not be the best way to deliver secondary education in Curriculum for Excellence. The Senior Phase should be a period where young people should be able to select the right qualification, at the right level for them, delivered at the right time for them. Therefore a transition at the end of Secondary 4, as is the case currently, is not tenable. A transition at the end of Secondary 2, while still not ideal, as described above, will help young people adapt to their new school environment and personalise their learning in Secondary 3 before they begin their Senior Phase in Secondary 4.

**Relevant Point**

_The council also needs to provide further details on the proposed arrangement for sharing teachers across schools to demonstrate how these arrangements will benefit children and young people’s learning experiences and are a viable and cost effective option._

**Response**

Coherent planning of shared staffing which would come from this proposal would support a balanced timetable between schools and would ensure that all subject contact time is not crammed into one or two days. Classes would have one teacher for all of their subject time. It would also enable better use of teachers contact hours rather than leaving them with surplus non contact time which cannot be accessed, or artificially splitting pupil cohorts to create small classes.

Such arrangements between Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and Anderson High School are viable based on one period per day of travel.
**Relevant Point**

*Finally, the council needs to set out clearly the arrangements it will make to reduce any potential negative impact on the community of the proposal.*

**Response**

Taking on board the depth of community concerns about the impact that the discontinuation of two stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department might have on the community and the local economy, Children’s Services commissioned a Socio-Economic Study to be carried out. Children’s services commissions socio-economic studies on all closure proposals, and this approach is recognized in the Report on the Commission for Rural Education as good practice.

Steve Westbrook, Economist, Nairn, in partnership with Sandy Anderson, were commissioned by the Director of Children’s Services, to undertake a Socio-Economic Study on the potential impacts on the community of Sandwick and the South Mainland of Shetland should the Proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department go forward. The full text of the study can be found as Appendix H.

The terms of reference for the study were to:

- **provide information on the economy of Sandwick Junior High School’s catchment area (i.e. employment, business output, etc);**
- **identify the direct and other impacts of proposed changes to the secondary department of Sandwick Junior High School;**
- **investigate possible mitigating actions which might be undertaken by the Council or other stakeholders.**

The main conclusions in the study are:

- **The net annual savings from discontinuing the S3 and S4 stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School are estimated by Shetland Islands Council to be £223,530;**
- **There are 1,407 resident households in the secondary department’s catchment area - 638 in the Dunrossness area, 388 in Sandwick and 388 in Cunningsburgh;**
- **The catchment area includes areas that have had the strongest population growth in Shetland over the last 10 years, but it also includes areas around Dunrossness with modest population growth or decline;**
- **The availability of social housing is below the Shetland average in the catchment area, especially around Dunrossness and Cunningsburgh;**
- **Growth in housing availability has centred on the communities to the north of the catchment area, especially Sandwick;**
- **Sandwick is identified in SIC’s Local Plan as the “area of best fit”, where**
any significant housing development should take place;

• The majority of the population of the South Mainland who are in employment travel outside the area for work (principally Lerwick);

• The major employers in the catchment area are the Council (mainly in education at the Sandwick Junior High School and its feeder primary schools and in social care at Overtonlea Care Centre), at Sumburgh Airport (HIAL and other companies based there), and in tourism at Sumburgh Hotel. There are also a number of employers in retail, knitwear and other sectors;

• Employment opportunities at Sumburgh Airport are expanding and this could put some pressure on housing in the Dunrossness area. Companies would be keen to recruit locally (subject to skills being available), but some will employ weekly commuters if necessary;

• Self-employment is an important feature of the local economy – through agriculture, crofting, tourism and other home based businesses;

• Total annual household income in the catchment area is estimated at some £54 million;

• The direct impact of discontinuing the S3 and S4 stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School would be the loss of teaching and support staff at the school. These employment reductions would be offset within Shetland to an extent by additional posts at Anderson High School in Lerwick and through the additional costs of school transport;

• There is also likely to be an impact on retail turnover, especially in the shop and bakery at Sandwick, from reduced spending by pupils and their parents;

• Whilst we found little evidence that families would leave the area in the short term if the proposed changes to secondary education at Sandwick are implemented, there is some concern that the loss of S3 and S4 education at Sandwick would make the area less attractive for families moving to or within Shetland and promote a drift towards Lerwick;

• It is possible that homes, especially in the Dunrossness area, will increasingly be occupied by older people and by workers at Sumburgh Airport who rent while maintaining a family home elsewhere rather than relocating their families;

• There is wide concern about young people becoming disengaged from their local community at a younger age and the effects this would have on community cohesion;

• The school building will still be heavily used for educational provision and there appears to be limited scope to extend its use for community benefit;

• Overall, the proposal to discontinue stages S3 and S4 of secondary education at Sandwick Junior High School is likely to make the South
Mainland a less attractive place to live for some families, but the other factors which will continue to attract people to live there may, on balance, outweigh the impetus to move away.

The suggested mitigating actions in the socio-economic study, which will be considered should this Proposal be accepted are:

- **Sandwick Junior High School will still be a busy school, used for nursery and primary education and for the S1 and S2 stages of secondary education.** Sandwick is an expanding community and has been identified in the Local Plan as the area where any significant development in the South Mainland should take place. It seems likely that the school roll will continue to grow in the medium term across those age groups for which it will cater. This would limit the possibility of there being spare capacity for community use of the school to be expanded, although this could be explored.

- **Concerns about community cohesion and loss of the bonds built between young people in their formative years at Sandwick Junior High School are strong.** To mitigate against this, it would be important to ensure that transport arrangements allow for pupils to return home promptly and to maintain opportunities for after-school, sporting and youth club activity in the South Mainland (whilst also being able to participate in after-school activities in Lerwick). In the current economic climate, where funding for youth work, for example, is being reduced, this could be difficult to achieve, but support for volunteers and in accessing alternative sources of funding would help.

- **The jobs lost at the school should have a relatively small net effect on the South Mainland economy, although the future decisions by teaching staff on where to live would be a key factor.**

14. **Integrated Impact Assessment**

14.1 An Integrated Impact Assessment has been carried out on this proposal and then reviewed in the light of the responses received during the statutory consultation period. A summary of the findings of the assessment is presented below. The full text of the Integrated Impact Assessment can be found as Appendix G.

14.2 There were sixty-four possible areas/groups assessed for impact. The impact from the intended outcome has been recorded as either:

- Positive;
- Negative;
- Neutral with no impact;
- Neutral because of both Positive and Negative impacts.

A note was given for each answer. Further mitigation was then recorded for all Negative impacts.
14.3 The Integrated Impact Assessment for the proposed discontinuation of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department demonstrates that the Proposal would have:

- 6 Positive impacts
- 8 Negative impacts
- 42 groups/areas experiencing no impacts. These are recorded in the document as “Neutral – n/a”.
- 8 groups/areas experiencing both Positive and Negative impacts. These are recorded in the document as “Both”, with Notes given to explain both the Positive and the Negative impact, with the Negative impacts receiving further mitigation

14.4 The Positive impacts can be summarised as follows.

Some young people will have greater access to cultural activities in Lerwick. They will experience a wider range of educational opportunities with access to a larger peer group. The proposal makes ongoing savings in Children’s Services budgets.

14.5 The Negative impacts can be summarised as follows.

Communities want education to be in local areas, to help sustain communities and protect local identities. There would be fewer professional staff working in local communities and being based there. Some young people would spend less time in their local communities. Some children who can currently walk or cycle to school will no longer be able to. Communities will feel their feelings about education in their area will have been ignored. There will be more travel resulting from this proposal. More school transport will be needed and more teachers will be travelling.

14.6 Mitigation for Reducing Negative Impacts can be summarised as follows.

Children’s Services will work with other Council services and other community planning partners to support affected communities, in line with Shetland Partnership’s agreed Community Plan, and Shetland Islands Council’s updated Corporate Plan agreed on 26 March 2014. Appropriate opportunities will be available for physical activity at the Anderson High School. School transport arrangements and teachers’ travel will be organised in the most efficient way possible.

15. Socio-Economic Study

15.1 In response to previous concerns expressed during statutory consultation periods about the potential socio-economic impacts any rural school closure proposal has in Shetland, Children’s Services now commission socio-economic impact studies to be carried out on all closure proposals. Although this proposal only involves two stages of education, this is still deemed a closure proposal on a rural school and therefore an independent socio-economic study has been carried out.

15.2 Steve Westbrook, Economist, Nairn, in partnership with Sandy Anderson, were again commissioned to undertake the socio-economic study on the potential impacts on the South Mainland of Shetland of the Proposal to discontinue stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, should it go forward. The full text of the study can be found as Appendix H.
16. **Health Impact Assessment**

16.1 Children’s Services commissioned a Health Impact Assessment to be undertaken on the potential impacts of the proposal to discontinue stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. The Health Impact Assessment was conducted by NHS Shetland in April 2014. The full text of the Health Impact Assessment can be found at Appendix F.

16.2 A Health Impact Assessment aims to identify and consider actual and potential health and equality impacts on a population. It also presents ways to minimise or mitigate negative impacts.

16.3 The Health Impact Assessment was conducted using the following methods: review of Strategy for Secondary Education documentation, review of Community Development data, survey of local community, individual and group interviews with community members, visit to Sandwick Junior High School, and an independent assessment of the proposed receiving school. A Health Impact Assessment Tool was used and the findings and recommendations presented.

16.4 The concerns raised by parents and community members were explored and assessed with conclusions and recommendations made. The main health impacts identified are as follows:

- there could potentially be negative health impacts from the closure of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 classes of the Sandwick Junior High School. It could affect the physical health and mental wellbeing of children of Sandwick Junior High School;

- the closure may also affect the community of the South Mainland as it is now as well as having an economic impact for parents/carers of children who would be moved to attend the Anderson High School;

- however it may also provide positive opportunities to young people who may benefit from having a greater range of opportunities available to them in regards to social groups, clubs, teams etc. They may also appreciate and develop their sense of responsibility with increased opportunities to make more independent choices, such as at snack/meal times.

16.5 The suggested mitigating actions are as follows:

- if the Proposal goes ahead, the Local Authority may mitigate some concerns over the transport of children to and from South Mainland to Lerwick if the South Mainland community is consulted on this and their views and opinions are considered when planning school bus routes/stops which mean that the children spend the least amount of time travelling as possible. The detail of the Proposal should be developed to ensure that there is no decrease in opportunities for physical activity;

- if the decision is made to implement this Proposal it would be helpful if Community Development engage with the community as a whole to ensure steps are taken to maintain groups/activities/events which currently run in Sandwick.
• if the Proposal is implemented, work must be done within the schools to make the transition as easy as possible for those affected. Appropriate support from staff, such as Pupil Support Teachers, will be essential in assisting those coping with a move to a bigger school. Schools may also want to consider setting up support networks such as ‘buddy systems’. Lines of communication between school and parents/carer must be kept strong to ensure families are confident they know how their child is coping with changes taking place.

Should this Proposal be implemented Children’s Services will take account of all these matters in implementing the change.

17. Strategic Environmental Assessment

17.1 Shetland Islands Council as responsible Authority carried out under Section 8 of The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005, a Strategic Environmental Assessment Gateway screening of the Strategy for Secondary Education.

17.2 The determination by Shetland Islands Council under Section 8(1) of the Act is that the Strategy for Secondary Education is unlikely to have significant environmental effects, and a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required.

17.3 Before making this determination, Shetland Islands Council sent a summary of its views as to whether or not the plan is likely to have significant environmental effects to Consultative Authorities (Scottish Natural Heritage, Historic Scotland and the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency) via the Strategic Environmental Assessment Gateway. Shetland Islands Council noted that the Consultation Authorities agreed with the view that the Strategy for Secondary Education was unlikely to have significant environmental effects and made the determination to that effect under Section 8 (1) of the Act. In making that determination Children’s Services applied criteria in Schedule 2 of the Act.

17.4 Shetland Islands Council notified the Strategic Environmental Assessment Gateway Manager and the Consultative Authorities of this decision. A public notice was also published in the local media on Friday 21 February 2014.

17.5 Further information and the responses of the Consultative Authorities can be found at www.shetland.gov.uk.

17.6 A copy of the Screening Determination is found at Appendix I.
18. Omissions or Inaccuracies

18.1 Following publication of the Proposal Paper, Children’s Services identified the following inaccuracies in it:

On Page 28, at Paragraph 5.13, the Proposal Paper states that the proposed Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 Department at Sandwick Junior High School would be staffed by 4.67 full time equivalent teachers. This is incorrect and the figure should say 4.89 full time equivalents. This is a typographical error. The information passed to Finance Services which was used to calculate the savings was correct.

On Page 33, at Paragraph 5.46, the proposal paper states that each depute at the Anderson High School teaches from time to time. This is incorrect. Each of the three deputes now teaches for some time each school year.

On Pages 16 to 17, and on Pages 22 to 23, an inconsistency was identified in the presentation of the attainment information for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and Anderson High School. All attainment information particular to each school was correct. The inconsistency was in the Shetland average and Scottish average figures only, and only for 2012/2013. The correct averages for this year were in the Anderson High School tables and they were not then correctly inputted across to the Sandwick tables.

The corrected text for the attainment information is set out below:

ATTAINMENT

Sandwick Junior High School

4.29 Sandwick Junior High School provides education for pupils until the end of Secondary 4. The attainment figures for pupils achieving awards as part of the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) for the last four years are listed below (2012/13 figures are pre-appeal)

4.30 Percentage of the S4 year group achieving five or more awards at SCQF Level 3 (Standard Grade, Foundation Level or equivalent) or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By end of S4</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandwick Junior High School</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Islands</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.31 Percentage of the S4 year group achieving five or more awards at SCQF Level 4 (Standard Grade, General Level or equivalent) or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By end of S4</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandwick Junior High School</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Islands</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.32 Percentage of the S4 year group achieving five or more awards at SCQF Level 5 (Standard Grade, Credit Level or equivalent) or better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of S4 Roll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By end of S4</td>
<td>06/07 07/08 08/09 09/10 10/11 11/12 12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwick Junior High School</td>
<td>55% 59% 52% 49% 63% 61% 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Islands</td>
<td>42% 49% 46% 47% 58% 53% 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>33% 34% 35% 36% 36% 37% 39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children’s Services accepts these inaccuracies. In accordance with The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, the details and the actions of Shetland Islands Council will be set out here.

These matters were corrected at the start of the two public meetings held in respect of the proposal at Sandwick Junior High School on 4 March 2014, and Anderson High School on 5 March 2014. The transcripts of these public meetings have now been published on the Council’s website. We also published a correction notice on Shetland Islands Council’s website.

We also received one written response which highlighted alleged inaccuracies in the Proposal Paper as follows:

- Access to Further and Higher Education opportunities;
- Variable timeframes for studying of Higher courses;
- Numbers of Placing requests into Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department;
- The timing of the start of Secondary 3;
- Wider achievement opportunities;
- Social spaces in the new Anderson High School;
- Attainment figures.

The detail of the points raised has been considered carefully, and have concluded that all but two reflect a misinterpretation of the points made in the Proposal Paper. These points have been addressed in the Consultation Report.

The detail about the issue regarding attainment is a reference to something which was said at the public meeting and not an inaccuracy in the Proposal Paper. Finally the respondent believes that there is one placing request into Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department and there is none. An explanation for this has been given in the Consultation Report.
19. **Compliance with Section 12 of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010**

19.1 Throughout this consultation Children’s Services has given special regard to the provision for rural schools within Section 12 of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

19.2 Sandwick Junior High School is designated as a rural school. In terms of Section 12 of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, Shetland Islands Council has given regard to the three required factors as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any viable alternative to closure</td>
<td>During the statutory consultation period the following proposals were put forward by respondents as alternatives to removing Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reduce the staffing (teaching and support) to be in line with national staffing levels;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reduce the number of promoted posts in Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• manage without quality improvement officers. Other local authorities do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• shut the whole of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these alternatives were considered in the Proposal Paper and are further discussed here.

Over the last decade Children’s Services has conducted a number of reviews and consultations with the key aim of providing an education model for Shetland that is sustainable and ensures best value in the use of public funds. The reviews have seen the following changes to the school estate:

- closure of Scalloway Junior High School Secondary Department (implemented June 2011);
- closure of Uyeasound Primary School (implemented December 2011).

In addition the following decisions have been made that will change the school estate:

- closure of Olnafirth Primary School (agreed October 2013);
- closure of Skerries School Secondary Department (agreed December 2013);
- Closure of Bressay Primary School (agreed March 2014).
Children’s Services has also implemented change in the following service areas as reasonable alternatives to school closures:

- reducing expenditure on In-Service training;
- reducing numbers of central staff;
- reducing money available for supply;
- reducing money available for Continuing Professional Development;
- ending knitting instruction;
- charging for instrumental instruction;
- increasing charges e.g. for school meals;
- reducing operating costs in schools, particularly resources available for learning materials and equipment;
- moving to national staffing levels in primary;
- reducing numbers of teaching staff in secondary;
- reducing numbers of catering and cleaning staff;
- reducing teacher input in nursery;
- securing more efficient use of resources for children and young people with Additional Support Needs;
- reducing music instruction;
- reducing Parent Council Clerks’ honorariums;
- reducing school building maintenance.

The savings measures already implemented within Schools/Quality Improvement section of Children’s Services as detailed above have resulted in a reduction in expenditure between 2009/10 and 2012/13 of over £5 million. Children’s Services has a further £3.268 million reduction in expenditure to achieve by March 2017. As you can see, the alternatives to considering closure proposals have been exhaustive and far reaching across the whole of the school estate in Shetland.

The reductions in central staff have included the reduction of three quality improvement officer posts, and two Education Support Officer posts, achieved by 2011. In addition, in the past two years we have made savings of £553,000 across all our school support staff posts, including catering and cleaning services. Work is continuing in this area to make further efficiencies which will impact on all our schools from 2015. Our savings, through reductions in secondary teaching staff posts in 2013/14 were £600,000, and our savings in provision for children with additional support needs over the past two years are estimated as £977,000.

The particular reasonable viable alternative options for the future provision of
education for children in Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 at Sandwick Junior High School discussed in the Proposal Paper were to:

**Maintain the status quo: retain Secondary 1 to Secondary 4**

One of the main drivers for considering the future of secondary provision in Shetland is consideration of how to maximise children’s opportunities to receive their full entitlements to a Senior Phase within Curriculum for Excellence. The Senior Phase is the period of school education from Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 and is the time during which children will sit their qualifications. This is required to be flexible so that children can sit a varied programme of qualifications over different periods of time. In particular they should have access courses from Secondary 4 onwards which can be studied over variable timeframes. They should also be able to bypass lower level qualifications and always be studying at the appropriate level to match their abilities.

Due to the limitations Shetland’s geography gives us, retaining the current system of Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 would mean that children will also potentially miss out on the full range of Senior Phase opportunities, such as employability skills, access to Duke of Edinburgh Awards, and volunteering opportunities.

The non-viability of the Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 junior high school, going forward into the future is also discussed further in this consultation report, and the following case is set out.

In 2011 the Management Board of Curriculum for Excellence issued a statement of its vision for the future of the Senior Phase of curriculum for Excellence. The full statement is published on the Education Scotland website. The following extract is relevant:

“One of the key aims of Curriculum for Excellence is to reduce the quantity of assessment which pupils undertake, particularly in the senior phase. Many schools are planning for the senior phase as a 2 or 3 year experience. The majority of pupils are staying on to at least S5, so it is no longer appropriate to view S4 in isolation or to see presentation for qualifications in S4 as a “given” for each learner in each subject. Schools may well take the opportunity this provides to offer National Courses over 2 years. Bypassing qualifications at National 4 and moving straight to National 5 or Higher is likely to become increasingly common, although this may be a gradual process. It will also be important to ensure that those young people who choose to leave school at the end of S4 or at Christmas of S5 are appropriately catered for in terms of qualifications.”

Curriculum for Excellence Briefing Paper 8, Progression for the Broad General Education to the Senior Phase, published in 2013 and also available on Education Scotland’s website, reiterates these requirements, and outlines how some schools have begun to tackle these aspirations as follows:

“Schools are also changing the way they deliver qualifications in order to provide the flexibility to meet personalisation and choice, for example by:
  - designing the Senior Phase as a three-year experience rather than planning each
year separately, so that individuals can gain **more qualifications at higher levels**, opening up more routes into post school destinations;

- delivering qualifications over a variable timeframe in response to young people’s needs and prior achievement, for example through programmes which lead to qualifications over one or two years, thereby creating space for **more in-depth learning**;
- when they are clear that the learner is securely at the level of the intended qualification, developing pathways for able learners which by-pass qualifications at lower levels to allow more time to be spent on **more challenging learning at higher levels**, while covering necessary knowledge and skills from the lower levels;
- providing appropriate, specific programmes which maximise achievement and attainment for young people planning to leave school after S4;
- ensuring all young people are aware of, and have the opportunity to meet entry requirements for post-school destinations, including college and university, and also have the qualifications and skills to enable them to progress to further training and/or employment as appropriate;
- designing pathways which both ensure young people gain the qualifications they need, and **improve their achievement of a wide range of important personal skills** including those gained through the qualifications."

Staff from Children’s Services, including two head teachers, attended a Senior Phase Leadership event in March 2014, hosted and funded by Education Scotland. The key messages from that day were:

- looking forward we see Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 planned together as one coherent programme;
- this year we are still seeing a distinctive Secondary 4 year, however a lot of schools have plans to change;
- we want to encourage the bypassing of lower level qualifications as an option for some children;
- we want to consider how progression in the broad general education is being secured;
- we want to see increasing work with partners to deliver a Senior Phase which meets the needs of all learners.

So, a Secondary 4 this year, 2013-14, which looks mostly like Secondary 4 in previous years, is a common feature for many schools in Scotland but this is not the future landscape. There are clear expectations from Education Scotland that Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 will **not** be seen as three separate years, that lower level qualifications will be bypassed to minimise the burden of assessment for learners and that further meaningful work will be undertaken with partners like colleges and other learning providers to secure opportunities are provided to all young people which best meets their individual needs.

The Anderson High School is quite clear that it cannot progress to fully develop these requirements whilst it continues to have children coming in at the end of Secondary 4 for Secondary 5. This creates a barrier to ever being able to consider Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 as a coherent whole, and limits the opportunities therefore to **all** children who attend the Anderson High School, including those who
have been there from Secondary 1.

As well as this, if Secondary 4 remains a transition point, then the opportunities to assess the appropriateness of bypassing lower level qualifications for individual children is not feasible. If a child is considered able enough at the end of Secondary 3 to start studying for a Higher, and they are in a junior high school, where would they go?

We are aware that most parents do not conceive of a future different to the one they are experiencing now for the children currently in Secondary 4, but Education Scotland leave us in no doubt that this is not the future world of Curriculum for Excellence. Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 schools, however well the community of Shetland feel they have served us in the past, are not the viable into the future. Such a system with a transition at the end of Secondary 4 cannot deliver a young people’s full entitlement to a Senior Phase. In addition, it puts in an artificial barrier for the Anderson High School which will inhibit them in delivering the full entitlement to a Senior Phase for all its children.

In addition if Shetland were to keep all of its secondary departments as they are currently, the financial resources for each would be reduced in due course, as substantial savings would have to be made to meet the demands of the current Medium Term Financial Plan. Savings would have to be made which could result in the following:

- fewer teachers;
- fewer Principal Teachers;
- fewer support staff;
- larger class sizes;
- Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 year groups combined where numbers permit;
- fewer resources for materials, educational visits and equipment.

Reduce provision to Secondary 1 to Secondary 3

Children’s Services put forward Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 as an option for the future of our smaller secondary departments at Whalsay School, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School in September 2013. Ideally Children’s Services considers that, to deliver to the children of Shetland, their full entitlement to Curriculum for Excellence there should be no transition point during a child’s secondary education. However, where as a result of geography this would not be feasible, Children’s Services considered that the best time to make a transition where it was unavoidable would be at the end of the Broad General Education in Curriculum for Excellence which is at the end of Secondary 3.

As a result of the deferral of this option by Shetland Islands Council it become one which was considered as part of the informal consultation on a future Strategy for Secondary Education in Shetland in October 2013. During the informal consultation, there was significant opposition from parents, children and school staff to reducing provision in junior highs to Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 only. Respondents were particularly concerned that a transition at the beginning of the Senior Phase in Secondary 4 could disrupt young people’s education in nine months prior to them
sitting their first formal examinations. There were also concerns that Secondary 3 was a very important year for children to undertake the right prior learning to prepare them for their subject choice at the end of Secondary 3, and this would be best served if children were in the same school for Secondary 3 and Secondary 4.

**Increase provision to Secondary 1 to Secondary 6**

This option would reduce the number of subjects and areas of the curriculum available for children at Sandwick Junior High School at the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Excellence as it would require an increase in resourcing to the school. Children’s Services cannot increase its expenditure at this time. In addition to the considerable savings it has already made of over £5 million in the past four years, it is required to reduce its expenditure by a further £3.268 million by March 2017.

**Closure of the Secondary Department**

Children’s Services has previously considered closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, with children attending Anderson High School for their secondary education. This option would provide children with their entire secondary education in the same setting which is the ideal scenario for children achieving their full entitlements in Curriculum for Excellence.

In addition, the financial savings accrued would provide benefit to all children in Shetland. However during the informal consultation on a future strategy for secondary education in Shetland in October 2013 respondents opposed the option to close Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department option, feeling that outright closure of the secondary department would be detrimental to the local community and would damage young people’s sense of community identity. At Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013, as part of the Strategy for Secondary Education Report, closure continued to be recommended by Professor Don Ledingham, for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department. However, an amendment by councillors was successful in altering the proposal for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, from closure of the secondary department to considering the provision of Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 education.

**Remote teaching**

An option for one teacher to remotely teach a number of classes, using a “Telepresence” video link, was modelled as part of the Strategy for Secondary Education in Shetland. This option would not meet Shetland Islands Council agreed priorities of operating within council budgets. It does not provide equal opportunity for all children, as those in the remote classroom settings would be disadvantaged. Early exploration of this option indicated that it would not be reliable and thus be too fragile an option for children to rely on for their secondary education. During the informal consultation in October 2013, parents, children and staff did not see this as a viable option; there was particular concern that this option would compromise the ability of the teacher to meet each young person’s individual needs, and that there was a high risk of the technology failing and children being left without a teacher. There was however, an acknowledgement that better use of technology in the future could enable children to access additional courses unavailable in a school, or to link with other children studying a course for which there was a small uptake.
Hub option

Four variations of a “Hub” option were included in the Strategy for Secondary Education in Shetland informal consultation. In these options management would be centred in one or both of Shetland’s high schools, with children at junior high “satellite” schools transferring to high school after either Secondary 3 or Secondary 4. Educationally then, for children studying within Curriculum for Excellence, these options would have the same limitations and advantages as retaining provision of Secondary 1 to Secondary 4, or retaining provision of Secondary 1 to Secondary 3 as outlined above. In addition there could be a negative impact on the continuity of young people’s learning and on the availability of liaison time between teachers and young people. Financial savings from the reduction of staffing costs would not be sufficient to meet Shetland Islands Council agreed priorities of operating within council budgets.

Factor

The likely effect on the local community in consequence of the Proposal (if implemented) with particular reference to:

1. The sustainability of the community;
2. The availability of the school’s premises and its other facilities for use by the community.

Response

1. The implication of any school closure cannot be addressed in isolation. There are a number of complex socio-economic issues that influence rural communities such as Sandwick. These issues are addressed as fully as is possible at this time by Children’s Services in the response to the Impact on the Community Concerns section of this Consultation Report.

Taking on board the depth of community concerns about the impact that the discontinuation of two stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department might have on the community and the local economy, Children’s Services commissioned a Socio-Economic Study to be carried out. Children’s services commissions socio-economic studies on all closure proposals, and this approach is recognized in the Report on the Commission for Rural Education as good practice.

Steve Westbrook, Economist, Nairn, in partnership with Sandy Anderson, were commissioned by the Director of Children’s Services, to undertake a Socio-Economic Study on the potential impacts on the community of Sandwick and the South Mainland of Shetland should the Proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department go forward. The full text of the study can be found as Appendix H.

The terms of reference for the study were to:

- provide information on the economy of Sandwick Junior High School's catchment area (i.e. employment, business output, etc);
- identify the direct and other impacts of proposed changes to the secondary department of Sandwick Junior High School;
- investigate possible mitigating actions which might be undertaken by the
The main conclusions in the study are:

- The net annual savings from discontinuing the S3 and S4 stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School are estimated by Shetland Islands Council to be £223,530;

- There are 1,407 resident households in the secondary department’s catchment area - 638 in the Dunrossness area, 388 in Sandwick and 388 in Cunningsburgh;

- The catchment area includes areas that have had the strongest population growth in Shetland over the last 10 years, but it also includes areas around Dunrossness with modest population growth or decline;

- The availability of social housing is below the Shetland average in the catchment area, especially around Dunrossness and Cunningsburgh;

- Growth in housing availability has centred on the communities to the north of the catchment area, especially Sandwick;

- Sandwick is identified in SIC’s Local Plan as the “area of best fit”, where any significant housing development should take place;

- The majority of the population of the South Mainland who are in employment travel outside the area for work (principally Lerwick);

- The major employers in the catchment area are the Council (mainly in education at the Sandwick Junior High School and its feeder primary schools and in social care at Overtonlea Care Centre), at Sumburgh Airport (HIAL and other companies based there), and in tourism at Sumburgh Hotel. There are also a number of employers in retail, knitwear and other sectors;

- Employment opportunities at Sumburgh Airport are expanding and this could put some pressure on housing in the Dunrossness area. Companies would be keen to recruit locally (subject to skills being available), but some will employ weekly commuters if necessary;

- Self-employment is an important feature of the local economy – through agriculture, crofting, tourism and other home based businesses;

- Total annual household income in the catchment area is estimated at some £54 million;

- The direct impact of discontinuing the S3 and S4 stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School would be the loss of teaching and support staff at the school. These employment reductions would be offset within Shetland to an extent by additional posts at Anderson High School in Lerwick and through the additional costs of school transport;

- There is also likely to be an impact on retail turnover, especially in the shop and bakery at Sandwick, from reduced spending by pupils and their parents;
• Whilst we found little evidence that families would leave the area in the short term if the proposed changes to secondary education at Sandwick are implemented, there is some concern that the loss of S3 and S4 education at Sandwick would make the area less attractive for families moving to or within Shetland and promote a drift towards Lerwick;

• It is possible that homes, especially in the Dunrossness area, will increasingly be occupied by older people and by workers at Sumburgh Airport who rent while maintaining a family home elsewhere rather than relocating their families;

• There is wide concern about young people becoming disengaged from their local community at a younger age and the effects this would have on community cohesion;

• The school building will still be heavily used for educational provision and there appears to be limited scope to extend its use for community benefit;

• Overall, the proposal to discontinue stages S3 and S4 of secondary education at Sandwick Junior High School is likely to make the South Mainland a less attractive place to live for some families, but the other factors which will continue to attract people to live there may, on balance, outweigh the impetus to move away.

The suggested mitigating actions in the socio-economic study, which will be considered should this Proposal be accepted are:

• Sandwick Junior High School will still be a busy school, used for nursery and primary education and for the S1 and S2 stages of secondary education. Sandwick is an expanding community and has been identified in the Local Plan as the area where any significant development in the South Mainland should take place. It seems likely that the school roll will continue to grow in the medium term across those age groups for which it will cater. This would limit the possibility of there being spare capacity for community use of the school to be expanded, although this could be explored.

• Concerns about community cohesion and loss of the bonds built between young people in their formative years at Sandwick Junior High School are strong. To mitigate against this, it would be important to ensure that transport arrangements allow for pupils to return home promptly and to maintain opportunities for after-school, sporting and youth club activity in the South Mainland (whilst also being able to participate in after-school activities in Lerwick). In the current economic climate, where funding for youth work, for example, is being reduced, this could be difficult to achieve, but support for volunteers and in accessing alternative sources of funding would help.

• The jobs lost at the school should have a relatively small net effect on the South Mainland economy, although the future decisions by teaching staff on where to live would be a key factor.

2. Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department will remain open for the
delivery of Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 education and primary and nursery education. Therefore the current use the community makes of the school can continue exactly as at present. The removal of two stages in the secondary department would potentially provide some additional space for community use.

**Factor**

The likely effect caused by any different travelling arrangements that may be required in consequence of the Proposal (if implemented) with reference in particular to:

1. the effect caused by such travelling arrangements including (in particular), that on the school’s pupils and staff and any other users of the school’s facilities and any environmental impact;

2. the travelling arrangements are those to and from the school of (and for) the school’s pupils and staff and any other users of the school’s facilities.

**Response**

The Proposal Paper clearly states the amount we estimate will be required to provide the additional transport; notwithstanding, the savings arising from the Proposal are significant at £223,530.

The costs stated in respect of the additional transport required reflect the current cost of transport provision, aligned with the individual locations of each child affected by the proposal. Although routes have not been tendered until very recently, a financial uplift has been applied to each contract year on year, to include Retail Price Index (RPI) and local fuel price fluctuations.

Competitive prices have been achieved for all school transport routes, as evidenced by the recent tendering exercise – awarding contracts for five years, as opposed to three, has made these contracts more attractive to the local bus operators.

The recent tender exercise in respect of school and public transport routes did not include the extra journeys required under this proposal; however, separate contracts will be tendered and awarded if necessary once a decision is made.

The budget for school transport sits within the Transport Planning Service which is part of the Development Department. A budgetary transfer would be required from Children’s Services to the Transport Planning Service and this is clearly factored in to all such proposals.

It is standard practice across Scotland for authorities to make maximum use of public bus services to convey children between home and school where it is cost effective to do so. The Scottish Government has commissioned a number of studies into school transport in recent years in this respect and the issue of risk arising from children travelling on public buses has not been highlighted in any of these studies. Consequently there is nothing to suggest that the approach adopted by Shetland Islands Council is unreasonable or unsafe.

There would be no impact on the public transport network as this proposal factors in a similar number of children who already access public transport. In fact, the number would reduce slightly from 20 to 18. All children will have bus passes for
the start of the new academic year so those not in receipt of passes will not be entitled to use the designated transport. The Council will ensure capacity exists for all those children who have been issued with bus passes.

If, as a result of a placing request, any child is attending a school other than their catchment area school, then there is no entitlement to free school transport; responsibility lies with the parent(s). Those children may take up any vacant seats on existing school transport, with the agreement of the Executive Manager, Schools, or avail themselves of seats on public transport routes, but any such children will not be taken into account when specifying the number of seats required for any bus contracts.

Children’s Services do acknowledge the concerns which have been raised by parents in relation to the increased travel times incurred by their children, particularly in relation to healthy lifestyles. However those young people may benefit from having a greater range of opportunities available to them in regards to social groups, clubs and teams. It is acknowledged however, that this Proposal may not allow for children from the South Mainland to cycle to school.

The South Mainland enjoys a very good public bus service which should help facilitate children affected by this proposal continuing their involvement in after school activities. Similarly, this should assist any children currently undertaking volunteering in their communities. If it does not however, then staff within Children’s Services will assist with finding alternative volunteering opportunities and extra-curricular activities. Community Development staff will be keen to engage with the community as a whole to ensure as far as possible that steps are taken to maintain groups/activities/events which currently run in Sandwick.

There is no evidence to suggest that children are disadvantaged educationally by travelling on school transport.

Shetland Islands Council has given a commitment that, as far as is possible, no secondary aged child will travel for longer than 65 minutes for any single journey. What is being proposed are the most direct, economic routes:

- Bus 1: Quendale – Scousburgh – Bigton – Quarff;
- Bus 2: Dunrossness – Levenwick – Gulberwick;
- Bus 3: Sandwick – Cunningsburgh.

Providing the transport in this configuration reduces the number of stops required.

Children with additional support needs have their needs regularly assessed and where dedicated transport is required, we try to ensure that it is as flexible as possible in its delivery. Some children with additional support needs travel from as far afield as North Roe and Whalsay to Lerwick on a daily basis to access their education.

All school transport routes are gritted in advance of that transport using those routes. Adverse weather can mean days lost for children but the presumption made is always against closure unless all the advice available to Children’s Services would indicate that children could not be transported to, and from, school safely. In those circumstances, any individual head teacher may take the decision to close
their school, or, if the weather conditions dictate, the Executive Manager of Schools may take the decision to issue a blanket closure instruction.

The Anderson High School enrolment form, which is used for all children attending there, has a section that asks for one of the contacts provided to be listed as a snow closure contact. However, it is many years now since the school has had to make use of these contacts for this purpose.

Since October 2001, all new coaches and minibuses have had to be fitted with seat belts. A forward facing seat fitted with a minimum of a lap belt must be available to every child. New regulations introduced in September 2008, requires all seated passengers aged 14 years and above to use seat belts when they are fitted in all buses and coaches. The Government have recently announced the intention to legislate to make seatbelts a requirement on all dedicated school transport in Scotland. This is planned for implementation in 2018 for primary children, and 2021 for secondary children. However, Shetland Islands Council already has these measures in place for all of its school transport contracts and so this latest announcement will not result in additional expense for the local authority.

Drivers employed are professional drivers, suitably qualified for the job. The operators are licensed, and the vehicles require to be licensed and tested as Public Service Vehicles. The School Transport Policy requires bus operators to have contingency plans in place, to deal with vehicle failures, adverse weather and the emergency closure of schools.

There is no statutory requirement for education authorities to provide supervisors on school transport provided under the Education (Scotland) Act 1980.

Risk assessments in respect of pick up/drop off points will be the responsibility of the local authority in future, as opposed to the transport operator. All such risk assessments will be carried out before the start of the new academic year, in August 2014. Additional Road Safety Audits will be carried out where the authority deems them necessary, or where requested by parents. Once this work is complete and pick up/drop off points designated, all parents will be made aware of the route and pick up/drop of point pertinent for their child(ren).

Increased travel time for teachers will result in additional mileage costs for the authority where that travel happens during the working day. Careful timetabling will ensure that this is kept to a minimum. Such staff sharing arrangements do allow for the most effective use of teacher contact time.

Shetland Islands Council as responsible Authority carried out under Section 8 of The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005, a Strategic Environmental Assessment Gateway screening of the Strategy for Secondary Education agreed proposals.

The determination by Shetland Islands Council under Section 8(1) of the Act is that the Strategy for Secondary Education proposals are unlikely to have significant environmental effects, and a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required.

Before making this determination, Shetland Islands Council sent a summary of its views as to whether or not the plan is likely to have significant environmental effects to Consultative Authorities (Scottish Natural Heritage, Historic Scotland and the
Scottish Environmental Protection Agency) via the Strategic Environmental Assessment Gateway. Shetland Islands Council noted that the Consultation Authorities agreed with the view that the Strategy for Secondary Education proposals were unlikely to have significant environmental effects and made the determination to that effect under Section 8 (1) of the Act. In making that determination Children’s Services applied criteria in Schedule 2 of the Act.

20. **Review of the Proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department**

20.1 Following the period of statutory consultation on the proposed discontinuation of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, Children’s Services has reviewed the Proposal as follows.

20.2 Firstly, it has given due consideration to the oral representations made at the two public meetings, and the additional meeting with parents of current Secondary 2 children at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, and to all the written representations (responses) received. These have been summarised and responded to in this Consultation Report.

20.3 Secondly, it has considered the points raised by children at both Sandwick Junior High School and the Anderson High School, and the comments made by the staff at Sandwick Junior High School and the Anderson High School. These have been responded to in this Consultation Report.

20.4 Thirdly, Children’s Services has carried out an Integrated Impact Assessment of the Proposal, NHS Shetland has carried out a Health Impact Assessment and an independent socio-economic study has been commissioned and received. All of this information helps Children’s Services comply with its statutory obligation in terms of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, but also provides significant detailed information which Children’s Services and all other stakeholders must take account of if this Proposal is implemented.

20.5 Lastly, Children’s Services has considered the content of the report by Education Scotland on the educational aspects of the Proposal who raise a number of significant issues. We are heartened and reassured that Education Scotland, our national external scrutiny body is also clear that Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 education in junior highs is no longer a viable way forward:

“The council has made a clear case that for, reasons of financial sustainability and the need to develop a coherent senior phase for young people which meets their diverse needs and aspirations, the current arrangement of providing education for the S1 to S4 stages at Sandwick Junior High School is neither viable nor in the best interests of children and young people.”

However Education Scotland also has concerns that a convincing case for Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 provision at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department has not been made.
21. **Representations to the Scottish Ministers in terms of Section 15 (4) of The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010**

21.1 The Scottish Ministers have six weeks to decide whether or not they are going to issue a call-in notice to Children’s Services. The six weeks begins on the day Shetland Islands Council takes their final decision to implement a Closure Proposal. The Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 amends the call-in period to eight weeks, however, this amendment is not yet in force at the time of publishing this Consultation Report.

21.2 There is a three-week period during which anyone can make representations to the Scottish Ministers requesting that they call-in Shetland Islands Council’s decision. This three week period begins on the day Shetland Islands Council takes their final decision to implement a Closure Proposal.

21.3 Therefore, anyone who wishes to make representations to Scottish Ministers can do so until 30 June 2014. The Scottish Ministers will have until 21 July 2014 to take a decision on the call-in of the Closure Proposal.

21.4 If anyone would like to make a representation to Scottish Ministers requesting them to call-in a local authority decision to close a school then they are asked that they please send an email, clearly setting out which of the criteria they believe are grounds for the case to be called in, and provide specific evidence to support their request, to the following addresses: schoolclosure@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

or post to: The Scottish Government, School Infrastructure Unit, 2A (South), Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ.

21.5 There is a section of the Scottish Government website which includes this information and the process:

[www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education/Schools/Buildings/changestoschoolestate](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education/Schools/Buildings/changestoschoolestate)

21.6 Shetland Islands Council cannot therefore implement its final decision until the six week period has elapsed, unless Scottish Ministers have earlier informed the Local Authority that they do not intend to call-in the decision.

22. **Conclusions**

22.1 Throughout this statutory consultation process Children’s Services has given special regard to the provision for rural schools within Section 12 of The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

22.2 The statutory consultation process was robust and provided an opportunity for all stakeholders to identify key issues of concern. These issues have been fully considered and Children’s Service’s response is detailed in earlier sections of this Report.

22.3 To ensure the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 were fulfilled in their fullest regard, a Socio-Economic Study was commissioned on this proposal and a Health Impact Assessment. Children’s Services also carried out an Integrated Impact Assessment.
22.4 Education Scotland visited Sandwick Junior High School and the Anderson High School to speak to parents, children and staff. They had the opportunity to view the proposal paper and all written responses.

22.5 In considering any statutory consultation proposal which proposes closure, Children’s Services is mindful of its key statutory obligations in the delivery of school education. The principal requirement of the local education authority is to provide adequate and efficient education and it must ensure that this education is directed to the development of the personality, talents and mental and physical abilities of the child or young person to their fullest potential.

22.6 The norm for almost all secondary aged children in Scotland is that they will receive all of their secondary education in one establishment from Secondary 1 to Secondary 6. As a result, the secondary stages of Curriculum for Excellence are designed to support this model. This is reflected most clearly in two of the entitlements of all young people within Curriculum for Excellence: all young people are entitled to experience a curriculum which is coherent from three to eighteen; and all young people are entitled to a Senior Phase. Children’s Services, since proposals for the rationalisation of the school estate were put forward in the Blueprint for Education in 2010, have argued that due to the requirements and entitlements of Curriculum for Excellence, that wherever it is feasible, secondary aged children in Shetland should be educated in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 school.

22.7 Clear proposals for the future of the secondary school estate in Shetland were agreed on 20 September 2012 as part of the Plan for Education 2012-17. However, as a result of a great deal of community concerns about the impact of these proposals; and as a result of the rolling out of the Senior Phase of Curriculum for Education, the future direction of the secondary school estate was the subject of further consideration by Shetland Islands Council during 2013.

22.8 The culmination of this work was the Strategy for Secondary Education Report which was presented to Education and Families Committee and Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013. The Strategy for Secondary Education Report was prepared following a further period of informal consultation across Shetland and the involvement of an independent educational expert, Professor Don Ledingham. This Report contained exciting recommendations for the future of education in Shetland which will be progressed through the Shetland Learning Partnership Project.

22.9 In addition, taking account of the informal consultation feedback from October 2013, a different raft of proposals, was proposed for the rationalisation of the secondary school estate as follows:

- the proposed closure of Aith Junior High School Secondary Department and Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department;
- the discontinuation of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education in Whalsay School Secondary Department, Mid Yell Junior High School Secondary Department and Baltasound Junior High School Secondary Department.

22.10 The rationale for the transition point at the end of Secondary 2 from the junior highs of Whalsay School, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School was put forward as follows by Professor Don Ledingham:
“For the reasons outlined earlier in this section of the report it is necessary to rationalise the delivery of secondary education in Shetland to protect the future high quality outcomes for all of Shetland’s learners.

Another key question that has emerged as a consequence of the consultation process and consideration of the development of the senior phase curriculum has been the notion of the appropriate time for students to transfer from Junior High Schools to High Schools.

Section 6 in the preceding report highlights the advantages of a transfer at the end of Secondary 3 and, also considers the transfer at the end of Secondary 2.

The Howie Report (1992), which looked at the Secondary 5/Secondary 6 curriculum, highlighted the two term dash to Highers as ‘perhaps the most fundamental theme of all — the uneven gradient of difficulty throughout school education’. That steep gradient in Secondary 5 resulted in senior pupils and their teachers having to do too much too quickly and from an unsuitable starting point.

What is very apparent from evolving senior curricular structures in Scotland is that schools are being encouraged to enable their students to commence their Higher course either at the beginning of Secondary 4 or half-way through Secondary 4. This addresses one of the key concerns regarding Higher course delivery, namely that they deteriorate into the ‘two-term dash’. By extending the learning time the opportunities for students to maximise their potential is greatly increased.

As such, any notion of a transfer at the end of Secondary 4 would significantly disadvantage students taking the ‘gold standard’ qualification of Scottish education.

There was very little support for an end of Secondary 3 transfer from any of the consultation respondent groups and I would concur with that conclusion. For that reason I would recommend a transfer to the Anderson High School from Junior High Schools at the end of Secondary 2. The logic and advantages of such a transition are set out in the aforementioned section but the prime factor would be to enable young people to settle into the new learning environment prior to commencing the most important two years of their education in terms of high stakes qualifications.”

22.11 Professor Don Ledingham concurred with Children’s Services rationale that wherever possible children should receive their secondary education in a Secondary 1 to Secondary 6 school. However, he also agreed that, due to Shetland’s geography that this was not feasible for all children.

22.12 In addition, as previously noted, Professor Ledingham also made it clear that the current provision of education in junior highs in Shetland for Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 was not a tenable position in moving forward to secure children’s full entitlements to Curriculum for Excellence are met. As transfer at the end of Secondary 3 was met with such concern, an earlier proposed transfer point, at the end of Secondary 2, had to be recommended.

22.13 Children’s Services has further made the case, in this Consultation Report, that the current system of junior highs in Shetland delivering Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 cannot continue if children in Shetland are to receive their full entitlements to Curriculum for Excellence.
22.14 This is because transfer at the end of Secondary 4:

- prevents the planning of the Senior Phase as a coherent two or three year experience which it should be for learners in order for them to study for different levels of qualifications over variable timeframes;
- prevents children from bypassing lower level qualifications;
- inhibits seamless progression through from the Broad General Education right through to the end of the Senior Phase;
- inhibits the development of the level of partnership working with employers and local colleges and other learning partners which would meet the needs of all learners for the duration of the Senior Phase.

22.15 The Anderson High School is also quite clear that it cannot progress to fully develop the requirements of the Senior Phase whilst it continues to have children coming in at the end of Secondary 4. This creates a barrier to Secondary 4 to Secondary 6 being developed as a coherent Senior Phase experience. The consequence of this then, is that it limits the opportunity of all children who attend the Anderson High School, including those who have been there from Secondary 1, to access their full entitlement to a Senior Phase.

22.16 In recommending the end of Secondary 2 as a transition point and not the end of Secondary 3, which is the end of the Broad General Education of Curriculum for Excellence, this was in response to community concerns as part of the informal consultation exercise carried out in October 2013.

22.17 These concerns were principally that:

- transfer at the end of Secondary 3 was too close for children, to the commencement of their first formal exams, when they would also be expected to settle into an new environment as well as study;
- it was important for children’s wellbeing to be educated for as long as possible in their own communities; and
- due to increased travel times, and different travel arrangements, that having some secondary education in children’s own communities would enable them to participate for longer in local social and community activities.

22.18 Secondary 1 and Secondary 2 education was not recommended for Sandwick Junior High School due to:

- the potential for daily travel for all secondary-aged children from the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department catchment area to be feasible within the agreed 65 minute limit for a single journey for a secondary aged child; and
- the potential for savings from the closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to secure significant progress towards target savings for Children’s Services as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan; thereby
helping protect educational benefits for all children in school education in Shetland.

However, Children’s Services were instructed to progress a proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School following a successful amendment made at Shetland Islands Council on 13 November 2013. In taking forward this proposal, the following educational benefits were identified:

- access to a common curriculum to ensure smooth transition to Secondary 3 at the Anderson High School;
- the opportunity to access, in a seamless manner, the right personalisation of the curriculum in Secondary 3 to prepare children for their subject choices at the end of Secondary 3 for the Senior Phase;
- a smooth and seamless transition at the end of Secondary 3 through to a full Senior Phase at the Anderson High School with the widest variety of learning opportunities available over Secondary 4, Secondary 5 and Secondary 6;
- teaching staff who would be working across schools sharing good practice, particularly in teaching and learning and assessment;
- as most teachers would also be involved in presenting for qualifications in another settings, children would benefit from their knowledge of the progression to the qualifications framework;
- being educated in their own community for the early years of their secondary education;
- as teachers will be working across settings, they may already know the children when they transfer to the Anderson High School for Secondary 3;
- access to a wide range of opportunities for wider achievement.

22.19 The report by Education Scotland on the educational aspects of the Proposal for Sandwick Junior High School also recognises that Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 provision in junior highs is no longer a tenable position for Children’s Services in Shetland. There are clear and strong messages on this matter which agree with the rationale put forward by Children’s Services in this Consultation Report. Education Scotland makes the following points:

“3.2 It is clear from the financial situation and, in order to continue the principles and vision of Curriculum for Excellence, that there is a need for change in the way that education is organised in the Shetland Islands. The council reports that the way that their secondary high schools and junior high schools are arranged is not financially sustainable. Young people are entitled to experience a coherent curriculum from 3 to 18. Anderson High School is currently developing the senior phase further. It is continually developing positive partnerships with a range of businesses, organisations and further and higher educational establishments which is enabling them to provide a more innovative curriculum to meet diverse needs. Young people would benefit from the range of flexible learning pathways better if they had continuous experience of their senior phase from S4 to S6.” (Page 7)

And again, in the Summary section at the end of their Report:

“4.1 The council has made a clear case that for, reasons of financial sustainability and the need to develop a coherent senior phase for young people which meets their diverse needs and aspirations, the current arrangement of providing education
for the S1 to S4 stages at Sandwick Junior High School is neither viable nor in the best interests of children and young people.” (Page 9)

22.20 However Education Scotland also feel that a clear case for Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 education only, in Sandwick Junior High School being the most appropriate way forward has not been made:

“However, in the consultation proposal, the council has not set out a convincing case that the discontinuation of S3 and S4 at Sandwick Junior High School is the most reasonable and viable option and will deliver clear educational benefits for the children and young people directly affected by it.” (Page 9)

The key issues identified in Education Scotland’s report to support this conclusion are:

- the timing of the proposal, with particular reference to the current Secondary 2 group at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, and the building of the new Anderson High School;
- the lack of informal consultation on this particular option;
- that the educational benefits of this proposal for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department are not clear;
- the impact of different travel arrangements on children with children travelling for longer each day on packed buses with no supervision;
- the potential impact of increased shared staffing arrangements on staff and children in Sandwick Junior High School and at the Anderson High School, for what is a relatively small amount of savings;
- that transition arrangements for a move at the end of Secondary 2 in the future are not clear, particularly if secondary departments and schools bring forward the change of timetable into Secondary 3 to the start of the formal exam period in April and May, instead of at the end of it.

22.21 The issues identified by Education Scotland reflect key issues raised by respondents during the statutory consultation period. The proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School was almost universally disliked.

22.22 Of the three hundred and sixteen written responses received during the consultation, 78.16% disagreed with the proposal in favour of no change to secondary provision at Sandwick Junior High School; 3.80% disagreed with the proposal in favour of the closure of Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department; 1.58% agreed with the proposal and 16.46 % did not express an opinion.

22.23 Those opposed to the proposal were concerned about the impact the discontinuation of Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School would have on the fabric of the community of the South Mainland, its economic viability and its attractiveness as a place to live. There was a huge amount of acknowledgement of the quality of education delivered in Sandwick
Junior High School Secondary Department by dedicated and committed staff who provide a supportive and inclusive learning environment. There were also a great deal of concerns about the increase in the numbers of teaching staff who would be shared between schools to make this Proposal work, and the impact this would have on staff and the education provided.

22.24 All the issues raised by respondents and Education Scotland have been addressed in this Consultation Report. Children’s Services has been clear all along that the educational case for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department becoming a Secondary 1 to Secondary 2 school is not as strong as it is for the smaller secondary departments in Whalsay School, Mid Yell Junior High School and Baltasound Junior High School.

22.25 However, it is also clear, as a result of the outcomes of the statutory consultation period on the proposal to discontinue Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, that there is a community imperative to retain some secondary education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department.

22.26 Children’s Services also believe that it will be feasible to create the climate for a successful transition for children from Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department to the Anderson High School at the end of Secondary 2. As the implementation date for this proposal is now recommended to coincide with the opening of the new Anderson High School in August 2016, aspects of the Shetland learning Partnership, principally the common curriculum and the alignment of the school day will be in place to facilitate this.

22.27 In recommending the implementation of this Proposal, Children’s Services is clear that is does so on the relative educational benefits to secondary aged children in the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department catchment area which can accrue from this Proposal, as set against the current arrangements. The continuation of Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 education in a junior high school is not a viable option moving forward.

22.28 Transfer at the end of Secondary 2 will enable children to access a seamless uninterrupted Senior Phase where they can maximise all the learning opportunities which will be created through the development of the Shetland Learning Partnership. It will also enable children to be educated in their own communities for as long as is feasible. In addition, for children from the Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department catchment area it does not generate unacceptable daily travel times.

22.29 This proposal, if implemented will provide recurring savings to Shetland Islands Council of £223,530. This proposal makes an ongoing contribution to Children’s Services meeting its target budget agreed in the Medium Term Financial Plan.
23. **Recommendation**

23.1 Children’s Services therefore recommends that:

- stages of education at Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department, namely Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 be discontinued with effect from 01 July 2016, or as soon as possible thereafter, when the new Anderson High School building is open for pupils;

- the Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 pupils of Sandwick Junior High School continue their education at the Anderson High School when the new Anderson High School building is open for pupils; at present this is still anticipated to be from 15 August 2016 but may be later;

- the catchment area for Anderson High School for Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 pupils be altered to include the current catchment area for Sandwick Junior High School Secondary Department Secondary 3 and Secondary 4 pupils.