

# Report of the Young People and Education Improvement Committee

## Scrutiny of School Refurbishments/New Builds

Adopted by committee 20 July 2005

[www.bradford.gov.uk/scrutiny](http://www.bradford.gov.uk/scrutiny)



# MEMBERS OF THE YOUNG PEOPLE AND EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE

Full Members of the Committee - Councillors

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat</b>
Clamp	P Thornton (Chair)	Beardmore
Amjad Hussain	A Thornton (Dep Chair)	
Kelly		

Alternates – Supplementary list of members, entitled to attend a particular meeting in place of the appointed member.

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat</b>
McNulty	Godward	Briggs
Sykes	Sajawal Hussain	
Walls		

## **VOTING CO-OPTED MEMBERS:**

Church Representative: Mr J Anderson (CE) and Mr K Crotty (Catholic)  
Parent Governor Representative: Mr R Glass, Mrs K McNulty and Mr M Pollard

## **NON-VOTING CO-OPTED MEMBERS:**

Teachers' Secondary Schools Representative: Mr S Davies  
Teachers' Primary Schools Representative: Ms J Laybourn  
Teachers' Special Schools Representative: Ms K Challis

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER:** Cllr Dale Smith

## **CONTACT FOR ENQUIRIES**

Peter Marshall  
Performance Co-ordinator  
E mail [peter.marshall@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:peter.marshall@bradford.gov.uk)  
Tel (01274) 432104

## **Contents**

Chapter 1 - Introduction	Page 4
Chapter 2 - Summary of background information	Page 5
Chapter 3 - Summary of evidence presented	Page 6
Chapter 4 - Outcomes	Page 11
Chapter 5 - Recommendations	Page 14
Appendix 1	Terms of Reference
Appendix 2	Evidence log
Appendix 3	Programme of Public Hearing held on the 8 <sup>th</sup> April 2005
Appendix 4	Report to Young People and Education Improvement Committee 6 <sup>th</sup> October 2004.

## **Acknowledgements**

The Chair of the Young People and Education Improvement Committee, Cllr Phil Thornton, would like to thank all the individuals and organisations that submitted evidence to this scrutiny, the members of the Committee for their hard work in both holding the hearings and producing the report and all of the officers involved for their invaluable assistance in arranging the hearing and the production of the report.

## Chapter 1 - Introduction

1. This scrutiny has been carried out in accordance with the arrangements detailed in paragraph 2, Part 3E of the Constitution of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (July 2004).
2. The Young People and Education Improvement Committee received a report in October 2004 which presented the findings of an initial questionnaire to schools that had moved into new premises or had significant refurbishments and/or extensions between September 2002 and August 2004. This report is attached at Appendix 4.
3. The committee made the following recommendations and agreed the Terms of Reference (Appendix 1):
  - (1) That this Committee notes with concern the high number of outstanding repairs that still exist following capital works carried out in our schools over the past two years.
  - (2) That this Committee also notes that while much good work has clearly been carried out to the benefit of many children and staff the significant number of outstanding jobs needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency.
  - (3) That this Committee requests that a full and detailed consultation is carried out with all schools that have required building works and a formal report be brought back to this Committee as a matter of urgency.
  - (4) That this Committee also recognises that a scrutiny of this matter will need to be held as a priority and requests that the terms of reference as agreed at this meeting be adopted.
  - (5) That the Chair write to all schools who responded to the questionnaire to make clear the determination of the Committee to resolve all outstanding issues relating to redevelopment/refurbishment.
  - (6) That this Committee will present a detailed report following the scrutiny setting out lessons to be learnt in anticipation of a major redevelopment of our secondary school buildings through BSF.
  - (7) That this matter be considered as urgent in light of the imminent allocation of contracts through the BSF project.
  - (8) That Jackie Laybourn be the Committee's Link Member on this issue.
4. A questionnaire was sent to all secondary and primary schools in December 2004 seeking their views and comments. The Committee held a "public hearing" in April 2005 to which certain managers and other witnesses were invited and from whom the Committee wanted to seek further information.
5. Details of all oral and written submitted evidence considered are in Appendix 2 "Evidence Log".

## **Chapter 2 - Summary of background information**

6. Over the period 1999 to 2005, funding of over £300 million has been invested in the school estate. This has either been as a result of mainstream re-organisation programme, modernisation and school site schemes, the on-going LEA repair and maintenance programme or schools own initiated projects.

### **Mainstream School Re-organisation**

7. This £195 million programme was introduced in 1999 and the building work was completed in 2004. This programme facilitated the change in the education structure from three to two tiers, represented the largest school building capital programme ever introduced in Bradford and was the largest whole scale re-organisation of schooling undertaken across the country. There were 132 separate building schemes that formed the LEA programme with a further 25 schemes delivered by the Voluntary Aided sector.
8. The re-organisation programme was delivered through the appointment of Bovis Lend Lease (BLL) as the Managing Partner (MP) in March 2000. BLL had the oversight of the whole MP programme and a direct delivery responsibility for 104 of the 132 LEA schemes. EC Harris were appointed as the Client Representative in relation to the MP programme. A small council team was appointed to facilitate the work of these two organisations. The remaining 28 schemes formed part of an accelerated programme of 21 primary and 6 secondary schools which commenced in 1999. The primary school element of this programme was delivered in house by the Council's CDMS and the secondary via 6 design and build contracts.
9. The reorganisation programme was based on the DfES template for accommodation requirements for Primary and Secondary schools (Building Bulletin BB82). The budget provision was to provide for the additional accommodation needed and not to address any backlog or repair and maintenance issues in existing buildings. Due to budget pressures, the original template of provision had to be revised and some facilities, notably ICT and music rooms, had to be omitted from the scope of the programme.
10. Once a facility is deemed to be complete, occupation can take place. During the next 12 months (the defects liability period), defects are addressed. Once all defects have been satisfactorily completed, the Clients Representative would issue the "Making Good Defects Certificate". Contractual payments to BLL have been dependent upon the issuing of this certificate and it has not been issued until all defects have been satisfactorily addressed.

### **Council School Building Modernisation**

11. Over the past six years, there have been schemes at four primary schools excluded from reorganisation to bring the buildings up to the standard of the reorganisation accommodation template, a new nursery, extensions at three primary schools, a rebuilding after a fire and a number of other schemes which in total amounted to about £15m.

## **Chapter 3 - Summary of evidence presented**

12. It is important to note that the Committee arrived at its findings and recommendations from consideration of all the oral and written evidence submitted. The summaries given in this chapter are simply to give an indication of the main issues raised and do not attempt to cover all of the evidence presented.

### **Responses from Schools to Phase 2 questionnaire**

13. This questionnaire was sent out to all secondary and primary schools. Responses were received in total from 103 schools. Just over half the replies are in relation to BLL reorganisation build schemes. The remainder are in relation to a variety of other capital projects, some but not all managed by the LEA.

### **Positive responses from schools**

14. Some schools indicated that they have had a positive and generally satisfactory experience with their refurbishments and/or new builds. A number of schools reported “no concerns” – indicated by N in the Concerns column (10 in total). The school numbers refer to the full version of the response previously submitted to the committee. Plus see in particular:

- School number 16 - CDMS architect team won an award for school design.
- School number 44 – generally happy with the process.
- School number 64 – happy with the process and end product. Happy with the LEA and the Architects
- School number 72 – Catholic school with building work controlled by diocesan representatives.
- School number 76 – refurbishments funded by Diocesan Board of Education. Satisfactory work.
- School 80 - work carried out directly by school.

### **Summary of Concerns/problems.**

15. This list highlights issues that more than one school has raised

- Lack of appropriate consultation on design
- Poor design not fit for purpose. This includes inappropriate and inadequate specifications of materials. Furnishings and fittings of poor quality which have to be replaced at schools expense after short period of time.
- Lack of regard of the special nature of schools in the building process.
- Poor communications between all parties ie school not sure who to contact on particular issues

- Poor supervision and general project handling by project team eg
  - Buildings handed over without adequate checks that work has been substantially completed
  - Completion of snagging lists taking in some cases more than 3 years
  - Lack of effective monitoring and supervision of progress
  - Poor workmanship by contractors that is not challenged
  - School concerns not taken seriously by project team
- Leaking roofs not resolved after considerable periods of time
- Very significant school staff time taken to resolve issues. Should have been the job of the project team.
- Inadequate heating
- Problems resulting from contractors going into receivership.

### **Summary of matters not satisfactorily resolved.**

16. This list highlights issues that more than one school has raised

- Snagging lists – some lists not resolved after 3 years

A few examples are:

- cracks in brickwork
  - boilers not commissioned/working
  - ventilation not completed
  - leaking roofs
  - water heaters not working
  - playground flooding
  - inadequate heating
  - defective fire doors & fire alarms
  - poor paint work
  - Health & Safety matters
  - Tiles falling of roof
  - Electrical wiring problems
- Ongoing school financial deficit partly caused by building problems.
  - One-year guarantee period is not long enough as many problems occur after this period.
  - A school wrongly charged for utilities as put on wrong tariffs. Still unresolved after over two years

### **How could these concerns and/or problems been avoided.**

17. This list highlights suggestions that more than one school has raised

- Better communication and involvement with schools re design/specifications/time scales

- Better leadership of programme and project management
- Better forward planning
- Better specification of materials and standards of workmanship
- Adequate and closer on site supervision of contractors – too much expected from school staff.
- Contractors and LEA should be willing to listen and believe that a problem exists
- LEA should accept some financial responsibility for putting problems right
- Job should be done right first time
- Longer guarantee process
- Not to give builders new work until they have completed previous works
- Higher retention of monies to improve snagging resolution problems
- Take longer to explain to and clarify with schools issues such as plans/specs etc
- Design more suited to 21<sup>st</sup> Century
- Quality of planning and hand-overs to be of much higher standard.

### **Summaries of evidence received at hearing held on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2005**

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| 18. Steeton<br>Primary | <p>Major H&amp;S issue– “live door handle and live metal banister – girl was electrified”.</p> <p>Arrangements for deliveries not stuck to by contractor. Handover took place too soon. Need better advice from Education about this – “they have building experts and we do not”. Outstanding work, including no hot water in some classrooms - some due to two heating systems not talking to each other. Daily meetings did take place with site supervisor from contractor but we were not skilled enough to make this really work. . Huge problems with having so many sub contractors.</p> <p>Needed huge amount of staff time both during the works and during the snagging period. Had to sort some urgent snags ourselves and at our expense.</p> |
| 19. Lister<br>Primary  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No real level of concern or understanding about school issues</li> <li>• Things done for a quick fix rather than strategic view</li> <li>• Huge amount of staff time taken up</li> <li>• Work carried out is inefficient</li> </ul> <p>Plus need to record all conversation with Asset Management, as costs escalated. Left to manage things on site ourselves. Pressure to agree handover because of pupils starting, even though lots of snagging issues left.</p>  |



20. Buttershaw High
- From transcript and from written submitted evidence.
- [Currently Involved in the BSF project (Phase 1)]
- Inadequate designs. No consultation with school. Short term cost driven e.g. inadequate door fittings that needed replacing after short time and other not fit for purpose fittings etc. Poor attention to snaggings from contractors. BB88 followed too slavishly. Creative dialogue stopped with school too early. Very significant costs to school once work was finished i.e. repairs and maintenance.
- Overall, problems of being price focused rather than “fit for purpose”. Need to make new BSF schools future proofed ie allow in the initial design for extensions etc that do not increase the overall footprint. Need architects who know what they are doing. BB98 needs to be treated as a guideline rather than a bible. Very positive about involvement in BSF Phase 1.
- Phase 2 and beyond schools need as much “research time” as schools in Phases 1 and 2 have had.
21. Parkside
- Little consultation about design. School insufficient size. Inadequate design of road access.
- Overall poor design of school. Poor quality of construction and materials. Inappropriate paint used on walls etc. Has resulted in very significant cost to schools budget to replace fittings etc. which have had to come from normal school budget. This is not satisfactory. Poor selection of site. Lot of leaks, inadequate walls specification – links to poor design. Door handles, for example, not fit for purpose. Inadequate electrical provision and ICT infrastructure.
- Involved in BSF Phase 0. Much better involvement with the design etc. Still issues about getting major snags resolved e.g. leaking roof now that contractors have gone and no retention left. Asset Management trying their best. Needs sharper decisions about when retention money is released.
22. Education Client Team
- Asset Mgt - £95 m worth of immediate repair and maintenance backlog work still to be done. Only got £3.5 million last year. Not really tackling the issue. (This does not include diocesan schools).
- Has the investment in buildings supported teaching and learning?
- BSF is not the only capital works programme in the future. So need to ensure that lessons learnt are applied to all capital programmes.
- Suggestion about clarity of roles. This is being progressed. E.g. a named programme manager for each capital programme. This would be **the** contact for schools. School re-organisation was largest in the country i.e. £195 million over 5 years ie 1999-2004. Remarkable achievement. Focus was to provide additional accommodation and not address backlog of maintenance issues. Hence new systems had to be added to old systems e.g. fire alarms/heating systems etc. Overall scheme was completed on budget and on time.

Vital importance of involving schools from the start. Need funds to enable staff to be released. BSF will enable this to happen. Funding for re-organisation was not sufficient for this.

ICT provision was not part of the reorganisation template.

23. E C Harris      Some difficult sites to work on. Very complex project. Most concerns raised by schools (in the re-organisation) have been resolved. Spec was essentially not tight enough. BSF and PFI are better at this. Was no full time Clerks of Work Service. Will be in BSF but the three initial sites will be spread out over the District.
- Key thing with incompetent contractors is strong site management. August is a difficult time to sort out a hand over at start of new academic year as people on holidays etc. Project was made to fit the budget.
24. Bovis Lend Lease      Claiming that all of the “snags” identified by the reorganisation schools in their matrix have now been resolved. Do not have a dedicated defects team, and so when a lot of work is being delivered, defects rectification suffers.
- Issues about “bad contractors”. Bovis have a database they use on sub-contractors, rating them. Could be made available to the Council.
25. Education Portfolio Holder      Have learnt lessons which are integrated into BSF.
- School re-organisation was underfunded. Was rushed. Not enough consultation. Dilemmas of responsibility between all the organisations/bodies involved. Problems of tendering i.e. not always the cheapest that will be the most cost effective. Got to strike off contractors who do not perform. Some lack of fit for purpose issues.
- Overall, re organisation part of building programme has been a great success. BSF will be able to give “time” to staff in schools.
26. Asset Management      Generally do have enough time to deliver capital projects for schools. Need a 3 to 5 year rolling programme and do not have this. Also need to improve involvement with stakeholders. Also ideally to adopt a whole life cost approach rather than a short term “cheapest” approach.
- (Members, at this stage, identifying weaknesses in three areas – project management, communications and forward planning.)
- Contrast between traditional procurement and Design and Build. The latter can result in “poorer” standards.
27. BSF Team      Bidders are incentivised to take a whole life cost approach. Have learnt from the re-organisation building programme. There will be supply chain arrangements set up by the firm that wins the contract. Will same problems occur as in re-organisation? Not up to scratch sub contractors can be kicked out.

## **Chapter 4 – Outcomes**

### **The reorganisation building programme**

28. It is clear that the reorganisation building programme achieved an enormous amount in a relatively short time and within a “tight” budget. However, a significant number of the schools involved did have and some still do have concerns about the process and the outcomes and it is important that appropriate lessons are learnt for future schools capital works.

### **The start of construction work.**

29. There is evidence that not all of the involved “parties” were consulted and involved at the start of some of the building projects. In particular, teacher trade unions were not as involved as they would like to have been. The procedure for involving the unions through pre-start site meetings was established but not often followed. On some occasions this led to problems for school staff which could have been avoided.

### **Liaison on site during construction phase.**

30. Considerable evidence was presented that the monitoring of work on sites by the client side was in many cases inadequate with schools having neither the skills nor the time to adequately play their part in this monitoring. Schools were at times unable to communicate effectively with the client side sub contractors and poor workmanship went unchallenged. In some cases, schools were not clear about who to contact about particular issues. A lack of regard and knowledge about the special nature of schools was in evidence in a number of cases. This resulted at times with some buildings being handed over with extensive and significant deficits, some of which had Health and Safety issues and some had operational issues.

### **Health and Safety**

31. Concerns were raised by a number of schools about Health and Safety issues. In particular, ones related to quality of workmanship and “on site” issues relating to the safety of parents, teachers and pupils during the construction period. This issue was also a significant concern during the maintenance phase with evidence that there were outstanding significant H&S issues during this phase.

### **Sub contractors**

32. Considerable concern expressed about the appointment, management and quality of sub contractors with some schools feeling that they had no involvement or say in this matter. With, at times, a large number of sub contractors on site at any particular time, management becomes a big issue for a school which, say, is having work done on their existing school. Schools at times were so unhappy with certain sub contractors that they wanted to “get rid of them” but were not able to achieve this. It was suggested that “the key thing with incompetent contractors is strong site management”.

### **Practical Completion Certificate (PCC)**

33. There was tremendous pressure on all parties to get this certificate signed so that the planned pupil entry could take place. The latter resulted in there being no capacity for any slippage and buildings being handed over with a very large number of defects. Although the Managing Partner agreement specified that it was fundamental that there

were no Health and Safety issues outstanding at the signing of the PCC, it is clear from the evidence that this requirement was not met in a number of cases.

## **Defects**

34. A significant number of schools experienced large numbers of defects after the “hand over” of the new premises which created Health and safety issues, operational issues, took up large amounts of staff time and, in some cases, took excessively long times to resolve. It was clear from the evidence that, in some cases, these problems were not helped by the fact that a defects only team was not in place and that defects were dealt with by general buildings teams when time could be spared.

## **“Making good defects” Notice**

35. The Phase 2 questionnaire to schools sent out in December 2004 resulted in a considerable number of schools indicating that they still had a large number of unresolved defects. The “making good defects” Notice was completed at the end of the defects liability period and when all defects/outstanding work was complete.

36. The “matrix” supplied to the committee at the hearing by Bovis Lend Lease indicates that the “signing offs” for the building works at about 100 schools for which they were responsible are complete. The response to the questionnaire sent out on behalf of the committee to these schools after the public hearing indicates otherwise. The 100 schools in the matrix were written to and of the 39 responses, 30 had outstanding H&S issues and 24 outstanding operational issues.

37. Hence there would appear to be contradictory evidence ie that it would seem from the information supplied to the committee that agreement had been reached with these schools that all defects had been resolved and that after this “agreement”, some schools still have defects concerns. These reported outstanding issues need further investigation to determine responsibility.

38. It would appear to the committee that the procedures followed by E C Harris, the Client Representative, were there to ensure robust monitoring of defects rectification leading to fully satisfactory “signing off” of all projects. These procedures need re-examining so that any appropriate lessons can be learned for future school building projects.

## **Design specification – “Fit for purpose”**

39. Inadequate and inappropriate design specification has resulted in considerable extra maintenance costs for some schools in. For some of the building work that has been carried out, the specification used was to fit the budget and, for example, items of furniture and fittings were clearly not “fit for purpose” and had to be replaced by the school at their expense in an unacceptable short time. Another example was electrical circuits and system installed that could not cope with the day to day electrical demands of a school.

40. It would seem that a short term view was taken of these issues, which resulted in some schools having to pay for the outcomes of this approach in increased maintenance and replacement costs.

41. It was suggestion by some witnesses that a whole life cost approach needs to be adopted as this would be cheaper and more efficient in the medium to long term than the “cheapest cost in the short term” approach

## **Future proofing of school design**

42. It is clear that the demands on school buildings are not static and will significantly change in the future. The “extended schools” initiative and changing school roles are two of the most obvious examples of changes that will take place and requests were made in the evidence that allowances are made in the “footprint” of the school to make as much allowance as possible to “future proof” the design.

## **Involvement of schools in design phase.**

43. It is clear that in a significant number of cases, schools were not adequately involved in the design stages of extensions and new builds. This resulted in inappropriate design which in some cases has had a long term effect on school operational issues. In the BSF project, much better involvement with the Phase 2 schools has been achieved, with some very positive comments being made by some school staff

## **Backlog of school maintenance**

44. Evidence was presented stating the following. “That there is a backlog of school maintenance issues, for which the Council is responsible, of about £95 million. Of this figure, about £40m is needed for urgent major fundamental issues and the Asset Management Service has a budget of about £3.5 million every year to tackle these issues”.

45. Clearly this is a major problem which, at times, must be affecting the ability of schools to deliver. The advent of the BSF and the Academies projects will have an impact on this matter.

## **Scrutiny of school building works.**

46. There is clearly a lack of clarity about the expectation on contractors and partners involved with the Council, in relation to school building works, with regard to their engagement with the Improvement Committees in the Council. The obligation of any party involved in these works, including sub contractors, needs to be made very clear at the start of any works projects and clear guidance needs to be available on the principles and details of any engagement.

## **Regular review of school buildings projects**

47. Given the impact and importance of school buildings projects and the fact that significant concerns are only emerging after certain projects have finished, it is clear that regular reviews by the Young People and Education Improvement Committee need to be built into the process in advance and that all interested parties know of and have access to this review process.

## **Chapter 5 - Recommendations**

These recommendations are directed towards **all** future school building capital works, including the BSF project and other school building capital works, unless otherwise stated.

### **1. Project Management (1)**

That, in order to provide strong site management, all future works should have, as part of the project management arrangements, an identified Programme Manager who will be the key contact point for schools on all matters and a clerk of the works, the provision of which should be determined by the programme manager (as appropriate to the nature/scale of the scheme) and who will, amongst other tasks, undertake day to day quality control of building work and liaison with the school.

Action by Director of Asset Management and Director of Education  
By December 2005.

### **2. Project Management (2)**

That, to ensure that schools are properly able to play their part in the project management of future new builds and major capital investments, funding should be made available to schools to enable sufficient dedicated staff time to be available.

Action by Director of Asset Management and Director of Education  
By December 2005.

### **3. Health and Safety.**

- a. That, given the need to comprehensively involve all interested parties, Health and Safety issues are discussed and a specific plan is agreed, prior to the construction stage of all school projects, by all interested parties including trade unions. This plan to be made widely available, for example to parents, governors, sub contractors etc.
- b. That a condition of agreeing the Practical Completion Certificate is that no Health and Safety issues are outstanding and that all the parties involved in agreeing the plan referred to in Recommendation 2(a) need to be satisfied that this condition has been met.

Action by Director of Asset Management and Director of Education  
By December 2005.

### **4. Start of construction.**

That all interested parties are involved in a final meeting prior to the start of future works to ensure that everyone is clear and in agreement about the detail of the project plan.

Action by Director of Asset Management and Director of Education  
By December 2005.

## **5. Sub contractors.**

That, in order to maintain quality of workmanship and site behaviour, all sub contractors are only appointed with the agreement of the Council and that the Council can require the contractor to dismiss a sub contractor if it sees fit.

Action by Director of Asset Management and Director of Education  
By December 2005.

## **6. Defects.**

That, to ensure defects can be addressed quickly and with the minimum of inconvenience to schools, defects teams are made available by the relevant contractors for the defects liability period following practical completion.

Action by Director of Asset Management and Director of Education  
By December 2005.

## **7. “Making good defects” notice.**

That, given the contradictory evidence about the satisfactory completion of defects at the end of the defects liability period in a number of schools and the lack of clarity in some cases in respect of procedures for monitoring defects rectification and the final “signing off”, the Asset Management Director investigate this matter further and produce a detailed report for the Young People and Education Improvement Committee in October 2005. This report to include recommendations on how to ensure that “making good defects” notices are only completed when all interested parties are satisfied that all defects have been satisfactorily addressed.

Action by Director of Asset Management  
By October 2005.

## **8. Design and design specification**

That the design and design specification used for future works must be (a) fit for purpose to provide schools appropriate for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, (b) encompass, so far as possible, features to allow for requirement changes in the future and that a whole life cost approach is taken to minimise future maintenance and refurbishment costs.

Action by Director of Asset Management and Director of Education  
By December 2005.

## **9. Involvement of Schools in design phase.**

That the best practice in BSF Phase 1 of involving schools from the beginning in the design of new schools be incorporated in the design of all subsequent phases of BSF and other school capital works.

Action by Director of Education  
By December 2005.

## **10. Backlog of school maintenance.**

That, given the concerns about the very significant backlog of school maintenance, the Asset Management Director produces a report for the Young People and Education Improvement Committee providing full details about this matter by October 2005. The report to include full details on the options available to address this matter and the impact of the BSF project and Academies.

Action by Director of Asset Management  
By October 2005.

## **11. Scrutiny of school building works.**

That, given the need to maintain regular and effective scrutiny of school building projects,

(a) Contracts and agreements with partners and contractors involved in school building works should include an explicit and unambiguous requirement to co-operate with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny arrangements

(b) The Corporate Improvement Committee (CIC) give consideration to whether such a requirement should be included in all commercial contracts that the Council enters into and

(c) The Young People and Education Improvement Committee carries out an annual review of the BSF project, supplemented by the ongoing work of the BSF Link Members.

Action by Director of Asset Management and the Corporate Improvement Committee.  
By December 2005.



## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1      Terms of Reference
- Appendix 2      Evidence log
- Appendix 3      Programme of Public Hearing held on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2005
- Appendix 4      Report to Young People and Education Improvement Committee  
6<sup>th</sup> October 2004.

## Young People and Education Improvement Committee

7 October 2004

### Terms of Reference for a Scrutiny of Schools Refurbishments & New Builds

See Part 3E paragraphs 2.1 to 2.11 of the Constitution of the Council

#### 1. Subject of Scrutiny

*Schools refurbishments, extensions and new builds.*

The scrutiny will look at the refurbishments, extensions and new builds that have taken place in the Districts schools. In particular the following will be looked at:

- a. The quality of the building work,
- b. The appropriateness of the designs,
- c. The handover processes
- d. The levels of satisfaction with the completion of outstanding work.

The scrutiny will aim to facilitate the swift resolution of any outstanding issues that school have in this matter and to inform the new school building projects that the Council is about to undertake so that lessons are learnt.

#### 2. Interested Parties

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation / body / department</b>
		Relevant Headteachers and Governing bodies
		Teaching Unions and other relevant Trade Unions
	Phil Green	Director of Education
	David Mallen	Chair of EPP
	Cllr Dale Smith	Education Portfolio Holder
		Relevant Building contractors
	Mark Pattison	Chief Executive – Education Bradford

#### 3. Means of consultation etc

- a. Committee (or nominated sub group) to hold “hearings” ie meetings in public. Invited “Interested Parties” to give a brief presentation (with a previously submitted written submission) to be followed by questioning by the committee.
- b. Committee (or nominated sub group) to invite written evidence from selected “Interested Parties”.

- c. Committee (or nominated sub group) to commission research
- d. Committee (or nominated sub group) to hold open meetings at which members of the public or interested organisations can present their views and evidence.
- e. Committee (or nominated sub group) to visit other relevant organisations to obtain evidence.

#### 4. Relevant Documentation

	<b>Document</b>	<b>Comments</b>
A	Report to Committee – 6 <sup>th</sup> October 2004.	
B	Responses to initial letter send from committee to certain schools (Aug/September 2004)	

#### 5. Indicative timetable

<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Comments</b>
6 <sup>th</sup> October 2004	Committee agrees Terms of Reference	
W/c 11 October 2004	Letter sent to relevant schools with detailed questionnaire	
W/c 22 Nov	Public Hearing – invited witnesses to give evidence	

## Young People and Education Improvement Committee

## Scrutiny of School Refurbishments/New Builds

## Log of evidence received and considered

Number	Title	Comments
1	Responses to Phase 1 questionnaire to schools	Has letter re Lapage School concerns attached
2	Responses to Phase 2 questionnaire to schools	
3	Schools Reorganisation Programme 1999-2004 – Evaluation/Review	Prepared by and from contributions made by Bovis, EC Harris and CBMDC Reorganisation Team – 2004
4	Schools (Mainstream) Reorganisation 1999-2004 Key Learning Points	Prepared by CBMDC Reorganisation Team – 2004
5	Report to committee (October 04)	
6	Resolution of committee (October 04)	
7	Terms of reference agreed by committee (October 04)	
8	Evidence from Education Client Team	Provided at the hearing
9	Evidence from E C Harris	Provided at the hearing
10	Summary of responses from Schools to Phase 2 questionnaire	
11	Evidence from Buttershaw High School	Provided at the hearing
12	Transcript of hearing held on the 8 <sup>th</sup> April 2005	

## Young People and Education Improvement Committee

## Scrutiny Hearing

Centre for Learning, St Peters House, Bradford.

8<sup>th</sup> April 2005

## Schedule – Final version

All timings are subject to change

Time	Organisation	Name	
10:00	Steeton Primary Lister Primary	Chris Newson – Headteacher Moira Hunt – Headteacher	
11:00	Buttershaw High	Allan Jarvis – Dep Headteacher	
11:45	Parkside	Richard Freeman – Governor (Premises Committee)  Dr Tony Rickwood – Headteacher	
12:30	Lunch		
13:15	Education Client Team	Rob Malley	
13:45	E C Harris	Wynne Davies	
14:15	Bovis Lend Lease	Darren Perkins (Project manager)	
14:45	Education Portfolio Holder	Cllr Dale Smith	
15:15	Asset Management	Mark Steed, Malcolm Gibson & Ray Kershaw	
16:00	BSF Team	Matthew Cooper	
16:30	End of hearing		

# **Report of the Head of Service improvement to the meeting of Young People & Education Improvement Committee to be held on 6 October 2004.**

---

## **Subject:**

**School Refurbishments and new builds**

## **Summary statement:**

**This report summaries the responses to a questionnaire sent out on behalf of the committee to schools that have moved into new premises or had significant refurbishments and/or extensions between September 2002 and August 2004.**

---

Stan Kidd  
Head of Service Improvement

Report Contact: Peter Marshall  
Performance Co-ordinator  
Phone: (01274) 432104  
E-mail:  
[peter.marshall@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:peter.marshall@bradford.gov.uk)

## **Portfolio:**

**Young People and Education**

## **Overview and Scrutiny Area:**

**Young People and Education**

## 1. **Summary.**

This report summaries the responses to a questionnaire sent out on behalf of the committee to schools that have moved into new premises or had significant refurbishments and/or extensions between September 2002 and August 2004.

The schools were asked to indicate if they have (or did have) concerns and problems with regard to any refurbishments, extensions or new build they have had in the above time period.

## 2. **Background**

The committee is currently considering the proposals for the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) initiative and believes that it is important to ensure that any lessons that can be learnt from the extensive school building work in the District's schools over the past few years are reflected in Phase 1 (and subsequent phases) of BSF. The questionnaire, requesting a simple yes/no answer at this stage, was sent out at the request of the Chair of the committee to determine the scale of any concerns

## 3. **Report issues**

The questionnaire was sent out to a total of 39 schools. 24 replies were received of which 22 indicated concerns and problems. The other 2 schools indicated a significant level of satisfaction with their building contractors.

Although details were not requested at this stage, some schools did provide details of their concerns and samples of these details are listed below:

- Extended period of completion of "snagging". Still ongoing after 12 months.
- Builder went "bust" after main works completed hence problems with "snagging" issues
- Heating system taking 18 months to work properly
- Disregard of safety issues by contractors
- Concerns re design and quality of buildings
- Drain on head teachers time to resolve large number of snags
- Serious delays in getting work done on time.
- Concerns have been significant and prolonged

## 4. **Options**

None

## 5. **Contribution to corporate priorities**

Within Priority 1 (Young People and Education), the section on improving educational provision emphasises the importance of improving school buildings and the role that BSF will play in this.

## 6. **Recommendations**

That the committee considers this report.