

Appraisal application form for Interaction NMP Board

A Summary and basic information

1. Title of proposal	Frobisher School; Alterations to Kitchen and extension of ICT suite		
2. Date submitted	12th April, 2007		
3. Summary of proposal (max 150 words) i.e. what does the proposal involve and what will it achieve?			
<p>To improve take up and quality of food served to pupils and staff through refurbishment and extension of the kitchen. To enhance pupil well being by offering more choices on the menu.</p> <p>To ensure that we meet new Health & Hygiene as well as Safety regulations.</p> <p>To provide a much needed community area of Hall and kitchen, which can be hired out for functions: community meetings: conferences etc. Thus extending the range of activities available to local residents.</p> <p>To enhance pupils learning through the extension of the ICT suite: allowing whole class teaching to take place.</p> <p>To provide extension of hours that the suite can be utilised for: the computer club: use during holiday and weekend times: research facilities (i.e. extension to the local library).</p> <p>To provide opportunities for adult and family learning through training courses and workshops that will extend people skills, knowledge and future job prospects.</p>			
3. How much will the proposal cost in total?			
	From NM	From other sources	Total
Capital	£192, 000	£4, 141	£196, 141
Revenue			
Total	£192, 000	£4, 141	£196, 141
4. Organisation responsible			
Name of contact and position	Mrs C. Watkins Head Teacher		
Address	Frobisher Primary & Nursery School, Frobisher Drive, Jaywick, C015 2QH		
Phone	01255 427073		
e mail	mwatkins@uwclub.net		

B The proposal

1. What is the problem you are trying to address?

Set out the problems and causes, using statistics and evidence where available – referring to the delivery plan and its targets and outcomes.

Frobisher School serves a very deprived area of Clacton with 38% of pupils on the Special Needs register and 35% of pupils having Free School Meals. At breakfast club the cook serves between 32 and 36 breakfasts daily.

We are endeavouring to raise attainment and attendance at school. By having better quality facilities, pupils will be learning in better surroundings.

The school took over the running of the kitchen from Scholarest in 2004. The current Kitchen is cramped and outdated. The kitchen layout makes it difficult for more than three staff to work in. Under new guidelines there should be separate changing and toilet facilities. Currently they are in same area. Fold up tables each of which accommodates 12 pupils at lunch time are housed in the Servery area. These have to be removed daily to the Hall. Once cleared, hot cupboards can then be moved to the servery area. This presents a safety issue. High cupboards in the kitchen make it difficult for staff to access equipment. They also run the risk of hitting their head on them when using the sink area. There are insufficient work surfaces. Most of the equipment needs to be replaced and/or updated. (some items have served for over 20 years). One cooker has been repaired three times in the last year. The handle to the deep freezer is broken.

Between 130-140 cooked meals are served daily. Cook provides three alternatives (two hot and 1 cold) for both main course and puddings. For many children this is their only meal. At Christmas time the staff served 280 traditional Christmas dinners. Between 32 and 36 Breakfasts are served daily. We have maintained the price of £1.40 in order that as many children as possible can take advantage of home cooked food.

Staff also eat with the pupils – this provides extra cover in the Hall, as well as a time for children to meet socially with their teachers.

The ICT suite currently has 23 working stations. It is very crowded. It has an interactive whiteboard. Each teaching unit within the school are timetabled to use the suite. As classes within KS1 are around 28 and KS2 tend to be over 30, this means that pupils do have to share computers and if one or more stations are not working, this makes it even more crowded. There is access to one stand alone computer in the library area.

Currently there is no air conditioning in the room, which makes it unbearable in the summer – we have to use fans in order to cool the room down. There is no fire exit from this room.

The suite is also used by a well attended computer club: Trustees in Year 6 are allowed to use it at any time during the school day. Children who attend the Saturday Club also have access to the suite once a month.

2. Proposal objectives?

List the objectives for the proposal (these should be measurable)

To increase size of the kitchen and ICT suite in order for:
staff to have changing facilities in the kitchen area: better working conditions for staff: to provide up to date equipment in the kitchen in order to provide quality food for pupils and staff: to be able to provide more choice for pupils by having designated hot and cold cupboards in fixed positions: to reduce safety hazards.
Be able to hire out the kitchen facilities together with the Hall for community use.
To provide a larger ICT suite to house 36 computer units in order to have whole class teaching: provide extended school services through use of suite: to provide adult training courses: research library facilities. To ensure there is a fire exit.

3. How do you propose to address the problem?

List the activities and set out who will benefit.

Extend the kitchen and ICT suite.

To provide a larger space for staff to work in: better facilities to produce better quality meals for pupils and staff: designated areas in the kitchen for preparation of food/cooking/ washing up facilities; safer fixed area as a servery (to store and serve hot and cold meals): less safety risks from carrying hot lots/large hot containers of food: cupboard space in the servery to house tall mops etc which can be removed from the kitchen allowing more space for dry goods/fresh vegetable storage: wall cupboard space in the servery for storage of jugs, crockery alleviating risk of causing injury: removal of tables to a cupboard in the hall.

To provide a larger working area for pupils and staff and ultimately the community in the ICT suite: to provide whole class teaching space: to provide a fire exit from the room: air conditioning to make it more pleasant to work in during summer months: less safety risks from using electric fans.

To provide an area that can be hired out for conferences: training: meetings: community use. Thus promoting effective partnership and wider community use.

4. How does this proposal address the problem. List activities and describe evidence from similar initiatives if possible.

A new extended kitchen and extended ICT suite will ultimately improve children's well being: extend pupil and adult learning. Research facilities will impact on standards. Results show that attainment is steadily increasing. (see OFSTED report for further evidence).

The refurbishment will provide better working conditions for staff. It will also improve safety. Better kitchen facilities will enhance the choices and quality of food being offered to pupils.

Extension of the ICT suite will allow for adult training which has been trialled previously and proven to be popular. However, it was only offered to parents and relations of pupils attending the school. With the reorganisation of staffing within the LEA, adult learning will be under threat. It is not known for how much longer courses can be provided within present premises in Clacton. Such a facility will enhance training for adults and better job prospects.

5. Community involvement

How have residents been involved in developing the proposal?

Pupils, staff and Governors initiated the proposal to extend the kitchen and ICT suite as part of discussions held following the school's exit from special measures two years ago. The school council have offered suggestions towards those proposals.

Members of the Governing Body, PTA, EPPa have been involved in the planning of the two areas.

Parents/carers have had the opportunity to view the plans at open evenings. They are excited about the multiple benefits to their children's education.

The Jaywick Forum is backing the proposal as they realise the potential of the facilities that will be available for community use.

Plans have been passed by Tendring District Council. Local residents have been consulted on the plans. Several have visited the site to look at the facilities and viewed the proposed plans.

6. Management arrangements?

Describe the arrangements for ensuring the proposal is managed, monitored and delivered as planned. Please give names of two references or referees (people that you've worked with before) that we can contact in advance of the appraisal process.

The management of the extension and building works will be undertaken jointly by the Head Teacher, members of the Governing Body and site Manager.

During construction there will be a designated project manager appointed by the building company. It will be overseen by Mr Doling employed by MLM (the architects). He will make regular checks. Building regulations will be overseen by Tendring District Council.

The extensions will then become part of the school annual development plan – ensuring that it is maintained regularly and that all regulations are met.

The impact of the new development will be reported on at Governor meetings by the Head Teacher. It will also be discussed at School Council meetings.

The hiring of facilities will become part of a sub committee formed by the Governing Body. This will also have a member of the PTA or EPPa serve on it.

7. Risks

Set out the risks associated with this proposal and how you plan to minimise them.

The Project Manager will adhere to strict risk assessments agreed before the start of the building works.

Ongoing use of the facilities will become part of the school's risk assessment and School Development policy. All of the building is under the scrutiny of the Resource committee which is a sub group of the Governing Body. Regular Health and Safety audits take place. An annual Safety audit is carried out by the County Education authority.

C Finances

1. What is the total cost of the proposal?					
Itemise the total spend as much as possible and set out the period this will cover, indicating what proportion is required from NM					
	item	£ year 1	£ year 2	£ year 3	Total
Capital (NM)	£192, 000				
Revenue (NM)					
Total (NM)	£192, 000				
Other funding	£4, 141				
Total	£196, 141				
2. Value for money					
Explain how this proposal provides value for money.					
<p>Provides a much needed facility for the school – to enrich the pupil’s surroundings.</p> <p>Provides opportunity for adult and family learning.</p> <p>Provides an area that has huge capacity for promoting effective wider community use.</p>					
3. What resources are already invested by your, and other, organisations in the area on this issue?					
<p>The school took over the running of the school kitchen in 2004. £8, 000 has already been allocated by the LEA to provide white goods: hot cupboards: electric potato peeler.</p> <p>The PTA has been fund raising towards the cost of the compound that will store the outdoor P.E. equipment – in order to free up the cupboard in the Hall.</p> <p>Maintenance is covered by the school budget.</p>					
4. Why is NM money needed?					
<p>We have previously put in a bid to the LEA for upgrading the Kitchen and ICT suite but was turned down. They were only able to fund training for kitchen staff. In order for us to meet the vision of an extended school, we need to be able to provide appropriate facilities. Capital funding can be allocated but it would take us almost eight years to build up sufficient funds to start this project.</p> <p>The project will allow us to improve the quality of life for many people living in a disadvantaged area of Essex. It will also improve facilities for children, staff and the neighbourhood.</p>					

5. Can you be paid this money in arrears, or do you need it to prime the project?

The company responsible for the building works would need most of the costs before starting: we would hold back 10% until everything was done to the specifications outlined in the building regulations.

6. Who are your organisation's auditors? (Please attach a copy of your last set of audited accounts)

School accounts are audited by the LEA.

D Options

1. What other options have been considered to address this proposal and if they were, why have they been rejected?

We have previously put in a bid to the LEA, but that was turned down.
The criteria for kitchen development was for equipment or training only.
Other options would be to fund raise through the PTA, but realistically this amount needed could not be achieved.

E Measuring and sustaining the impact

1. What outcomes do you hope to achieve? (i.e. overall results and benefits that relate to the delivery plan)

How will the outcomes be measured?

Improved facilities. Better menu choices for pupils. More pupils taking up lunches.
Better surroundings for pupils and staff. Higher attainment.
Extended school facilities. Opportunities for family and adult learning.

Outcomes will be measured by pupil/staff surveys: annual questionnaire to parents: more use of the facilities by outside agencies/local businesses/residents.

2. What monitoring arrangements will be put in place?

Set out your milestones (what you will have done by when) and outputs (things you can count to measure your activities) How will spend be monitored?

Contact builders to set out timetable for building works.

Appoint Project Manager.

Building of outside Compound (storage units) to commence end of May 07.

Extension of Kitchen and ICT suite commence mid June/ July.

Completion of extensions by end of August/early September.
Refurbishment of Kitchen and ICT suite by end of September (at the latest).
Regular checks on building works by members of the sub committee and Mr. Doling. Building checks by Tendring District Council.
Signing off of building works by early October.
Final check before last payment released.
Once built: Daily checks on ICT suite by Mr. Sisson (IT technician):
Daily checks carried out in kitchen:
Half termly safety audits by members of resource committee:
Maintenance checks carried out by Site Manager.
Annual School Development Plan: Building timetable.
Annual safety audit

3. Evaluation

How will you measure success and use lessons learnt?

More lunch numbers.
Pupil voice – on lunch menu. Information fed back to kitchen staff.
Staff meetings to discuss issues in kitchen: action plan to resolve any issues.
Staff Appraisals – how kitchen development has improved working conditions.
School council – feedback from pupils: pupil/staff surveys: Parent/carer questionnaire. Data used to inform improvements.
Hiring out of facilities – part of evaluation forms completed by delegates/companies. Any issues acted upon.
Impact of project will be reported on at Governing Body meetings by Head Teacher. Any issues on health/safety/risks raised by members of the resource committee – acted upon.
Letters to parents/carers will keep them updated on project development: any courses or initiatives organised.
Circulars to local residents and neighbours distributed to keep them updated with progress.
Open day for community to view facilities.
Audit of accounts should show increased revenue for school – which will be put back into furthering school facilities.

4. The long term and future

How will the benefits be sustained when NM resources are no longer available?

The upkeep of the kitchen and ICT suite will be sourced through the school budget or through revenue received through hiring of facilities.

Appraisal and approval structures

Amount of funding	Appraisal method	Approval required
Up to £2.5k	Neighbourhood Manager can carry out appraisal and submit for approval	Neighbourhood Manager and 2 Board members one of whom should be a resident board member if possible
Over £2.5k	Neighbourhood Manager and two board members one of which should be a resident board member if possible must go through the project appraisal form and submit for approval	Full Board

Signed:(project proposer) Date:12/4/07.....

Name:Mrs C Watkins.....

Frobisher School – Extension of ICT suite

Appraised by Elizabeth Foss-Smith

Date; 26 April

Appraisal Checklist – Interaction NMP Board

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources?	Yes	
Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation?	Yes	
Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes?		
Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea?	Yes	School community
Will it make a lasting difference?	Yes	
Is this a substitute for mainstream funding?	Yes	LEA refused bid
Does it provide best value?		unclear
Is it too risky?		
Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated?		Rather vague
Section A	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Is it clear what is being proposed?	Yes	
Is it clear how much money is required?	Yes	
Is it clear who the responsible organisation is?	Yes	
Section B		

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Is it a convincing proposal in terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities?	Yes	
Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes?		unclear
Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services?	No	Unclear how much is duplicated at Bishops Park College and Jaywick Resources Centre and Enterprise centre (eg. Other IT facilities for community use) Community use of primary school facilities is often necessarily restricted.
Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)?		Only school community
Are management arrangements adequate?	Yes	
Have risks been adequately considered and planned for?	Yes	

Section C	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail?	NO	
Does the proposal provide value for money?		UNCLEAR
Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation?		UNCLEAR
Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required?		TO REPLACE LEA FUNDING
Section D		
Have other options been adequately considered?		UNCLEAR
Section E		
Have measurable outcomes been identified?		NOT MEASURABLE

Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place?		ONLY BUILDING CHECKS
Are mechanisms in place for evaluation?	Yes	
Is it clear how the benefits can be sustained?	Yes	

Decision of appraisal panel

Recommend approval	
Do not recommend approval	
Recommend changes required before approval	YES
<p>If so, please state or refer to above sections</p> <p>Very unclear whether [a] there is sufficient funds for this or [b] it fits within the NM delivery plan.</p> <p>Would want much more detail on costings; listed measurable outcomes which will be monitored.</p>	

Name	Elizabeth Foss-Smith	
Signed	<i>Elizabeth Foss-Smith</i>	
Date	26 th April 2007	

Frobisher School – Extension of ICT suite

Appraised by Maureen Hanley

Date; 1 May 2007

Appraisal Checklist – Interaction NMP Board

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources?	Yes	
Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation?	Yes	
Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes?	Yes/no	Cross reference the proposals to outcomes in the in the LAA or neighbourhood plans – needs to be included
Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea?	Yes/no	Useful to have links with Adult Community Learning to identify what is already in existence and how this proposal can enhance provision. Links to LDG plan for extended schools.
Will it make a lasting difference?	Yes	
Is this a substitute for mainstream funding?	No	
Does it provide best value?	Yes	
Is it too risky?	No	
Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated?	Yes	
Section A	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Is it clear what is being proposed?	Yes	
Is it clear how much money is required?	Yes	
Is it clear who the responsible organisation is?	Yes	

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Section B		
Is it a convincing proposal in terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities?	Yes	

Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes?	Yes	
Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services?		This area could be clearer with reference to ACL provision as indicated above
Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)?	Yes	
Are management arrangements adequate?	Yes	
Have risks been adequately considered and planned for?	Yes	Potential take up of ICT community provision might be recognised as a risk but wouldn't prevent the recommendation to fund this initiative.

Section C	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail?		Presumably the Neighbourhood manager has detailed breakdown of how figures have been arrived at and whether a tendering process will be put in place etc.
Does the proposal provide value for money?	Yes	
Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation?	Yes	
Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required?	Yes	
Section D		
Have other options been	Yes	

adequately considered?		
Section E		
Have measurable outcomes been identified?		Could be further developed – adult learning
Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place?		Could be developed – adult learning
Are mechanisms in place for evaluation?		Could be developed further in terms of achievements for adults
Is it clear how the benefits can be sustained?		Needs some links with ACL to address sustainability

Decision of appraisal panel

Recommend approval	Yes
Do not recommend approval	
Recommend changes required before approval	Some additional information
<p>If so, please state or refer to above sections</p> <p>Links with plans/outcomes</p> <p>Needs analysis in terms of ACL</p> <p>Links with ACL</p> <p>Monitoring outcomes for ACL aspects</p> <p>Budget breakdown</p>	

Name	Maureen Hanley
Signed	Maureen Hanley
Date	1 st May 2007

