



PARENT COUNCIL MEETING

Date: Friday 9th January 2015

Place: Hillhead Primary School

Parent Council Attendees: Ruth Downes (Chair), Susie Haigh (Secretary), Amalia Theodorakopoulos (Treasurer), Senga Minto, Astrid Azurdia, Emma Benzie, Kirsty Mathieson, Amanda Buchanan, Claudine Corneloup, Margaret Mitchell, Fauzia Khan, Rachel Lowther, Julia Boswell

Staff Attendees: Andrew Robson (Depute), Francis Donaghy (Headteacher)

Other Attendees: Four parents from Hillhead Primary School parent forum.

Apologies: Anne Hanson, Andrea Fisher, Lisa Crampin, Colin Tsang, Agnieska Lampart, Sandra Huettenbuegel, Anke Hilt, Isolde Tod, Kiki Kobatake

AGENDA

1. Welcome and apologies
2. Consultation response and next steps
3. Feedback on actions from meeting 2nd December
 - a. Guidelines on website
 - b. Summer fair – cost of let; set date and lead person?
 - c. School disco – feedback from children; next step?
 - d. Fundraising bag/t-towel – lead person?
 - e. Class email lists – feedback?
 - f. Uniform - feedback
 - g. Outdoor Learning/playground group – feedback; next steps?; lunchbox storage?
 - h. Healthy Eating sub group – next steps? Advance ordering option (email suggestion)
 - i. Fundraising subgroup – next steps?
4. Use of PC funds
 - a. Next step?
 - b. Date for Pupil Council meeting
5. Head Teacher's update
6. AOB
 - a. After school care provision
 - b. Food bank collection feedback
 - c. FGM

MINUTES

First part of the meeting took place in the underground car park in order that parent council could inspect space that GCC proposing to convert into dance studio.

1) Welcome and Apologies

Francis Donaghy welcomed those present and showed parents area of car park identified for use on plans. All interpretation was based upon *Appendix K* (attached) from GCC proposals. The following points were discussed:

- At moment no detail and plan hard to read, so just indication on what might happen and how it would work.
- Would need to be two fire escapes, and currently back exit has short but steep flight of steps which would need to be adapted for disabled access / exit.
- Initial concerns about the low ceiling height and presence of large ducts that currently service the kitchen and require maintenance access at various times in the year.
- Entry / exit to studio for children still to be resolved. One suggestion, made in *Appendix K*, was to build a corridor in small area of playground between car park building and old house.
- Worries about removing playground space and an area that had been identified for outdoor gardening planters.
- Another option from *Appendix K* is to build a staircase down from the changing rooms above the Car Park. Concerns about removing a changing room and subsequent costs / time scale.
- Overall the time scale is a concern, assuming all the building issues could be resolved. Where would Hillhead Primary fit into GCC's investment programme set out in the 4Rs refurbishment project – clarity required?

RD circulated a series of points raised by parent council member Colin Tsang who has professional experience in building / construction. He estimated 10-11 months for such a project to be completed. (***Appendix A***).

Overall concern expressed by a number of parents about the time scale for such a project, the continuation of space issues in the school during this time and the subsequent effect on the children's quality of education.

Others pointed out the report states GCC have agreed to do a feasibility study, not to deliver, and that it might well prove not to be feasible, which would mean very little was being done to address the space issues.

Meeting moved inside and Ruth Downes welcomed those present.

2) Consultation

RD explained that the main purpose of the meeting would be to discuss the summary report on the consultation published in December 2014.

<https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=26922&p=0>

The parent council sent a letter to all parents in December to make them aware of the report and ask for feedback. Ruth read a summary of main points raised in the feedback received. There have been approximately 7 emails broadly in support of the response and 44 not in support at the time of the meeting. (**Appendix B**)

RD emphasised that the point of the meeting was to discuss findings but also to decide on what action the PC should take. The executive committee will be likely to be asked to approve and vote on the report on 22nd January 2015.

There was a wide-ranging discussion during the meeting, focusing mainly on the following areas:

- Feasibility of dance studio being built and whether even if it were, it would go far enough to alleviate problems.
- How realistic is the intended cap and how likely is it to be maintained?
- Composite classes.
- On-going use of the media suite as a shared classroom.
- Consultation process itself.
- Action PC should take.

Please note, that these minutes record the main discussion points raised but not each individual speaker apart from, for purposes of clarity, Ruth Downes (RD), Susie Haigh (SH), Francis Donaghy (FD) and Andrew Robson (AR).

Dance Studio

- Concern raised about the time scale – could be well into 2015 before built.
- Executive Committee being asked to approve something that a) might not work and b) they have no sense of wider views of community on, as there was no mention of this option during the consultation process.
- Impractical use of money, when converting EYC could be done quickly and more cost effectively. If the dance studio doesn't happen, GCC have effectively done very little to address the problems the school face. Meanwhile children at the school have to suffer consequences for years to come, having faced problems of overcrowding over the past few years.
- Comment made one advantage is the space couldn't be used as a classroom. (FD said that a legal definition of a classroom may need to be sought but felt Dance Studio could be considered as a classroom since teaching and learning would take place on a daily basis.)
- If options to add space to the school back on the table – what about pushing for them to add a floor to the social space? Seems some of these options that GCC dismissed may well be possible.

- FD was asked if from the school's perspective would the use of the EYC space provide a better solution to the space crisis.
- FD stated that if that space became available it would provide new options for classrooms, GP space, break out space and an area that could relieve lunchtime pressure and would provide extra playground areas.
- Point made that the extra classrooms from EYC could lead to the school capacity increasing and ultimately make the school bigger and more overcrowded.

FD confirmed that technically all rooms could be used as class bases (subject to legal requirements on floor space) but the infrastructure of the school was finite (gym space, dinner hall space) and would not support this continuous growth.

- Surely it would be better for the school to have the space to allow a realistic and fluid intake over years to reflect the catchment in which it sits. The EYC space would allow the school to be more flexible and work on a shifting intake of 75-99.
- Relocating the nursery is not an option - it was never proposed, closure was the only option so to talk about relocation is misleading. The EYC should not have to move in order to solve the space issues at the primary.
- The location of the current KPEYC is important for the parents accessing it.
- SH however confirmed that the PC position had been that relocation was preferable, but that the PC supported the initial proposal to close / disperse nursery if necessary in order to provide space to school as was felt this was best solution to space crisis and one that could deliver results very quickly –is still opinion of majority of the PC?
- RD confirmed that of course the PC were not unsympathetic the concerns of the nursery, which is why the PC had pushed so strongly for GCC to consider relocating to an alternative site.

Cap

- What if they go over the cap? How likely is it they can keep to the cap, and also keep to the cap in subsequent years (i.e. children joining the school in P2).
- FD updated on current registrations:
 - As of Friday 9th January 106 catchment children have registered for education in Hillhead Primary School, but more enrolment sessions to come. The situation is very hard to pin down as fluid.
 - All children have to register with local school first even if they intend to go elsewhere. It is therefore difficult to establish how many will want to come to Hillhead Primary School.
 - Children with a sibling currently at the school who find themselves out of the catchment will be considered as catchment, and indeed may come ahead of lone parent and distance to school in terms of criteria for entry.
 - We await the decision of the Executive Committee who will determine, how many, if any, reserved spaces will be in place for in P1 for Hillhead Primary School next session.

- It could be that GCC will have to increase the numbers in P1 intakes in other local schools.

In the discussion that followed:

- Point made that children who live very near the school and due to attend in 2015 could find themselves unable to secure a place.
- The cap is a catchment change by another name, but one that is implemented in an ad hoc and unpredictable way, leaving parents feeling frustrated and open to long periods of uncertainty. Local children should be able to attend their local school.
- If the new catchment zone is predicting 80+ children eligible, what is the likelihood of GCC being able to maintain a cap of 75 year to year?

(See appendix C to view summary of different intakes on classrooms requirements)

Composite Classes

- Would composite classes help to alleviate the problems by reducing the number of overall classes and therefore number of class bases required?
- Andrew Robson provided detailed information about how composites would work with current school roll with two models: (a) P1 intake cap of 75 and (b) P1 intake cap of 90. (Anyone interested to see the full breakdown of figures should contact Andrew Robson).

75 model

- A cap of 75 each year up to and including 2019/20 will return the school to 21 classes by August 2019.
- This model will return the possibility of reclaiming the Media Suite in 2016/17.
- The eventual capacity arising from this model would be 651 as of August 2019, this is dependent on no additional classes being added to the model.

75 model with Composite (P2/3)

- Although a cap of 75 for P1 in August 2015 along with a composite class created between P2 and P3 will free up 2 GP rooms or the Media Suite in August 2015, it would be beneficial for one year only and then it would impact negatively on space for 4 further years.
- This newly created composite alongside a consistent cap of 75 each year will return the school to 21 classes in August 2021.
- This model would mean that 1 GP room less will be available (compared to the straight 75 model) in years 2017/18, 2018/19, 2019/2020 and 2020/21.

75 model with composite (P3/4)

- A cap of 75 for P1 in August 2015 and a composite created at P3/4 would free up 2 GP rooms or the Media Suite for 2015/16 and 2016/17 but it would then take 1 additional year (compared to straight 75 model) to return to 21 classes (it would be 2020/21).

- From an educational point of view are composites good or bad?

FD answered that they exist for organisational purposes and are created by joining children from 2 or more Year groups to form a class. The legal maximum is 25 pupils and they are common practice and are an accepted model throughout the country.

A comment was made that it was irrelevant whether good or bad, why do it, if they don't bring the space / gp rooms we require? And the model relies on years of waiting for things to improve whereas with the KP space the problems would be instantly addressed.

On-going use of the media suite

- Issue of media suite raised, many of parents present concerned and angry that it will continue to be used as a shared classroom. It was supposed to be an emergency temporary measure and it now looks set to continue.
- The consultation response does not address this and seems to find it acceptable to continue, many parents have contacted the PC to say how unacceptable they find this situation.
- FD confirmed that the school agreed to the option of two classes sharing the space in order to keep one classroom as a GP space, as the alternative was that a barrier would be inserted to make it a classroom with a very small GP space at one end, this was deemed to be a worse option, as the entire school would be reliant on this one very small GP room annexed to a classroom. The arrangement was temporary and GCC agreed to upgrade the wireless capability within the school, provide 20 I-Pads and other IT Hardware to ensure ICT could continue to be delivered to all pupils.

Comments followed:

- Wide agreement that this is unacceptable, the space is not designed as a teaching space and means the room / resource is unavailable to rest of school, it isolates a group of children at one end and limits access to roof garden for other groups of children. Limits the type and scope of IT education available.
- Feel caught between a rock and a hard place - if we complain and tell them game over on sharing the media suite, the danger is they will just make it permanent, i.e. put in with very small gp space at one end. If pc focus on this and force GCC hand on it danger it could precipitate an even worse option and a more permanent loss of Media Suite.
- FD confirmed next year due to the fire regulations the only years with suitable sized classes would be P1 to P4, so it would be two classes from these year groups sharing if GCC kept the arrangement in place.

A further comment was made:

- To push for removal of shared space on basis of it being shared is difficult as shared open plan teaching areas are common and are educationally sound.
- Point made that shared teaching may be acceptable – but in purpose-designed open plan schools. And the point was that it wasn't designed for this and it restricted use of the floor and it took away a resource from the rest of the school.

Consultation process

Main points raised in discussion:

- The terms of the consultation were confusing – parents who might have suggested relocation and marked ‘against’ could be considered counted as against the proposal, when in actual fact they are for moving the nursery off the site.
- Some parents questioned the presentation and interpretation of the figures.
- Could the parent council make a formal complaint?
- The additional consultation and the for/against boxes were confusing and the P7 decant option and second form confused things further. And now an option that nobody was giving their opinion on is the final result.
- Given opinions and strength of feeling about EYC from some parents, but lack of opinion offered from others, would it be good idea to do some kind of straw poll? Seek further mandate.
- RD we could attempt to seek clarification from those who supported relocation. Eg “I support relocating the EYC, and if this is not possible, would support it closing and dispersing amongst existing nursery providers” / “I support relocating the EYC, but if this is not possible in the short-term, I would rather it stayed on site”.
- Concerns raised about devising, circulating and analysing the results of any such poll before the Executive Committee meet next week.
- Others pointed out we asked for feedback before Christmas, can’t spend our time constantly trying to seek out opinions, it is up to parents to make their views known. We are nominated PC, we had a number of emails raising concerns, and our remit is to seek out and push for the best solution for the children in the school.
- SH seems sensible that if we were to attempt a poll it would be better placed to come after RD has met with elected members and council officials.

Other points raised

- Can we ask staff to do anything, what is their view?

FD pointed out staff are seeking Union advice.
- Point made that significant number of parents who are not aware of the complexity of the issues and therefore not responding or engaging with the process. Worry they are accepting the outcome because they not aware of the scale of the problems and time scales. That the ‘solution’ as it stands means for the vast majority of the children in the school currently nothing much will change and they will continue to suffer the effects of bad planning for their time at primary school. The solution also means a number of catchment children will be denied a place at their local school.

- Issue of scale in a big school – other schools have access to gym / dinner hall for GP but ours in constant use, other schools have football pitch (which is legal requirement) available every playtime, ours is available to limited number of children for limited amount of time – e.g. half an hour a week and access relies on parent volunteers. The school needs good quality flexible general purpose space IN the school in order to function effectively.

Conclusions / Action

RD asked PC to focus on what action should be taken.

RD proposed that the responses received combined with the view of the majority of the PC suggest we take action and make known our concerns about the results of the consultation and the action GCC plan to take.

RD proposed that we ask for an urgent meeting with Maureen Mckenna (Executive director of education) Stephen Curran (Executive Member for Education and Young People) and Gordon Matheson (Leader of the Council and Chair of the Executive Committee).

This would be first step in order to seek clarification on concerns.

Do all agree? No objections raised.

One parent asked if Ruth could clarify the issues she intends to raise in these meetings?

RD summarised briefly what she thought the main points were – see below. Confirmed she would clarify further / add specific questions, put in writing, and circulate to the full PC prior to any meeting.

Following issues / questions to be raised as a matter of urgency:

- How do GCC plan to maintain cap and what criteria will be applied?
- If financial investment available for extending infrastructure of the school is this the best use of that money?
- How does the response tackle the problem of overcrowding being experienced by children currently in the school, in particular the on-going use of the media suite / library as a shared classroom?
- Better explanation as to why KPEYC not being relocated as this still viewed as the optimum outcome for all.
- Process – the for / against tick boxes combined with the multiple aspects of the consultation, split over two forms has led to confusion and inaccurate findings.
- The five months of consultation have led to an outcome not included in any previous consultation document and no one has had a chance to scrutinise or comment.

Suggested PC then meet again to discuss. Formal letter will then be written to Executive Committee and Stephen Curran to raise all concerns before the vote.

6) Any Other Business

Noted that run out of time for other agenda items (3), (4) and (5) – SH / RD to email in due course and update on these, ask parents to take forward in sub-groups.

Ruth Downes offered thanks to everyone for attending.

The constitution states that a third of PC members shall form a quorum at PC meetings and this was easily met.

Supporting Documents

Appendix A: Car Park Notes

Appendix B: Feedback Response Summary

Appendix C: Class Bases 75 and 90 Cap

Appendix K: Plan of proposed Dance Studio (taken from GCC education response to consultation)

Appendix A - Notes on Car Park

Means of Escape – The Council's drawing (*Appendix K*) showing the proposed layout on the drawing does not appear to comply with building regulations for escape sequence. The corridor escape/access should really extend to the fire exit door (nearest Otago St). Fire separation etc would need to be reviewed.

Wheelchair Access - The steps from Otago Lane as a fire escape for wheelchair users would likely require use of an "Evacu-chair" as part of the Fire Risk Assessment procedures and therefore will probably need additional staff to lift, supervise other children, etc.

Programme - Assuming it is feasible, GCC would require to undertake the detailed design, say 3 months, Planning and Building Warrant and Tendering, another 3-4 months and say 4 months on site to carry out the works. A total of 10-11 months and dependant on the detailed scheme proposed. These are conservative estimates however given past experience it will inevitably be longer.

Cost - Given that a figure of £180k was quoted for the original nursery alterations for taking away some toilets and opening a door between the buildings, the cost of conversion will be more than this, in particular if they need to form some of external link corridor. The council should have an idea as to budget allocated, given that they have carried out a feasibility study already.

Head Height - The floor to ceiling height is restricted by the existing ductwork, pipes, etc and a raised floor will further reduce the floor to ceiling height. This will be on the low side and likely to require steps/downstands. Ducts can be resized and moved however they normally affect the efficiency of plant and add to the cost. I understand that the council did say at previous meetings that this was one of the reasons as to why the proposal was discounted.

Access from Changing Areas - Some form of corridor should be provided from the changing rooms to access the basement to negate the need for children to exit and enter the building for changing, toilets, etc. Alternatively children would have go outside and back in - assume more staff would be required to manage. External alterations will also need planning consent. The plant room ventilation grilles are along the wall would need to be maintained, so any corridor would have to be "horse shoe" shaped to maintain the fresh air/ventilation for plant room - again adds to cost.

Ventilation, Light etc - There will be the need to provide additional mechanical ventilation and heating for use of the space as a dance studio, again the necessary plant and ducts will reduce the ceiling height or actual space created. It is also likely that vehicle fume extract well be needed for the remaining car parking. The existing grilles along Otago Lane could be changed to windows to provide some degree of natural light, however the quality/amount of natural light will be limited and poor. The concrete wall appears to be retaining structure supporting the lane so not easily altered. There will also be need to insulate, etc. to comply with Building Regulations which reduces space and again the floor to ceiling height.

Loss of Car Parking Spaces - The drawing states that 8 car spaces will be lost, however in reality it will probably be the minimum number as it does not appear that the proposals account for need to relocate accessible spaces, bike stands, and possibility need of turning space.

Appendix B – Summary of responses

In support of response: 7

Main points:

- Response proposals keep all three institutions intact and preschool/school provision together on one site.
- Use of a P2/3 composite class could reduce number of rooms required to 23, freeing up media suite
- If media suite to be used again for two classes, could lobby for better partitioning. Or could move one class out leaving small GP area plus dance studio and social space.
- Solution to the problems achieved through the cap and lowering the number of children coming into the school rather than making more rooms available.
- Dance studio GP space could never be used as classrooms
- Could dance studio space be used for after school care?
- Children with additional support needs should be taught in class and therefore additional break out space not required
- If financial investment is being offered, should welcome it.

Not in support of response: 44

Main points/concerns:

- Serious concern about reality of GCC holding to 75 cap and fact that catchment children will consciously continue to be excluded from school in the longer term if space genuinely to be regained in the school. Catchment reduction by stealth if happens and no help for problem if it doesn't.
- Response just talks about initiating study, not commitment to build. Even if feasible, considered unlikely that dance studio/GP space could be scoped, built and finalised by August 2015. Many factors could derail, delay or stop this development completely. If doesn't happen, school left with status quo.
- Continued use of media suite as shared classroom (not designed as classroom, fire risks, use by younger children, health and safety issues). Also continued impact on its removal as GP space. (*Proposal for discussion to move one class out of media suite into remaining GP room*)
- Does not address problems faced by current pupils or represent much of a solution for future. Effectively the status quo. Response proposal does not provide additional wider infrastructure required/help alleviate pressure on overall infrastructure of the school (playground, dining room, toilets, GP space).
- Not clear why relocation options have been rejected and continued support for this as best outcome.
- Highly flawed process – lack of information or confusing; one answer box for two entirely separate questions; P7 decant; divisive nature. Serious problem with interpretation of figures – one box to tick for two very separate questions; how have people who ticked No but asked for relocation of KPEYC off site been interpreted? If simply been seen as 'not for closure' this is highly misleading as many, if relocation off table, would support closure and dispersal. Makes 50:50 split highly misleading. Document does not accurately reflect voting intention of many due to over simplified form and flawed process. Cost of whole exercise with no acceptable outcome.
- Catchment concerns: split of Woodlands with corresponding community impact (not addressed in response document, similarly safe routes to school issue); catchment change by stealth; not sufficient involvement of non-English speaking communities;

why is Park area only area adjacent to Kelvingrove Park that has been kept in the catchment area and not other houses similarly adjacent?

- Serious impact on children with additional needs of continued overcrowding of school infrastructure.
- Continued pressure on staff
- Continued restriction of use of outdoor woodland area because of EYC use of gate.

Open letter sent to SNP Councillors and Executive Committee members raising concerns also sent to PC email – 69 signatories (some overlap with 39 cited above but also names of people who have not written separately)

Partial/mixed support: 2

Main concerns:

- Initially pleased but increasingly concerned as look at details that outcome not guaranteed, no costings, no proper study and no proper thinking on best use of space/money
- Ensuring that conversion was done well and with proper investment

Suggested points in emails to raise with GCC:

- How do GCC plan to maintain cap and what criteria will be applied? How do they justify consciously excluding catchment children from their local school?
- Request more detail about how and when the feasibility/scoping study for the car park conversion is going to be done. Has any work already been done? Is there any more detail?
- What does the Council intend to do should the feasibility study show conversion is not possible or that the timescale will extend well beyond August 2015 as this would effectively leave the school with a status quo position? Problems of overcrowding in the school need to be addressed now.
- Better explanation as to why the option of relocating KPEYC has been rejected and, further, why closure/dispersal has been taken off the table if relocation not considered possible.
- Concerns about process – five months of consultation led to an outcome which was not included in any previous consultation document and no-one has had a chance to scrutinise or comment on. Serious concern about interpretation of responses and numbers (especially on relocation) given how questions framed. How can Executive Committee vote on a proposal about which they have so little detail?
- Concerns about the catchment – community impact on Woodlands, impact on mainly ethnic communities who have least voice, why certain park adjacent houses been re-included and others haven't.
- If financial investment is available, would other options be better such as two rooms on roofed social space, building on top of nursery or refurbishing building for KPEYC relocation which could provide better solutions to the overcrowding than the current proposal?
- After school care issue

Appendix C – Class bases 75 and 90 Cap

THIS YEAR	
P1	4
P2	4
P3•	4
P4	3
P5	3
P6	3
P7	3
total classes	24

2015/16			
	75 CAP		
P1	3		
P2	4		
P3	4		
P4*	4		
P5	3		
P6	3		
P7	3		
total classes	24		

2016/17			
	75 CAP	90 CAP	99 CAP
P1	3	4	4
P2	3	3	3
P3	4	4	4
P4	3	3	3
P5*	4	4	4
P6	3	3	3
P7	3	3	3
total classes	23	24	24

2017/18			
	75 CAP	90 CAP	99 CAP
P1	3	4	4
P2	3	3	4
P3	3	3	3
P4	3	3	3
P5	3	3	3
P6*	4	4	4
P7	3	3	3
total classes	22	23	24

2018/19			
	75 CAP	90 CAP	99 CAP
P1	3	4	4
P2	3	3	4
P3	3	3	4
P4	3	3	3
P5	3	3	3
P6	3	3	3
P7*	4	4	4
total classes	22	23	25

2019/20			
	75 CAP	90 CAP	99 CAP
P1	3	4	4
P2	3	3	4
P3	3	3	4
P4	3	3	3
P5	3	3	3
P6	3	3	3
P7	3	3	3
total classes	21	22	24

- 'BULGE YEAR'

Hillhead Primary Classrooms and GP space

23 classrooms
 media room / library
 from August 2015? Dance studio

With KPEYC space

25 classrooms
 1 medium gp room
 extra break out space
 extra toilets
 2-3 small GP rooms for music etc
 media room / library

Appendix K - (taken from GCC education response to consultation)

OPTION 2

Formation of Dance Studio within Basement Car Park
Headroom restrictions (2600 to u/s beams + 900mm beam depth [excludes new floor make up]).
Two means of escape to be provided from basement.
Access, including DDA, to be provided from existing adjacent functions, such as changing facilities.
Existing access available via lift, external stair from ground floor roof terrace and car park entrance.
Note, the potential exists to form a new enclosure to the existing external stair to provide direct covered access between Dance Studio and changing rooms.
Adequacy of existing changing provision to be reviewed.
New windows to external wall, formed within existing louver vent openings.
Mechanical extract from car park may be required due to reduced cross ventilation.
Net reduction of 8no car spaces within car park.

