

**BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE – FENLAND PHASE 2**

*To:* **Cabinet**

*Date:* **28 September 2010**

*From:* **Executive Director: Children & Young People's Services**

*Electoral division(s):* **Chatteris, March East, March North, March West, Roman Bank and Peckover, Waldersey, Whittlesey North, Whittlesey South, Wisbech North, Wisbech South**

*Forward Plan ref:*

*Key Decision:* **No**

*Purpose:* **To update Cabinet with developments in respect of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme in Cambridgeshire**

**To seek Cabinet endorsement for the timetable, resourcing, affordability and risk implications associated with the Fenland Phase 2 schools**

*Recommendations:* **Cabinet is recommended to:**

- i. Note recent developments with the BSF programme nationally and in Cambridgeshire;**
- ii. Note the implications and principal risks set out in sections 2 and 3 and Annex 3 of this report; and**
- iii. Confirm the Authority's commitment to proceed with the Fenland Phase 2 schools by endorsing the timetable, resourcing and affordability implications set out in this report.**

<b><i>Officer Contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member contact</i></b>	
Name:	<b>Alan Kippax</b>	Name:	<b>Councillor David Harty</b>
Post:	<b>BSF Programme Director</b>	Portfolio:	<b>Cabinet Member for Learning</b>
Email:	<a href="mailto:Alan.kippax@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Alan.kippax@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email:	<a href="mailto:David.harty@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">David.harty@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel:	<b>01223 716152</b>	Tel:	<b>01223 699173</b>

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Financial Close was achieved and contracts were signed for the Fenland Phase 1 Schools<sup>1</sup> on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2010. At the same time, the Local Education Partnership (LEP) - Cambridgeshire Learning Community Partnerships Ltd (CLCP) - was established and Facilities Management (FM) and Information Communication Technology (ICT) Managed Services contracts were signed with CLCP for all six BSF schools in Fenland. Equitix Ltd is the consortium lead in CLCP supported by the building contractors Kier Eastern, Galliford Try, Willmott Dixon and Clugston, the FM services company Mitie and the ICT provider Dell.
- 1.2 Construction work began at the Phase 1 Schools in July 2010 and is due to be completed at both schools by early 2013. Construction work at the Phase 2 Schools<sup>2</sup> is programmed to start in spring 2012. A timetable for the Fenland BSF programme, together with summary details of the scope of each scheme, is set out at **Annex 1**.
- 1.3 All six schools are the subject of an Outline Business Case (OBC) which was approved by Partnerships for Schools (Pfs) in April 2008.
- 1.4 On 5<sup>th</sup> July 2010 the Secretary of State for Education announced an end to the national BSF programme under which all 3,500 secondary schools in England were due to be rebuilt or refurbished over a 15 year programme. Many projects across the country have been stopped as a result of this announcement. However, a number of projects which have passed financial close, including the six BSF schools in Fenland, will continue to be funded.
- 1.5 Whilst this is welcome news for Fenland, it is less positive for the remaining 38 eligible BSF schools elsewhere in Cambridgeshire for whom the prospects of significant BSF-style investment have almost certainly disappeared. Nor is it a helpful development for the new joint venture partnership with CLCP which was predicated on a regular pipeline of significant value projects in order to maximise the benefit and efficiency of the LEP delivery vehicle.
- 1.6 The Government has established a Review Group to consider how capital investment in schools should be prioritised in the aftermath of BSF. The Terms of Reference for the Review Group are set out at **Annex 2**.
- 1.7 The Review Group is due to produce an interim report in time for the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in October and a final report by the end of the calendar year. The outcome of this Review will be important in a number of respects, including:
  - establishing criteria for prioritising capital spending on schools in the period through to 2014/15;
  - quantifying the amount of schools' capital which is likely to be available overall and to individual local authorities;
  - defining the structures and processes for allocating this funding, including the future role of Pfs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Clarkson Community College, Wisbech; Neale-Wade Community College, March

<sup>2</sup> Sir Harry Smith Community College, Whittlesey; Cromwell Community College, Chatteris; Meadowgate Special School, Wisbech; Fenland Junction Pupil Referral Unit, March

- 1.8 In the short-term, PfS remains the national delivery agency for those BSF schemes which are still going ahead and further PfS approval for the Phase 2 schools is required through the so called “Stage 0” approval gateway.

## **2.0 STAGE 0 APPROVAL**

- 2.1 Stage 0 is the process by which PfS formally confirms the funding for the Phase 2 schools. In order to secure the necessary funding commitment from PfS Local Authorities are required to demonstrate, among other things, that:

- the Phase 2 projects are not materially different in scope from those approved at the OBC stage;
- the projects are affordable and the Authority is committed to resourcing the programme appropriately;
- major risks have been considered and mitigated; and
- firm commitments are in place in respect of school contributions for ICT and FM services.

- 2.2 A letter from the Authority’s Accounting Officer<sup>3</sup> (“S151 Officer”) is required to be submitted with the Stage 0 submission setting out the affordability and resourcing implications with respect to the Phase 2 schools in detail. The Stage 0 submission also requires evidence that the Authority’s Cabinet is content to proceed with the development of the Phase 2 schools.

- 2.3 In summary:

- whilst there are inevitably pressures, the Phase 2 schools are considered to be affordable on the basis of the expected capital grant available from PfS;
- school contributions to FM and ICT costs are secure via signed Governing Body Agreements with the respective governing bodies;
- an appropriately experienced and resourced client side team is in place, with a confirmed net budget of £774k in 2010/11 and an estimated net budget of £700k and £650k in 2011/12 and 2012/13 respectively;
- planning risk at Cromwell Community College, Sir Harry Smith Community College and Meadowgate Special School is considered to be low and is being further mitigated by the preparation of planning briefs for each development.

- 2.4 The effect of indexation since the Outline Business Case (OBC) (March 2008) has been to reduce significantly the headline capital figures available for each of the Phase 2 schools in the Funding Allocation Model (FAM). The location factor has also declined (the location factor reflects regional variations in construction costs). In theory, the construction deflation seen over the past two years which this reduction in funding reflects should mean that the same project scope is deliverable at less cost. However, as noted at 3.3 below, there is some risk around this.

- 2.5 Consequently, in order to maintain project affordability the following mitigation measures may need to be considered as part of the design development process:

- i adjusting the proportions of new build to refurbished accommodation – that is, less new build, more refurbishment;
- ii forgoing some aspects of schools’ Strategies for Change;
- iii securing additional savings and efficiencies through the LEP;

---

<sup>3</sup> Corporate Director of Finance, Property and Performance

iv additional capital contributions from the Local Authority.

(i), (ii) and (iii) in some combination represent the best way forward.

- 2.6 In practice, we would seek to deliver each scheme within the funding available from PfS by prioritising design development decisions accordingly. We would also be looking to the LEP to maximise the value for money of its design solutions to ensure that the available funding buys the maximum amount of school in the prevailing market conditions.
- 2.7 As part of the Stage 0 process PfS requires an assurance that the Phase 2 schools will be sufficiently “transformational” as articulated in the approved Strategy for Change and Outline Business Case documents. Whilst a reduction in the FAM as a result of indexation is likely to pose schools and the LEP some challenges in this regard, officers believe that the fundamental ingredients of each school's Strategy for Change can still be delivered by the available funding.
- 2.8 The Stage 0 submission for Sir Harry Smith Community College, Cromwell Community College and Meadowgate Special School is expected to be submitted to PfS by 1<sup>st</sup> November 2010. The Stage 0 submission for Fenland Junction Pupil Referral Unit will be made separately in 2011 once a site for the new unit has been secured and outline planning permission has been obtained.

### **3.0 SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 Some of the implication and risks referred to in this section apply to and have been reported previously to Cabinet in the context of the Phase 1 schools. Where relevant, they are referred to again here in respect of the Phase 2 schools for completeness.

### **Resources and Performance**

#### *Conventionally Funded Schools*

- 3.2 The Phase 2 schools are all conventional Design and Build (D&B) schemes funded by capital grant.
- 3.3 A particular risk in respect of the Phase 2 Schools is the recent downward movement in the Tender Price Index of Public Sector Buildings (“the PUBSEC index”) upon which the funding from PfS is based. Between the period in which the funding for these schools is confirmed (likely to be late 2010) and the construction start date (likely to be spring 2012 in most cases) the risk is that the actual construction costs will start to increase again creating a potential funding pressure. The contingency currently identified from the final capital allocations for the Phase 2 Schools will provide some protection against the risk that construction inflation will start to rise again after the recent period of negative inflation. An additional mitigation factor will be the management of stakeholder expectations and if necessary a revision to the specification and / or proportions of new build and refurbishment / remodelling undertaken on the Phase 2 projects.
- 3.4 The experience from the Sample Schools regarding the furniture, fittings and equipment (FF&E) allowance in the costs (in which FF&E costs were somewhat understated) has been managed on the Phase 1 Schools by some refinement of the schemes to remain within the overall funding available. As the projects are developed

the client side team will also review closely the FF&E costs that are factored into the Phase 2 project proposals.

- 3.5 In addition any unused contingency from the Phase 1 schemes will be made available to help manage the risks identified in 3.3 and 3.4.

#### *FM Services*

- 3.6 The Governing Body Agreements entered into with the BSF schools in Fenland<sup>4</sup> commit the D&B schools to make revenue and capital contributions to the lifecycle costs of their modernised schools. These contributions were signed up to as part of the Final Business Case and the FM and ICT Managed Services contracts to which these contributions relate are now live.
- 3.7 It was noted at the time that Cabinet approved the formal submission to PfS that, in order to meet the realistic lifecycle maintenance costs of BSF schemes over time, additional capital contributions would be required from the Authority to ensure that schools modernised through BSF are appropriately maintained thereafter. For the five D&B schools in Fenland, the capital contribution is estimated to be approximately £11.5m (nominal) over 25 years. This will be a call on the capital programme and, for the most part, would be expected to replace normal capital schemes, including major capital repairs, at these schools over the equivalent period. The precedent set by the CLCP in respect of the lifecycle costs for the Neale-Wade scheme was a lower 25 year lifecycle cost compared to the Authority's OBC control options upon which the £11.5m is based. £11.5m is therefore considered to be a prudent position across the five schools.
- 3.8 There is a risk that any further reduction to the Authority's school capital allocations will compound this issue and would be a particular concern given the demands on these resources from the significant infrastructure development required to meet our targets for new housing in the Greater Cambridge Area and the potential reductions in central government funding in the current economic climate. This risk can only be managed by ensuring that priority is given to capital support to these schemes within the capital programme.
- 3.9 In addition there is a risk that school budgets may be under more pressure as the government progresses with its spending plans, which will be outlined in the forthcoming CSR in the autumn. Whilst this is not considered a direct risk to the FM and lifecycle elements of the BSF projects as the Governing Body Agreements are signed there is potential pressure for the BSF school budgets.
- 3.10 The financial strategy for the lifecycle costs will be to establish a sinking fund to meet the lifecycle commitments. When the costs exceed the balance of school contributions in the sinking fund the Authority will provide capital resources up to the value noted above as required to restore the balance.

#### *ICT Services*

- 3.11 The LEP will provide an ICT managed service to the six Fenland BSF schools paid for from BSF capital grant and revenue contributions from the BSF schools of £110 per pupil per annum (at April 2008 prices). The ICT managed service contract will provide

---

<sup>4</sup> Fenland Junction Pupil Referral Unit has a different status to the other BSF schools and has a management committee rather than a Governing Body

“Early Services” to all BSF schools from January 2011 and then roll out “Full Services” to each BSF school as the modernised schools are handed over. Early Services include the provision of a web-based Learning Platform, some training and professional development services and a catalogue from which schools can purchase ICT equipment and services. Full Services include, additionally, the installation of new ICT infrastructure and devices, on-site technical support and a performance and availability regime under which deductions are levied if the required standards are not achieved.

- 3.12 The same risk noted at 3.9 above applies to the ICT services.
- 3.13 The financial strategy for paying for the ICT managed service will be to establish a sinking fund using the school contributions. No additional Authority contributions are required in the delivery of this service. However, the Council has recognised the ‘demand risk’ issue faced by BSF schools’ contributions to the ICT managed service if actual pupil numbers are less than those upon which schools’ contributions are based. To address this, the Cambridgeshire Schools Forum has agreed that above a certain threshold additional financial support for BSF schools will be provided through a call on the secondary quantum of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). There could be risk around this in future years as the DSG comes under more pressure from further austerity measures affecting school budgets and an expansion of Academies and Free Schools.

#### *Value for Money and Risk Transfer*

- 3.14 Value for money and risk transfer has been tested through the use of standard form contracts with agreed derogations where a better balance of risk and price can be achieved locally and testing costs against the Phase 1 projects and other local and national benchmarks.
- 3.15 The standard form contracts on which the Cambridgeshire BSF contracts are based envisage some risk being retained by the Authority. These include additional costs for asbestos removal not identified in the Type II asbestos surveys commissioned by the Authority and warranted to the LEP, those latent defect risks in retained buildings not identified as contractor's risk in the contract documents and risks associated with title, planning and compensation events in certain circumstances. Any or all of these could have an impact on programme and price. Some contingency is being held against these risks as noted above.
- 3.16 The contracts for the Phase 2 schools will be entered into at the end of the design development process which, according to the current programme, will be in spring 2012.

#### *Human Resources*

- 3.17 Approximately 7 staff currently employed by the Phase 2 schools as ICT technicians will transfer to the employment of the ICT managed service provider (Dell). For those transferring employees currently in the Local Government Pension Scheme, their new employer will seek Admitted Body status to the LGPS. The Authority will retain pension contribution rate risk above a fixed rate calculated by the pension fund actuary and also the risk of historic scheme underfunding. After the transfer date, the scheme will be closed to new employees.

## *Property*

- 3.18 With the exception of the Fenland Junction Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) there are no significant property implications at any of the Phase 2 schools other than the planned schemes themselves. In the case of Meadowgate and Cromwell additional land has been or is being acquired to facilitate the expansion of these school sites. In the case of the Fenland Junction PRU, a site in the Authority's ownership has been identified as a possible new location for the Unit. However, planning permission has yet to be secured at this site.

## *Risk Management*

- 3.19 BSF Programme risks are recorded on the BSF Risk Register and the risk probability and mitigation measures are monitored by the BSF Board on a regular basis.
- 3.20 A key risk associated with BSF which is not otherwise addressed in this Implications section is the risk that educational outcomes do not improve as a result of the BSF investment. BSF requires a significant commitment from schools in time and resources and during the design development and construction phases in particular there is the added risk that standards could fall during this period. The BSF Project team is working with the schools concerned to mitigate this risk as far as possible.
- 3.21 A summary of the principal risks associated with the development of the Phase 2 schools is set out in **Annex 3**.

## **Statutory Duties Requirements and Partnership Working**

- 3.22 To date, Cambridgeshire's BSF programme has demonstrated some good examples of partnership working with, among others, the Headteachers, staff and Governing Bodies of BSF schools, Fenland District Council, the College of West Anglia and the constituent companies within the Equitix consortium.

## **Climate Change**

- 3.23 BSF will assist the Authority to meet its climate change objectives by replacing old, inefficient school buildings with modern facilities which meet far higher environmental standards. BSF schools will meet or exceed the Authority's policy of Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) "Very Good" and deliver significant carbon reduction savings through higher standards of energy efficiency and greater use of renewable energy systems.

## **Access and Inclusion**

- 3.24 BSF will assist the Authority to meet its access and inclusion objectives by providing modern school facilities which meet relevant Special Education Needs (SEN) and Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) standards and by providing school based facilities which can be used by the community. Note that whilst designs for BSF schools will include improved community and extended use facilities, such facilities must have a curriculum use to qualify for BSF funding and the costs of making these facilities available for community use (heating, lighting, cleaning etc) cannot be met from school budgets.

- 3.25 The development of exciting new schools at the heart of local communities is also likely to stimulate a new interest in learning and education.

### **Engagement and Consultation**

- 3.26 Consultation with local communities and other stakeholders is an important part of BSF in terms of identifying local needs and aspirations and through the design development and town and country planning processes.

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
<i>Previous Cabinet reports</i>	

## Annex 1 – Fenland BSF: Timetable and Scope

Table 1 - Timetable

School	Construction Start	Services Start	Final Completion
<i>Sample Schools (Phase 1)</i>			
Thomas Clarkson Community College	Jul 2010	Jan 2012	Dec 2012
Neale-Wade Community College	Jul 2010	Sep 2012	Feb 2013
<i>Non Sample Schools (Phase 2)</i>			
Cromwell Community College	Apr 2012	Jan 2014	tbc
Sir Harry Smith Community College	Apr 2012	Jan 2014	tbc
Meadowgate School	Apr 2012	Jan 2014	tbc
Fenland Junction PRU	Oct 2012	Jan 2014	tbc

Services Start means that a significant part of the school has been handed over and ICT and/or FM services are being provided under the BSF contracts.

Final Completion dates for the Non-Sample Schools will be agreed as part of the New Project Approval Process

Table 2.1 - Scope of Sample School projects

PHASE 1: Sample Schools					
Category	Details				
	Name	Scope of works	Capacity	Service start	Capital investment
PFI	Thomas Clarkson Community College, Wisbech (Foundation School with Trust)	Construction: 84% New build 16% remodel  Services: • All FM except catering • Managed ICT service	1950  1650 11-16 300 16+	Jan 2012 (Phase 1 handover)	£33.35m
D&B	Neale-Wade Community College, March (Community School)	Construction: 55% new build 45% remodel  Services: • Hard FM • Managed ICT service	1780  1500 11-16 280 16+	Sep 2012 (Phase 2 handover)	£25.8m

Table 2.2 - Scope of Non-Sample School projects

PHASE 2: Non-Sample Schools					
Category	Details				
	Name	Scope of works <sup>5</sup>	Capacity	Service Start	Capital investment <sup>6</sup>
D&B	Sir Harry Smith Community College (Foundation)	Part New; Part remodel / refurbish Services: • Hard FM • Managed ICT service	1250 1050 11-16 200 16+	Jan 2014	
D&B	Cromwell Community College (Community)	Part New; Part remodel / refurbish Services: • Hard FM • Managed ICT service	1325 1125 11-16 200 16+	Jan 2014	
D&B	Meadowgate (Community Special)	Part New; Part remodel / refurbish Services: • Hard FM • Managed ICT service	140 100 11-16 40 16+	Jan 2014	
D&B	Fenland Junction (Pupil Referral Unit)	100% new build Services: • Hard FM • Managed ICT service	45 + Key Stage (KS) 4 / KS3	Jan 2014	

<sup>5</sup> The final Scope of Works will emerge through the detailed design development process which will follow approval of the Stage 0 submission.

<sup>6</sup> The Capital investment figures for each school will be confirmed in the S151 Officer Letter to accompany the final Stage 0 submission to Partnerships for Schools.

## **Annex 2 –Terms of Reference for Department for Education (DfE) Review of Schools Capital Expenditure**

### **Purpose**

1. To review, in the context of the Government's fiscal consolidation plans and emerging policy, the department's existing capital expenditure and make recommendations on the future delivery models for capital investment for 2011-12 onwards.
2. The overall aim of the review is to ensure that future capital investment represents good value for money and strongly supports the Government's ambitions to reduce the deficit, raise standards and tackle disadvantage.

### **Scope**

3. The review will consider how all DfE capital expenditure within any spending constraint and PFI policy could be distributed more effectively over the next Spending Review period (2011-12 to 2014-15).

The review will be broken down into four main strands:

#### **Allocation of capital funds:**

- To evaluate the extent to which value for money has been achieved in capital expenditure to date;
- To consider how to generate sufficient places to allow new providers to enter the state school system in response to parental demand
- To review current methods of allocating capital (for example, by formula to local authorities);
- To consider options for reflecting Government policies on carbon reduction;
- To enable the establishment of new schools.

#### **Distribution of capital investment**

- To assess the scope and make recommendations for how to distribute capital more efficiently and less expensively, including simplification of procurement, and increased use of standard and modular design;
- To develop a clear understanding of current approach, waste and issues associated
- To consider the relationship between schools, local government and central government;
- To increase choice locally determined by parental demand;
  - To review the current procurement/delivery models, including:
  - the use of frameworks to deliver capital (currently used for academies and a third of BSF projects); and
  - the BSF Investments (BSFI) investment vehicle.
  - To review the roles of bodies involved, specifically DfE, Partnerships for Schools (PfS), local authorities, the local education partnerships (LEPs) and National Framework
  - Provide recommendations for central structure required to manage;

#### **Reducing the burden on schools**

- To review and reform the requirements on schools including the building/School Premises Regulations, design requirements and playing field regulations

#### **Capital return**

- Establish processes to monitor value for money and return on future capital investments (to include expenditure, impact etc)

## **Relevant considerations for the review**

4. The review will draw on previous and current related work to examine the role of the capital programmes including:

- Existing internal management data;
- the National Audit Office report on BSF in February 2009 which examined the progress of the programme and the delivery mechanisms at national and local level;
- annual reports (in December 2008, January 2009 and March 2010) by PricewaterhouseCoopers giving the results of their evaluation of the programme;
- other publicly available reports, including those carried out by the Children, Schools and Families Select Committee (now the Education Select Committee) and the CBI; and
- internal reports, including those carried out by the Major Projects Review Group, as well as PfS's procurement reviews, the second of which is due to report in July 2010; and newly commissioned work such as on condition assessment and pupil place data carried out by PfS.

5. The review should take account of value for money issues and resource considerations in any recommendations. Recommendations should be costed and regard should be had to affordability

## **Governance of the review**

6. The review will be chaired by Sebastian James and supported by a review panel.

## **Outcome of the review**

7. The review will commence in July 2010. It will report to Ministers in mid-September and a forward plan for capital investment over the next spending review period will be produced by the end of the calendar year

### Annex 3 – Principal Strategic Risks

Risk	Risk Description	Mitigation
<b>Financial Risks</b>		
Impact of Inflation – Build contracts	BSF grant is awarded at a point in time and 'frozen' at that point. The actual movement in construction indices during the design development and construction phases may differ (adversely) from the indexation assumption on which the grant is based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with Partnerships for Schools to better reflect this risk in the funding model.</li> <li>• Assume a greater proportion of contingency within the allocated BSF funding to set against this risk.</li> <li>• Work with schools to manage expectations over the likely affordable scope of works</li> </ul>
Authority Capital programme	Future reductions in (non-BSF) capital allocations to the Authority and/or unavoidable calls on capital reduce the Authority's ability to support future lifecycle costs in BSF schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure appropriate level of school contributions to future lifecycle costs from Devolved Formula Capital and the Dedicated Schools Grant</li> <li>• Ensure proper attention to lifecycle issues during the design process</li> <li>• 'Sweat' assets</li> </ul>
Scope creep – design phase	Changes to design compromise affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusive design development process that manages expectations from an early stage</li> <li>• Robust "adds and omits" process rigidly applied during the design development and Reviewable Design Data (RDD) stages</li> </ul>
Scope creep – operational phase	Excessive charges levied by the LEP for minor changes, equipment replacement etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforce benchmarking and market testing provisions</li> <li>• Non-PFI FM contract has a works ordering process which requires competitive quotes above a de minimis threshold</li> </ul>
Furniture, Fittings & Equipment (FFE)	Unrealistic expectations and/or inadequate budget for FFE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximise use of existing equipment</li> <li>• Greater proportion of BSF funding allocation to be used for FFE to ensure that an appropriate proportion of the total project spend is applied to FFE at an early stage</li> </ul>
'Demand Risk'	Student numbers on roll do not match the forecasts on which the ICT costs are based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools Forum has agreed that this demand risk can be managed through a call on the secondary quantum of the DSG</li> </ul>
LEP performance	Poor performance of the LEP and/or LEP schemes do not represent value for money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforce contractual safeguards Note: The loss of exclusivity which is the primary contractual 'stick' is less relevant where there are no follow on projects</li> </ul>
<b>Policy and Strategy Risks</b>		
Future BSF policy	Government does not continue with BSF (Note: this risk has	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider delivering non-BSF projects through the LEP</li> <li>• Re-negotiate contract with LEP to</li> </ul>

*Recommended Confidentiality Status: Level 2*

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
	materialised)	mothball the LEP or terminate early
Education Outcomes	Educational outcomes do not improve as a result of BSF investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with schools to manage requirements for staff input during design development and to minimise disruption during construction</li> <li>• Continue to focus on maintaining educational priority in design and programme development so that the BSF project supports school improvement and in-school approaches to re-thinking the curriculum and student experiences</li> </ul>
Technology changes	Unexpected changes in technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICT Services contract will ensure that the technology proposed will be timely and reviewed at regular stages.</li> <li>• The final choice by schools on hardware is made 6 months prior to service commencement.</li> </ul>
Disagreement over vision	Schools and Cambridgeshire CC do not share a common vision regarding the required outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All schools are working closely with Cambridgeshire CC to produce school vision documents which will support the Strategy for Change (SfC) submission and demonstrate coherence with the local programme objectives.</li> <li>• Original Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) Vision was produced in collaboration with schools and is a 'broad church' within which schools have significant scope to develop a local and unique offering</li> </ul>
Outcomes do not meet programme objectives	The partnership does not provide delivery solutions which meet the required quality for facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Authority Requirements have been prepared to ensure that the LEP provides the required delivery solutions and standards.</li> <li>• The Contractor's Proposals to meet the Authority's requirements were finalised and agreed as part of financial close. These need to be developed into a standard format for future projects</li> </ul>
Change in key documentation	PfS Standard documents change during BSF Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCC/LEP to agree process as part of the new projects protocol in order to reduce costs. Strong relationships to be maintained by all parties with PfS</li> </ul>
DfE targets change	DfE targets change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCC to work closely with PfS and DfE to get certainty on the programme. The BSF Programme to be closely monitored.</li> </ul>
ICT	The ICT Managed Service fails to deliver a step change in ICT provision and usage in BSF schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close involvement of school users in Learning Platform development , testing and implementation</li> <li>• Tight contract management to</li> </ul>

*Recommended Confidentiality Status: Level 2*

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
		enforce contractual safeguards