

## Members' Library Service Request Form

Date of Document	30/11/16
Originator	Fiona Robertson, Head Of Education
Originator's Ref (if any)	
Document Title	Report on the Outcome of the Consultation on the New Additional Secondary Education Provision in the Musselburgh Area

Please indicate if access to the document is to be "unrestricted" or "restricted", with regard to the terms of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

Unrestricted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Restricted	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	------------	--------------------------

If the document is "restricted", please state on what grounds (click on grey area for drop-down menu):

For Publication
-----------------

Additional information:

This report accompanies a report of the same title, submitted to East Lothian Council at its meeting on 20 December 2016.

Authorised By	Fiona Robertson
Designation	Head of Education
Date	12/12/16

For Office Use Only:	
Library Reference	235/16
Date Received	12/12/16
Bulletin	Dec16



**EAST LOTHIAN COUNCIL**  
**RESOURCES AND PEOPLE SERVICES**  
**EDUCATION**  
**CONSULTATION REPORT**

**REPORT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE CONSULTATION ON THE NEW  
ADDITIONAL SECONDARY EDUCATION PROVISION IN THE MUSSELBURGH  
AREA**

**November 2016**

This Consultation Report has been issued by East Lothian Council in accordance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

## **Contents**

1. INTRODUCTION
2. BACKGROUND
3. CONSIDERATIONS
4. THE CONSULTATION PROCESS
5. THE PUBLIC MEETING
6. RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE
7. EDUCATION AUTHORITY RESPONSE TO WRITTEN AND ORAL REPRESENTATIONS
8. EDUCATION SCOTLAND REPORT
9. TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS
10. ALLEGED OMISSIONS OR INACCURACIES
11. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 9(1) OF THE SCHOOLS (CONSULTATION) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010
12. LEGAL ISSUES
13. PERSONNEL ISSUES
14. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
15. CONCLUSION
16. RECOMMENDATIONS

## **List of Appendices**

- Appendix 1 - Note of public meeting (pages 30-44)
- Appendix 2 - Summary of Questionnaire Responses (pages 45-48)
- Appendix 3 – Comments from Questionnaire Responses (pages 49-74)
- Appendix 4 – Written Responses from Individual & Groups (pages 75-98)
- Appendix 5 - Note of staff drop-in sessions (pages 99-107)
- Appendix 6 - Note of pupil voice sessions (pages 108-122)
- Appendix 7 – Financial Information (page 123)
- Appendix 8 – Transition Chart: ‘Affected Pupil Year Groups Diagram’ (page 124)
- Appendix 9 - Education Scotland Report (pages 125-128)

## EAST LOTHIAN COUNCIL

### RESOURCES AND PEOPLE SERVICES

#### EDUCATION

This report has been prepared following consultation on the following proposal:

- A new additional secondary school will be established in Wallyford from 2020, or as soon as possible thereafter, to provide additional secondary education provision within the Musselburgh cluster area;
- The site of the new additional secondary school will be in the area of Wallyford;
- The catchment area of the new secondary school will be created from the present Pinkie St Peter's Primary School and proposed revised Wallyford Primary School catchment areas;
- S1-S2 young people who reside within the catchment areas of Wallyford Primary School and Pinkie St Peter's Primary School will attend a new secondary school in Wallyford from 2020, or as soon as possible thereafter;
- The children attending Wallyford Primary School and Pinkie St Peter's Primary School will transfer to the new secondary school at the end of P7 with effect from 2020 onwards, or as soon as possible thereafter.

This proposal also had implications for:

- Musselburgh Grammar School
- Sanderson's Wynd Primary School
- Ross High School

Having had regard (in particular) to:

- a) Relevant written representations received by the Council (from any person) during the consultation period
- b) Oral representations made to it (by any person) at the public meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016
- c) Oral representations made to it at the staff drop-in session
- d) Oral representations made to it at the pupil voice session
- e) Education Scotland's report on the proposal

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This is a Consultation Report prepared in compliance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 on the above proposal.

1.2 The purpose of this report is to:

- Provide a record of the total number of written responses made during the Statutory Consultation period;
- Provide a summary of the written responses;
- Provide a summary of oral representations made at the public meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016;
- Provide a statement of the Council's response to those written and oral representations;
- Provide the full text of Education Scotland's report and a statement of the Council's response to this report;
- State how the Council reviewed the above proposal following the representations received during the Statutory Consultation period and the report from Education Scotland;
- Provide details of any omission from, or inaccuracy in, the Consultation Proposal Document and state how the Council acted upon it; and
- State how the Council has complied with Section 12 of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 when reviewing the above proposals.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

2.1 Education Authorities have a statutory duty in terms of the Education (Scotland) Act 1980 to make adequate and efficient provision of school education across their area. This duty applies in respect of both the current school population and anticipated pattern of demand. In addition, Councils have a statutory duty to secure best value in terms of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003. Most importantly, the Education Authority would wish to optimise the educational experience to ensure:

- East Lothian's young people are successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens;
- East Lothian's children have the best start in life and are ready to succeed;
- East Lothian's children experience equality of opportunity within an inclusive educational experience'
- East Lothian's children's care, welfare and personal and social development is central to raising their attainment and achievements; and
- In East Lothian we live healthier, more active and independent lives.

- 2.2 East Lothian Council is committed to raising educational attainment and ensuring that all children and young people have the best opportunities in life. The educational benefits that will arise from this proposal for children affected or likely to be affected are outlined in the Consultation Proposal Document.
- 2.3 The Council must ensure provision can be made for the education of children and young people in its area and must consult on certain changes in such arrangements before it can commit to delivering them.
- 2.4 On 24<sup>th</sup> February 2015, approval was given by East Lothian Council to undertake consultations relating to the school estate (i.e. schools, catchment areas, locations) as necessary to support the emerging Local Development Plan (LDP), where there is likely to be a need for new or re-provisioned facilities, without further reference to or approval by Council; and to report back to Council on the outcomes of such consultations in order that the Council can make a decision on any proposed changes.
- 2.5 The Strategic Development Plan (SDP) for South East Scotland was approved by Scottish Ministers in June 2013. The SDP with its Supplementary Guidance on Housing Land requires the LDP to ensure sufficient housing land is available to deliver 10,050 homes during the period 2009 – 2024 with 6,250 of those homes capable of being delivered across East Lothian in the period to 2019.
- 2.6 In order to accommodate these strategic development requirements for East Lothian, the emerging LDP (draft proposed plan as approved by Council on the 17<sup>th</sup> November 2015 superseded by the Proposed LDP 2016, approved by Council for representation on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2016) details a preferred approach of “Compact Growth” with a requirement for additional secondary education capacity in the Musselburgh cluster to allow this growth to come forward.
- 2.7 The Council must consult on certain changes in arrangements for educating children and young people in its area before it can commit to delivering them including, if required, to make proposed development sites effective. The LDP is only deliverable if it is complemented by an educational solution that meets the increase in projected pupil numbers that will be generated from the new housing developments. All of the uncommitted development in the existing Musselburgh cluster including that identified in the Proposed LDP 2016 requires additional secondary education capacity to be established in order for such development to come forward.
- 2.8 A pre-consultation exercise was carried out by the Council’s Education Service with the pupils, parents and staff of all Musselburgh primary schools and the existing secondary school on three education options for the delivery of additional secondary education capacity. This took place from 24<sup>th</sup> June 2015 to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015. The pre-consultation exercise is an informal consultation which allows the Council to consider a wider range of possible options in advance of statutory consultation before clarifying which option or options should become the statutory proposal(s). It does not,

however, commit the Council to taking the range of possible options forward within the formal Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 Proposal Document.

2.9 The additional secondary educational provision in the Musselburgh catchment area will directly affect the following schools and was considered in the Consultation Proposal Document:

- Pinkie St Peter's Primary School
- Levenhall Nursery School
- Wallyford Primary and Nursery School
- Sanderson's Wynd Primary and Nursery School
- Ross High School
- Musselburgh Grammar School

### **3. CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 The main considerations relating to the establishment of a new additional secondary school in the Musselburgh catchment area are fully explained in the Consultation Proposal Document and the main points are highlighted below:

- The condition and suitability of the establishment to facilitate learning and teaching processes in the 21st Century;
- East Lothian Council will meet the cost of the new provision, which will be partially off- set by Developer contributions;
- The need to develop inspirational learning environments which raise the aspirations of children and young people, staff and the wider community;
- The increasing pupil population in the area projected to arise from committed and planned housing developments that are identified in the Proposed LDP 2016;
- The need to address potential over-capacity in the school estate and create a sustainable school estate for future generations;
- The need to reduce the Council's carbon footprint, to adapt to climate change and the reduction in finite natural resources;
- Making a clear civic statement about the value the Council places on investing in education and lifelong learning, and provide new education and community provision to the vibrant learning community;
- A flexible design that allows creative and multiple uses of space by the staff and pupils, and also the community. Spaces for learning will be designed in such a way as to allow a range of teaching styles and approaches including: active learning, interdisciplinary learning outdoor learning, and digital technologies;
- The opportunity for both Musselburgh Grammar School and the new additional secondary school to work collaboratively to increase personalisation and choice for

pupils when considering subjects within the senior phase, in addition to enhancing support for the authority's approach to Developing our Young Workforce.

#### **4. THE CONSULTATION PROCESS**

- 4.1 The Council has also met the minimum requirements set out in the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 with regards to ensuring the views of all members of the community were listened to and their views are included in this report. The Council believes that this report accurately reflects the views of the community, which have been gathered through a range of engagement events and response mechanisms. It is for members of East Lothian Council to decide to adopt the proposal, withdraw it or seek to consult on another proposal.
- 4.2 On 24<sup>th</sup> February 2015, approval was given by East Lothian Council to undertake consultations relating to the school estate (i.e. schools, catchment areas, locations) as necessary to support the emerging LDP, where there is likely to be a need for new or re-provisioned facilities, without further reference to or approval by Council; and to report back to Council on the outcomes of such consultations in order that the Council can make a decision on any proposed changes.
- 4.3 On 26<sup>th</sup> April 2016, approval was given by East Lothian Council to consult on the proposal to establish a new additional secondary school in Wallyford from 2020 or as soon as possible thereafter.
- 4.4 Notification of the consultation was given to all statutory consultees prior to the commencement of the consultation.
- 4.5 The Consultation Proposal Document was published on East Lothian Council's website and paper copies distributed on 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2016 to:
- All Musselburgh schools
  - Wallyford Community Centre
  - Wallyford Library
  - Musselburgh East Community Learning Centre
  - Musselburgh Library
  - Brunton Hall, Musselburgh
  - John Muir House, Haddington
- 4.6 The consultation period commenced at 12.00am on **Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2016** and lasted until 12.00am on **Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016**, being a period of six weeks, which also included the statutory minimum 30 school days.
- 4.7 The proposal on which consultation took place was to:



- Establish a new additional secondary school in Wallyford from 2020, or as soon as possible thereafter, to provide additional secondary education provision within the Musselburgh cluster area;
- The site of the new additional secondary school will be in the area of Wallyford;
- The catchment area of the new additional secondary school will be created from the present Pinkie St Peter’s Primary School and proposed revised Wallyford Primary School catchment areas;
- S1-S2 young people who reside within the catchment areas of Wallyford Primary School and Pinkie St Peter’s Primary School will attend a new additional secondary school in Wallyford from 2020, or as soon as possible thereafter;
- The children at Wallyford Primary School and Pinkie St Peter’s Primary School will transfer to the new additional secondary school at the end of P7 with effect from 2020 onwards, or as soon as possible thereafter.

4.8 The requirements for consulting on a relevant proposal relating to schools are set out in the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010.

4.9 An information leaflet setting out details about the proposal and consultation meetings was issued to the consultees listed in the Consultation Proposal Document. Advice on where the complete Consultation Proposal Document could be obtained was included and was published on East Lothian Council’s Consultation Hub <https://eastlothianconsultations.co.uk/education/musselburgh-school/>

4.10 If requested, copies of the proposal would have been made available in alternative formats or translated for readers whose first language is not English.

4.11 A “Frequently Asked Questions” document was also prepared which was available at the same location on East Lothian Council’s Consultation Hub: <https://eastlothianconsultations.co.uk/education/musselburgh-school/>

4.12 An advertisement was placed in the local newspaper on **5<sup>th</sup> May 2016** and **19<sup>th</sup> May 2016**. A pre-announcement was also made on the Council’s website and social media posts on the **2<sup>nd</sup> May 2016**. In addition, there were announcements related to the consultation process on East Lothian Council’s website, linked via a Facebook page and Twitter feeds.

4.13 The public meeting was held in **Brunton Hall, Musselburgh** on **30<sup>th</sup> May 2016** at **7.00pm**.

4.14 In addition to specific meetings with statutory consultees, drop-in sessions were held in respect of the proposal at the venues listed below, at which any members of the public were welcome to attend:

Venue	Date	Time
Wallyford Primary School	16 May 2016	11:00am – 5:00pm

Venue	Date	Time
Brunton Hall	18 May 2016	10:00am – 2:00pm
Pinkie St Peter's Primary School	19 May 2016	11:00am – 5:00pm
Pinkie St Peter's Primary School	26 May 2016	5:00pm – 8:00pm

4.15 In accordance with statutory requirements, the following persons, including those indirectly affected, were consulted:

- The Parent Councils of Campie, Musselburgh Burgh, Loretto RC, Pinkie St Peter's, Stoneyhill, Wallyford and Whitecraig primary schools and Musselburgh Grammar School;
- The parents of pupils at Campie, Musselburgh Burgh, Loretto RC, Pinkie St Peter's, Stoneyhill, Wallyford and Whitecraig primary schools and Musselburgh Grammar School;
- The parents of any children expected to attend Wallyford Primary School, Pinkie St Peter's Primary School, Musselburgh Grammar School and Ross High School within two years of the date of publication of the proposal paper;
- The pupils at Campie, Musselburgh Burgh, Loretto RC, Pinkie St Peter's, Stoneyhill, Wallyford and Whitecraig primary schools and Musselburgh Grammar School;
- The staff at Campie, Musselburgh Burgh, Loretto RC, Pinkie St Peter's, Stoneyhill, Wallyford and Whitecraig primary schools and Musselburgh Grammar School;
- Musselburgh Area Partnership;
- Musselburgh Community Council;
- Wallyford Community Council;
- Whitecraig Community Council.

4.16 The following schools are **directly affected** by the proposal:

- Wallyford Primary and Nursery School
- Sanderson's Wynd Primary and Nursery School
- Pinkie St Peter's Primary School
- Levenhall Nursery School
- Ross High School
- Musselburgh Grammar School

4.17 Representations were sought from statutory consultees and the wider public in the following ways:

- An online questionnaire on East Lothian Council's Consultation Hub. The questionnaire asked specific questions and enabled general comments and views to be entered. The Consultation Hub stored all relevant consultation documentation for public viewing;

- Widely distributed paper copies of the same questionnaire, at Council buildings around the Wallyford and Musselburgh area. Sealed boxes were also located at questionnaire distribution points for their return;
- Paper and digital flyers, in addition to the press adverts and Council web and social media announcements linked to the Consultation Hub. These flyers also detailed a specific Musselburgh Consultation email inbox, to which any queries could be submitted during the consultation period;
- Flyer distribution to pupils at all Musselburgh Grammar School catchment Primary schools, Sanderson's Wynd Primary School, Ross High School. A digital version was sent to Musselburgh Grammar for distribution. Head Teachers used their established methods of communication to engage/remind parents about the consultation and the Education Scotland independent evaluation visit.
- In addition to the public meeting and public drop-in sessions, school staff were invited to attend briefing sessions held at their school to discuss the proposal;
- A representative group of pupils from all current catchment schools attended a workshop where they were able to express their views on the proposal;
- Meetings held with Wallyford, Pinkie St Peters, Musselburgh Grammar and Sandersons Wynd Parent Councils;
- A joint meeting held with Musselburgh, Wallyford and Whitecraig Community Councils.

4.18 This Consultation Report is the Council's response to the issues raised during the consultation period on the Consultation Proposal Document.

4.19 This Consultation Report will be published for a period of three weeks before a final decision is taken by East Lothian Council on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2016.

## **5. THE PUBLIC MEETING**

5.1 A public meeting was held in Brunton Hall on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016 which was attended by over 40 members of the community. A full note of the meeting is attached at Appendix 1 which details the questions and issues raised at the meeting. The points raised are addressed within the response to Frequently Asked Questions or within this report.

5.2 Additionally, four drop-in sessions were arranged during the consultation period, enabling any member of the public to ask questions and discuss the proposal, the consultation process and how they could make representations. The most commonly asked questions at these drop-in sessions, informed the content of the Frequently Asked Questions document to provide relevant stakeholders and members of the public with points of clarification or further information.

## 6. RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE

- 6.1 As part of the consultation process, the Council sought the views of a wide range of stakeholders. Information about the consultation was placed in a local newspaper, on the Council's website and at various schools, libraries and other centres across the Musselburgh area.
- 6.2 The Council provided stakeholders with a short online or paper questionnaire and also made good arrangements for receiving additional written responses. The Council received 423 responses to its questionnaire. A clear majority of respondents to the questionnaire (60.5%) support the proposal. 35.2% of questionnaire respondents oppose the proposal.
- 6.3 A summary of all questionnaire responses has been included in Appendix 2. The comments made as part of these questionnaires are also included in Appendix 3, apart from submissions which consultees did not wish East Lothian Council to share publicly. Even if a submission is not shared publicly, it has still been included in the collation of stakeholder's views and informed the response as detailed in paragraph 6.7.
- 6.4 The Council received 10 written submissions to its consultation, 4 from individuals and 6 from groups, during the consultation period. Of those that expressed a preference, a narrow majority favoured the proposal. Of the 6 written responses from groups, 5 of these were from Parent Councils of schools within the Musselburgh cluster area: 3 of these Parent Councils expressed support for the proposal, 1 was opposed and 1 was evenly split. One Community Council also opposed the proposal. All the written submissions are included as Appendix 4.
- 6.5 The summary of responses categorised by demographic are as follows:

- **Parents of pupils currently at schools:**

A greater proportion of parents of pupils currently at school, agreed with the proposal than disagreed, for all schools. In total, 67.2% supported the proposal, 30.8% opposed the proposal. The greatest proportion who supported the proposal was parents of pupils at Wallyford Primary (92.1% agreed/strongly agreed). 56.7% of parents with pupils at Pinkie St Peters supported the proposal. The greatest proportion who opposed the proposal were parents of pupils at Musselburgh Grammar (48.1% disagreed/strongly disagreed)

- **Parents of future pupils at schools:**

A greater proportion of parents of future pupils at schools agreed with the proposal than disagreed, for all schools apart from Whitecraig Primary School. In total, 70.9% supported the proposal, 26.8% opposed the proposal. The greatest proportion who supported the proposal was parents of future pupils at Wallyford Primary school (95.1% agreed/strongly agreed). 53.3% of parents of future pupils

at Pinkie St Peters supported the proposal. The greatest proportion who opposed the proposal were parents of future pupils at Whitecraig (100% disagreed/strongly disagreed). However, this related to only one parent. 40% of parents of future pupils at Musselburgh Burgh, Pinkie St Peters and Musselburgh Grammar disagreed/strongly disagreed with the proposal.

- **Pupils currently attending school:**

A greater proportion of pupils currently attending Campie (66.7%) and Wallyford (100%) agreed with the proposal. A greater proportion of pupils currently attending Musselburgh Burgh (66.7%), Stoneyhill Primary (100%) and Musselburgh Grammar (61.9%) opposed the proposal. In total, 56.4% of pupils opposed the proposal, 33.1% supported the proposal.

- **Members of Staff:**

A greater proportion of staff members at Campie Primary (77.8%) and Whitecraig Primary (100%) agreed with the proposal. A greater proportion of staff members at Stoneyhill (100%) and Musselburgh Grammar (61.5%) opposed the proposal. In total, 57.1% of staff who responded via the questionnaire supported the proposal.

- **“Other” Respondents:**

These respondents included grandparents, other family member, members of the public etc. 76.1% of these respondents supported the proposal.

- **Parent respondents (with stage banding of pupils):**

A greater proportion of parents of pupils in all age bandings supported the proposal, apart from parents of pupils from S1-S6. There was a general trend regarding the younger the pupil banding, the greater proportion of support for the proposal. 67.9% of parents with pupils in the stage banding who would experience the transition between Musselburgh Grammar and the new secondary (current P4-P7), supported the proposal.

- **Catchment of Respondent:**

A greater proportion of respondents from Musselburgh Burgh (64.4%) and Wallyford Primary (85.7%) support the proposal. A greater proportion of respondents from Pinkie St Peters Primary (50%) and Stoneyhill Primary (47.5%) oppose the proposal. There are equal proportions of respondents supporting/opposing the proposal, who live in either Campie Primary (45.3%/45.3%) or Whitecraig Primary (50%/50%).

6.6 During the consultation period, Council officers visited Wallyford Primary, Pinkie St Peter’s Primary, Loretto RC Primary, Stoneyhill Primary, Campie Primary, Musselburgh Burgh Primary, Whitecraig Primary and Musselburgh Grammar schools, providing

good opportunities for pupils and staff to discuss their views. Overall, pupils, particularly at the primary stages, showed support for the proposal. A note of the staff drop-in sessions and pupil voice sessions are included as Appendices 5 and 6.

6.7 A number of common themes emerged from the written and oral responses and can be grouped as follows:

- Concerns over the proposed site or catchment of the new school;
- Choices for places to have lunch
- Community facilities
- The Consultation Process
- Continuity of school network of friends
- Divisive for the community & rivalry
- Environmental impact
- The proposal not being the preferred option
- Parity of subject choices and facilities at both schools
- Traffic, transport, parking and Safe Routes to School
- School capacity
- SIMD profile & diversity
- Transition concerns & siblings

## **7. EDUCATION AUTHORITY RESPONSE TO WRITTEN AND ORAL REPRESENTATIONS**

### **7.1 Concerns over the proposed site or catchment of the new school**

7.1.1 An options appraisal on a number of suitable sites was carried out at an earlier stage in the planning process for this proposed school. Proposals MH11 and ED1 Part A of the Proposed LDP 2016 identify a new secondary school establishment in the expanded Wallyford settlement. The site will be accessible both in public transport and sustainable transport terms. The site is in close proximity to the existing settlement and has the potential for well developed pedestrian and cycle (shared) links connecting onto a wider permeable network.

7.1.2 The new additional secondary school will be at the heart of the growing community in the area, providing a hub for learning, activities and facilities that will make a contribution to improving people's health and wellbeing, adding to the strength and vibrancy of the wider community. All existing and new housing in the proposed catchment area will be within two miles of the new school. All pupils will be able to walk, cycle or scooter to school with the subsequent health benefits. The site of the new secondary school is in close proximity to the primary school located in Wallyford, as is the case in North Berwick. In East Lothian Council's experience, this has not caused any issue.

7.1.3 The new school and its associated catchment area will meet the requirements of the Proposed LDP 2016, which was in turn informed by the Main Issues Report 2014 and

the Compact Strategy for housing growth. The Compact Strategy and assessment of sites for the Proposed LDP sought to locate housing growth where possible to take advantage of existing infrastructure or areas where additional infrastructure could be easily provided, to reduce the need to travel, the distance of travel and to be close to public transport links to reduce dependency on private cars.

7.1.4 The proposed catchment area for the new additional secondary school provision takes account of proposed house building across the Musselburgh cluster area with the intention of having two secondary schools with viable rolls that can both be accommodated within a maximum building capacity of 1,350. Roll projection modelling carried out on alternative catchment area combinations within the Musselburgh Cluster did not produce as equitable a split in pupil numbers between the two secondary schools over time.

## **7.2 Choices for places to have lunch**

7.2.1 The proposed new additional secondary school will have capacity for all pupils and staff to have lunch in the dining facilities if they wish. The environment in which pupils have lunch will provide opportunities not only to eat but to build positive relationships and socialise with peers. All pupils will be encouraged to have lunch on school premises. The school dining staff will offer balanced healthy meals, reinforcing the learning delivered by teachers through the Personal and Social Education programmes. These programmes encourage young people to make healthy lifestyle choices. The school will also offer lunchtime activities e.g. sporting activities and clubs, to further promote health and wellbeing. This should encourage all pupils to stay within the school at lunchtimes. Out with the school premises, the approved development at Wallyford, now under construction, includes a new local centre with retail and other commercial units close to the proposed school location and which may provide pupils with more choice in the future.

7.2.2 The proposal should have little or no effect on existing businesses in the town centre as the roll of Musselburgh Grammar will remain viable and fairly stable in the coming years.

## **7.3 Community Facilities**

7.3.1 The existing Wallyford Community Centre will continue to support community related activities. It is, however, recognised that more space will be required to meet the needs of the growing community. The new secondary school will be a key community asset and will be designed to provide a range of facilities to support existing and new community activities, including for example, access to a library and learning centre and sports facilities. The nature and scope of community use and access will form part of the consultation process with a range of stakeholders, including community representatives during the preparation of the brief and specification for the new facility.

## **7.4 The Consultation Process**

- 7.4.1 As stated earlier in section 2, the Council must ensure provision can be made for the education of children in its area and must consult on certain changes in such arrangements before it can commit to delivering them including, if required, to make proposed development sites effective. The LDP must be complemented by an educational solution that meets the increase in projected pupil numbers that will be generated from the new housing developments. The consultation process focuses on consulting on an education solution and does not take into account other factors including, the review being conducted by the Boundaries Commission.
- 7.4.2 The informal pre-consultation exercise was carried out on three possible options for the delivery of additional secondary school provision to assist the Council in their evaluation, and identify which of these should be taken forward as the statutory proposal as the best long term option. This took place between 24<sup>th</sup> June and 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015. A summary report detailing pre-consultation feedback from respondents was published on East Lothian Council's website. As part of their representation, Musselburgh Grammar Parent Council refers to their concern regarding the pre-consultation summary.
- 7.4.3 An appraisal of each of the three school options on each of the two potential sites was carried out based on the qualitative criteria and features which formed part of the pre-consultation. The respective advantages and disadvantages of each option including the associated costs were evaluated by relevant Officers from across the Council's services as detailed in the consultation documentation.
- 7.4.4 The statutory consultation process undertaken between 12.00am on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2016 until 12.00am on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016 with regard to the new additional secondary provision is predicated on consulting on a proposal that is viable and deliverable and represents the very best educational outcomes for its young people. The best value option for the Council was a new additional secondary school located in the Wallyford area. The other options detailed in the pre-consultation exercise were discounted on the basis of deliverability or not offering high quality educational outcomes for our young people.
- 7.4.5 There were opportunities for open and free discussions to take place at the public meetings and with Parent Councils regarding the other options in the pre-consultation exercise which were discounted. For example, the Council clearly demonstrated at the public meeting held on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016 that the large school option was not just discounted in terms of its initial capital cost but also on its potential revenue costs, and more critically the determination that establishing a secondary school with the estimated school roll was not in the best interests of all young people, particularly those within specialist provision.



7.4.6 Representations made during the consultation, requested more detailed financial information. Section 4(2A) of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) 2010 Act states that a proposal must contain financial information where that proposal relates to a school closure. This proposal does not relate to a school closure. However, the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 Section 1 places a duty on authorities to secure best value while maintaining an appropriate balance between quality and cost. The Scottish Government statutory guidance May 2015 states that an authority may wish to demonstrate best value although it recognises that some of the information may be sensitive. To that end a degree of financial information was provided at the public meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and subsequently published on the consultation hub. A copy of this high level cost information, comparing a single secondary school for the whole of the Musselburgh cluster and an additional secondary school is included in Appendix 7.

7.4.7 The statutory consultation activities undertaken with regard to the new additional secondary provision fully met the legislative requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, and were designed to encourage maximum participation. The Council actively engaged with all stakeholders, including staff, parents, pupils and the Musselburgh area Community Councils at a range of events during the statutory consultation period. These events were widely advertised through letter drops, social media, local press and school communications etc. All statutory consultees were contacted. However, the specific mention of Whitecraig Community Council and Wallyford Community Council, who were contacted and consulted during the statutory consultation period, was not referred to in the Consultation Proposal Document. This omission was recognised and was detailed in the 'Omissions, Corrections and Amendments' document on the Consultation Hub, during the consultation period.

7.4.8 With regard to the educational benefits set out in the Consultation Proposal Document, the Council believes it has complied with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010. It has described how it sought to balance the educational benefits against the impact on Musselburgh Grammar School and its communities as a result of realigned catchment areas in the consultation documentation.

## **7.5 Continuity of school network of friends**

7.5.1 In order to establish the new additional secondary school with an initial viable roll, the following pupils will be the first cohort at the new school on opening August 2020 (or as soon as thereafter):

- pupils who live in the proposed new additional secondary school catchment area and are transitioning from P7 into S1 in, will start their secondary education at the new school;

- pupils who live in the proposed new additional secondary school catchment area and are transitioning into S2 and S3 will move to the new school;

7.5.2 Pupils who live in the new additional secondary school catchment area and are moving into the Senior Phase (S4-S6) in August 2020 (or as soon as thereafter), will remain at Musselburgh Grammar School. Younger siblings of S4-S6 pupils who live in the new additional secondary school catchment area at the effective date will have the option to attend Musselburgh Grammar School if they wish.

7.5.3 The Council recognises that the transition process will need to support both the academic and pastoral needs of the pupils. It is, therefore, committed to ensuring that both schools will work very closely together. They will operate within the same learning community and there will be many opportunities, planned and naturally occurring, for pupils to meet, work and socialise together at shared sporting, social and curricular events. A common timetable will offer more breath of choice across the curriculum and enable pupils in the Senior Phase to study together. Both schools will be expected to offer extra-curricular activities to peer groups across the Musselburgh Learning Community. These and other measures will support networking and friendships to be made across both schools, especially for those pupils moving from S2 and S3 to the new additional secondary provision. Transitional support is specifically addressed in section 7.13.

7.5.4 The parents of children who live in the proposed catchment area of the new additional secondary school who wish their children to attend Musselburgh Grammar School at the effective date but are not going into the senior phase (S4 to S6) or a younger sibling of a senior pupil, can make an out of catchment area request, in line with the Council's Pupil Placement policy.

## **7.6 Divisive for the Community and Rivalry**

7.6.1 In addition to the measures detailed in 7.5.3, it will be the responsibility of both schools and the community to cooperate closely, as is current practice across our schools. This is in line with national expectations as set out within Education Scotland's How good is our school? Self-evaluation Framework Quality Indicator 2.7 Partnerships which provides an illustration of effective partnership practice. Schools recognise that Curriculum for Excellence cannot be delivered in isolation. They particularly need to work with their associated primary and secondary partners. This will also involve working with other partners including Community Learning and Development, Community Councils and police, and providing shared educational experiences across both schools. Increasing the secondary provision in the Musselburgh cluster area will provide opportunities for schools to work in a new wider community. Both schools will have a strong ethos at establishment level and ensure that pupils have pride in their school, whilst developing shared values across the learning community. These values should reflect the four capacities of a Curriculum for Excellence, especially the importance of being a responsible citizen, and build on

the very good work undertaken by Musselburgh Grammar School regarding fostering new relationships and welcoming new families and individuals to the area. It is proposed that the two secondary schools will have a common logo to share their identity. This logo would represent the individual identity of both schools within the Musselburgh Learning Community. Pupils will be able to identify with their school through a more prominent placement of their own individual establishment within any school clothing. By doing this, the Council is communicating an important message to staff, pupils and the community that all pupils, whilst attending a separate establishment, are part of the same learning community. Additionally as part of consultation with the Parent Council and pupils of Musselburgh Grammar School, dress code could also help establish the visual similarity of the schools.

## **7.7 Environmental Impact**

7.7.1 The impacts of the proposals are assessed and the relevant technical and environmental information is published alongside the Proposed LDP. The interim environmental assessments, site assessments and other technical documents for the Main Issues Report and Proposed LDP are available on the Council's website.

## **7.8 The Proposal not being the preferred option**

7.8.1 The Consultation Proposal Document clearly sets out why the options of a single school or a split-site school were discounted:

### **A new S4- S6 senior phase school for Musselburgh Grammar School on a separate site**

A review of school consultations conducted by other local authorities, along with additional research presented evidence relative to the consideration of a split site school. The results indicate a desire to move away from an existing split site provision due to the following reasons:

- the potential adverse impact on young people's learning experiences resulting from increased staff movement across school sites;
- the potential adverse impact on continuity and progression in the curriculum;
- increased teacher travel costs;
- reduced pupil contact time for teachers;
- pupil safety in moving between sites;
- the potential for higher levels of truancy if young people have a greater distance to travel to and between school buildings;
- planning staff movement between sites during the school day;

- impact on capacity to supervise behaviour due to staff travel between sites;
- the negative impact of separating junior and senior pupils that minimises opportunities for senior pupils to act as positive role models to younger peers;
- reduced opportunities to hold whole school and cross-stage events and activities such as assemblies that result from physical capacity restrictions and have a negative impact on a whole-school community ethos.

7.8.2 Establishing a new S4–S6 senior phase facility would introduce the requirement for further transition arrangements in relation to physical relocation. If this option was to be pursued, consideration would need to be given to young people’s mental, emotional, social and physical needs in planning these transitions particularly for those within the specialist provision.

7.8.3 The pre-consultation exercise identified some advantages to this option mainly in relation to no changes to existing secondary catchment areas and the enhancement of provision. However, many of the concerns identified above are reflected in the comments made by respondents to the pre-consultation exercise (see Appendices B1 and B2 in the following report to Council: [Council Meeting 26/04/16](#)) and through discussions with parents at a pre-consultation meeting held at Musselburgh Grammar School and at drop-in sessions during the consultation period.

### **A new single S1 to S6 Musselburgh Grammar School**

A new single S1 to S6 Musselburgh Grammar School sized to accommodate all currently committed and projected future growth in the Musselburgh area is currently projected to have a peak roll of 2,386.

Scottish School Estate statistics show that the three largest secondary schools out of the 365 Scottish secondary schools have school rolls of between 1,700 and 1,995 pupils. Educational literature on the issue of school size is generally inconclusive citing advantages and disadvantages to large and small schools in relation to improving outcomes for learners.

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Directorate for Education and Skills review of School Size Policies November 2014 (see link at section 7.2 in the following report to Council: [Council Meeting 26/04/16](#)) concluded that, even if there may be benefits to larger schools, such as broader academic curricula with specialised courses or a wider choice of extra-curricular activities, these benefits can unequally affect pupil performance with some pupils benefitting more than others, in particular those from socioeconomic advantaged backgrounds. Through the pre-consultation exercise and the formal consultation process, respondents recognised that a larger school has the potential to offer a broader curriculum, including vocational programmes and that all members of the community could benefit from a new single facility. However, other respondents voiced their concerns about young

people's ability to cope in a larger school, the resulting impact on their achievements and also on the potential impact on maintaining a community spirit and positive ethos. As a Council, we are committed to meeting the needs of all children, including those with additional needs who may not cope as well in a very large educational setting.

## **7.9 Parity of Subject Choices and Facilities at both schools**

7.9.1 Both secondary schools in the Musselburgh Learning Community will have the facilities to meet the needs of their pupils. They will deliver a curriculum in line with the Council's aspirations to enable all our young people to achieve and progress to sustained positive destinations. Those moving into S1-S3 in the new additional secondary school provision will experience a broad general education, as is their entitlement, and experience a senior phase as they move into S4-S6. Musselburgh Grammar School currently offers, and will continue to offer, a broad curriculum to meet the needs of learners. As is current practice, this will be delivered through partnership arrangements such as Edinburgh College with further opportunities being offered within the new additional secondary school.

7.9.2 The cost of the new additional secondary provision will be met by the Council's capital budget, partially offset by developer contributions. Innovate East Lothian Limited is contracted to maintain and operate East Lothian Council's six secondary schools until year 2035. Inbuilt into the contract, are rigorous performance standards that Innovate East Lothian Limited is contracted to achieve. The performance standards ensure that the schools are 'kept in safe, good and substantial condition and good decorative order' and that a robust maintenance and lifecycle replacement programme of work is set out for the remainder of the contract period. To ensure due performance is achieved and sustained throughout the contract period, a process for fault reporting, handling of service requests and a performance monitoring mechanism is operated by East Lothian Council and Innovate East Lothian Limited.

7.9.3 As described in paragraph 7.5.3, the Council will use the opportunities created by two secondary schools in the same learning community, not only to strive towards parity of subject choice but enhance the subject choice across both schools. The Council is committed to this aim and will ensure infrastructure is in place to address operational issues. Musselburgh Grammar School will continue to be involved in the ongoing discussions around secondary school curricular provision with a continuing focus on Developing the Young Workforce (DYW) and extending the range of qualifications and courses being delivered in our secondary schools. This will in turn lead to the appropriate allocation of investment in the resources necessary for any additional qualifications and courses to meet the needs of learners at Musselburgh Grammar School and across East Lothian. As such, facilities in the existing Musselburgh Grammar School building, as in other secondary schools across East Lothian, would be

developed accordingly to reflect the courses on offer. Both schools would work together to share their current and new facilities.

7.9.4 The learning environment is a significant factor in delivering high quality experiences for our young people. As important as the physical environment is, the most critical component is the environment created by excellent teaching and learning, committed staff, a very good school ethos and shared values. This will be underpinned by effective use of the National Improvement Framework for improvement, especially in developing teacher professionalism.

7.9.5 The new additional secondary school will be staffed in line with current East Lothian recruitment procedures, appointing the best candidates for each vacancy. Recruitment will be open to all appropriately qualified staff from East Lothian and beyond. Whilst this will provide career opportunities for many of our existing staff, the staffing will be phased in over a number of years and should not have a detrimental impact on the teaching and learning in neighbouring schools. The Council does not foresee the need for compulsory redeployment of staff as a consequence of this proposal. In line with the Council's risk management processes, the Education Service has measures in place to monitor current national recruitment problems.

#### **7.10 Traffic, Transport, Parking and Safe Routes to Schools**

7.10.1 East Lothian Council is aware of the traffic impact on Wallyford and will be undertaking a Transport Appraisal in the context of the Proposed LDP. The Appraisal is to examine the effect of the cumulative impacts from the housing and economic development land allocations in East Lothian on the local and strategic road and rail networks and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions. Housing in the catchment area of the new school will not exceed two miles therefore all pupils will be able to walk to school. A range of measures would be put in place to reduce the risks involved in children and young people travelling to and from school. Transportation Officers at East Lothian Council will be working closely with staff, pupils and the community to establish how best to put in the necessary interventions to ensure there are safer routes to school.

#### **7.11 School Capacity**

7.11.1 As stated above in paragraph 7.1.4, the proposed catchment area for the new additional secondary school takes account of committed and planned house building across the Musselburgh cluster area with the intention of having two secondary schools with viable rolls that can both be accommodated within a maximum building capacity of 1,350. Both schools will have the capacity to meet projected school rolls. Based on house completion rates provided for the Proposed LDP 2016 technical work, provisional modelling carried out by the Education Service projects the proposed new additional secondary school growing from an initial S1-S3 roll of circa 330 to an S1-S6 roll over a 20 year period of circa 1,150. Over this same 20 year period the roll at

Musselburgh Grammar School would start with an S1-S6 roll of circa 1,150 and have a projected roll 20 years on of 1,240. This modelling is based on proposals discussed through the consultation exercise and set out in paragraph 7.13.1, i.e. S4 to S6 from the Wallyford Primary and Pinkie St Peter's Primary school catchment areas continuing their Education at Musselburgh Grammar School at the point of the new secondary school provision opening, taking into account potential sibling retention for those senior pupils staying at Musselburgh Grammar School, and the new secondary provision starting with an S1-S3 roll which grows from that point onwards.

7.11.2 Musselburgh Grammar School's pupil capacity, based on both planned and committed housing developments in the Musselburgh cluster area (as set out in the Proposed LDP 2016), is not projected to be breached until 2021. The proposed new additional secondary provision, if agreed by Council, is still on schedule to be delivered for August 2020. If further housing development is approved, it will be subject to the school's capacity to accommodate the projected pupil numbers arising from the proposed housing.

## **7.12 SIMD (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation) Profile and Diversity**

7.12.1 Secondary pupils living in the 30% most deprived areas (2016 SIMD deciles 1-3) currently make up 29% of the school roll at Musselburgh Grammar School: 26% of those pupils are from the current Musselburgh Burgh catchment, 32% from Pinkie St Peter's catchment, 29% from Wallyford catchment, 9% from Whitecraig catchment with the remaining 4% from out with the Musselburgh cluster area. While there will be a difference in the SIMD profiles of the two secondary schools in the short term, the SIMD profile and social demographic across the Musselburgh cluster will change as the new houses are built and new families move in to the area. We anticipate that the difference between the demographic of the new additional secondary school and Musselburgh Grammar School should not be significantly different in the longer term.

7.12.2 Based on current modelling, approximately 65% of pupils attending the new additional secondary school, when it opens, will be from the current houses in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary school catchment areas. 35% will be from the new housing developments. Over time, the proportion of pupils from the current houses will gradually decrease over an 18 year period as the pupil population arising from the proposed new housing developments in the two catchments increases. By 2040, it is projected that 30% of pupils attending the new school will be from current houses and 70% of pupils will be from the new housing developments.

## **7.13 Transition concerns and siblings**

7.13.1 As stated in the Consultation Proposal Document, the transition arrangements for the new additional secondary school would be as follows:

- the new S1 intake at the effective date, i.e. August 2020 or as soon as thereafter, living in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary school catchment areas would transfer to the new additional secondary school;
- the pupils attending Musselburgh Grammar School, living in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary school catchment areas and going into S2 and S3 at the effective date, would transfer to the new additional secondary school;
- the pupils attending Musselburgh Grammar School, living in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary school catchment areas and going into S4, S5 and S6 at the effective date, would remain at Musselburgh Grammar School for the remainder of their senior phase education;
- Younger siblings of existing S4-S6 pupils living in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary school catchment areas and attending Musselburgh Grammar School at the effective date, would have the option to attend Musselburgh Grammar School if they wish;
- Pupils living in the new secondary catchment area, who will continue to attend Musselburgh Grammar in their senior phase due to the above reasons and who require a bus pass to travel to Musselburgh Grammar, would continue to have their bus pass.

7.13.2 A copy of the 'Affected Pupil Year Groups Diagram' that was published on the Consultation Hub is included as Appendix 8.

7.13.3 As with existing arrangements, P7 pupils living in the Musselburgh cluster area and attending Loretto RC Primary School would continue to be allocated an S1 place at St David's RC High School in Midlothian. If they did not wish to attend St David's RC High School then a place would be allocated at the associated secondary school for the primary catchment area that the pupil lives in through existing processes.

7.13.4 The Council will put a robust transition programme in place well in advance of the pupils moving into the new school. This will include the recruitment of the new school's Senior Management Team (SMT) a number of months before the pupils are due to move. The new SMT will be located at Musselburgh Grammar School and through a series of activities and events will get to know their pupils well. In addition there will also be a full transition programme devised for the P7 pupils moving into S1. Teaching staff will be recruited prior to the transition to the new school in order to prepare for the delivery of the curriculum within the new school and to establish positive relationships with the pupils due to attend the new school. Consideration will be given to how senior pupils (S4 to S6) from Musselburgh Grammar School will work with S1-S3 pupils in the new school to provide support as positive role models until the new school fully functions as an S1 to S6 secondary school. Staff will place the



social, emotional and wellbeing needs of pupils transitioning to the new school at the centre of this programme.

7.13.5 For those pupils living in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary school catchment areas who are moving into S1 to S3 at the effective date and have an older sibling in the senior phase (S4 to S6) remaining at Musselburgh Grammar School, these pupils will have the option to remain at Musselburgh Grammar School.

7.13.6 For those children with Additional Support Needs there are well established procedures to identify particular learning needs and provide the required support measures. Such work involves close liaison with parents and carers, and where relevant, Community Planning Partners. Pupil Support staff and teaching staff will work closely across both secondary schools to ensure that the learning, pastoral and social needs of children are fully supported during the transition process, including enhanced arrangements for children and young people with Additional Support Needs.

7.13.7 Timescales of the construction of the school facility will be closely monitored by East Lothian Council and one year's notice of the opening date will be communicated to parents and the public to assist transition preparation. This date would be the expected opening date, subject to ongoing construction timescales. The opening of the facility would not be before this date, and any amendments to this timescale would likewise be communicated as soon as possible.

7.13.8 The transition arrangements described above seek to minimise potential disruption to the education of all pupils who will be at Musselburgh Grammar School and especially those transferring to the new additional secondary school at the effective date.

## **8. EDUCATION SCOTLAND REPORT**

8.1 In accordance with the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, a report was produced by Education Scotland on the educational aspects of the proposal. A full copy of the report can be found in Appendix 9.

8.2 In preparing this report, HM Inspectors undertook the following activities:

- attendance at the public meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016 in connection with the Council's proposals;
- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the Council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written and oral submissions from parents and others; and

- visits to the sites of Musselburgh Grammar School and Ross High School and Campie, Musselburgh Burgh, Pinkie St Peter's, Sanderson's Wynd, Stoneyhill and Wallyford Primary Schools, including discussion with relevant consultees and representation from Loretto RC Primary School.

### 8.3 The Education Scotland consideration of the proposal is summarised as follows:

- Education Scotland stated that most parents, children and staff who met with HM Inspectors were positive about the proposal and understood the benefits which it could bring. The same groups of stakeholders from Musselburgh Grammar School who met with HM Inspectors were less positive, with most parents and staff opposing the proposal and sharing some common concerns.
- Education Scotland stated that parents are appreciative that the Council has made necessary arrangements to allow the younger siblings of existing secondary age pupils to attend the same secondary school as their older brother or sister. Most parents, too, are appreciative that young people entering Musselburgh Grammar School at S4 would be able to continue their education there throughout their senior phase (S4-S6).
- Education Scotland also stated that the proposal has the potential to reduce the level of traffic around Musselburgh Grammar School and the Council should continue to work with stakeholders to establish and develop safe routes to the new secondary school.

8.4 Education Scotland concluded that the Council's proposal to establish a new additional, secondary school at Wallyford, within the Musselburgh cluster area, by August 2020 or as soon as possible thereafter, has educational benefits for the young people within this area. Significant projected increases in the school roll will result in Musselburgh Grammar School becoming overcrowded and, eventually, well over capacity. If the proposal is implemented, children living in the catchment areas of Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary schools will attend the new, purpose-built school and this has the potential to address issues of overcrowding at Musselburgh Grammar School. In taking its proposal forward, the Council should address the legitimate concerns of some stakeholders, including: the proposal possibly leading to an adverse 'split' within the community; ensuring that transition arrangements are well planned and implemented; providing safe routes to the new school; and providing greater clarity and detail, once this is possible, over the financial implications of the proposal. In its final consultation report, the Council will need to set out the actions it has taken to address any alleged inaccuracies and omissions notified to it.

### 8.5 East Lothian Council's Response to Education Scotland's Report

East Lothian Council welcomes the report from Education Scotland and accepts its findings. The points raised by Education Scotland within the Education Scotland Report were also key themes identified through the consultation process and are addressed in Section 7 of this report.

## **9. TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS**

9.1 Transition arrangements are set out in section 7.13 above. The new school is due to open in August 2020 or as soon as thereafter, and the Local Authority will work with the school community to put in place measures to minimise any potential disruption to the pupils' education.

## **10. ALLEGED OMISSIONS OR INACCURACIES**

10.1 Section (10) (3) of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 also places a requirement on the Council to provide details of any inaccuracy or omission within the Consultation Proposal Document which has either been identified by the Council or raised by consultees. This section of the 2010 Act also requires the Council to provide a statement on the action taken in respect of the inaccuracy or omission, or, if no action was taken, to state that fact and why.

10.2 At the start of the consultation period the Council omitted Wallyford Community Council and Whitecraig Community Council from its list of consultees in the original Consultation Proposal Document. However, the Council had notified Wallyford Community Council and Whitecraig Community Council of the consultation at the start of the process. The Council publicly notified this omission in the documentation by publishing these details in the 'Omissions, Corrections & Amendments' document on the Consultation Hub. Officers of the Council met with Wallyford Community Council and Whitecraig Community Council as part of the consultation process.

10.3 There were no other areas identified by respondents as being inaccurate or omitted from the Consultation Proposal Document during the consultation period.

10.4 One representation was made after the consultation period had ended. The representation alleged that omissions had been made from the Consultation Proposal Document. In adherence to Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, full and detailed consideration was given by the Council regarding these allegations of omissions and the Council provided its determinations directly to the member of public. It was the Council's view that it did not uphold the allegations of omission and therefore no additional action was required to be taken. However, the views expressed by the member of the public in their representation were submitted to Education Scotland with all representations that had been made during the consultation period and are also subject to the Council's response in this Consultation Report.

## **11. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 9(1) OF THE SCHOOLS (CONSULTATION) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010**

11.1 Section 9(1) of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 states that:

*After the Education Authority has received Education Scotland's report, the Authority is to review the relevant proposal having regard (in particular) to:*

- (i) written representations received by the Authority (from any person) during the consultation period,*
- (ii) oral representations made to it (by any person) at the public meeting,*
- (iii) Education Scotland's report.*

11.2 Following receipt of four hundred and twenty three questionnaire responses and an additional ten written representations and consideration of oral representations made at a public meeting held during the consultation period, officers reviewed the proposal.

11.3 The feedback from the consultation was considered by relevant officers across a number of Council Services including Education, Finance, Planning, Property and Transportation. This ensured that the Council met the requirements of sections 9(1), 12 and 13(3) (b) of the 2010 Act.

11.4 Officers of the Education Authority have listened carefully to the points made at the public meeting and have considered equally carefully the written representations, including the Education Scotland report. Having reviewed the feedback from consultees, officers conclude that the basis of the original proposal remained the best solution to provide appropriate and effective additional secondary education provision pupils within the Musselburgh cluster area.

## **12. LEGAL ISSUES**

12.1 The Council has complied in full with the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 throughout this statutory consultation.

12.2 The Council is mindful of its duties in respect of equality and the Equality Impact Assessment did not identify that any parent, child or young person would be treated less favourably as a result of this proposal.

12.3 Under the terms of the Schools (Scotland) (Consultation) Act 2010, it is a legal requirement that the Council should not reach any formal decision without having reviewed the relevant proposal having regard, in particular, to:

- a) relevant written representations received from any person during the consultation period;

- b) oral representation made to it by any person at the public meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016;
- c) the Education Scotland report;
- d) preparing a Consultation Report; and
- e) waiting until a period of three weeks starting on the day on which this Consultation Report is published in electronic and printed form has expired.

12.4 As it is the intention that this Consultation Report should be published, both electronically and in written form, if required, on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2016, this meets the statutory requirement to publish this report more than three weeks before consideration of the proposal by East Lothian Council.

### **13. PERSONNEL ISSUES**

13.1 No personnel issues have been identified with regard to this proposal.

### **14. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

14.1 As stated above, the impacts of the proposals are assessed as set out above and the relevant technical and environmental information is published alongside the Proposed LDP. The interim environmental assessments, site assessments and other technical documents for the Main Issues Report and Proposed LDP are available on the Council's website.

### **15. CONCLUSION**

15.1 The Council now has 3 options to consider, namely:

- a) adopt the proposal;
- b) withdraw the proposal and make no additional provision for secondary school education;
- c) undertake a further consultation exercise on a new proposal.

15.2 In withdrawing the proposal, the Council would not be able to accommodate the educational requirements of secondary pupils arising from committed and planned housing developments in the Proposed LDP 2016.

15.3 Again, undertaking a further consultation on a new proposal would have a significant negative impact in the medium term on the Council's ability to accommodate the educational requirements of secondary pupils arising from already committed housing developments. The projected pupil numbers arising from both committed and additional planned housing developments outlined in the Proposed LDP 2016 cannot be accommodated in the existing Musselburgh Grammar School.

15.4 Education Scotland has identified that the proposal would lead to clear educational benefits for children. This includes providing a high quality learning environment

offering greater flexibility for all school activities which is designed to deliver a 21st century education in line with the principles of Curriculum for Excellence.

15.5 If the Council adopts the proposal, it would be on the basis that the educational benefits set out in the Consultation Proposal Document would materialise. There would also be a requirement that close joint planning with parents/carers, staff and pupils, is well managed in ways which are supportive to the pupils concerned, and in their long term interests.

15.6 The key messages deriving from the consultation period are as follows:

- A clear majority of respondents to the questionnaire (60.5%) support the proposal. 35.2% of questionnaire respondents oppose the proposal.
- The Council received 10 written submissions to its consultation, 4 from individuals and 6 from groups, during the consultation period. Of those that expressed a preference, a narrow majority favoured the proposal. Of the 6 written responses from groups, 5 of these were from Parent Councils of schools within the Musselburgh cluster area: 3 of these Parent Councils expressed support for the proposal, 1 was opposed and 1 was evenly split. One Community Council also opposed the proposal.
- During the consultation period, Council officers visited all schools within the Musselburgh cluster area, providing good opportunities for pupils and staff to discuss their views. Overall, pupils, particularly at the primary stages, showed support for the proposal.

## 16. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

16.1 On the basis of the feedback received and taking account of the educational and social benefits of the proposal, it is concluded that the following proposal is the most suitable option and it is recommended that the Council approves the following:

- A new additional secondary school will be established in Wallyford from August 2020, or as soon as thereafter, to provide additional secondary education provision within the Musselburgh cluster area;
- The site of the new additional secondary school will be in the area of Wallyford in line with the Council's proposed development strategy for the Musselburgh cluster area as set out in the Proposed LDP 2016;
- The catchment area of the new additional secondary school will be created from the Pinkie St Peter's Primary School and Wallyford Primary School catchment areas including, if approved, amendments as proposed in the Pinkie St Peter's and Wallyford Primary Schools Catchment Area Consultation, 8<sup>th</sup> November 2016: <https://eastlothianconsultations.co.uk/education/pinkiewallyford-catchment/>

- Pupils living within the catchment areas of Wallyford Primary School and Pinkie St Peter's Primary School transitioning from P7 into S1 will attend the new additional secondary school at the effective date, i.e. August 2020 or as soon as thereafter;
- Pupils living within the catchment areas of Wallyford Primary School and Pinkie St Peter's Primary School transitioning into S2 and S3 will move to the new additional secondary school at the effective date, i.e. August 2020 or as soon as thereafter;
- Pupils attending Musselburgh Grammar School, living in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary school catchment areas and transitioning into S4, S5 and S6 at the effective date, i.e. August 2020 or as soon as thereafter, would remain at Musselburgh Grammar School for the remainder of their senior phase education (S4 –S6).
- Younger siblings of S4-S6 pupils living in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary and Wallyford Primary school catchment areas and attending Musselburgh Grammar School at the effective date, i.e. August 2020 or as soon as thereafter, would have the option to attend Musselburgh Grammar School if they wish.

Fiona Robertson  
Head of Education  
November 2016

## **Appendix 1: Note of Public Meeting, 30 May 2016**

### **STATUTORY PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING**

#### **NEW ADDITIONAL SECONDARY EDUCATION PROVISION IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA**

**30 MAY 2016**

**BRUNTON HALL MUSSELBURGH**

#### **PRESENT:**

Fiona Robertson, Head of Education  
Chris Webb, Chair of meeting  
Liz Shaw, Corporate Finance Manager  
Eddie Reid, Team Manager, Property  
Emma Taylor, Planning  
Grant Talac, Transportation Planning Officer  
Sally Stewart, Education Scotland  
Richard Parker, Education Service Manager  
Fiona Brown, Principal Officer, Education Business Unit  
Val McIntyre, Principal Officer, Education Business Unit  
Rob Lewis, Senior Information Officer  
Pauline Smith, Principal Officer, Information and Research  
Calum Murray, Business Support Officer, Education Business Unit  
40 + Parents/Carers/Community Council members

Chris Webb welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the Council Officers present.

Chris Webb introduced himself and outlined the purpose of this evening meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to give the public the opportunity to:

- hear more about the proposal from Council officers
- ask questions about the proposal
- have your views recorded so that they can be taken into account as part of the consultation process.

He also gave a brief outline of the legislative framework within which the council must work.

The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act came into force in 2010 and was amended in 2014. The Act, as amended, has established an open and transparent system for consulting changes to the school estate as proposed by councils. Once a council has taken the decision to consult on a proposal the Act requires all councils to follow the same basic sequence:

- The council had to prepare a proposal paper, including an educational benefits statement and other required information. The council has produced this.



- The council then had to publish the proposal paper, advertise the fact and notify mandatory consultees and Education Scotland.
- The consultation had to run for at least 30 school days and include a public meeting;
- Once the consultation period is over, the council must send relevant papers to Education Scotland. Once these have been received HM Inspectors have three weeks to prepare a report on the proposal and send it to the council.
- Once the council has received the report from HM Inspectors, it has to review the proposal and take account of the report by HM Inspectors and any representations you might make during the consultation period.
- The council must then prepare and publish a final consultation report three weeks before the council takes its final decision.

Fiona Robertson reiterated that this evening's meeting was being held to discuss the following proposal:

- To establish a new secondary school in Wallyford from 2020, or as soon as possible thereafter, to provide secondary education provision within the Musselburgh cluster area.
- To vary the secondary catchment area associated with Musselburgh Grammar School and create a new second secondary catchment area.

She then went on to explain the background of the consultation:

- The Strategic Development Plan for South East Scotland (SDP) was approved by Scottish Ministers in June 2013.
- The SDP with its Supplementary Guidance on Housing Land requires the Local Development Plan (LDP) to ensure sufficient housing land is available to deliver 10,050 homes during the period 2009-2024 with 6,250 of those homes capable of being delivered across East Lothian in the period to 2019.
- The emerging LDP (draft proposed plan as approved by Council 17<sup>th</sup> November 2015) details a preferred approach of "Compact Growth" with a requirement for an additional secondary solution in the Musselburgh cluster to allow this growth to come forward.
- The Council must ensure provision can be made for the education of children in its area and must consult on certain changes in such arrangements before it can commit to them
- The LDP is only deliverable based on approving an educational solution to meet the increase in projected pupil numbers.
- All of the uncommitted development in the existing Musselburgh cluster including that identified in the draft proposed plan requires the new secondary education facility in order for such development to come forward.

- A pre-consultation exercise was carried out by the Council's Education Service with the pupils, parents and staff of all Musselburgh primary schools and the existing secondary school on three education options for the delivery of secondary school facilities.

Views were sought on the three options:

- Option A – a new second secondary school serving part of the Musselburgh area (40%)
  - Option B – a new S4-S6 senior phase school for Musselburgh GS on a separate site (26%)
  - Option C – a new enlarged S1-S6 Musselburgh GS on a new site (32%)
- A qualitative assessment of potential sites for future secondary school provision in the Musselburgh area was prepared in February 2015
  - Taking into account pupil movement, accessibility, transport services the preferred potential site for the additional secondary provision is at Wallyford.

Liz Shaw ran through capital costs and savings, comparing these to a single secondary school for the whole of Musselburgh.

The cost of building a second secondary school for part of the Musselburgh is estimated at £35 million and the cost of a single secondary school for the whole of the Musselburgh is estimated at £65 million, resulting in an additional £30 million. However, this is offset by potential savings from buying out the current Musselburgh Grammar PPP contract which would be £12 million of savings. Liz Shaw highlighted that the cost of buying out the PPP contract would have to be funded from cash reserves as the Council would not be allowed to borrow for this type of payment. Therefore when this is taken into account the net additional capital cost arising from building a single secondary school for the whole of the Musselburgh area is £18 million.

Liz Shaw then ran through the revenue cost and savings.

No savings have been identified from teaching staff. There are important factors to take into consideration regarding staffing. Promoted management posts are subject to the national job sizing toolkit which determines the grade of post. In terms of job sizing, points are awarded for responsibility for pupil roll, staff numbers, budgets and whole school responsibility. It is therefore possible that the management costs of a large single secondary school could be greater than those of two separate schools. The national commitment to maintaining teacher numbers in line with the current pupil teacher ratio also need to be considered. This cannot reduce as there would be a considerable financial impact on the council. The council currently receives a share of £10 million for maintaining teacher numbers in line with pupil-teacher ratio.

There is a potential saving of £100,000 per annum from Single Status staff. Liz Shaw highlighted that this will be challenging but could potentially be achieved.

There would be additional transport costs arising from a single secondary school compared to a second secondary school. If there is a second secondary school, the majority of pupils will live within the Council's 2 mile transport policy and will not require transportation. If there is a single secondary school, a vast majority of pupils will need to be transported, incurring significant transport costs of approximately £195,000.

Liz Shaw then explained that there could be potential savings in catering in a single secondary school, these would equate to £11,000 per annum.

There are also potential savings with regards to cleaning costs in a single secondary school, which equates to £124,000 per annum.

With regards to property maintenance it is estimated that there would be an additional cost of £200,000.

In summary there would be additional capital costs of £18 million and additional annual revenue costs of £160,000 for a single secondary school for the whole of the Musselburgh area.

Fiona Robertson explained:

Map 1 – showing the location of the proposed new Wallyford Primary (site 2), the location of the existing Musselburgh Grammar (site 3) and the location of the proposed new second secondary school (site 4)

She then went on to explain the projected population data and the impact this will have:

- The secondary pupil population for the Musselburgh Area, taking into account pupils from new housing with consent and those that will arise from the emerging LDP is currently projected to have a roll of 2,337.
- Musselburgh Grammar School does not currently have the capacity to accommodate the projected pupil numbers that will arise from the LDP and will exceed capacity by 2020.

Fiona highlighted the proposal:

- Establish a new second secondary school in Wallyford
- Revise existing catchment boundaries of Pinkie St Peter's Primary School, Wallyford Primary School and Musselburgh Grammar School
- Revision of Sanderson's Wynd Primary School and Ross High School included within the consultation relating to the relocation of Wallyford Primary School and variation in its catchment area.

Map 2 – shows the catchment areas for the proposal. Section A of this map shows the section which is currently in the Sanderson’s Wynd and Ross High catchment area and within the school consultation for the relocation of Wallyford Primary School there is a variation in the catchment area to take this section into the Wallyford Primary School catchment. The associated secondary school, dependent on the outcome of this consultation would be the new second secondary school.

The catchment segments in pink are the catchment areas that feed into the current Musselburgh Grammar and the catchment segments in green are the proposed catchments that will feed into the new, second secondary school

Fiona went on to explain transition arrangements:

- There will be establishment of temporary admission arrangements to accommodate the phased population of the school.
- Variation in the arrangements for the transfer of pupils from a primary school to a secondary school by altering the designated secondary school.

In terms of affected year groups, any newborn in 2015/16 through to those pupils who are currently in Primary 5, these are the ages and stages that would transfer to the new second secondary school. Children who are currently in Primary 6 through to S6 will not be affected by this proposal.

Fiona Robertson reiterated that:

- The new S1 intake at the effective date, from August 2020 or as soon as thereafter will be those living in the Pinkie St Peter’s Primary School and Wallyford catchment areas;
- Pupils attending Musselburgh Grammar School, living in Pinkie St Peter’s and Wallyford catchment areas going into:
  - S2 and S3 at the effective date would transfer to the new secondary school. Fiona Robertson pointed out that initially there will be young people in S1 and S2 at Musselburgh Grammar who will be hosted there and then will move back to the new second secondary school.
  - S4 to S6 would remain at Musselburgh Grammar School.
- Any younger siblings of pupils attending Musselburgh Grammar School at the effective date would have the option to attend Musselburgh Grammar School if they wish.
- For those in Sanderson’s Wynd and affected by the change in the catchment area, they can continue to attend the associated secondary school of Ross High school or they can choose to attend the new second secondary school.

Fiona Robertson then outlined the Educational Benefits through:

- Providing a hub for learning, activities and facilities that will make a contribution to improving health and wellbeing and achievement;
- Creation of more flexible learning spaces which facilitate and promote co-operative, inter-disciplinary and outdoor learning;
- Improving the social and learning environment for all children; and
- Enabling the full potential of the use of technologies to enhance learning and teaching.
- Support delivery of vocational learning and promote skills for learning, life and work;
- Support collaborative working practices designed to enhance educational provision, including increased personalisation and choice for young people; and
- Offer a range of varied extra-curricular opportunities to young people across the two sites.

She further advised that:

- Staffing arrangements will be consistent with East Lothian Council's staffing standard and other local arrangements taking into account staffing requirements as the school roll rises in the new school.
- The Senior Leadership Team and staff necessary to secure a smooth pastoral and curricular transition will be in post prior to the opening of the new school in order for them to facilitate a smooth transition

Fiona went on to outline the project time line:

- Emerging Local Development Plan (LDP)
- Qualitative Assessment of options
- New Secondary & Catchment Area Variation Proposal
- Statutory Consultation which closes on 15 June
- Final Proposal Paper
- Council Approval
- User Reference Group
- Transition and Leadership Arrangements
- New Secondary School opens August 2020 (or as soon as thereafter)

Chris Webb invited questions from the public.

**John Williamson, Local Councillor for Musselburgh West asked with regards to additional capital costs has any figure been factored in for the value of the old Musselburgh Grammar School site.**

Liz Shaw explained that if the Council were to opt for a single secondary school then we

would have additional income of possibly £2-3 million but she advised that she didn't know the value of this at this moment and this has not been built into the figures that have been presented at this meeting.

**Member of the community mentioned the statement that the new second secondary school at Wallyford will be built by 2020 or as soon as thereafter, if Musselburgh Grammar is reaching capacity at 2020 , by the exact time the authority is proposing to open the new second secondary school, Musselburgh Grammar will be over subscribed. He then asked how soon will the school be built.**

Eddie Reid advised that the Council has some input into the phasing of the housing completions for all the applications in the area. The housing is phased and roll projections are carried out on this basis, therefore the new school would be delivered before the existing school breached its capacity.

**A Pinkie St Peters parent asked when would it become clear whether 2020 is the date and if it isn't would there be a mid-year transition or would the Council wait until the next school year for entry.**

Fiona Robertson explained that if it was mid -year, this is would not unusual with regards to transition into schools. The authority would look very carefully at the timeframe and this is why the authority has committed to recruiting staff and a leadership team in order that we plan that transition at an appropriate time. It is not uncommon across Scotland that school buildings are ready part way through the year.

**Roger Knox, retired lecturer in education and former depute Provost in East Lothian stated that he was disappointed that there was more or less a "fait accompli" in the proposal. He then asked how much consideration has been given to the division with the old Ward 5 which has been identified as an area of multiple deprivations along with Wallyford, being segregated from the rest of the town. He then raised concerns about the rivalry between the two schools and asked how this might be elevated.**

Fiona Robertson explained that consideration has been given to the impact on communities. She also explained that we have a community that is unknown to us and it is a growing community and the need for an additional secondary school is because of the plan for housing developments in the emerging development plan. It's about how we work together in joining the two communities together. There are examples across Scotland where Education play a critical role in the community cohesion and this would be part of the whole development plan for the new additional secondary school. Fiona explained that the Authority would involve the community and Area Partnerships. The Head Teachers are keen that that it remains one large cluster with all the head teachers working together.

Fiona also advised that the authority is looking at joint badges on school logos, whilst retaining the schools own identity.

**Grandparent of Pinkie St Peter's Primary School commented on the drive to increase the level of attainment in education. To what extent have the demographics been considered in this decision to take out Pinkie St Peters and Wallyford and develop it for the new school. Would like to know the facts of the demographics.**

**She also commented on the pre-consultation and the poor acceptability for a S1-3 and a S4-S6. What evidence was looked at in terms of the success rate of Junior High Schools and Senior High Schools in other parts of the country.**

Fiona advised that we are growing a new community so in terms of closing the attainment gap there is an assumption in terms of the population that is growing.

Emma Taylor explained that there are elements of deprivation around Wallyford and the Musselburgh area and this has been recognised. With the new housing that is planned there will be a mixture of social housing, some low market rate housing and general housing. The expectation is that there will be regeneration benefits into the Wallyford area. By the provision of the expanded Wallyford, benefits will be brought to the area which will help raise attainment levels and improve the social mix around that area.

Fiona Robertson then explained that the authority did look at other establishments within Scotland and explored literature around the variation in the nature of schools at an international level. Prior to coming into the post of Head of Education, part of Fiona Robertson's roll within Education Scotland was as an independent adviser in relation to Education Scotland looking at school consultations and from this perspective she is very aware of schools with almost similar context to this area, where S1-3 and S4-6 are on split sites but the schools are trying to go back to a single S1-S6 school. This is for a number of reasons, such as seniors not being able to act as role models to their younger peers, transportation costs for staff as they go between the two buildings, because staff wish to teach the whole range of qualifications across S1-S6.

**The grandparent clarified that she would like to hear about the evidence of educational benefits and attainment in relation to Junior and Senior High Schools.**

Fiona Robertson further advised that in terms of attainment there are varying contexts. For example where there are successful split sights in rural areas the size of the schools are much smaller than the size of school for the Musselburgh area so a direct comparison cannot be made.

Chris Webb advised that within the consultation document there is an opportunity for the council to set out its reasons and address the issue raised regarding Junior and Senior High Schools.

**Mr Harkins, Pinkie Primary School parent and member of Musselburgh Community Council queried the pre-consultation exercise and who was involved and the number of people involved. He also enquired about the transport links and the new infrastructure that will be in place to support the new school.**

Fiona Robertson advised that the number of responses from the pre-consultation was 261 and were predominantly from parents and pupils.

Grant Talac further advised that in terms of transport currently there are a number of pupils who come down from the Wallyford area to Musselburgh Grammar School. Therefore these pupils will not be travelling as far. The pupils from the Pinkie area will have a longer distance to walk, however as mentioned previously pupils will be within the 2 mile transport policy for walking to school. Road Services will now walk the routes to the new school site and this will form part of a Route to School Analysis Report, which looks at public transport connections, actual route safety, accident history, traffic conditions and infrastructure provision.

Grant mentioned that there is a signalised junction to be put in at The Loan on Slater's Road to facilitate safe crossing. There is also a signalised junction to be put in at the Industrial Estate junction.

Chris Webb highlighted that the User Reference Group would have input into this with regards to safe routes to school and dealing with transport issues.

**Gaynor Allan, Co Chair of the Musselburgh Grammar Parent Council commented on the pre consultation exercises. Ms Allan advised that the Parent Council felt that it was a flawed exercise as it came out at the very end of the school term and a lot of Parent Councils did not get the chance to discuss it. Ms Allan also stated that the Parent Council felt that the questions were emotive and the responses from the pre-consultation were not representative.**

Chris Webb clarified that there was no question to be answered in Ms Allan's statement.

**A Musselburgh Burgh/Musselburgh Grammar parent asked if there was any money allocated for updating the existing Musselburgh Grammar School. She also asked if there was anything more that could be done to try and get feedback from parents.**

Fiona Robertson explained the Council has met its statutory duties in terms of the consultation. However, over and above the statutory duties the Education Department



have organised drop in sessions for parent, issued leaflets to all parents, adverts in East Lothian Courier and Group Call. Fiona Robertson then advised that in terms of the pre-consultation exercise that was carried out, this is not a statutory obligation that the Council has to undertake. She also highlighted that as certain criteria factors change, the original options that may be offered at a pre-consultation exercise, the Council are not obliged to take all of those back out to a formal consultation.

In term of having an effective LDP the Council have a preferred option for a new second secondary school in order for that LDP to move forward. In the final report, the Education Department must take into account the views gathered from the feedback. The public have the right to have their say and express their views through the written representation, through the online questionnaire or completing a paper copy.

Fiona Robertson highlighted that a solution must be found to the secondary school provision in the Musselburgh area in order to have an effective LDP.

Chris Webb explained that the Council is governed by other statutory obligations. The Education Scotland Act 1980, sections 1 and 17 states that an authority needs to provide an adequate and appropriate accommodation. The Local Government Scotland Act 2003-2004 requires the Council to secure best value in the delivery of its services. So in terms of the options open to the council, the Schools Consultation Act obliges the council to set out what it believes to be the most reasonable alternative available.

Eddie Reid went on to advise that approximately £100,000 - £400,000 per annum is spent on Musselburgh Grammar. There will be £310,000 spent on lifecycle works in 2016/17 which will include roof works to the games hall and assembly hall, renewing skylights, timber floor refurbishment, kitchen improvements, classroom decoration, new flooring and new classroom furniture.

**Another Musselburgh Burgh parent asked if the same provisions would be made for the existing Musselburgh Grammar School. For example more digital technologies, digital Whiteboards in every classroom.**

Liz Shaw advised that it would be helpful for parents to express what they think they won't have in Musselburgh Grammar School.

**A further Musselburgh Burgh parent, who lives in the Pinkie Catchment area expressed her disappointment in the decision for a second secondary school as she felt that it was the worst of the three options from the pre-consultation. Her main concern was around the catchment area that will be created for the new school and she asked what percentage of the new catchment area will be new people that we don't know.**

Pauline Smith, Principal Officer – Information and Research explained that the information is not expressed as a percentage at this time but this will be answered in the final consultation report.

**Another Musselburgh Burgh parent asked if there is a design life for the existing Musselburgh Grammar School and why, if there was an option to buy out the PPP contract, is this not being considered.**

Eddie Reid advised that the PPP contract runs out in 2035. Liz Shaw confirmed that at the end of the PPP contract the school must be handed back to the Council almost as if it were a new school. The PPP contractor has an obligation to maintain the building to a high standard.

Liz Shaw also advised that although the saving is £12 million from buying out the PPP contract, as mentioned previously the Council would have to use substantial cash reserves to do this, therefore a decision would have to be taken on whether this could be an option.

**The parent then commented on losing the opportunity to improve the fabric of the building and the quality of being in it, the impact on children's education and the willingness of parents to send their children to that school.**

Fiona Robertson pointed out that there seemed to be a focus on finance being the only factor determining the preferred option of a second secondary school. However a range of factors were considered such as transportation, pupil movement, size of school and parents commenting in the pre-consultation that they would not wish for their child to attend a school of 2400 which would be the largest school in Scotland.

Fiona Robertson stressed that the key resource is the teacher in the classroom and the school creates the ethos of the community within that school building.

She acknowledged what people were saying in relation to not wanting to be left behind and feeling that your child might have a lower level of quality of education, but again stressed that this would not be the case. The quality of provision within that school will be as high quality as that in the new build.

**Parent of an S1 at Musselburgh Grammar School and P4 at Wallyford Primary raised concerns that her P4 will spend some time at Musselburgh Grammar, however unless her S1 child remains at school until S6, she will not have the option to keep him at Musselburgh Grammar School. In relation to making a placing request, when my child is already at the school, will there be priority given to these children.**

Fiona Robertson advised that those children who are in S1 and S2 in 2020 will move back to the new second secondary school and confirmed that unless there were older siblings in the

school, parents will not be given the option for their children to remain at Musselburgh Grammar. This decision has been made in relation to keeping the school rolls viable in both the new second secondary school and Musselburgh Grammar.

It was also confirmed that there will be no priority given to those who make a placing request.

**Campie Primary School parent asked, children who are in early primary stages and are attending a non catchment school, would they have to apply for a non catchment place to attend Musselburgh Grammar School.**

Fiona Brown confirmed that a non catchment placing request would have to be made as the catchment is base on your home address and not the school that your child currently attends.

**A further Campie Primary School parent asked what the school roll would be in both schools.**

Pauline Smith explained that the projections are still in draft because there is not yet an approved list of LDP sites, and these are subject to change. She did provide provisional figures for the projected peak of the Musselburgh Pupil Population in excess of 2300 with the Musselburgh Grammar, Campie, Musselburgh Burgh, Stoneyhill and Whitecraig catchments feeding into it, going up to 1100 and 1200 as a peak roll and the Pinkie and Wallyford catchments just over 1200.

The current roll at Musselburgh Grammar is 1127.

**Pinkie St Peters Primary parent asked how much more LDP is there. Looking at the map around Pinkie St Peter's and Wallyford, there is a lot of green space. How much of that is included for new builds in the current plan and therefore what is the risk of these green spaces that haven't been included being built on which would impact on both schools rolls.**

Emma Taylor explained that there is an emerging LDP. To allow ELC to meet the Scottish Government requirement of delivering 10,050 homes. It is anticipated that a subsequent LDP for East Lothian will only require the delivery of 500-700 homes.

**Chris Knight, Chair of Musselburgh Area Partnership asked how will you demonstrate that this process has credibility and that the views expressed will be taken seriously.**

Fiona Robertson advised that the Council has been very open in relation to the discussions and level of meetings that have taken place. The Council has engaged with parent councils, community councils, with children and young people and parents. The written

representations and online questionnaires will be collated and a final report will be written that takes account of the views. The final report will then go to the Elected Members, who will make a decision based on the outcome of the school consultation. The process is transparent and it is robust.

**Sean Elliot, Co Chair of the Musselburgh Grammar Parent Council stated that the real concern is around the pre consultation in relation to the numbers and the statistics being used. The parent council feel that this pre consultation was flawed and asked why the statics were being used as evidence and potentially swaying public opinion.**

Fiona Robertson reiterated that 261 individuals did respond to the pre consultation. The views of the pre consultation have been extracted and noted in the consultation document. This is only one piece of the information with regards to preparing the documentation on this proposal. The Educational Benefits within the consultation document outlines the reasons why the other options were discounted.

Fiona Robertson advised that the council had to demonstrate that the pre consultation took place and 261 people responded but also that this was only one piece of information that was used.

**Campie Primary School Parent ask if there were opportunities for teacher expertise to be shared over the two schools for example if a subject is being offered at one school but not the other, will pupils have the opportunity to travel to the other school to share this expertise.**

Fiona Robertson advised that this was one of the factors that were taken into consideration and in terms of a User Reference Group being established it is important that curriculum models and frameworks are explored. If the proposal does go ahead the council would involve parents and young people in visiting other schools to look at the potential and possibilities in relation to having a curriculum that can be complimentary whilst also broadening the opportunities for young people.

**Fraser McAllister, Ward Councillor asked for confirmation that the numbers predicted in Table 3 of the consultation document were based on the new school being open and occupied in 2021 and also what are the predictions beyond 2021.**

Pauline Smith confirmed that the 1484 roll in 2021 continues to grow beyond that and takes into account the draft list of LDP sites at the moment. The 1484 is the roll if no new additional secondary school is built therefore breaching capacity.

**Fraser McAllister then asked what the school roll in Musselburgh Grammar will be in 2026 if there is an additional secondary school built.**

Pauline confirmed that in 2026 if an additional secondary school goes ahead, the projected roll of Musselburgh Grammar will be 925 and it grows in 2032 to over 1000 and by 2037 to over 1100.

**Grandparent of Pinkie St Peter's Primary mentioned the intention to start the school with only S1 – 3 and felt that this was a contradiction on a previous answer given with regards to having a junior and senior split school.**

Fiona Robertson explained that the new school has to grow in some form. There will not be enough of a school roll to have an S1 – S6 immediately but would need the new school at this point because capacity will be breached at Musselburgh Grammar.

Fiona Robertson also explained that with regards to a junior and senior split school the key factor why this was not a viable option was the constant travel that would exist between the two buildings.

**John Williamson, Local Councillor for Musselburgh West was concerned that there was not a requirement to add names and addressed on the consultation questionnaire and felt that this could affect the result as people could complete multiple questionnaires. Mr Williamson also asked what would happen if the majority of the responses received were against a second secondary school.**

Fiona Robertson explained if the vast majority did not want a second secondary school this would have to be taken back to the Elected Members and they would have to determine how to find a solution because the Local Development Plan cannot move forward without securing the secondary school provision.

Chris Webb thanked Mr Williamson for his comment on the consultation questionnaire and advised that this could be something the council takes into consideration for future consultations.

**Will there be a process for out of catchment applications to Musselburgh Grammar School in 2020 and will there be roll capping which could prevent these from being successful.**

Fiona Brown, Principal Officer for Education Business Unit explained that the process for applying for out of catchment places will remain the same as it currently is. She also explained that the intake is managed and roll capping would be looked at but would not be to prevent parents from being successful in their placing requests. Roll capping is to ensure that we have equity throughout the authority and employ the right amount of staff for the right amount of subjects.

**Have the cost of safe walking routes and pedestrian crossings on Haddington Road up to Wallyford been taken into account (*anonymous online question*)**

Grant Talac advised that at the moment this has not been costed because the route analysis still has to be completed and the infrastructure that might be required has not yet been identified.

**Member of the community mentioned that the Goshen Farm developers put in an appeal against the rejection of that site for potential housing, if they win that appeal will this have a knock on effect for catchment areas or has this site been completely ruled out for building a school.**

Emma Taylor advised that at the moment Goshen Farm is not on the table and the preferred site is Wallyford. If Goshen Farm came back in and the Elected Members decided that they wanted to look at this as an option then consultation process would have to begin again.

**Member of the community asked if the developers don't sell the houses that are being built at Wallyford, would this have a knock on effect for the entry date for the new school.**

Fiona Robertson advised that it is not unusual nationally where you are undertaking movement of pupils because of housing development for time frames to change and confirmed that it could have an effect on the entry date.

**Member of the community then asked how far in advance would you know this information.**

Pauline Smith explained that roll projections are continuously monitored, not just from year to year but also throughout the year and her team are in constant communication with Property to ensure that they can react quickly to any changes in roll projections.

Chris Webb drew the meeting to a close and thanked everyone who attended the meeting and outlined the next steps in the process. Education Scotland will produce an independent and impartial report on the consultation process and the recommendations. This will be published along with the council's final consultation report. It is then the Elected Members who will make a decision.

## Appendix 2:

This is a summary of each category of respondent, in relation to the extent to which they agree/disagree. Please Note: A respondent can identify as more than one category - therefore the totals in the tables below do not add up to the total number of responses received via questionnaire (423)

Parent of Pupil at:	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% AGREE /STRONGLY AGREE	% DISAGREE/STRONGLY DISAGREE
Campie Primary	16	15	2	4	12	49		63.3	32.7
Musselburgh Burgh Primary	7	8	1	4	5	25		60.0	36.0
Pinkie St Peter's	7	10		6	7	30		56.7	43.3
Stoneyhill Primary	6	7	1	2	3	19		68.4	26.3
Wallyford Primary	51	7		3	2	63		92.1	7.9
Whitecraig Primary	1	2		1	1	5		60.0	40.0
Musselburgh Grammar	10	16	1	6	19	52		50.0	48.1
Other school	1	2			1	4		75.0	25.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>247</b>		<b>67.2</b>	<b>30.8</b>
Parent of Future Pupil at:	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% AGREE /STRONGLY AGREE	% DISAGREE/STRONGLY DISAGREE
Campie Primary	3	4			2	9		77.8	22.2
Musselburgh Burgh Primary		3		1	1	5		60.0	40.0
Pinkie St Peter's	3	5	1	2	4	15		53.3	40.0
Stoneyhill Primary	1	4			1	6		83.3	16.7
Wallyford Primary	34	5		1	1	41		95.1	4.9
Whitecraig Primary				1		1		0.0	100.0
Musselburgh Grammar	14	11	2	6	12	45		55.6	40.0
Other school	3			1	1	5		60.0	40.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>127</b>		<b>70.9</b>	<b>26.8</b>

Pupil Attending:	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% AGREE /STRONGLY AGREE	% DISAGREE/STRONGLY DISAGREE
Campie Primary	2			1		3		66.7	33.3
Musselburgh Burgh Primary		1		2		3		33.3	66.7
Pinkie St Peter's	1			1		2		50.0	50.0
Stoneyhill Primary					1	1		0.0	100.0
Wallyford Primary	10	1				11		100.0	0.0
Musselburgh Grammar	4	25	14	33	37	113		25.7	61.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>133</b>		<b>33.1</b>	<b>56.4</b>

Member of staff at:	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% AGREE /STRONGLY AGREE	% DISAGREE/STRONGLY DISAGREE
Campie Primary	3	4			2	9		77.8	22.2
Stoneyhill Primary					1	1		0.0	100.0
Whitecraig Primary	1	2				3		100.0	0.0
Musselburgh Grammar	1	4		3	5	13		38.5	61.5
Other school		1		1		2		50.0	50.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>28</b>		<b>57.1</b>	<b>42.9</b>

"Other" Category	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% AGREE /STRONGLY AGREE	% DISAGREE/STRONGLY DISAGREE
All "Other" Categories	27	8		6	5	46		76.1	23.9



Parent of pupils aged:	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% AGREE /STRONGLY AGREE	% DISAGREE/STRONGLY DISAGREE
Not yet in Education	31	9	1	3	1	45		<b>88.9</b>	<b>8.9</b>
Pre-school Education (3-5 year old)	41	22	1	5	6	75		<b>84.0</b>	<b>14.7</b>
P1 - P3	57	26	3	13	17	116		<b>71.6</b>	<b>25.9</b>
P4 - P7	46	30	2	14	20	112		<b>67.9</b>	<b>30.4</b>
S1 - S6	13	28	4	17	40	102		<b>40.2</b>	<b>55.9</b>
No longer in school Education	10	3		1	1	15		<b>86.7</b>	<b>13.3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>465</b>		<b>68.0</b>	<b>29.7</b>

Catchment	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% AGREE /STRONGLY AGREE	% DISAGREE/STRONGLY DISAGREE
Campie Primary School	19	20	8	14	25	86		<b>45.3</b>	<b>45.3</b>
Don't know	1			1	1	3		<b>33.3</b>	<b>66.7</b>
Musselburgh Burgh Primary School	18	20	2	10	9	59		<b>64.4</b>	<b>32.2</b>
Not Answered	2	5	1	1	1	10		<b>70.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>
Other	4	2		3	9	18		<b>33.3</b>	<b>66.7</b>
Pinkie St Peter's Primary School	10	20	3	14	19	66		<b>45.5</b>	<b>50.0</b>
Stoneyhill Primary School	5	12	4	10	9	40		<b>42.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>
Wallyford Primary School	94	20		8	11	133		<b>85.7</b>	<b>14.3</b>
Whitecraig Primary School	1	3		4		8		<b>50.0</b>	<b>50.0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>423</b>		<b>60.5</b>	<b>35.2</b>

Reason for Opinion:	Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Grand Total		% AGREE /STRONGLY AGREE	% DISAGREE/STRONGLY DISAGREE
Location of the proposed school	139	65	4	35	36	279		<b>73.1</b>	<b>25.4</b>
Transport / access issues	64	36	3	30	18	151		<b>66.2</b>	<b>31.8</b>
Size of the proposed school	107	48	3	12	3	173		<b>89.6</b>	<b>8.7</b>
The curriculum at the proposed school	23	11	3	5	7	49		<b>69.4</b>	<b>24.5</b>
Community Facilities that would be available at the new school	71	23	2	18	14	128		<b>73.4</b>	<b>25.0</b>
Cost of building the proposed school	10	10	3	13	17	53		<b>37.7</b>	<b>56.6</b>
Other	11	13	5	24	60	113		<b>21.2</b>	<b>74.3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>946</b>		<b>66.7</b>	<b>30.9</b>

### Appendix 3 Comments from Questionnaire responses

Of the 423 questionnaire responses, 101 declined permission to publish their comments. However, their representations have been taken account of and responded to in this Consultation Report. The summary of comments below, were made from the remaining 322 responses who gave permission to share their comments.

COMMENT
I strongly believe it would be wrong to create two separate catchment areas for secondary education. Currently, children from a wide range of backgrounds study together. In my view, that is right. To create segregation based on where you live would be wrong for the children and wrong for the community.
I agree that there is need to make provision for additional secondary school education in Musselburgh and the surrounding areas and it does seem sensible that catchment areas are revised. However, my personal concerns are that my daughter currently attends Campie School as we used to live in that catchment but have since moved to the Pinkie St Peters catchment area. My daughter wanted to continue her education where she started it with familiar teachers and pupils and did not want to go through the upheaval of changing school. She is shy and I believe a move would have been detrimental to her education. I would be concerned that my daughter would be made to attend the new school with children she does not know and not allowed to move to MGS with her Campie friends. I trust there will be some give and take and that pupils who attend a specific primary school at the moment would be allowed to transfer to the respective High School relating to their primary school with their friends.
Would possibly suggest that Whitecraig catchment area be also moved to new school along with overspill from Sanderson's Wynd and Windygoul Primaries too.
I live in the Musselburgh Burgh catchment area however my daughter attends Pinkie St Peters. I do not want her to be in a different catchment area for high school than her current class mates. We live a few minutes walk from Pinkie school and a mere 5-10 minute walk to the existing high school however my child would potentially have to travel into a neighbouring town (which Wallyford will be a town/village of its own right by the time the proposed building works have taken place) simply to attend school.
If you have made friends at high school with a catchment area that's closer to the new Wallyford school you will be split up from them which is unfair.
I don't think its a good decision because there enough access to Musselburgh grammar and it wouldn't have a lot going on around it
what will happen to pupils who live a while away from proposed school
I wood be worried because my little brother and sister wood go to a different school from me .
I don't think that pupils should get forced to go to the new school as they might not want to and could already go to the grammer and don't want to move
I just personally disagree with the decision of it being in wally ford.my oldest is currently at the grammar school and was hoping my other children would go there as well,yes it will cause transport difficulties too,I strongly disagree with the decision for a number of reasons

## COMMENT

Although I live in the catchment for Pinkie St Peters PS my 2 youngest children attend the Burgh PS as did their elder sibling who is now at the Grammar. The reasons for sending them to the Burgh were due to childcare. My mother who lives in the Burgh catchment looks after them while I work full time. I have to leave my house before 7am to get my children to my mums house who then gets them ready for school for me. My main concern is that my children have all went to the Burgh but now due to this proposal my youngest 2 children may end having to go to an entirely different secondary school from their peers because I live outwith the Burgh Catchment. If they are expected to go to the new school how do they get there? Furthermore are my youngest 2 children to go to one secondary school while their older sibling goes to Musselburgh Grammar. May I suggest that it might be a wise idea that once in a Primary School that pupils then go to the secondary school attached to that Primary even if the pupil no longer stays in that catchment. It will certainly cause my youngest 2 children much distress if they are not allowed to go to secondary school with the children they have spent up to 9 years with at Primary.

On another note I also do not like the idea of Musselburgh having 2 secondary schools. I realise changes are needed due to all the houses being built but Musselburgh had always been a town with one secondary school. What happens if one school is seen to be "the better school". This may cause rivalries and issues in the community. In my opinion it is only fair that every child in our town is given the same opportunities and one secondary school can help achieve this. I would therefore favour having one building for S1-3 pupils and another for the S4-6 pupils. This way every child is exposed to the same opportunities.

Please consider attaching set Primary Schools to the new proposed school instead of linking to catchment as it is not fair on those pupils who now live out of catchment.

Please also consider keeping Musselburgh as a one secondary school town but having a junior and upper site.

if your not in the catchment area you will be split up with your friends

no places to go for lunch

My concern would be living in the pinkie catchment but my son attends Campie primary due to a house move & I do not want him separated from his friends at a crucial stage in his education & life. I'm also very concerned that this would cause a huge divide in the community especially among the young & would hate there to be animosity but I feel strongly that this will happen.

My preferred option would be to have the two schools but to split them S1-S3 and then S3-S6. My middle daughter has just completed her first year at the Grammar & found being among a lot of older pupils quite intimidating. S5 & S6 are young adults there's a massive gap between an 11year old and a 17/18 year old. I realise there are lost opportunities in older kids leading by example however I don't believe this outweighs the negatives in this situation. I'm sure chances for this & joint learning could be managed through odd assemblies & other events. This would give the younger kids time to adjust to the big changes high school brings around more people that are closer in age. I also feel this gives all the children of high school age a turn to attend the 'new' school therefore not causing animosity.

I hope that the new school is within walking distance from our house (near Pinkie Primary) and that there will be a safe cycling route. I am concerned that having 2 high schools will be divisive for Musselburgh.

Gap between the standard of school provided for pupils depending on where you live within the catchment.

The existing secondary school is out of date and in need of major renovation, it also has little access for outdoor sport. Having one new, and I assume well equipped secondary school, and one run down and out of date school will result disharmony with teachers, parents and pupils. Why would you want to teach or be taught in a run down school when there is a new and better equipped school only a mile down the road. And why should you address dictate that you child cannot be

## COMMENT

educated in a building that is fit for the purpose of modern education. This will cause problems within the town.

It would be unfair for pupils coming to the current school while the other catchment areas are getting brand new facilities.

Friendship groups would be split up

I am worried about the demographic of the proposed area as predominantly lower class.

Is there really enough pupils to warrant a new school and would there be enough good teaching staff to fill vacancies?

I am worried about the provision for special needs. My son currently attends the special needs unit at MGS - will they just be sent to one school or go to their local school with their peers and again where is the specialist staff coming from?

Because the Pinkie pupils only live five minutes away from the current school, however the new school would be thirty minutes up the road! The pupils would get no more exercise when travelling to the school because they would have to be transported by vehicle. I'M VERY OUTRAGED AT THIS IDEA OF A NEW SCHOOL, JUST BUILD AN EXTENSION, A SUPER SCHOOL. Make Musselburgh great again!

because no where to go out for lunch

there is no where to go out to eat at lunch times and I know that no pupil wants to stay in the cafeteria every day.

I don't think it has been very well planned out e.g where will the pupils go for lunch? why is it going to be a long trek away for pupils attending farther schools, why are you letting people from Wallyford settle into the Musselburgh Grammar School and make new friends to just up and leave?

Don't like it but will have to look into it more for my final opinion

Would be separated from friends

it would be better to make a super school as know one would be separated and would be easier for people to get to school.

I'm third year at the Grammar, when the new school is finished in sixth year half of my friends will be separated against their will for the last year.

Do something else, why not give the sixth years catchment immunity.

And when you build a new school make the dining hall bigger and keep the music department away from the exam hall.

pupils will split from their friends, and people that have exams it will be even harder because different teachers and maybe different teaching

I have lots of friends from Wallyford and Pinkie and I would like to keep them at this school

Pupils can not become friends with others in the same year group and will have limited amount of friends.

I think it is a bad idea because what if people move when people are at the new school

People will be separated from their friends.

I have been at Musselburgh grammar school for two years now and made lots of friends, you have now splitting me up from them, there are plenty of other suggestions you have that could suit everyone in all local areas. Such as building a super community high school for everyone. Classes for younger ones which will then benefit them for coming up to high school instead of everyone being split (east and west). Which could then also cause gangs/ young team's fighting and putting a downer on the community.

## COMMENT

there is absolutely no point in splitting us up, even build a junior school for s1-s3 and a upper school s4-s6 that would suit the majority because older ones don't want younger ones and younger ones hate older ones.

people will be separated from there friends and will never meet the people who go to other schools

Pupils can't become friends with others in the same year group and will have limited amount of friends.

I don't think seniors and juniors should be separated as it is good for the seniors to help the juniors get through high school.

If the are separated then there could be a return of gangs with the West side and the East side.

Have one big school so that extends there friendship group.

Also Musselburgh can come together as one community.

no where to get lunch

splitting friend groups up

people doing exams

different teachers with different teaching

May result in myself and/or family members being taken away from friends in school.

Junior School - Senior School would be a better split

Flawed consultation process: I believe East Lothian Council's decision has been made purely on cost grounds, not a full appraisal of the best educational option for young people in the area. I think a decision was made and then the pre-consultation and this very short consultation process were designed to fit that decision. I do not think the council has been open and honest about its intentions. I do not believe the range of options have been fully and openly discussed with all interested parties - and that the siting of the new school has been presented as a fait accompli, based on a housebuilder's bounty rather than an assessment of what is best for young people. I do not believe the range of options has been laid down clearly to give parents an idea of what a single school might look like and how it might work as a community hub like the school at Lasswade. Financial details have been very sketch with the figure for a new single-site school calculated by simply doubling the cost of a new second school - surely there would be economies of scale to be gained by a single site option? However, as the council has clearly ruled this option out, evidence seems to have been presented only if it fits the council's pre-determined view of where the new school should be. I am very concerned about the location of the school, effectively next to the A1, and about the safety of younger pupils walking to school across increasingly busy roads - and the amount of traffic using the Wallyford Toll roundabout which already has very poor sight-lines for drivers, around the travel times to and from school. I am also very concerned that a two-school option could well leave Musselburgh Grammar School starved of resources and treated as a second-class establishment, despite the swift progress in improving the school made by its excellent new head teacher. I understand the rationale for two schools, based on the proposed future roll, but I understand that the estimated future roll has already dropped from a peak of 2500 to 2200 and I am also aware of other towns of similar size to Musselburgh where a second school has been built only for the roll to fall sharply. I have little confidence in predicted future school roll numbers when a change of 300 has occurred in such a short time.

I am not necessarily in favour of a new, single-site school but I would have liked to have seen more detail on the options for a single site. I understand council budgets are under pressure and that money from new housebuilding is crucial to providing new facilities. However, I feel the decision to proceed with a new second school at Wallyford is being pushed through based on a flawed pre-consultation process that gave very scant details of future options.

## COMMENT

East Lothian Council has handled the whole process very unprofessionally and in the kind of detached and superior 'we know best' manner that makes people despair of local government.

The new proposed secondary at Wallyford is not conducive and not appropriate for the community of Musselburgh.

It will have a detrimental impact socially to the community and create a social and economic divide between the East and West of the town. Currently the 7 feeder primaries work well together and the transition to Musselburgh Grammar works extremely well and breaks down barriers. There is a real sense of pride for Musselburgh Grammar school and this is created through community spirit in the school and the wider community.

I am proud to say where I work currently but if the school is divided I will have to think carefully about where to work to ensure I support those in need most.

It truly would be a disaster to allow a new secondary school to go ahead and a new purpose built super school would be far more appropriate and give pupils far greater opportunities for learning and links with community partners a vocational options.

I am concerned about the rivalry that may occur between different areas in Musselburgh if the new high school is built. It will create a divide between the town and may start problems that are not there now. Musselburgh as a town that should be kept as a whole and this will just split it.

I do agree the current high school is too small but I personally think building one larger high school or having a lower school and upper school in separate campus's better ideas. It will keep Musselburgh together that way.

It would separate current friendship groups.

Classes would have to be completely changed.

Easier to expand Musselburgh Grammar.

Why have a school for only two catchment areas?

This will split the community. My daughter will attend the current grammar school as she goes to Campie and will not have Wallyford or Pinkie pupils in her year at all. It will be as if they come from a different town. I agreed with the other proposal which were either 2 schools with a lower and senior section or one bigger "super" school. Surely there are other sites more central? The old Tesco site? I understand that if the location has to be Wallyford this makes sense but I still believe this will split the Musselburgh community.

As per comments above.....This will split the community. My daughter will attend the current grammar school as she goes to Campie and will not have Wallyford or Pinkie pupils in her year at all. It will be as if they come from a different town. I agreed with the other proposal which were either 2 schools with a lower and senior section or one bigger "super" school. Surely there are other sites more central? The old Tesco site? I understand that if the location has to be Wallyford this makes sense but I still believe this will split the Musselburgh community.

Splitting the town in 2 will allow cause issues and the divide is significant west/east at present.

how can having 2 schools in 1 community be a good idea.

1 community, 1 school for all the kids.

Potential rivalry between schools

as above

As a pupil at MGS, I don't think it is right that there should be 2 secondary schools so close to each other in the same town. This will breed rivalry and wearing the same school uniform or badges will not resolve this problem.

I am also concerned that we are not being asked on our views on the other options.

Splitting of catchment areas

## COMMENT

I don't think it would be a good idea to separate the catchments into two schools because the children will not get to mix with everyone in the local area and there won't be as many different people to interact with. It would also not be good because many friends will be split apart as they live in different catchment areas. I think if the plans go ahead as they are then all the senior pupils who are already at the school should stay no matter what their catchment is so that they are not split up from their close friends. I know myself that I would be very upset if they had to go to the other school having spent 4 years at school with them and being very close friends.

This is not a demographically diverse community, in socioeconomic terms and will create a very unbalanced student population - which in turn will lead to reduced house prices in that area, lack of attracting new families to the area - a school you may struggle to recruit teachers to and retain good teachers to. There needs to be a balance of a town/s population to create a high school or you create two opposing schools with may attract rivalry and violence in itself.

By proposing this school you will not then gain that balance with families in the 'new builds' as it will not attract these families to the area with the knock on effect of over supply and reduced value of property.

Perhaps but incorporating a section of Ross High/PL catchment will balance this demographic.

I think it's a horrible idea because young people aren't just friends with pupils in their school they have a wide variety of friends in Musselburgh, and might be looking forward to meeting them and spending their days with new friends. Also pupils in the current Musselburgh grammar school have the privilege of the high street and there isn't much in Wallyford for the 'new school'. The money that will be used for the new school could be used for much more important matters, I strongly believe that this is a bad idea because people who went to one primary and have younger siblings in other schools and will be separated parents will have to drive to two different schools. I think this is very very bad idea.

Dividing a community to support a housing requirement driven by East Lothian Council, voted for by the majority of councillors who do not represent Musselburgh in a very democratic local council system.

There are a number of key factors which have influenced my decision. Firstly East Lothian Council have known full well that the Boundaries Commission were near the end of carrying out the review of the ward boundaries in East Lothian and that their review was due in June 2016. The proposal from the Boundaries Commission was to make Musselburgh a single ward and move Wallyford and Whitecraig into the Fa'side/Tranent ward. This has a huge potential impact on all areas. But yet East Lothian Council surged ahead with this consultation with even mentioning this. Whilst East Lothian Council are against the Boundaries Commission proposal, the final review has not changed and the final proposal to Scottish Government proposes this change. If this proposal is accepted this will mean that one school in the Musselburgh ward will be the only school in Musselburgh to go to another high school in a different ward. It also means that Whitecraig pupils will be going to Musselburgh Grammar School which will also be in a different ward. The key issue here is that this will split a community both from a social aspect and also potentially create a class divide, which is how some view the east and west of Musselburgh. Whilst this is very unhealthy it is how things are perceived. The current catchment proposal for the proposed new school will accentuate this greatly and split the town. It may also result in issues with elected members as a parent with an issue at the proposed new school will have to deal with a council or from a different ward who covers the school and not their own. Secondly this consultation whilst made to look very professional when implemented has not been the case on the lead up.

The pre-consultation undertaken last year was flawed and biased to say the least. It was based on one housing requirements option preferred by the council and not all the alternative options, which were known. More importantly at the time of the pre-consultation the council had not made any decision on the housing requirement. This was highlighted at the time as an evidence gathering



## COMMENT

exercise purely to support the councils preferred option and was disagreed with by many, never the less the council surged ahead. However, the response was not great in number and the figures who were in favour have been converted onto percentages to make them look favourable when the reality is that there were less than 300 responses out of a pupil population of nearly 3000 in the Musselburgh catchments area. When this is transposed into parent numbers we can assume at minimum of 3000 but likely to be around 5000. This was a very poor pre consultation engineered by the council for the council and not the people.

The proposal itself combined with the potential for significant ward change will split a town which has been working very hard over the year through local organisation to prevent a town split/divide. I am personally disgusted that East Lothian Council has not even given this consideration. The democratic process in this council is stacked highly against the largest town in East Lothian when full council get to vote on an issue as no matter if all local council lot. Were to support a particular stance, if the rest of the council vote against something that does not affect them then we have no voice.

Musselburgh has been a community for centuries and is reputed as possibly the oldest town in Scotland, this proposal threatens our community cohesion through a break up of the town. In the current climate of wide spread urban masses and a lack of community spirit and cohesion, this is just another proposal which takes little cognisance of the community impact.

The Educational Benefits Statement clearly states "By locating the school at the heart of the community it will provide a hub for learning, activities....." This proposal is not in the heart of the community and indeed is on the geographical periphery splitting the community by the way it is being manufactured, purely to satisfy the councils wishes and not the communities.

To sum up, I am disappointed and near disgusted with East Lothian Councils approach to Musselburgh as a community or not as it appears to be. The potential ward change needs to be taken into consideration and should have been highlighted to the community. How will the new proposed site be a focus for the community of the people living in the current Pinkie catchment area, in particular Lewisvale, Edenhall, Pinkie and Linkfield Road.. It won't. How will pupils who live in the Lewisvale area with a secondary school on their doorstep feel about being moved to Dolphinton.....Not happy.

My son has a close group of friend, 2 of whom are in his class, however they went to Pinkie School before moving house to the Burgh catchment area, however they remained at Pinkie which is actually closest. However, if this proposal is approved, they will remain at Musselburgh Grammar and my son would leave MGS and go to the new school, probably devastating him with the loss of close friends which he fully needs the support of in his education. I am sure there are many others in the same boat.

In conclusion I do not support this proposal and I do not support the splitting of our town and community by East Lothian Council for more financial than education reasons. I also question the lack of any information regarding the current MGS and how this will impact on both the current and future pupils.

I personally think this would divide Musselburgh and the cost really puts me off, I think this money would be better spent upgrading Musselburgh Grammar's Facilities and it would not divide Musselburgh. Another thing that puts me off is that it would divide me seeing my friends at the Grammar.

I am concerned that having two High Schools in Musselburgh is going to cause unnecessary rivalry between young people.

I also feel that should there be two, Pinkie pupils should have gone to the current Grammar and perhaps either Wallyford or White Craig should have gone to the new one as they are separate from Musselburgh anyway.

## COMMENT

I am also concerned that everything is going to be brand new at the new school and that undoubtedly facilities and equipment will be better and more modern thus disadvantaging current and future pupils of the current Grammar.

I feel this whole campaign has had a very low profile despite its huge importance within the community.

In my opinion, a junior and a senior high school would have been a fairer and better option as it would not have caused rivalries and everybody would have experienced the new school at some point.

Once again, it seems like decisions have already been made anyway and that our views will have very little impact on the ultimate decision.

I feel that it would create a divide in a very close-knit community and also not have as diverse a range of pupils. It would also have an affect on the local businesses in Musselburgh who get a lot of profit from kids at the grammar buying their lunch there. There is also not many places to buy food near the proposed school location so the school cafeteria would be overwhelmed.

I have concerns that the community of Musselburgh will be divided. The socio economic profiles of the catchment areas are likely to lead to division. I remember ' Worst School in Scotland ' headlines at a time when there were gang difficulties in the community. The school has worked hard to make it a truly inclusive school where the previous territorial attitude of some pupils has been eradicated. The proposals are likely to fracture the community and ideas such as sharing logos are unlikely to resolve the issue.

One new school was rejected largely on financial grounds but it was the way forward to give the whole community pride and unity

Feel breaking up the town is the biggest issue. Splitting the town up in such a divisive way seems incredulous and can only lead to negativity and problems rather than fostering a sense of community that many people over many years have worked hard to achieve.

I feel that this is Musselburgh's chance to build something special for the future of the town and the youth coming through! We are so far behind on many sporting and academic points within the region and this is our chance to make something that inspires the youth to want to learn, to be fitter and better and maybe encourage people to move to the area. This is the chance to have a sporting academy that can match the independent schools and use the talents of many of the town folk of Musselburgh. Instead a half hearted school will divide the town in such an uneven way, who benefits from that? Certainly not the children attending who will either spend time with more people of a similar background and no diversity!

This decision that has clearly been made without any consultation on the people who count is to be bashed through whatever the outcome or desires of the parents of Musselburgh and doesn't seem to benefit anyone.

I feel very disappointed and that this is a missed opportunity. Sad.

This proposal is frankly a total and utter disgrace to the community of Musselburgh. Having worked at Musselburgh Grammar School now for the best part of the last ten years, there is a tremendous sense of community spirit and coming together between all seven feeder primaries currently linked to the school. Splitting these up and enforcing both Pinkie and Wallyford primaries to feed into a new secondary school will only seek to weaken or split this community spirit/feeling. There is also a very grave social aspect to this proposal. With the seven very different communities that come together to create Musselburgh Grammar as it currently stands, the school can only be described as a very real and true comprehensive secondary school; this is very much to its credit as there is such a wealth of diversity and different backgrounds within the school. If this new 'East Musselburgh' secondary school is to go ahead, this could create a big socio-economic divide within the town and its communities, which I believe would be of terrible detriment to various families and individuals. This whole proposal simply reeks of cost saving and trying to come up with a moany-saving solution;

## COMMENT

in my view there has been little consideration given to either pupils or their families in the drafting of this proposal, which frankly is disgraceful.

I do not want the community split with a new school. We are a tight knit, thriving community and effectively splitting the town will cause social discord. A well designed, carefully thought out extension to the grammar does not seem to have been considered. Additionally I have concerns about the investments in education at Musselburgh grammar. The proposal for the new school suggests a modern school ingesting new technologies and I wonder if the grammar will be left behind.

I think this is a great plan and forward thinking for the local community. I'm sure many residents will complain but it won't be that when they can't get their children into the school due to no spaces! Well done ELC for thinking.

I think it is a great proposal for Wallyford to have a second primary school, with it rapidly expanding it makes perfect sense and it will be fantastic for the local community.

With Wallyford's expansion well under way a new secondary school to go along with the new primary school is a fantastic idea and will be a huge asset to the local community both for Wallyford and the close surrounding areas.

A new secondary school is much needed and having it located in Wallyford is a great idea.

From a grandparent's view I think it would be wonderful to have the secondary school in Wallyford, walking distance for many of the children. And will be good for the local community.

It's a no-brainer, Wallyford needs a secondary school it's a perfect solution with the expansion of Wallyford. Can't wait to see it built and the benefits it will provide to our children and community.

I feel that this is a fantastic idea to build a school in an area that has massively increased its population from a small village to what once after the new houses are built will become a small town. People need to remember that it is an ever-growing population and more and more children are being born who will eventually need an education. I feel that this area provides ample space to build a school that can support the community and surrounding area for the next few decades at least enable all children to get the education they deserve.

With the expansion of Wallyford it makes perfect sense to include a new secondary school within these plans. Not only to benefit my nieces but the whole of Wallyford and its surrounding areas.

I think it would be great to have not only a new primary but secondary school within Wallyford. With such a huge housing development happening I can't see how it could not go ahead.

There is a desperate need for a new secondary school within the area and Wallyford is a perfect site for this.

The village and future growth needs a secondary school and the proposed location is perfect for my children.

I live in Wallyford and have a pre-school child and this proposal makes sense having the 2 schools in close proximity to each other, in the centre of the village. As if there wasn't a new Secondary school being built it would put a strain on the Musselburgh Grammar even with an extension with all of the houses being proposed in Wallyford. I hope the size of the new school will be big enough when the time comes when all of the development has completed.

The surrounding area is increasing by a huge amount with the new housing development and I believe it is necessary to provide a secondary school for local catchment alongside the new primary school. As a local mum I would much rather see my children who are just entering the school system to be at a school within the village they live. The logistics in the future of one being in primary and one in high school will be much simpler if there is secondary provision in Wallyford. As the increased population within Wallyford will warrant this proposal it seems a reasonable response.

A new school is always good for the students. They seem to respond well to a new environment, something they can be proud of rather than a building that is old and tired and not fit for purpose in

## COMMENT

this modern world and anything that engages pupils is a bonus. Unfortunately my children would not benefit from this new school as they are heading to the end of their education, but I still felt I had to comment as education is important for the future.

I think it will be a great opportunity for wallyford to have its own secondary school. Great for the local and wider community too..

With wallyford expanding so much it makes perfect sense for a new secondary school to be built along side the new primary. Can't wait for it all to be done.

I would really like them to build a new secondary school as well as a primary one. If all goes ahead I will be one of the first to go through the school, which is really exciting for me and my friends.

It would be nice for wallyford to have a new school, it will be good for me as I will be able to walk to it.

Am new to wallyford, but with it doubling in size and a new primary being built, great idea to put a new secondary school in too. Great for wallyford community and the surrounding communities too...

Great opportunity for all the children in wallyford and surrounding area to have a secondary school here. Musselburgh can't cope makes total sense to split catchment area and give wallyford a secondary school.

With the expansion of wallyford it makes perfect sense to build a secondary school to accommodate the vastly growing population. It will be fantastic for all the golden being able to walk/ bike to school and will have such a positive impact on the local community.

## COMMENT

I strongly disagree with the proposal to establish a new secondary school in Wallyford as I do not consider that East Lothian Council has met the statutory requirements under the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 for the following reasons - 1. Failure to prepare an educational benefits statement in accordance with the 2010 Act which provides-(1)The education authority must prepare an educational benefits statement which includes—(a) the authority's assessment of the likely effects of a relevant proposal (if implemented) on—(i) the pupils of any affected school,(ii) any other users of the school's facilities,(iii) any children who would (in the future but for implementation) be likely to become pupils of the school,(iv) the pupils of any other schools in the authority's area,(b) the authority's assessment of any other likely effects of the proposal (if implemented),(c) an explanation of how the authority intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects that may arise from the proposal (if implemented),(d) a description of the benefits which the authority believes will result from implementation of the proposal (with reference to the persons whom it believes will derive them).(2) The statement must also include the education authority's reasons for coming to the beliefs expressed under subsection (1)(d).(3) In subsection (1), the references to effects and benefits are to educational effects and benefits.I consider that the educational benefits statement does not set out the authority's assessment of the likely effects of the proposal, if it were implemented, on the groups of people as specified in section 3(1)(a)(i) to (iv), namely the pupils and other users of the facilities at any affected school, children who would be likely to attend the school, and other pupils in the authority area. The authority also has not explained the benefits that it believes will accrue from the proposal and why, and any ways in which it would minimise or avoid any adverse consequences which it has identified.Referring to the consultation proposal itself and the educational benefits statement -A. The summary to the statement does not provide the relevant information. Paragraph 1 of the summary does not relate to education benefits. The second paragraph does not say how the new sense of community will be established (again nothing about educational benefits). The 3rd paragraph does not make sense as it says "the establishment of the new secondary school will have a positive impact on the balance between the number of pupils at Musselburgh Grammar School and the new school". What is meant by the new school having an impact on the number of pupils at the new school? The believed benefits outlined in the 4th paragraph is applicable to any new school including the other options considered by the Council - not just the proposal to build a second secondary school at Wallyford. The believed sustainability benefits also apply to any of the new school build options (not just the Wallyford proposal) and does not relate to educational benefits. No impact assessment is provided.

B. As in the summary statement, the conclusion of the proposal also makes claims which are not backed by evidence.

The Council states that it is believed that the current proposal will bring significant educational benefits to children and young people and will also bring positive benefits to the whole community. However the Council has failed to outline what these significant educational benefits are. Any benefits specified are too general and vague and do not relate solely to the current proposal but could equally apply to the other 2 options initially considered by the Council - i.e. any new school would provide them. No reasons are given as to why the provision of a new secondary school will enhance, build upon and improve the existing provision further as claimed in the conclusion. Nor is it explained why, as asserted, it is believed that the current proposal is the most reasonable, viable and appropriate course of action open to the Council. No reasons are given why it is believed that the measures proposed in this document (in contrast to a new "super school" or split campus school) will enhance the provision of secondary education in East Lothian. The Council go on to assert that there are strong educational and economic arguments in favour of this proposal but they do not show any evidence to support this.

C. The Educational Benefits Statement is too brief and general and fails to identify specific benefits to the pupils of the affected school (as highlighted in the Statutory Guidance to the 2010 Act - this

## COMMENT

leaves the Council open to criticism from HMIE). No specific benefits are outlined which relate to the provision of a second secondary school. All benefits stated could apply equally to any new school build including a "super school" or split campus school. There is no discussion as to how the proposal raises the standard of education.

D. The detail of the Educational Benefits Statement includes a lot of irrelevant reasons (see paragraphs E and O to R).

E. The statements made in paragraphs B to D and F to N are just that. They are statements - no reasons or evidence is given as to how the educational benefit arises from the current proposal. The statements in paragraph B outline no concrete benefits but merely mention that the new school would make a clear statement. Reference is also made to the vision of the Council. Again, all these so called benefits would arise from any type of new school provision and are not related solely to the current proposal.

F. As the statutory guidance specifies - . The 2010 Act requires authorities to consider current and future pupils of any affected school, current users of its facilities, and the pupils of other schools in the authority's area; and also to explain how the authority intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects of the proposal. The authority must also include its reasons for reaching the views which it sets out regarding the educational benefits. Reasons should be supported by evidence, including HM Inspector reports or condition or suitability ratings of the schools involved, to assist consultees in their understanding of the projected educational benefits. No evidence of the educational benefits is presented in this proposal. No reasons are included. In addition, the Council does not show that it has fully considered each of the groups of affected pupils and users. Nor does the Council explain how the authority intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects of the proposal.

G. Adverse effects of the proposal are not given full consideration. Investment in Musselburgh Grammar School is likely to suffer as a result of the new school. The condition of the school will deteriorate. The Council may give assurances that routine maintenance will continue however this is the bare minimum required and thus offers no comfort. On the one hand the whole basis of the Council's argument for the current proposal is the benefits which will accrue to the pupils attending the new school and the community it serves. However, on the other hand it offers nothing in terms of investment to benefit the existing school - Musselburgh Grammar. By that reasoning the Grammar School is adversely affected by the proposal and no explanation is provided as to how this adverse effect will be minimised or avoided.

H An overall picture of the benefit (or disbenefit) for each of the categories of user set out in section 3(1)(a)(i) to (iv) of the 2010 Act should have been set out, which demonstrates a clear educational benefit from the proposal and any disbenefits addressed.

I In general there has been a lack of wide consultation on the broader question and the 3 options and a lack of expert evidence on the pros and cons.

J A divided community will result from having two Musselburgh secondary schools. There could be "unfriendly rivalry" which would not be calmed by wearing the same badge. Although pupils will go to the separate schools for reasons of population and geography it is inevitable that one school will be better than the other (and/or have a catchment area encompassing a more socio-economic deprived area) which is likely to result in rivalry and competition for out of catchment placement requests. Concrete steps would need to be taken to develop and maintain a sense of community.

K The Council by its own admission in the proposal highlights that the educational literature on the issue of school size is generally inconclusive citing advantages and disadvantages to large and small schools in relation to improving outcomes for learners so this reason cannot be used as a reason not to go with the "super school" option.

## COMMENT

There may be merit in exploring new catchments and boundaries East Lothian wide and establishing new schools but this should not be to the detriment of any existing community.

Many of the arguments put forward appear generic e.g. many of the same advantages were outlined in a Perth & Kinross proposal paper to establish similar secondary school sites. There may well be commonality but I want to be reassured that such decisions are based on specific benefits to the pupils of the affected school/schools.

I would like to have seen more consideration given to the Educational Benefits of the new school in line with Schools Consultation Scotland Act 2010: Section 3. I feel that it is difficult for me to establish the evidence of benefits for all from the consultation document.

I remain unconvinced over arguments about the cost of building a new school as opposed to developing a new super school to serve the whole community of Musselburgh. I do not feel the financial costs of both models have been clearly explained - such a major investment in Education demands further detail. I would like to think that any investment would be fair and equitable for all pupils attending every school in East Lothian.

I would like to think that consideration was being given to the views of all parties: the consultation period appears to have been quite rushed and kept to a statutory minimum, thereby discouraging response to a decision which will affect pupils and communities for years to come.

With the above in mind I found it difficult to strongly agree or disagree with the proposals outlined.

This proposal has been rushed through without proper public consultation and with nowhere near enough information regarding future investment in the existing grammar school or the impact the new school would have on already strained transport systems.

All options do not seem to have not been fully explored. Initially the recommendation was for a single school however the change of location seems to have changed this approach to a second secondary school approach. A second school could:

- create issues between pupils from both schools.
- impact on the current teaching staff who could look to move to new opportunities available at a new state of the art local school.
- There is also no clear investment plan for the current secondary school, MGS becomes the second class school in the area.

Have opportunities to create a central school, sporting and community hub been fully explored using the current site, the sports centre and the old Tesco site. A facility similar to Lasswade would allow the school to be centrally located and be very much part of the community. In doing so all school pupils in the area would receive the same level of education & benefit from the improved facilities without the need for 2 separate schools

Not enough detail on the other options has been provided to make a balanced decision on the right option. This questionnaire provides no opportunity to collect statistical information on opinions on the different options. It appears to be a 'leading consultation' and the whole impression is of a 'done deal'.

As a member of Musselburgh Grammar Parent Council, I fully support opposition to this proposal and my concerns regarding the validity of the consultation process are already expressed in the letter submitted and signed on our behalf by our Co-chairs.

## COMMENT

I'd like to make a few points. Firstly, the lack of consultation on the broader question. We are not being invited to hear from experts on the pros and cons of a junior and upper school model, nor on the option of a "superschool". I'm more interested in the former as it's always struck me as odd to have kids of 11 mixing with young adults of 17. An upper school might also give a better opportunity to connect with college and university education. I just don't know and it looks like I'll never know because it's not an option on the table. Secondly, the community is being bounced into a choice. The council should have been communicating and involving the community long before now. Thirdly, catchment changes. I can imagine parents from Pinkie will be worried about the trek their kids will face to get over to the eastern edge of Wallyford, but the flip side of that is kids currently at Wallyford won't have so far to travel in future. We need to make sure there are good walking and cycling links across busy roads and the railway line. Finally, the state of MGS. If a new school is built at Wallyford, will the Grammar be left to wither on the vine? At the recent public meeting this concern was brushed aside by a senior council official who didn't seem to think school buildings had much impact on the learning environment. Clearly the condition of your surroundings does have an impact. Can ELC give assurances that MGS will get the maintenance and upgrades it deserves?

The road infrastructure is not up to the amount of traffic planned and for the safety of the pupils travelling to school.

The majority of pupils would have to be transported to the school, which would have to be paid for presumably by the Council.

Access into the school from the A199 would be a concern would another roundabout be needed? Three within a short distance. A T junction would be a safety concern from a main road. With the recycling centre in the middle of the road and cars slowing up to turn in, this needs careful consideration to the travel systems in the area.

The consent of all the building in the area has caused these issues and at what point was the concern about Education

discussed? The village of Wallyford is being swamped and the whole area is being made out of all recognition. The local residents are losing their Community.

My concern would be with the maintenance of the existing school. I feel that the children left at the grammar would be at a disadvantage of not having new modern facilities.

Personally, I am disappointed that Craighall is not the preferred site for an additional secondary school in Musselburgh, as there was potential for links with QMU and also as I live in the Stoneyhill catchment. However, I can see why Wallyford is the preferred site over Craighall.

I am concerned that children who will attend the existing Musselburgh Grammar School will be disadvantaged in terms of the facilities available and that there will not be any budget available for any renovations there because of the cost of the new school. I would like to see opportunities made for sharing facilities and joint activities at both sites and would also hope that this would help promote a community feeling between the two schools rather than a sense of rivalry.

I am not averse to a new school being built, but I am concerned that MGS will then be seen as the "poor relation". There is talk of maintaining MGS, but not improving it so that both schools are of the same standard

After the new school is built, Musselburgh Grammar School will be severely obsolete, and pupils who attended would get a lower quality education

A second school would divide Musselburgh and create rivalries



## COMMENT

The proposal for providing an additional secondary school based in the Wallyford area does not mention any plans for upgrading the current provision at Musselburgh Grammar School therefore I am concerned that without a plan for investment in MGS alongside the development of the new school it seems there will be a notable inequality in educational facilities between the two sites. I would like reassurance that MGS will secure investment from East Lothian Council to ensure both schools are of a comparable standard.

Within the Musselburgh area there is a strong sense of community that has been nurtured and maintained through good links between the cluster schools and key relationships with supporting agencies such as Police Scotland. I am concerned that having two separate secondary schools will have a detrimental effect on community links by dividing the community, resulting in a range of social issues and unhealthy rivalry. The splitting of the Musselburgh area into new catchment areas for the two proposed secondary schools also places a higher concentration of children from areas of deprivation into one school catchment, at the risk of further community division while potentially resulting in a widening attainment gap between the two schools.

I would like more information regarding how East Lothian Council proposes to minimise the impact on our community and ensure strong links are in place between the two schools and with local support agencies to prevent the types of issues outlined above occurring.

I also have concerns regarding the ability to recruit sufficient high quality teachers to support a second secondary school. There has been a recent national problem with teacher recruitment and the proposal does not touch on how this will be overcome. Also, with a new and better equipped facility in the same locality, what will happen with staff retention at MGS if teachers would prefer to work in the new facility?

During the pre-consultation on this matter there was very limited information made available on the three options. The questions were also emotive and biased, which I feel may have skewed the data sample collected.

I am in favour of the super school option as I this would provide the community with a centre for excellence for secondary education that can work with multiple agencies to ensure the best experiences for our children.

This option would provide no division of the community, no issue of attainment gap by separating the areas of higher deprivation into a different school and could attract high quality teaching staff. This would also ensure there was no discrepancy between the educational facilities made available to the children as would be the case if the current MGS was kept in use alongside a new school.

I appreciate that people are concerned about some children being 'lost' within such a large facility, however good management of the school would prevent this from happening.

I also feel there has not been transparency regarding the financial data. Any costs associated with this could have a lasting impact on future school budgets and expenditure. In order to make a fully informed decision about whether the proposed option is optimal this information should be shared. The costs associated with all three school options should be outlined including; details of estimated land values and build costs, infrastructure costs for safe routes to school, ongoing maintenance and utilities costs and expected staffing expenditure.

I would be interested to know if the existing Musselburgh Grammar would be updated. Would the facilities there be as modern as at the new school? Also would the access to subjects for exam study be the same? Would pupils at each school be given the same opportunities?

Staffing- would the current Musselburgh Grammar staff be split over the 2 schools or would they recruit a whole new team of staff for the new school?

Would there be links between the new schools? How can we avoid creating a divide between the schools in the town?

Children will only get to mix with some schools and not all the schools.

The views of Musselburgh Grammar School Parent Council have been fully expressed in our letter

COMMENT
submitted to Council officials, dated 10th June.
I agree with the concerns and issues raised by MGS Parent Council & would refer you to the letter they have sent to the Council.
Not enough time or consideration of the other options has been presented.
A new school serving the east of Musselburgh is a must due to the huge expansion family homes in the area.
Desperately need another secondary school and as wallyford is expanding so much it makes perfect sense to build a new one to serve them.
Wallyford needs a secondary school to cope with all the extra housing..
Musselburgh can't cope and with wallyford expanding so much, they need a school too.
Wallyford is perfect site for new school. Musselburgh can no longer cope. Fab idea can't wait to see it built
I do not see that there is any other / better option.
The proposal to introduce a new secondary school to this area is long overdue. This school is absolutely necessary to develop the children and young people living in the area, giving them the confidence that the local council fully support their growth and education.
The significant increase in population means that the proposal must go ahead. Any opinions otherwise will likely be voiced by people who do not live in the catchment area and do not want funds being spent that will not directly influence their own children.
I think if the proposals say that the curriculum and facilities will be better at this new additional school then those opportunities should be available for all children ie a continuing Musselburgh cluster with all children within the cluster having access to the improved facilities.
I would like to see the continuance of a "Musselburgh cluster" so that my children, who currently mix with children from all over the cluster through various activities, will continue their educational career with their friends from the wider community.
The facilities and opportunities at both the schools need to be equal
If the new school is built I will be able to walk to school with my mummy and my big sister
I feel that living in Pinkie and being within walking distance of the grammar it doesn't make sense that the new catchment are for my kids will now be Wallyford, it takes away the option of my children being able to walk to school as it would be too far and unsafe given the new location of school and busy roads and unless school transport is provided it would have large financial implications for myself.
At the time this school is proposed to open I would have a child in S3 at the Grammar and another starting S1. I would be unhappy at children being made to move school when they are already settled into their school and possibly being pulled away from their friends, this would cause undue stress and upset to children and I feel high school life can be stressful enough. I feel it would make a lot more sense to have 1 new school for all rather than the 2 that's proposed as I can see there being a lot of rivalry between the schools. If children who were already settled into the grammar were given the option to stay at that school, then that would certainly be better for them however it would also mean that both my children would be at different schools, which again I feel makes no sense!, given they both stay in the same area.
I think the proposal for the new secondary school in wallyford is put through quickly so that the building can start ASAP.
I feel that the proposed site is too far out of Musselburgh and Wallyford for it to be easily accessible for children/teenagers to make their way with sustainable routes to school. It will require transport for significant numbers of pupils and this will lead to other issues. I think a review of the site should be considered.
Effect on pupils that will have to move school

## COMMENT

Some of the pupils that will have to move school will be preparing for exams and the movement will cause a disturbance. It would also be unsettling for newer pupils as they have only recently started secondary school and are trying to settle in, they will be taken away from new friends, teachers they have a good relationship with and a comfortable atmosphere that may not be re-established at the new school.

I think that it would be highly unfair on those preparing for exams those years because the change would be too vast and may affect their grades/learning. It also will cause disturbance in local businesses that profit off of the children at our school who buy from the local area because they will no longer be nearby.

pupils will be split up

I think that the new secondary school should not be built as everyone would be split up and the education system will be a disaster as pupils who have exams that year will be stressed out already about exams and if they are moving to a new school with new teachers and different ways of teaching they will be confused on what to learn, each student will not have the right facilities to learn properly and efficiently

Effect on the pupils moving to the new school and staying in the old one.

The pupils preparing for exams would be taken away from a school they are used to and forced into a new environment that some are not comfortable with. This would put a huge strain on pupils who are not only trying to pass important exams, but will now be trying to make new friends and settle into a new school. Friendships would be torn apart and relationships with teachers and other pupils would be abolished. For some this would cause them to become isolated at an already difficult stage in their life and possibly have a longer-term effect on the individuals life. In conclusion I feel this would have a mass effect on pupils already in the school (current first and second year pupils) and also tear apart friendships in those who are still in primary school.

Building a second secondary school in Musselburgh is a prerequisite for the the compact strategy of the ELC's current LPD which I do not believe is sustainable.

The educational benefits ascribed to the new school could equally apply to an expanded MGS if half the proposed capital investment was spent at the Grammar. This would necessitate a PFI buy out which I would support and a Roodlands Hospital style controlled building plan.

A agree with many of the objections enumerated by the MGS Parent Council.

I would like replace the compact LPD strategy with one that is dispersed primarily because Musselburgh is becoming overcrowded. Roads, parking, rail and us transport cannot cope with the intensity of use. This will worsen given the development which is in progress and is committed.

There is no scope for these major people movement problems to be resolved.

I wish to see a severely moderated LPD house building programme for Musselburgh and its environs which reduces the projected Grammar School pupil population to around 1500 for a short lived peak.

The existing school as well as being rented and costing a fortune should be fully removed in my opinion, although this is not the point! The school isn't big enough for the growing population of the area. Whilst there is all this dilly dallying around, my children's education is going to be distrupted and affected. There needs to be a new school as you are building so many houses, as soon as possible. Please just get on with it! All theses concerns of not enough public response ect are just creating more delays and meetings ect, which is just raising the cost of the publics purse. Please just get on with it!

I am afraid that the new secondary facility won't be built by the time the current Grammar school is over capacity in 2020 and this is going to be detrimental to my youngest children's education The same thing has happened to them at Wallyford primary as all the new housing was allowed to be built before the new school and they have had to build temporary units which have taken up room

## COMMENT

in the playground. The dining hall is far from adequate for the current children. It is too late for my children but I believe their education has suffered and I don't want this to happen again at the latter stage of their secondary school when they are doing exams. Also having had 2 children go through education at the Grammar I think that the building needs a lot of improvement to make it fit for purpose as I fear there will be resentment from the Musselburgh community and a divide will be caused. This is a real fear. I feel that I wasn't listened to when I pointed out my concerns before and my children have suffered so please take this into consideration.

I agree there is a need for this proposal because the existing secondary school cannot support the growth in population living in the area. My kids will have the opportunity to attend a newly built school and the use of modern facilities - this can only help with their learning.

Although in agreement that the school is needed and my kids would directly benefit from it I have major concerns about the ability of the current infrastructure to support it - particularly the road and pavement network. The local road infrastructure is already creaking at the seams and will be put under more stress in the coming years with more and more houses being built but with very limited improvements in the infrastructure to support those developments. This has to be addressed as a major factor during the planning phase.

Currently, children moving on to high school usually come from the several schools in the local area. If one new high school was to serve potentially only 4 primary schools, I do not think it assists children in the diverse, social world we live in and I believe it would not make a positive contribution to their emotional independence if they simply 'move next door' with their classmates. High school is a huge milestone and it should be an opportunity to meet peers from a wider area, culture, social status etc. Also, Wallyford being an area of social deprivation highlights the fact that many youngsters here are unemployed, single parents. Many people here do not work or are unable to work due to ill physical/mental health. Wallyford is an old mining village and the deprivation is visible. What will a young person's outlook on life be if they are 'surrounded' in that environment? Understandably new housing will bring new people etc but it will not eradicate the long term problems/issues here. Young people in Wallyford need to see there is more to life than what is on the doorstep. More than what their parents/grandparents had. They will not have the opportunity if their daily radius is a few hundred metres.

Wallyford has long been thought of as having a larger proportion of deprivation than the rest of Musselburgh, a new school excluding the rest of Musselburgh except Pinkie St Peter's would have a higher percentage of students from these areas attending and could have potential impact on quality of learning the children would receive as well as the ability of the school to attract and retain the best teachers again having a negative impact on the children. Also creating two Musselburgh / Wallyford based schools could divide the community and create a one versus the other culture creating rivalry and potential clashes within the town.

I think that financially and educationally the two secondary schools option makes sense. However I am greatly concerned that there will be a new 35 million pound school and another school (the current grammar) that is not fit for purpose. I hope the council invests in the current grammar too otherwise a "good and bad school" will be perceived. This must be a fair decision for all pupils - every pupil should be entitled to the best facilities regardless of your postcode.

Whilst I support the proposal to build a new secondary school in Wallyford, and agree that it is a sensible location (being near good transport links, etc) I would like to see public funds also spent to improve the facilities at Musselburgh Grammar school, and a concerted effort made to improve the quality and range of secondary education there, which has been below par for too long.

I think a new school at Wallyford is the best option, as long as it either positively impacts quality of current teaching provision, or is at worst, neutral. I hope the council do not use this as an exercise in budget-cutting and provide at least a 1:1 increase in teacher numbers with student:teacher ratios in the affected catchments.

## COMMENT

Feel building a new school is best option as both schools will have averaged sized rolls as opposed to one huge super school. Concerned that the grammar will suffer from all capital investment pouring into new school

the grammar might be too big  
might be too expensive

I think it is a god idea but its also not cause it will split Musselburgh and we will lose all our new friends and there is no where to go for luch.

I think that having a school in Wallyford and the existing Musselburgh Grammar school will benefit pupils more than having a large combined super school. I think that a very large school will be unable to fully meet the needs of the pupils.

I agree with the proposal as the current level of speeding traffic coming through Inveresk Village diuring school rush hour is unacceptable and it is becoming insafe for my children to cross the road to get to school safely. Increased housing and a larger high school at the current site would only exacerbate the problem

I have concerns about the volume of housing being planned without due consideration to the existing road infrastructure . Inveresk road is already heavily conjested with the new housing on Pinkie Road !

There's already a large school in Musselburgh and Prestonpans. A new school in Wallyford makes sense for all involved.

I am concerned that without the new school there will not be sufficient provision for the upcoming pupils and I may be forced to have one child at one school and one at another. A brand new local school with sufficient provision for all the new house builds will ensure I can send both my children to their local catchment school. This has not happened for nursery provision and as such my sons are currently in different schools which is a childcare nightmare and has huge implications for drop off and collection.

I have concerns regarding the location of the new school as the traffic situation is already worrying in Wallyford and we are already asking children to cross an increasingly busy main road. The new houses will only make this problem worse. Are there any plans to alleviate the traffic or to build a pedestrian subway or flyover for the children to use to bypass a very dangerous and over run main road. I have heard about a new road around the back of Wallyford to take some of the traffic but I do not believe that people will use this when there is a more direct route through the Main Street. I am also concerned that the proposed site for the High School is at the furthest point from my own home and many of the new houses and this means that even more parents will take the easy option and drive their child to school. As an advocate of healthy living, I would like to know that the walking option is safely available for those who want it.

I fully understand that a new school is required to accommodate pupils and that Musselburgh Grammar School does not have the capacity for this. I also think a new school is something that will be beneficial to the children's learning, new facilities etc will be greatly appreciated. I have a few reservations about how this new school will work and one of my concerns is the location. We live on the catchment border and I think the location of the new school will be a lengthy walk for my children. We live closer to Musselburgh Grammar school than we will to the new school. The walk up to Wallyford at the moment is lengthy and the A1 is a fast road. My biggest concern, however, is that I feel it will create a huge level of rivalry within the Musselburgh area. I grew up in Musselburgh and attended Musselburgh Grammar School and with only one high school the level of rivalry between different areas of Musselburgh was terrible. There was gangs formed, dependant on the area you lived in and it caused a lot of trouble and fighting. I know that this will happen between the schools even if the children are integrated with regards to sports etc.

## COMMENT

I think building a new school is a good idea because it could bring up new competitive options between the two schools Interschool Athletics, Intellectual competitions etc. However building a new school has its drawbacks. It does limit the people the new primary children can become friends with. I have made some amazing friends at the Grammar and I wouldn't have met some of them had there been a second school. This could cause some interschool fighting etc. A new school also wouldn't help the current traffic problems both in Musselburgh and Wallyford. I do think that a new school is a good Idea simply because this school barely fits the current roll. To increase this by a further 1000 people would be madness.

Best of original 3 options presented. However, I would like further details on what implications this has for future upgrades/ improvements at Musselburgh Grammar - will there be opportunities for the facilities there to be improved in future years or will the school estates budget be used entirely on the new build at Wallyford? Also what access will the wider community have to the new facilities at Wallyford?

No other potential options being presented at this time, would suggest we are being consulted on a decision already made.

As the village expands there is a need for more secondary provision. My personal opinion is that smaller school numbers are more effective in discipline, attainment & social development of the pupils.

I think this proposal is a welcome & positive boost for the kids of Wallyford & Pinkie primaries. I think 2 public secondary schools to serve the Musselburgh cluster is potentially a great outcome from the expansion of the population. Managed correctly this will provide many opportunities for the young people of our cluster.

I STRONGLY AGREE that the proposed council approach is the right approach for our community in the long term, given:

- the majority of new homes will be built in the east of the town (and fully expect the Goshen site to eventually return to a development plan also)
- it will reduce the need for transportation for pupils living in the centre and west of Musselburgh, which in turn will minimise the traffic pollution and volume travelling to and from the new school.
- the size of the school proposed
- that it will serve (in part) to build the community forming on the eastern side of the town
- the size of the proposed school role will be fairly average.

However, as a parent of a child currently at Burgh Primary School I would seek assurances that the council will:

- upgrade the existing Musselburgh Grammar School and provide ongoing financial support to ensure that the environment, facilities and extracurricular activities are comparable across the two schools
- provide like-for-life subjects available, educational standards and outcomes across the two schools

I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to the ideas that have surfaced in the debate around:

- school rivalries - a point I felt was particularly unhelpful
- a super school being better/preferable - which I feel is ludicrous given where it would be sited and that it is a totally untested scenario across Scotland in terms of role size (i.e. 2,500 pupils). I fear that under-achieving children or those with additional support needs would simply 'disappear' in a sea of kids if the super-school option were to be pursued
- the socio-economic arguments - given that the east side of town will be unrecognisable due to the level of building that will take place, I would argue that the socio-economic make-up of this part of Musselburgh will change dramatically in the years to come making this argument irrelevant.

## COMMENT

My only concern is that my daughter will have completed 2 years at Musselburgh Grammar and will be transferred to the new school. I fully support the new school and would love my daughter to attend however I am really concerned about the impact this will have on her education particularly as she will be entering into a crucial educational year and the unsettling nature of a move to a new school could have a detrimental effect on her education and future career.

I would ask that consideration is given to keeping the current P5 classes at Musselburgh Grammar for the cycle of their education to avoid unnecessary disruption to the children's education at a critical time.

I have multiple issues if the proposal for a second high school is not actioned.

My main concern is that my child's excellent start at an academic level will be muted in a school of the size required to house 2550 students resulting in poor qualifications and behavioural issues.

I also have no desire to see my child commute across a busy town like Musselburgh in order to get to school.

Finally and let's not lie to ourselves about the reality. People are lazy and a school that size would be a neighbour from hell. Even at your smallest school the parent council meeting is dominated by parking issues and concerns from residents. Lets not forget Qmu also proposed resident parking restrictions because of an ill thought out policy based on a desire rather than real life.

I don't believe that a super-sized school is a good idea for the children. My experience is that smaller schools achieve more and discipline is better because staff can know the names of all children.

Regarding 48. There is a concern that the existing Community Centre in Wallyford will suffer as the new primary school and now new Academy school begin to offer learning and social activities which will take away from the Community Centre. How will the Community Centre be part of this process? Also, regarding 48, there is the current policy to not allow external partners to use school facilities outside of core school hours from Facilities management within East Lothian Council. It would be good to be able to get a 'let' of current schools and not have to wait for the revision of current facilities policies that will need to be put into place to meet the aspirations of the model that is being proposed. Apart from the above statements, it is terrific to see the thought that has gone into this document in a difficult transition, and it is exciting to see investment being made into an area which has been overlooked for a long time such as Wallyford, for any upgrades and upkeep. As a member of this community, I value the effort that will be made to give the children of this area and farther afield a first class educational provision.

\*I did not agree with the previous proposal for a super-sized school outside of the centre of Musselburgh (the size of the school was unprecedented)

\*I feel that Musselburgh has a better sense of community by having a secondary school remain in a central location

\*I do not agree that having two campuses will be divisive for the community, if a split campus is managed well it can provide opportunities for all pupils in the area

\*I feel that children who can currently walk to a school in their locality, should not be made to then need to be transported (mainly by car) to a school outside the area, thus causing extra traffic through an already congested town. The proposed site of the new school appears to provide the opportunity to the children in that catchment to also walk to school

\*I feel that two smaller, more intimate schools will provide better support for students (especially in S1, S2)

The east didside of Musselburgh is an established area of social and economic deprivation and having one school to serve that area will mean a loss of diversity and aspiration.

## COMMENT

I prefer the option of an annexe to the existing Grammar so it is primarily one school with perhaps S1-S3 in one building with S4-S6 in the other. I do not like the "rivalry" threat that would occur in there being 2 distinctly different schools. The new school would be in the more deprived area of Musselburgh and it also concerns me that when you look at this area there are poorer pass rates along with poorer attendance and I feel that the children who do aspire to achieve will suffer due to the higher rates and probable concentration on the less-able children. I attended a High School and was in the annexe building (original Victorian building) for S1 and S2 before transferring up to the main building in S3-S6. There were no issues with this format whatsoever. Also, I understand the lack of large spaces in central locations but I feel that the infrastructure is not in place and this would need to be properly addressed. I've heard the conversations of developing the pathway up behind Pinkie Terrace but in Winter this path would be dark and would not feel safe. I certainly wouldn't want my daughter to walk/cycle down there on her own.

I feel that the Education Department have dismissed the Annexe option without properly investigating this. It has worked well in lots of schools. In fact, it would be less of a daunting prospect for a P7 transferring from Primary to Secondary knowing that it was not the whole school. I know I felt like that when I went to High School. The Education spokesperson I spoke to said they could only provide this 2nd school option as that is what they can deliver but I see no reason why this would be the case. If a teacher needed the variation of teaching all years then they can take a year about like they do in Primary School. They can teach S1-S3 one year and then transfer to S4-S6 the following year. This appeared to be the only reason why this option was not preferred from the Education Department point of view. I also feel quite strongly about the division of the "poor" and "rich" area split and this concerns me greatly particularly as I said before with the hard-working children potentially not fulfilling their potential at the "poor" school as the focus would be the attainment/attendance of the children who are not interested in school. Leaving it as one school would mean a wide range of levels of skills.

The rivalry which would have the opportunity to exist with 2 schools. Which I believe was a valid reason that a second school was not built in Dunbar which of course has 1 school 2 campuses. If this was part of the decision making process in Dunbar for a primary school then it should be given very serious consideration for high school age pupils in Musselburgh.

Having 2 schools would split the community.

Although none of the three proposals are perfect this is the one that suits me and my family best. If two schools (splitting between S1-S3 and S4-S6) could have been incorporated into the area the current school is in, that would have been my preferred option. As this clearly isn't viable, a new school with a new catchment area is the next best option.

I still support the previous proposal of one site for S1 to S3 and another for S4 to S6. Two separate schools will create unhealthy rivalry and will cause trouble in the area. Also the pupils at the new build school will have a massive advantage with brand new facilities. Two separate campuses will allow all pupils to have the benefits of a new school and facilities.

I feel extending the existing school building would be a much better option for all

I think it is not a bad idea but I think they should just build a bigger school instead of splitting everyone up and moving them to an other school and splitting them up with there friends



## COMMENT

I am in favour of one school. I do not want our community to be split and do not want the existing school to become a second class educational establishment as it will not have the technology, space or facilities that a new school has. We have had no indication that any investment would be made to bring the Grammar school in line with a new build. This could mean we could lose staff and event the head as he was taken on to run a school of up to 1700 and the Grammar could end up at 1000. I think all of our children deserve the very best and do not think this proposal would provide this. I am also not convinced by the council's argument that there will be safe routes to school for the kids from Pinkie as we have no evidence at all of this and with so many more houses there would be far more traffic and danger on the roads. Wallyford and Whitecraig Community Councils have not been informed about this for the full consultation time - the bare minimum possible - and have had just over four weeks to look at this. This is massive for their community and they should have had the full consultation period if not more.

I believe this has been a flawed consultation and we have not been given proper facts and figures to justify the council's preferred option. I would like to see the one school option, which I think should be a well managed large school with better facilities and community links. I do not think the council has put up proper economic or educational arguments to support this proposal, and feel we have been railroaded into a quick decision in order to get the Local Development Plan through. This is not the best solution for our community, particular that of Pinkie. This consultation was based upon the council's flawed pre-consultation, which was based on 261 responses, only 174 from parents. ELC has been disingenuous with its information and based too much weight on a pre consultation with so few responses.

I also worry about the lack of investment in our existing school and whether this would become a second class educational establishment at the side of a new school with updated facilities and technology. We have had no reassurances that this will not happen and simply been told the best resources are teachers. This may be true, but teachers also need resources to work with. We needed more accurate information about the three options originally proposed, more honesty and openness from the council and a longer time period for proper consultation. The council has box ticked and provided the bare minimum. People have asked for financial information and what was eventually given was basic and couldn't be believed. For example we were told that a smaller school would cost £35m and a larger one will cost £70m, with nothing taken into account for economies of scale. Many in our community have said time and time again that it this was a done deal, and nothing has been done to make people feel otherwise.

I cannot see how a new effective school will be developed against the current timelines. The pupils attending the new school will be at a severe disadvantage.

It will take years to establish a school, ethos, staff, curriculum, faculties etc. Currently a range of the pupils in Musselburgh will be a 5-10 min walk from the Grammar. They will now have to make their way up to the far end of Wallyford. Very worried about how the school will be staffed. There are not huge numbers of teachers at present, especially in certain key subjects.

Please take into consideration the timescale for building the new school. The pupils of Wallyford have already suffered many delays on their school being built as a result of building too many houses. The school is now overcrowded and my concern is that the Grammar will suffer the same problem as it will be oversubscribed by 2020. The new school won't be by it by then and my younger children will be in their senior years doing exams. I do not want their education to suffer in any way. I feel the kids in their year already have suffered as a result of a failure to build a new school sooner. Also the facilities at the current Grammar school need to be sorted out and made more like a

COMMENT
21st century school.
The timing of the high school build along with the new wallyford primary build will result in some pupils education bring incredibly disrupted.
Local traffic issues a huge problem with a great influx from outside only causing lateness and further pressure on road network
Difficult to comment on the size of the proposed school and the curriculum given that no details of this are made in the consultation document. However much further consideration must be given to the transport/access issues to the proposed new school. As it currently stands, there are no direct buses which travel along Pinkie Road to the new school. It would have been more helpful if some more work had been done on the safe routes to school assessment in time for the consultation events, rather than 'consideration will be given'. The proposed new site for the school is at least a 30 mins walk from the west side of the Pinkie catchment area and while I am all for children walking to school, parents will need to know that this is safe.
<p>I find it difficult to get around Wallyford on foot as well as travelling by car and getting out of my street and since the tail back in Wallyford is horrendous, I am occasionally late for different events or can be sitting in traffic a lot longer than I should be for a small town/village..</p> <p>It's a health and safety hazard and since there is only one set of pedestrian crossing lights in Wallyford I am highly concerned as to what precautions will be taken to ensure the safety of pedestrians and drivers with the building of a new school.</p> <p>Although, I do believe that offering the children of the area a chance to work in a more familiar area is a good idea which will increase success rates.</p> <p>My only issues are travel and the safety of others.</p>
<p>I am concerned about where exactly the school is going to be because half way up the tranent road is too far and that road is extremely busy. It is not safe for children to be going up and down past the round-about twice a day and possibly at lunch times as well.</p> <p>Also the Grammar is close to many nature areas like lewisvale and the esk where I can remember I was taken as a child during lessons - what exactly will be on offer in the locale of Kinwegar Recycling Centre &amp; Waste Transfer Station.....</p> <p>The two schools will not be equal.</p>
Where would pupils go for lunch in new school.
I don't really care
do not do it !!!!!
As a relative newcomer to the area, my preference for a separate school is purely about the educational opportunities that will be available to my children.
Does it really matter.
<p>Given likely objections, the number of new homes proposed after examination of the local plan may well be a lot less than envisaged in this document with significant impact on the secondary school provision needed.</p> <p>There are advantages of option B, especially if housing numbers are reduced, that have not been properly considered or weighed against the stated disadvantages (relationship with the town, avoidance of competition, economies of scale in management and facilities).</p>

## COMMENT

A new secondary school presumably needs a critical mass of pupils to function effectively. I fear that rather than legitimate planning considerations this will dictate the number of new homes. New secondary provision should be based on housing numbers, not the other way round. I see the process here as 'cart before the horse' or 'tail wagging the dog'. It is premature since we do not know what the housing numbers will be. A reduced number of new homes - which may be the case given the unrealistic nature of the current proposals - will need a different approach to secondary provision (possibly option B) and a further readjustment of catchment areas.

Other concerns:

1. Where will the pupils at the new school get their lunches? The small district centre proposed certainly will not cope. There will be mayhem.
2. How many from the Pinkie St Peter's catchment will realistically be able to walk to school?
3. There is no reference in the document to possible joint arrangements with Midlothian which were referred to in the Main Issues Report. For pupils living in new housing at Craighall this would make sense and reduce pressure on the Grammar School.
4. What will the new school be called in order to maintain a connection to the town?

This will be hugely detrimental to Musselburgh as a community. It is likely to create a 'magnet' and a 'sunk' school based largely on the socio-economic divide of the respective catchment areas.

Musselburgh would benefit more from a unitary all-through comprehensive school. Initially a separate junior/senior facility could be built at Pinkie on the school playing fields with the possibility of an enlarged school being grafted on when money allows.

Why should a child who lives in Tranent with a secondary school within walking distance go to a school which can't be walked to and would require public transport (school bus)?

The present Grammar School serving the present schools will Wallyford school change any of the catchment areas and if so will parents have the opportunity to view concerns if need be.

Strongly support proposal for 2nd secondary school located in Wallyford for all the reason set out in the Consultation document (Educational, safety, community cohesion, encouraging healthier lifestyles, transport issues). I am especially supportive of proposals for facilities for other users living in the area.

Not really anywhere else in Musselburgh to locate a large building though transport is an issue and infrastructure.

My main concern is the infrastructure and how the new building will affect the traffic through the area. Also the distance for Pinkie children to travel each day and on very busy roads.

I feel a super school would mean that children would be lost in the great numbers. A school at Wallyford for all children would be difficult for transportation, congestion, walk to school and safety. It would also be disastrous to the High Street if there were no children at lunchtime/after school and taking children away from the heart of the community.

better than 1 big school with less of community feel  
concerns about how both schools will be impacted by this

Concerned about the effect of new secondary school will have on existing grammar school eg will all East Lothian education funding be 'used up' by creating new school so grammar will suffer? How is this to be stopped. Will all stronger teaching staff move to new school with the better facilities.

Safe travel to school is essential

I strongly agree with the new school and believe a new, medium-sized secondary school is best for Musselburgh.

I'm concerned that the transition will be smooth - with a clear date confirmed well in advance.

This option was the chosen proposal to turn it down would cause a problem for school provision in the area as the projected role will outstrip existing provision in 2020.

## COMMENT

The main reason for supporting the proposal is that I feel a 'super-school' would be too large - all pupils would be on same campus but how integrated would they feel?

Other comments on consultation brochure -

frequent mention of cycle provision to chosen site. The cycle lanes available are on fairly busy roads - I would not let a child cycle on these. Can separate cycle lanes be provided? What about within the new development?

from Pinkie/Wimpey only ways to new development are across railway bridge or by Haddington Road

educational opportunities at new secondary are pushed. Should these not be happening at all schools in the cluster. There is still talk of cross curricular access between new school and the Grammar but how realistic is this? The schools would be well over a mile apart. Have transport links needed to achieve this been considered?

In additions to these comments I would like to give feedback on the process. I don't doubt that the statutory requirements for the planning process have been carried out but I feel the planners and elected members should reflect on how good this process actually is at gathering the views of the community. Comments at the public meeting suggest that a lot of people feel excluded from the "pre-consultation". I think the Council would have had more people on board if it had carried out more of a consultation at an earlier stage - and involved the community not just in the school provision and it's location but in the whole 'greater Wallyford' development - what sort of housing and other facilities are planned for there

- the whole thing has a feeling of being rushed through

- as far as the location goes, it seems a shame that we are loosing some agricultural land /(ex?) Green Belt

- finally I sometimes attend MGS Parent Council meetings. I was really unimpressed that letters/emails for information on the proposals were not replied to. No wonder people got the impression that the process was not open and transparent.

## **Appendix 4 – Written responses from individuals and groups**

### **Individual Representation 1:**

I am responding to your consultation on a new secondary school at Wallyford.

I do not consider this to be a true consultation exercise. The Council is presenting its plans for the future of secondary education in the Musselburgh cluster as a 'fait accompli'. The questionnaire asks whether the respondent agrees with the proposal and asks for reasons for their decision. The Council is quite clear that all other options have been ruled out, which will deter people from taking part.

I no longer have a child in education but my future grandchildren will be attending school in Musselburgh, and my great-nieces and nephews attend primary schools in Musselburgh, the youngest about to start and the oldest about to go into Primary 7.

I believe that schools should be the heart of the community. Because Musselburgh, Wallyford and Whitecraig have grown considerably in the past few years and will see even more growth in the future, it is right that primary schools should be developed to cope with the influx of increasing numbers, especially in Wallyford where the current primary school is inadequate.

However, a secondary school, taking in students from each primary school should be in the centre of the town, at the heart of the community. I have spoken to several children currently attending Musselburgh Grammar and they want one school serving the whole cluster. To be fair, some of them were not all that bothered where the school was sited so long as they attended the same school. Others expressed concern that in Wallyford, there was nowhere to go and nothing for them to do at lunchtimes. At present they can leave the Grammar at lunchtime, take up any one of several options for lunch and return in time for their classes in the afternoon. Teenagers hanging about with nothing to do and nowhere to go, will become discontented and bored.

Two separate schools within one community is a recipe for disaster. Regardless of efforts to the contrary, a real or perceived rivalry will emerge between the schools which will last for generations. It will also create competition between parents who will regard a second, newer school as "better" than the existing facilities and try to have their children placed there regardless of their catchment area.

As someone who was bussed to Dalkeith St David's and witnessed fights - running battles with students from Dalkeith High School, I do not understand why any Council would deliberately choose to create an environment which will foster such rivalry. Sadly it is inevitable should these proposals go ahead, despite parents', teachers' and the police' best efforts.

My {child} loved Musselburgh Grammar, met pupils from other schools within the Musselburgh cluster and made friends with children from Pinkie, Wallyford and Whitecraig whom {they} might otherwise not have met, which enriched {their} secondary school

experience. I am sure the mix of students helped the majority of children and that many of these friendships still exist.

The Council's proposals actually narrow the student experience instead of broadening their horizons which is what I, as a parent would expect from secondary education.

Regardless of the future of secondary schooling, a review of primary school catchment areas in Musselburgh and Wallyford is long overdue but that such a review should be carried out for a couple of schools in isolation from the rest of the town is wholly wrong. Catchment areas overlap at their borders and it is not uncommon for a child who should go to Pinkie, say, attends the Burgh or vice versa, and that kind of flexibility is important for families. A review of Pinkie Primary School's catchment impacts on Wallyford and the Burgh schools' catchment boundaries and has a knock-on effect on Campie and Stoneyhill.

The Council owns land at the former Tesco/Wireworks site and could build another educational facility on that site which lies across a cul-de-sac from the current Musselburgh Grammar School. The enlarged school would effectively be in one location albeit on 2 separate sites. Whether one should be a senior secondary school only, is for the educational experts to consider. This seems to me to be the most practical solution for the students, their education and for the community as a whole.

Also since this 'consultation' started, First Bus has announced it will be closing its Musselburgh Depot. This presents an opportunity for development which could be used to alleviate the problem of finding a suitable location for a "one-school" solution.

## Individual Representation 2:

One school vs two

Unfortunately I am unable to attend the meeting this afternoon (6/6/16) so I am jotting a few thoughts here.

This is the first opportunity individual staff have been given to comment on this which seems quite far down the road as, according to some reports, the decision to build 2 schools has already been made.

It has been made clear {redacted as view attributed to a third party} would like one big school. The only reason given so far is that 2 schools would divide the community. I find this statement quite closed and divisive and not helpful in fostering open discussion {redacted as may be identifying information}.

As educators it is our job to ensure young people develop a sense of tolerance, an acceptance of difference and change so as they can learn to live in harmony with others throughout their lives and cope with the ever changing nature of life. The idea is that this approach runs through every aspect of our education while we are at school and is fundamental to some of the main principles that inform our practice as teachers.

Yet here we are saying that a community, with a reputation for being close and caring, is unable to accommodate a new school in their midst for fear it might create some kind of a divide and disharmony. This does not seem to add up and smacks just a bit of scaremongering.

I am not from Musselburgh but if I was I would be highly insulted by this assertion .

We in education at every level should be re-assuring parents and others in the community that a new school, whatever its size, will enrich the lives of all rather than create difficulties.

It will offer opportunities for inter-school partnerships and sharing of knowledge, skills, resources, facilities, ideas, initiatives, training and more. Managed well and with vision it could showcase how communities can work well together in accepting significant growth in their population.

So rather than encouraging fears by suggesting a second school will divide Musselburgh the community would be better served by looking for ways to ensure this process is carried out with the best interests of all the people of Musselburgh, both present and future, at its core.

This is the basis from which we must move forwards .

The debate about school size is very complex and once again may be used to serve the interests of the few rather than the many.

From my own personal experience the idea of a school of 2500 pupils throws up so many worries that I feel it would be a huge gamble. A school of 1200 pupils has the advantages associated with a large school without the many problems associated with super schools and I see no reasonable arguments to suggest a super school can improve on this. There are however many arguments against super schools which are well documented and good super-schools are the exception rather than the rule.

I personally hope for the two school option and a future where young people feel part of and cared for as individuals in their school community. This is just not viable in a super school.

Thanks



### **Individual Representation 3:**

#### **Response to East Lothian Council's Musselburgh School Consultation**

We are parents in the Pinkie St Pater's catchment area, with children in the key years which will be most affected by the proposal. We understand the need for additional secondary provision in the Musselburgh area and strongly support the decision to build an additional school given the pupil numbers involved - one very large school would have been far too big for many pupils to flourish or receive an individual education.

We understand why the proposed site has been chosen and are content with it, although we have two main concerns:

#### **Safe routes to school**

It is disappointing not to see full details of how safe walking routes will be provided for pupils from the different parts of Pinkie's catchment. In particular, we are concerned that:

- the proposed walking route up 'the Drift' is unfamiliar and at present completely inappropriate. To make it appropriate for pupils to feel safe on it at all times of year will require it to be made a broad, brightly lit path that is also well used by adults from the community:
- Haddington Road - the obvious route for all pupils in the Ravensheugh area, is a fast key transport route into Musselburgh. If pupils are to use it to walk to school - and it would be very hard to dissuade them from the shortest route - it will require proper pedestrian crossings with lights, wider, full pavements on both sides of the road and a reduction in the speed limit to 30mph. This could cause traffic problems.

#### **Transition to the new school**

We understand, and broadly support, the proposal to start the new school with 3 years of pupils. However, it is essential that:

- There is at least 12 months notice of the new school opening date - if it slips from August 2020. It will be very unsettling for pupils and their families not to be sure whether they will complete their education at Musselburgh Grammar School (MGS), if they will go directly to the new school, or if they will start at one school and move to another.
- The new school opens at the beginning of an academic year. A mid-year transition from MGS would be highly disruptive to all the pupils involved and is very different from mid-year transition of all pupils from an old building to a new one. Reforming classes, friendship groups and changing teachers mid-year would undoubtedly affect academic process and well-being and must be avoided.
- A full range of subject choices, in S3 through to S6, in line with those that will be available to later years are provided to the first few years in the new school

irrespective of the fact that those first few years will have fewer pupils as the new housing is still being occupied and while some potential pupils choose to remain at MGS through placing requests or siblings.

- Placing requests to MGS should be viewed sympathetically and with flexibility in the first few years as some individual pupils will have good cases to continue there without the disruption of a move and this was the school which all parents reasonably expected their children to attend and this may have influenced their choice of non-catchment primary school.

#### Further comments

We hope that the new school can include good community facilities to be shared with the school. In particular, good sports facilities including a swimming pool and sports halls to reflect the pressure on Musselburgh Sports Centre (which will not have the capacity to serve the new housing) and reducing the pressure of traffic going into Musselburgh for these. A community library would also be of great benefit.

The new school should have sufficient dining space for all pupils to eat in the school and every effort made to avoid opportunities or a culture of leaving the school for fast food at lunchtime. Please look at innovative approaches taken in other schools in Scotland to offer a wide variety of flexible food options to help pupils make healthy choices among a population where that is desperately needed.

There should be co-timetabling between the new school and MGS to allow a wider choice of subjects for all pupils in the area in their senior phase, and promote links between the two schools and their pupils.

There should be wide opportunities for parents to be involved in and kept informed as the plans for the new school are developed.

Yours sincerely

#### **Individual Representation 4:**

To whom it may concern,

My name is {individual identified}, and I am a potential future parent that will (going on the information provided at the public meeting held at the Brunton Hall last night) - any future children I may have would fall into the catchment area for the proposed second high school in Wallyford.

A few people in attendance at last night's meeting expressed concerns about the catchment split if the proposed second high school is given the go ahead.

As someone who grew up in the Wimpey/Wallyford area as a child, and in the Fisherrow area as a teenager - attending both Pinkie St Peters and Musselburgh Grammar School as a pupil, I would add that these concerns are not without basis.

I was a pupil at Musselburgh Grammar School when gang fights between Wimpey, Pinkie and Fisherrow/Stoneybank were a serious school issue about 2 or 3 times per academic term during my time as a pupil at Musselburgh Grammar School between {years}. One of the common instigators of these gang fights was when the amusements/fair came to the racecourse by Levenhall - and youths from these areas would congregate and fight. I can also say that I was a pupil at Musselburgh Grammar School when this issue made the national papers (although it was perhaps blown out of proportion by some of the media - for me this was just the norm as far as being a pupil at Musselburgh Grammar School went during my time as a pupil) :-

"In June 1999 Musselburgh Grammar School was criticised following a Care and Welfare Inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education. The report referred to having witnessed a battle between rival gangs in the school entrance area and that a third of pupil's surveyed feared for their own safety. It also mentioned general weaknesses in safety, security, care and welfare; although the staff are praised for their efforts in the face of serious challenges. This led to a media furore with some newspapers describing the school as 'the worst school in Scotland'."

The problem as far as I see it with having 2 high schools is that you are immediately stoking a split/rivalry that on the evidence of previous incidents - is already there, and has already caused problems in the town. Couple that with the fact that you are basically splitting the "better" parts of the town from some of the more "deprived" areas of the town within the proposed geographical split - I can only envisage that this will intensify that rivalry. As much as I wish it would - I really don't think a "joint school badge" as suggested by one of the members of the panel at last night's meeting will help address this issue.

I genuinely think 2 high schools will cause serious problems along the lines that I have mentioned as others also expressed last night - it has to be 1 new high school as far as I'm concerned if these tribal issues that exist within our community are to be eventually alleviated. I'm genuinely disappointed I didn't know anything about the "2 High Schools Proposal" until it had pretty much already been decided.

As someone who has lived in Musselburgh all my life {age}, I am pretty sure that Lewisvale Park and the fields at Inveresk/Wallyford will host some of the worst fighting the town has witnessed if the 2 high schools proposal goes ahead - between rival gangs from the Eastside & Westside of Musselburgh that this proposal will help to formalise.

From what I heard last night - it sounds like the 2 high schools proposal has already been decided and last night's meeting was simply a tickbox exercise as far as progressing this proposal is concerned. I am genuinely worried about the kind of problems this will cause in our community in the future if this proposal goes ahead.

Yours sincerely

## Group representation 1: Campie Primary Parent Council

### East Lothian Council Consultation on the Proposed New Additional Secondary Education Provision in the Musselburgh Area – Campie Primary School Parent Council Response

Dear Councillors,

As both Parent Council representatives and individual parents/carers within the Musselburgh area we have actively participated in the information sessions and public meetings hosted by East Lothian Council throughout the consultation period.

Following open discussion at our recent Parent Council meeting (1<sup>st</sup> June 2016) we established that our members have varied opinions on the validity and suitability of the proposal to build an additional S1-S6 secondary school in Wallyford. Approximately 50% of our members agree with the proposed option for the additional secondary education provision, while the other 50% would prefer a 'super school' to accommodate all pupils within the Musselburgh area. However, while we do not concur regarding the suitability of the proposed secondary education provision, we do share the same general concerns and questions surrounding the matter.

Our concerns related to the current East Lothian Council preferred option for the additional secondary education provision in the Musselburgh area are outlined herein and we trust that they will be given due consideration by East Lothian Council prior to finalising the plans.

#### 1. Current and Future Provisions at Musselburgh Grammar School

The proposal for providing an additional secondary school based in the Wallyford area does not mention any plans for upgrading the current provision at Musselburgh Grammar School. This has raised concerns that the provision of educational facilities at MGS will not be equal to those on offer at the new facility. Our Parent Council members would like reassurance that MGS will secure investment from East Lothian Council, beyond basic maintenance costs, to ensure both schools are of a comparable standard in every sense. While we understand that the teacher and learners are the best resource in any classroom, the physical resources and setting will impact the ethos and quality of learning that takes place.

In a report released by East Lothian Council in February 2016 (An Assessment of Potential Sites for Future Secondary School Facilities in Musselburgh Following Pre-Consultation Feedback) there are several references to a site designed for '21<sup>st</sup> Century education' and new learning spaces '*allowing innovative ways of learning and teaching to be undertaken*'. While these comments are intended to be positive, they highlight a probable discrepancy between what is expected to be on offer at the new school in comparison to the current secondary education provision for the Musselburgh area. Without a plan for investment in Musselburgh Grammar School

alongside the development of the new school it seems there will be a notable inequality in educational facilities between the two sites.

## 2. Community Division

Within the Musselburgh area there is a strong sense of community. This has been nurtured through the collegiate approach to education demonstrated by the cluster schools and by maintaining key relationships with supporting agencies such as Police Scotland. This has been achieved while also introducing elements of healthy competition between the primary schools in the area. There are concerns that the provision of two separate secondary schools will have a detrimental effect on community links by dividing the community, resulting in a range of social issues and unhealthy rivalry. The splitting of the Musselburgh area into new catchment areas for the two proposed secondary schools also places a higher concentration of children from areas of deprivation into one school catchment, at the risk of further community division while potentially resulting in a widening attainment gap between the two schools.

Our Parent Council members would like more information regarding how East Lothian Council proposes to minimise the impact on our community and ensure strong links are in place between the two schools and with local support agencies to prevent the types of issues outlined above occurring.

## 3. Catchment Areas

With regards to the school catchment areas, we have questions about the impact of the proposed new secondary school on children currently attending an out of catchment primary school. Several children currently attending Campie Primary School would fall outside the Musselburgh Grammar School catchment area therefore potentially leading to the splitting of friendship groups when making the transition to secondary school. More information is required on how out of catchment placement requests would be handled, as this is an area of concern for many parents/carers. Further to this, our Parent Council members question whether the proposed catchment areas could be revised to allow all schools within the Musselburgh town border to attend Musselburgh Grammar School, and all outlying towns (e.g. Wallyford, Whitecraig) to attend the proposed new school, thus reducing travelling distances to and from school and minimising the impact on individual school communities.

## 4. Staff Retention and Recruitment

The introduction of a new secondary school in the Musselburgh area will require a large scale recruitment programme. Several of our members are concerned about the impact this may have on current staffing levels and continuity of provision at Musselburgh Grammar School, as many teaching staff may prefer to work within a newly built and better equipped facility.

Also, given the recent national issues surrounding recruitment of teachers there is a genuine concern about whether adequate numbers and quality of staff to support an additional secondary school in the area could be recruited.

#### 5. Safe Routes to School

While there is an understanding that providing two secondary schools could reduce the traffic congestion in Musselburgh town centre, we do not believe there is sufficient information currently publicly available regarding the provision of safe routes to school. Given the proposed site of the new school and the feeder schools located in the catchment area there do not appear to be sufficient routes currently in place to allow safe access for all pupils. The location of the new school site in relation to the Pinkie catchment area would drastically reduce the number of pupils able to walk and/or cycle to school from this location. At the recent public meeting (30<sup>th</sup> May 2016) it was unclear whether East Lothian Council had factored the cost of infrastructure for providing safe routes to school into their financial plans for the proposal. It is imperative that safe routes to school are considered for all pupils and that walking and cycle paths are provided where possible. Our Parent Council members request that a clear plan for the delivery of safe routes to school be shared publicly prior to finalising the plans for the additional secondary education provision in the Musselburgh area.

#### 6. Financial Transparency

While our Parent Council views the quality of the learning environment as the most important aspect of this decision making process, the financial implications of the final option will have a lasting impact on future school budgets and expenditure. Throughout the consultation process there has not been transparency from East Lothian Council regarding the financial information pertaining to the proposed new secondary education provision. In order to make a fully informed decision about whether the proposed option is optimal this information should be shared. The costs associated with all three school options should be outlined including; details of estimated land values and build costs, infrastructure costs for safe routes to school, ongoing maintenance and utilities costs and expected staffing expenditure.

#### 7. Pre-Consultation Exercise

The information gathered during the pre-consultation exercise undertaken by East Lothian Council in June 2015 appears to have been used to determine the council's preferred option to take forward into the formal consultation diet. During the pre-consultation, information on the three options under consideration was limited and the questions presented in the questionnaire were emotive and biased. Given the unsuitable timing of the pre-consultation and the low number of respondents, this raises concerns regarding the validity of the data collected.

Our Parent Council members would like more clarity regarding how East Lothian Council agreed on their preferred option and how the pre-consultation data contributed to the decision making process.

Many thanks for affording us the opportunity to lodge a formal response to the proposed plans for the additional secondary education provision in the Musselburgh area. We trust that our concerns will be given due attention and welcome any feedback you can provide.

Yours sincerely,

Chairperson  
(On behalf of Campie Primary School Parent Council)



## **Group representation 2: Musselburgh Grammar Parent Council**

East Lothian Council's consultation on the new additional secondary education provision in the Musselburgh area

Dear Fellow Parent Councils,

At our Parent Council meeting held on Thursday 2nd June, a discussion was conducted regarding the Parent Council's formal response to 'the proposal to establish a new secondary school in Wallyford that will serve the Pinkie St Peter's and proposed revised Wallyford catchment areas'. At the end of the discussion we held a vote and MGS Parent Council unanimously voted to 'strongly disagree' with the proposal. Below, we outline our reasons for this and what we feel should now happen.

In our opinion, East Lothian Council (ELC) has failed to run an open and honest consultation process and has not provided sufficient information in a timely manner to give full confidence that the proposal is sound and is the best option for future generations of Musselburgh (including Wallyford and Whitecraig) children and for the community as a whole.

We feel that ELC has not been honest and open in its approach to the whole issue of secondary education options in Musselburgh and should be running a longer consultation in order to fully engage with the public, provide people with all of the facts and figures relating to the options and therefore a genuine opportunity to make up their own minds.

We have serious misgivings about the validity of the consultation process, especially given the magnitude of the decisions to be made and the long-term effects these will have on education and the community in and around Musselburgh. Given the length of time ELC has known that a public consultation is required, it has not conducted a proper and full consultation process in a timely manner, one where the appropriate consultees and the general public should have been given the full facts and figures to enable them to form their own views on this important decision.

Instead, it would appear that a last minute, rushed and flawed consultation process has been undertaken, one which is aimed at ticking the required statutory boxes to the minimum level.

Following the publication of and consultation on ELC's 'Main Issue Report' prior to the summer of 2015, Musselburgh Grammar School Parent Council (MGS PC) has asked for information regarding additional education provision. Between November 2015 and April 2016, emails and contacts on this matter received no feedback. Following complaints about the lack of responses, a verbal apology was given by Alex McCrorie, ELC Depute Chief Executive. A meeting was arranged for April 13th 2016 between all Musselburgh schools Parent Councils and ELC officials, we believed on the basis of providing information. However, many questions were not answered on the basis that the Council meeting on the matter was being held on 26th April and certain information could not be divulged prior to this. Only after this date was the consultation exercise announced, to be completed in the

statutory minimum period of 6 weeks. When asked about why the consultation period was only going to be 6 weeks, Fiona Robertson, ELC Head of Education stated that 'this is the consultation period required'.

ELC ran a pre-consultation exercise just before the end of the school summer term in 2015. This was poorly timed and yielded a very small sample of respondents - totalling 261, only a proportion of which were from parents. Despite 261 respondents not constituting anything like a representative sample, coupled with the fact that a pre-consultation exercise is not a statutory requirement of a full consultation, ELC has utilised the findings of the pre-consultation to support their preferred option, consistently citing percentages rather than number of respondents and therefore potentially misleading readers.

The questions in the pre-consultation were also emotive and biased. We believe it was a fundamentally flawed exercise in terms of its construction, timing and the number of respondents. Our concern is that use of the results from this flawed device, which is not a statutory requirement, has prejudiced the consultation process.

We were alarmed when we saw a report on the ELC website in February 2016 entitled 'An Assessment of Potential Sites For Future Secondary School Facilities in Musselburgh Following Pre-Consultation Feedback'. This report contained opinions which were not based on fact and was derogatory about the existing MGS, using false and inflammatory comments to justify ELC's view. Although this report was withdrawn from the website following complaints, it was seen by members of the public and again made use of percentages from the very small sample of respondents to the pre-consultation exercise.

It has been noted that Wallyford and Whitecraig Community Councils have been omitted from the list of statutory consultees in ELC's Consultation document and indeed were not formally consulted properly. This constitutes a breach of process.

There has been a lack of clarity surrounding the financial analysis to support ELC's preferred proposal. Financial analysis information was requested at the cluster Parent Councils meeting on 16th May. A further request for this was made by MGS Parent Council prior to the public meeting on 30th May as the information had not been made available. Financial information was presented verbally at the public meeting but raised further questions and concerns about the integrity and validity of such information:

- ELC officials admitted that the cost of infrastructure to ensure safe routes to school had not been included in the information presented.
- No teaching staff savings were included in the comparison of a single school solution versus the additional school proposal.
- The location of the single school used in the financial comparison was not stated - this must have a bearing on the cost.
- An increase in property maintenance of £200,000 was cited for the single school option versus the additional school proposal. No explanation of this was provided.
- A figure of £65m capital cost for the single school option was quoted - this is £30m more than the cost of the proposed second school and raises questions about why no economies of scale can be achieved.

- ELC officials admitted that no account had been taken of the value of the land on which existing the MGS stands.

Given that ELC's original preferred option was for a single secondary school on the Goshen Farm site until this site was excluded from the Local Development Plan following a decision by Councillors late in November 2015, it is difficult to understand the financial case presented now by ELC which appears to justify the additional school option.

The questionnaire deployed by ELC in the consultation also raises the following concerns.

- There is no verification of respondents. Surely here should be some verification of entitlement to submit a response and to ensure that multiple responses from the same person, eligible or otherwise, cannot be submitted? How can the information from the questionnaire be considered credible if this does not happen?
- Out of 9 questions in the questionnaire, there is only 1 pertinent to the options and this question merely asks for opinion on supporting ELC's proposal or not. No attempt is made to elicit views on the other options - it is very much a 'yes' or 'no' response - is this truly consultative?

Finally and of crucial importance to all parents and prospective parents of children who will attend the existing MGS under ELC's proposal, when questioned at the public meeting about what commitment will be made to investing in the existing MGS to ensure that Musselburgh has two secondary schools of equal standing, ELC officials were not willing to state any commitment to invest, other than maintenance expenditure. Instead, Fiona Robertson, Head of Education, asked the audience 'What is it that you want?'. Frankly, we find such a comment incredible and it does not allay our fears that, should a second school be built, the existing MGS will end up as a second-class establishment without any commitment from ELC to invest in it and ensure that educational facilities match those of the new school.

In summary, we believe that the consultation exercise has been mismanaged to the extent that it should be halted, independently investigated and re-run properly with more and complete information on the options, enabling parents and the general public to be fully informed before making a decision to support or oppose ELC's proposals.

Yours sincerely,

On behalf of Musselburgh Grammar School Parent Council

### **Group representation 3: Pinkie St. Peters Primary Parent Council**

#### **Pinkie Parents' (the Parent Council of Pinkie St Peters Primary School and Levenhall Nursery) Response to East Lothian Council's Musselburgh School Consultation**

At a special meeting held on 13 June, Pinkie Parents discussed the Council's proposal to establish a new secondary school in Wallyford to serve the Pinkie St Peters and revised Wallyford catchment areas.

Pinkie Parents has a number of significant concerns in relation to the implementation of the proposal. These are detailed below. However, as a result of a vote of those parents present at the meeting, Pinkie Parents' unanimously voted to "agree" to the proposal, with a majority voting to "strongly agree". We welcome the proposal to build a new medium-sized secondary school on this side of the Musselburgh cluster and hope that it offers a practical solution for the whole cluster and a good opportunity for those children who will attend it.

The factors that most influenced our decision, are

1. size of the proposed school
2. community facilities that would be available at the new school

Despite our strong support for the proposal, Pinkie Parents was disappointed that neither the consultation proposal nor Council officials could provide detailed answers or reassurance for some of our concerns. We would like to place the following concerns on the record. We feel that getting all of these issues right will be essential for the first cohort of pupils at the new school, and failing to do so would cause huge concern to parents.

In no particular order:

#### **Timeline to the new school**

We understand and support the proposed plan to open the new school in August 2020, and the advance notice that gives of which pupils will be affected. We are very concerned that there is a risk that the timetable may slip due to delays in relation to the approval of the Local Development Plan or the pace of house building in the area, or in the delays in the construction of the new school itself. Any change would have a significant effect on which pupils are affected and their families, who are already forming expectations of how they would be affected by the new school. We urge the Council to commit to a realistic timeline as early as possible and ensure this is achieved. We believe that it is essential for a positive and orderly transition to the new school that pupils and families have as much notice as possible of the start date for the new school and that this should be at the start of a new academic year.

#### **Pupils moving from Musselburgh Grammar School**

We are concerned that the pupils moving from Musselburgh Grammar School to form S2 and S3 at the new school (expected to be current P4 and P5 pupils) are most likely to be negatively affected by the proposal. It is important that they are supported while at MGS so that they have a positive experience there and are fully integrated into the school. It will be

vital to support and prepare them for the transition to the new school in such a way that it does not cause them stress and anxiety. Care will also need to be taken that there is no academic disadvantage due to the change. A key part of this will be a guaranteed start date for the new school (see above), but individual pupils may still find the proposed change more difficult than others and require particular support and, if necessary, to remain at MGS.

### **Leadership and teaching at the new school**

We hope that the new school will attract great teachers, but this must not be left to chance, and its newness and initial small size may work against this. It will be essential that the new school has an experienced leadership team that can work well with MGS and build the new school. The new school will also require an appropriate range of experienced subject teachers from the outset to ensure that teaching has the necessary breadth and depth from the outset. Our children only have one chance at their secondary education and well developed courses, drawing on those established at existing schools, will be essential and will require considerable preparation.

### **Subject choice at the new school**

We are concerned whether, as the initial cohorts at the new school will be smaller than at MGS and only include S4, S5 and S6 in subsequent years, there will be sufficient subject choice for pupils. It is essential that there is no narrowing of subject choice on moving to the new school, and that this is equal to that at MGS, or this will disadvantage pupils and lead to placing requests to MGS. We support co-timetabling of courses across the two schools where that offers additional opportunities to pupils, but that is not a substitute for having an adequate choice available to pupils at each school.

### **Routes to school**

We would have liked to have seen full details of what safe routes to school will be designated from different parts of the Pinkie catchment to the new school, and how these will be made safe. We are concerned about pupils walking and cycling on busy roads and junctions, and regarding the proposed footpath and rail underpass. These routes are all likely to require significant adaptation to ensure they are safe for pupils and have parents' confidence, avoiding significant car usage and the burden that places on families and its impact on traffic and the environment. We understand that work on safe routes to the school will be undertaken if the new school is agreed upon and would expect parents to be involved in agreeing those routes.

### **Musselburgh cluster**

We strongly support considering the new school as part of the same Musselburgh cluster as MGS and all the feeder primary schools of Musselburgh, Wallyford and Whitecraig. We hope the two secondary schools could work very closely together, sharing facilities and having a joint sense of identity. This would reduce the risk of rivalry developing and allow the links that exist across the community to continue and flourish.

### **Dining facilities**

We think that the new school offers an opportunity to promote healthy eating and ensure pupils do not rely on fast food in the way that so many do at MGS. It is important to the

new school has adequate dining facilities for the full pupil roll and that the opportunity is taken to promote healthy options and avoid pupils leaving the site during the school day for fast food.

Regards

Acting Chair on behalf of Pinkie Parents (Parent Council for Pinkie St Peters Primary School and Levenhall Nursery)

#### **Group representation 4: Stoneyhill Primary Parent Council**

This response has been prepared by Stoneyhill Primary School Parent Council, as a cluster primary school of Musselburgh Grammar School (MGS). Having engaged with parents at a school event, via social media and at parent council meetings, the content represents the views of all Stoneyhill Parent Council members, and is in addition to our completed consultation questionnaire. Members of the wider parent forum have been encouraged to express their views via the Council's consultation hub.

Having read the Council's consultation papers, engaged with local councillors, attended cluster parent council meetings and public meetings, and considered the implications of the Council's proposal, **our position is that we are in favour of the Council's proposal**. We have reached this view on the basis that, should the Council's proposal be implemented, it would not change the secondary school provision for Stoneyhill pupils from the current arrangements. However, in our broad support for the proposal, we seek the following assurances from both East Lothian Council and Education Scotland.

#### **Quality of Education and Educational facilities**

We are keen to ensure that there will be no disparity between the quality of education received by Musselburgh children attending the new secondary school, and those attending the existing MGS. We accept that the MGS building is subject to a PFI contract until 2035 which limits the ability to change the building, however, within that contract will be an obligation for maintenance of the building. We would like the Council to explain whether - and how far - it will be possible under the PFI contract to upgrade the MGS building to align its facilities with that of the new school, ensuring that pupils attending MGS have the same level of opportunity as those attending the new school.

And, importantly, we would like an assurance that the Council would be in a position to make such upgrades.

In addition - and irrespective of any upgrade to the MGS building - we accept that the new school will have superior facilities, and we would like the Council's assurance that MGS pupils will have the opportunity to take advantage of new facilities where the MGS facilities may fall short - for example, sports or vocational training facilities.

#### **Community Impact**

Some Parent Council members are concerned that the creation of a second secondary school in Musselburgh (i) may have a divisive effect on the community and (ii) may create tension and rivalry between pupils, with potential for anti-social behaviour and negative impact on pupil safety. In both regards we accept that change is inevitable but feel strongly that, particularly where the education of our children and young people is concerned, it must be for the better.

We would appreciate a commitment from the Council that it will actively create and pursue ways in which to mitigate against the potential for negative impact that we have identified

here, and that these would be implemented before the first pupils transition from MGS to the new school.

### **Pressure on existing school accommodation**

The Council calculates that by 2020 MGS will be unable to accommodate the number of secondary school aged children and young people living in its catchment. We would be interested to know (i) what the Council's plans are for accommodating and ensuring no disruption to pupils in the run up to the new school's completion and (ii) how the Council will manage this if the new school's build is delayed in any way.

### **Transition**

As acknowledged in our opening statement, we understand that the implementation of the Council's proposal would not change Stoneyhill pupils' catchment secondary school, however, we are concerned about potential impact on pupils for whom the change comes within their secondary school career. In particular, those pupils entering SI in 2019, who will transition into, what is likely to be a crowded school, and then have to adapt to a potentially different structure 12 months later; we are also concerned about any impact this transition period would have on pupils who will sit exams in 2019 and 2020 in a crowded school that is preparing to disperse. How will the Council manage effective transition for pupils when / if this proposed change takes place? And how will it mitigate against negative impact? We are keen to ensure that the needs of all pupils will be taken into account at this time, not just those who will be transitioning out of MGS and into completely new surroundings.

We look forward to the outcome of the Council's consultation and the ultimate decision. In the meantime we would be pleased to engage further with the Council.

Chair, Vice Chair

14 June 2016



## **Group representation 5: Wallyford Primary Parent Council**

### **Proposal for new additional secondary education provision in the Musselburgh area**

As Chairperson of the Parent Council at Wallyford Primary School I have sought to engage as many parents as I can in conversations about the proposal for a second, separate secondary school located in Wallyford. As a parent council we have communicated with parents through social media, frequent groupcalls (school text message service) and conversations. The most effective method proved to be locating ourselves in a visible position during the already established Family Fridays when parents are in the school, as well as engaging with parents waiting for children who were in school for P1 transition visits. By these two methods we have directly gathered the opinions of over 40 parents and carers. With the help of school management we have listened to concerns and answered questions on the proposal. It was apparent from some of the conversations that not everyone has filled in the online questionnaire and some people hadn't engaged too heavily with the information provided.

We asked people to indicate whether their reaction to the proposal was 'great, ok, no thanks, no way or who cares?' The great majority of people marked their response as great. A smaller minority chose 'ok' but have some concerns they would like to see officially addressed. No one who we chatted to disagreed with or had no opinion on the proposal.

We asked parents what their most significant concerns are. The most frequently occurring concern is over the details of the transition. How the transition will be managed, particularly for those children who will move from the current primary school to the new primary school then to Musselburgh Grammar and finally to the new secondary school proved to be a question shared by many parents. Some children will cope better than others with this kind of change so some parents have suggested they would like the option to keep their child at Musselburgh Grammar if they felt that was educationally and socially the best option for them. With the housing proposed in Wallyford the children of the village are going to be faced with a lot of changes. They will potentially form many new friendships as people move into the area. Naturally they will also build new friendships in their classes at Musselburgh Grammar before transitioning to the new school.

The concern is how they will be affected by the potential separation from the friends who remain at the Grammar.

Parents wanted to be assured that S4,5 and 6 will not be moved to the new school during critical exam years. Will those pupils from Wallyford who remain at Musselburgh Grammar still be entitled to a school bus pass after the new school is opened?

We asked how parents felt about their children starting a completely new school. There were a few concerns about the establishment of a new school with a completely new staff team, a new set of pupils, a new building etc. How will everything be managed to ensure minimum disruption particularly to children approaching important exam stages? How can the time for everything to settle be reduced and for expected 'hiccups' to be ironed out. How

will the ethos, vision, identity, community and values of the new school be established and how long might that process take? How will the staff team be recruited and bond as a new group?

One parent commented on the good provision for children with special needs at Musselburgh Grammar and was interested to know what that will look like at the new school?

We discussed the fear of rivalry between schools highlighted by local media and this opened an interesting conversation in one of our sessions. Some parents experienced the rivalry that existed between communities in this area in the past and the fighting that took place. While there is an understanding that this is less evident presently, there is a fear among those who remember it that the separation of schools could trigger a regression to past behaviours. There is also realisation that rivalry between schools is common and, if managed correctly, can be a healthy situation.

While most parents weren't concerned they are keen to hear plans to reduce or eliminate potential unhealthy rivalry between Musselburgh Grammar and the new school. How will the schools collaborate as well as maintain their own identity?

It would be helpful to hear the expected benefits of having the primary school and secondary school so close together. One parent noted concern over negative influence and bullying of younger children when older ones are going to school on the same routes.

Several parents are interested in what lunch facilities be like in the new secondary school? Will children leave the school premises at lunch time as they do presently from Musselburgh Grammar? Will this be anticipated in the provision of suitable places to buy cheap lunches within a safe, walking distance of the school or will the building be designed to provide suitable facilities to accommodate all children on site?

Will there be facilities in the new school to complement the facilities planned for the new primary school which will be available and suitable for providing Wallyford with excellent accommodation for local clubs and activities?

Management of heavier traffic is an ongoing concern in the village. How will the extra traffic generated by the new schools be controlled? Can safety be ensured and congestion avoided?

I hope you get a sense from this letter that we have had many interesting and engaging conversations with parents and carers from Wallyford Primary. I recognise that we haven't engaged every parent and there may be some differences in opinion or other concerns. Hopefully these will be reflected in individual questionnaires. From the sense of positivity I have heard towards the proposal my understanding is that none of the issues raised are currently considered as reasons to oppose the proposal. I believe however that in fulfilling my responsibility to forward those views to the Council our expectation would be that we will be assured that these issues are considered and addressed appropriately. We understand the need for extra secondary level provision, particularly as our village prepares

for a massive expansion and the influx of many more people. We are excited and hopeful about the potential for 21st century-ready facility. We anticipate that if managed correctly, this will bring a welcome and positive boost to our community.

Yours sincerely,

(Chair, Wallyford Parent Council)

## **Group representation 6: Musselburgh and Inveresk Community Council**

### **RESPONSE TO EAST LOTHIAN COUNCIL CONSULTATION ON SECONDARY SCHOOL PROVISION FOR MUSSELBURGH**

Community Councillors from (MICC) have been present at a number of meetings that have taken place throughout the town as part of the current consultation exercise. This has helped to inform the views that form this submission. Concerns have been expressed throughout the community about the original pre-consultation exercise.

These concerns relate to:-

- The timing of the exercise - just prior to the school term coming to an end and prior to the peak holiday period;
- The response rate - did the timing and lack of communication around the pre-consultation exercise have an impact on the response rate? The population of Musselburgh is around 21,000, the pre-consultation exercise saw 261 people respond which is 1.24% of the population;

The most important part of any community are the children and Musselburgh Grammar School has played a major role over the years in educating many generations from Wallyford, Whitecraig and Musselburgh so it would be sad to see a split developing within the community. During our attendance at meetings throughout this consultation it became apparent that there were doubts that in the event of a new school being built Musselburgh Grammar School would be left with basic maintenance.

As representatives of the community we are aware that there is a great ethos in the school at present and that many parents and indeed grandparents are upset at the prospect of a community that may perhaps become divided.

We do not underestimate the difficulty of planning the future of secondary school provision in Musselburgh against the background of an expanding population and the challenges that this brings. The current process is being widely questioned, largely due to the way the pre-consultation exercise was conducted. We would therefore ask East Lothian Council to consider starting this exercise again. As a Community Council we would be happy to assist in helping to mobilise and promote engagement with a fresh consultation process in any way we can.

Chair  
On behalf of MICC

## **Appendix 5 – Summary of questions/responses at Staff Consultation drop in sessions**

These sessions were open, drop in meetings specifically for all staff members, if they wished to attend.

### **STAFF CONSULTATION**

#### **LORETTO RC PRIMARY SCHOOL**

**15 June 2016**

**David Scott (DS) gave the background to the consultation proposals.**

**Q – If new school at Wallyford PS, potentially Loretto RC may lose some children. There are some pupils who are not RC but choose Loretto from Wallyford catchment area?**

A – Parents choose schools for a number of reasons and not always based on new school facilities, but based on ethos of school, standard of teaching and learning etc. Don't think that will be the case. Indeed, new houses in Musselburgh cluster will produce RC pupils which would be accommodated at Loretto RC. Projections will have been carried out to consider the impact of the Loretto RC school roll and its ability to cater for the RC pupils from the new housing. May require roll capping in the future to ensure the school can accommodate RC pupils – this happens in other RC schools in East Lothian.

**Q – In terms of new secondary provision, some pupils found it difficult to understand that initial intake is only S1-S3 but school will grow after opened as opposed to only being an S1-S3 school.**

**Q – Still RC journey to St David's (and not MGS), but some do not choose that route and go to MGS. Is it dependent on where they live?**

A – Yes. If live in Wallyford or Pinkie catchments, they could opt to transfer to the new secondary provision. If the other MGS catchment, they could opt for MGS.

**Q – So could have 3 way transition eg St Davids, MGS and new secondary provision at Wallyford?**

A – Yes, although both secondary schools in Musselburgh area will still be part of the Musselburgh cluster under as a Musselburgh Learning Community – so transitions may be coordinated and on same days possibly? Also planning common timetable across secondary schools in ELC and complimentary senior phase across two Musselburgh secondary schools if proposal is agreed..

**Q – staffing at new secondary school?**

A – new school and standard recruitment process. Leadership Team set up before new school in operation.

**Q –great opportunity for that S1-S3 cohort to develop in that school. Also opportunities for S3 to act as roll models when previously would not have that chance in with S4,5 & 6 in school already.**

A – Yes, and already good ideas from senior pupils at MGS in terms of roll they could play in new school.

## STAFF CONSULTATION

### MUSSELBURGH BURGH PRIMARY SCHOOL

13 June 2016

**David Scott (DS) outlined the two consultation proposals.  
Musselburgh Burgh PS catchment will still continue to feed into MGS.**

**Q – will start at MGS for S1 and S2 and then move to new secondary school if they live in Pinkie or Wallyford catchment?**

A – Yes

**Q – Can they remain at the MGS if settled?**

A – if sibling in S4,S5 & S6, they can remain if they want. If not they can make a placing request which will follow the normal process. Accept that this may present challenges for parents and pupils, so would plan to have an enhanced transition with Leadership Team in place prior to the school opening to facilitate a smooth transition.

**Q – Some pupils have asked if they could go to the new secondary school when it is open, even although they live in the MGS catchment? They may have friendships groups that will place pupils in different schools.**

A – Yes but again subject to making a placing request. We appreciate that for some parents and pupils that this may be difficult, although it is still a few years away and friendships and children will change over the period. We will try and manage transition as much as possible. Also new facilities will provide Community facilities which will be to the benefit of both Musselburgh and Wallyford communities.

**Q –Will money be spent on MGS?**

A – Already money spent on MGS annually through the PPP project. If there are areas of MGS that people feel need upgraded, please let us know. Both schools will have the facilities to deliver the curriculum.

A – new school will also be subject to usual recruitment process. Some parents felt that teachers might move from MGS to new school, although it is recognised that a number of the staff at MGS are committed to that school. New School facilities are not the biggest factor for teachers choosing a particular school.

A – Will also still have one cluster group and come under a Musselburgh Learning Community.

**Q – Events where two schools would get together eg camps for S1 to S3 – pupils have said that this would be important to them?**

A – Yes. Something for both school management teams to consider. There is an expectation that schools will work together in a number of areas. Will be a common timetable, wider course opportunities for pupils will allow for cross-over in senior phase. Develop clubs, orchestras which could be joined.

**Q – Pupils strong that they would like joint sports team?**

A – Has been raised and something to consider as it might reduce the rivalry issue. Also dual badging on the uniforms for both schools.

A – Councillors will ultimately decide, but need to find a solution. Would also have implications for the LDP.

**Q – any grounds to say no to proposal?**

A – Yes. Elected Members listen to public opinion but it is their decision.

A – Could only consult on something ELC could deliver, hence why no proposal for a super school. Split site was not considered further due to the educational disadvantages.

**Q – Tranent parents consulted?**

A – Yes. One of the parents attended the Parent Council meeting which DS and FR attended. They also have choice of Tranent schools or new Wallyford if already in catchment area. Information has been circulated in the affected schools.

**Q – Any different consideration for P1 placing requests - Pinkie catchment pupils often apply for Musselburgh Burgh PS?**

A – The usual process would apply and parents would be required to also submit placing request for MGS in S1 if still living in that catchment.

**Q – new secondary school a PPP contract?**

A – No. Traditional contract, but ELC will gather some developer's contribution towards the building of the new secondary school.

## STAFF CONSULTATION

### MUSSELBURGH GRAMMAR SCHOOL

6 June 2016

**David Scott (DS) and Fiona Robertson (FR) gave the background to the consultation proposal.**

**Q - Travel to new secondary school from Pinkie area– buses?**

A - Within the 2 mile limit – new school is within walking distance. Safe routes to school will be considered as part of the establishment of the new school.

**Q - Cost of new road crossing etc? Even external to the provision?**

A- Transportation Dept will consider what measures are required when assessing the routes to school and interventions required – costs considered within the developers contribution in the s75 agreement. Not just in relation to the school, but whole infrastructure is considered when looking at school sites.

**Q - Concerned about entrance to existing MGS – most dangerous in Scotland according to a Courier newspaper. Not safe exit for pupils. (not answered as questioner continued with additional question)**

**Q - Any thought about how many parents might look at MGS building and compare to a new school building. Currently degraded in her opinion.**

A – Parents would be able to make a placing request if they do not reside in the catchment area. Roll would be capped and reserve places as is normal practice – not determined on ‘space’ in the school. Will plan in relation to the projected pupil growth.

A – Educational outcomes for pupils are a main factor for parents, not a ‘bright, shiny’ new school.

**Q -Plan to upgrade facilities at MGS?**

A - Under a PPP contract which should mean facilities are maintained to an agreed standard over the length of the contract. At end of contract, the building should be handed back in same state. What are the deficiencies in the building – FR would like to know? Feedback so far has been in relation to 6<sup>th</sup> year areas, social areas but would welcome more information?

**Q – need to be able to provide something for senior pupils so not funnelled into cold areas where they need to stand about - doesn't promote mature behaviour.**

**Q - How will it start in new school?**

A - S1 – S3 at the effective date of August 2020 or as soon thereafter. Hosted in S1 and S2 at MGS in years prior to opening of new school which is common with other schools in Scotland. Staff in both schools will work in collaboration to ensure smooth transition. Senior management team will be in place in the months prior to the opening of school as well as key pastoral staff to be involved in the curriculum transition. New staff recruited as per normal recruitment not moved from MGS, although staff can apply for posts at new school if they wish. A specific Transitional Leadership team will be in place to support the transition to the new school. It is anticipated that staff will be in place at existing MGS during the summer term.

**Q - What if pupils have formed relationships in MGS and then move in S2 and S3?**

A - Parents will have the option to make placing requests to remain at MGS. Younger siblings of pupils attending MGS at the effective date would have the option to attend MGS if they wish.

A - Outlined in the consultations. Similar in other situations in Scotland with hosting situation.



**Q - Surplus staff?**

A - Would follow the standard ELC policy on the redeployment of surplus staff. Same as it would be for all ELC schools. Staffing will be in place for the start of the new school. Staffing in any ELC school is dependent on school roll.

**Q – There will be a situation whereby MGS will be have staffing to meet the needs of a higher roll in the years preceding the opening of the new school and then S2 and S3 pupils will leave to transfer in 2020 – what will happen to these staff as dropping MGS roll? Moved automatically to new school?**

A – Would follow the standard ELC policy on redeployment of surplus staff. MGS breaches capacity at 2020.

**Q – will new school have a Head Teacher?**

A - Yes

**Q - Fait accompli?**

A - No –definitely not. We need to able to respond to queries so have anticipated the questions that would be raised. In line with the statutory requirements, ELC will provide a report on the consultation findings which will also be considered by Education Scotland in terms of the Educational Benefits of the proposal. Finally a report will be made to the East Lothian Council and Councillors will decide whether to proceed with the proposal or not.

**Q - If Council reject?**

A – There is a need to have an education solution to ensure provision can be made for the increase in the projected pupil numbers through the emerging LDP. Not agreeing the education proposal would result in the LDP not being effective which is a statutory obligation. If Council don't agree the proposal, then another solution would need to be found.

**Q - Other two proposals have been rejected?**

A - Education Service had to consider a number of factors to ensure a viable solution and a proposal was deliverable, provides best value and the best educational outcomes for young people.

**Q - Community fractured? When talk to young people in school they don't want community split up? One community. Fully comprehensive school. Strength of school. Damaging to community. Varied socio-economic groups.**

A – Musselburgh has pockets of socio-economic variations. But new community, change in SIMD. Not unusual in Scotland to have two secondary schools in one community. About bringing the community together which has been an important aspect of the information sessions and public meetings. Discussed with parents about schools in Scotland have dual badging – part of a wider community. Willingness to work together in community is key.

A – Two schools will work in the same cluster group. Senior Phase – explore opportunity for Senior Phase as close together eg Bucksburn/Dyce. Broadening the curriculum. Exploring common timetable across authority as a whole, but could be opportunities for offering subjects. Not about diminishing curriculum but complimenting and enhancing it over the two schools.

**Q - Similar communities as Musselburgh with similar proposed? Arbroath and Elgin have similar situation and significant divides between schools socially and academically.**

A – Arbroath to tend to work well together – FR has visited previously.

**Q – Social divide when the situation arises eg Dumfries – community is fractured as one school is seen to be more academic.**

A – Dumfries has a number of schools in the town – St Josephs, Dumfries High School, Dumfries Academy, Maxwelltown – all serving different parts of the community. Also senior college model – major work underway in this area to change to this model to enhance the senior phase for all the pupils from those Dumfries school.

**Q - Concerned?**

A - Understand concerns as unique situation in East Lothian that proposal to have two secondary schools serving the same community

**Q - Some rooms are not fit for purpose?**

A - Where are they? All school buildings are categorised for suitability and condition and reported to the Scottish Government. Through the PPP contract, MGS is not deemed to be 'Not fit for Purpose' . Need to know what is not enhancing the learning environment for pupils so we can explore this further. Needs to be articulated. 6<sup>th</sup> year areas will not necessarily be covered as there are different approaches in Scotland on 6<sup>th</sup> year. If schools are trying to raise attainment, 6<sup>th</sup> years are often timetable into classes to act as positive role models for younger peers and keeping them focused on their studies. Opportunity to provide feedback in the Consultation process.

**Q- Need to fight corner. Not brushed aside. Work really hard to keep community together and disappointed that torn apart because of money. Could see super-school working.**

A – Money is not the one determining factor. Overall size of school. A super school would be largest school in Scotland by around 400 pupils. Also Communication Provision in MGS, so would need to consider implications for those young people in a significantly larger school. Could not accommodate super school on current MGS site so transport implications - would require to transport pupils from parts of Musselburgh to new super school site. A number of factors apart from capital outlay were considered.

**Q – Community was fractured before, not community it is now so ELC need to recognise this. Needs sensitive handling. Gang fighting before in early 1980s. Some deep-rooted feelings in the community. As a school they have tried to manage this over years. This may not be represented through the consultation process as there are some parents who don't traditionally engage with officialdom or have low levels of literacy.**

A – appreciate that schools has worked hard over the years for its place in the Community. There will be a new growing community. But we need to find a solution.

**Q – public meeting – what is parents reaction?**

A - FR outlined the number of information and drop-in sessions at schools for the community, parents, staff and pupils as well as the public meetings. Meetings have also been held with Community Councils and Parent Councils when requested.

A- Fairly positive reaction. Parents have often come with questions specific to their situation but in most cases we have been able to answer these questions. Common themes have been transport/travel, school places, siblings, transition.

## **STAFF CONSULTATION**

### **PINKIE PRIMARY SCHOOL STAFF**

**TUESDAY 7 JUNE 2016**

David Scott provided an outline of both consultations to the one member of Pinkie St Peter's PS staff present.

#### **Questions?**

**Q – What is the current catchment school for Dolphingstone area?**

A – Sanderson's Wynd PS and Ross High School

**Q – Large number of children on feeder and surrounding roads when both Wallyford PS and new secondary at Wallyford on adjacent sites?**

A – Safer routes to school and new roads infrastructure will be put in place. New secondary catchment areas will not require home to school transport as within the 2 miles. Increasing awareness of health agenda and encouraging of pupils both walking and cycling to schools.

**Q – Existing MGS school roll?**

A – Will increase to 1350 by 2020.

**Q – Concern that Musselburgh community will divide if two secondary schools? Better S1 and S2 together and S4-S6?**

A – Split side considered but some disadvantages with staff movement, travel time, management team over two sites. Difficult to promote notion of one school when over two sites. Gave example of Madras HS in St Andrews who are now moving away from split side currently in operation. Split site reduces the ability for senior pupils to act as role models for junior pupils. Organisational difficulties have been experienced on split side in other LA's. Timetabling difficulties to ensure staff are able to deliver both BGE and national award courses. Faculty cohesion when PT's between two schools.

**Q – Rivalry?**

A – still within same cluster under a Musselburgh Learning Community. Consideration of Dual badging. Common timetable to provide greater curriculum opportunities for pupils. Expectation that both schools work together.

## STAFF CONSULTATION

### WHITECRAIG PRIMARY SCHOOL STAFF

WEDNESDAY 7 JUNE 2016

David Scott provided an outline of both consultations to the four members of Whitecraig PS staff present.

#### **Questions?**

#### **Q- What is being done to the existing grammar in order to make it as appealing as the new school?**

A-The consultation does not consider the existing grammar although this is brought up repeatedly. The existing PPI contract requires that the school is maintained. So refurbishment and repainting etc should be carried out on an on-going basis.

#### **Q- In regard to activities like swimming will the children have to travel to the existing facilities nearer Musselburgh Grammar to participate?**

A-This hasn't currently been decided but a user reference group involving community members will be looking at that. The new school would be a community facility which would be open after school hours for clubs and other activities. The new facility would for example envisage having all weather pitches, dance studios and an indoor gym provision.

#### **Q-Currently many children at the grammar go out for their lunch. What would the options be at the new school?**

A-It's envisaged that there will be a new town centre build incorporating retail units and the pupils would have access to these.

#### **Q- What will be the transition process and method of moving pupils into the new school?**

A-In 2020 or as soon thereafter S1-S3 will move into the school. This will comprise the normal P7-S1 transition and the S1-S2 and S2-S3 transition for that year. This will build to S1-S6 over three years. The reasoning that S4-S6 will not move in initially in 2020 is that this period takes in their national examinations and it would be less disruptive not to move them.

If a pupil moving into S1 in 2020 has a sibling at the MGS in S4-S6 but is in the catchment area for the new school they will be able to go the MGS without a placing request being made. This will be an on-going arrangement.

A placing request would need to be made for pupils in S1-S3 in 2020 who live in the catchment area of the new school but would like to attend MGS (if they did not have siblings in S4-S6 continuing at MGS).

It is intended that there will be a transitional leadership team in place before the new school opens working in MGS at least for the last term. The school would be staffed in the normal way.

#### **Q-The topic of a social divide being created with the creation of a second secondary and whether this would lead to a schism in Musselburgh?**

A-Firstly they would both come under the same cluster. Normally a cluster only includes one secondary. However although there will be two secondary schools in the cluster under one Musselburgh learning community. A common timetable will be implemented across the two schools. Therefore at the senior levels there may well be movement between the sites for certain courses. Also being considered are clubs over the two sites, a shared orchestra and a sweatshirt with both school names present circled within a Musselburgh learning community symbol.

**Q-Will Musselburgh Grammar retain its name and how will the new school be named?**

A-Yes Musselburgh Grammar will remain Musselburgh Grammar. The new school will be named by the community with a final decision taken by the councillors. May well be named after someone known from the area.

**Q- Will Loretto pupils continue to go to the grammar?**

A-Depends on where the pupils live. If they live in the new secondary catchment then they will go to the new secondary. Loretto is however a feeder primary for St David's and all pupils who live in the Musselburgh cluster and attend P7 at Loretto are automatically offered places at St David's RC High School. If they choose not to attend St David's, they would be able to enrol in the secondary school associated to their catchment area.

## **Appendix 6 – Pupil Voice Interviews**

The Pupil Voice Interviews were a structured workshop session with a representative group of pupils from the school. The following are summaries of the discussions and questions/answers.

### **STUDENT CONSULTATION**

#### **CAMPIE PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS P1 –P7 PUPIL COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES**

**7 June 2016**

**David Scott and Val McIntyre gave the background to the proposals.**

#### **WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE PROPOSAL AND IF YOU THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA WHY?**

- Good idea, MGS will be too 'packed'. Too many in MGS, older sister says too crowded.
- What will the new school be called? *To be decided.*
- Will MGS ever get an extension? - *no plans, new school is to accommodate increase in pupil rolls.*
- Friend going to Holyrood HS – *this will have been through a placing request.*
- Friends from football might go to different schools.
- What about the dress codes? *Will be for schools to decide.*

#### **WHAT TYPE OF FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THE NEW SCHOOL?**

- Different range of sports

#### **IS THERE ANYTHING WHICH WOULD WORRY YOU ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL? E.G. TWO SEPARATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA.**

- Two schools might be in competition
- Separate sports team
- Friends potentially going to different school
- People fighting over what school is better

#### **HAVE YOU ANY IDEAS HOW THE TWO SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA COULD WORK TOGETHER?**

- The facilities could be shared

**THERE WILL BE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACCESS SOME OF THE NEW FACILITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOL OUTWITH THE SCHOOL DAY EG SPORTS HALL/LIBRARY ETC IS THIS SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO DO AND WHAT FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE?**

- This was considered a positive

#### **OTHER QUESTIONS**

- **How big will new school be?**

Roughly 1200 pupils, which will be approximately same as MGS.

- **Q - I live in Wallyford and will have started at MGS – do I need to go to new school? I'm in P6.**

You can remain in MGS as will be in S4. Younger sister will have the choice of schools. In 2020 only S1-S3 initially and then grows. Reason for that is because sitting exams in S4-S6 and could be disruptive.

## STUDENT CONSULTATION

### LORETTO RC PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS P1 –P7 PUPIL COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES

#### WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE PROPOSAL AND IF YOU THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA WHY?

- Good that it's in Wallyford
- Makes the community bigger
- Ok – lot of room to put a new secondary school

#### WHAT TYPE OF FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THE NEW SCHOOL?

- Lockers
- 1 Dining Hall
- If shops are being built near new school – fruit shops, access to health food
- Breakfast bar/breakfast area
- Basketball court
- Tennis court

#### IS THERE ANYTHING WHICH WOULD WORRY YOU ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL? E.G. TWO SEPARATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA.

- Would there be other ways of getting to school other than bus/car
- Would teacher be moved from other schools to the new school
- Might get too crowded at lunchtime

#### HAVE YOU ANY IDEAS HOW THE TWO SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA COULD WORK TOGETHER?

- Sports clubs could share facilities – e.g. football pitches
- Very important to have one community

#### THERE WILL BE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACCESS SOME OF THE NEW FACILITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOL OUTWITH THE SCHOOL DAY EG SPORTS HALL/LIBRARY ETC IS THIS SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO DO AND WHAT FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE?

- Yes this would be a good idea
- Good for sports clubs to use the facilities
- football pitches
- Gym
- Swimming pool
- Would be good to have access to the library



## STUDENT CONSULTATION

### MUSSELBURGH BURGH PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS

#### P1 –P7 PUPIL COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES

#### WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE PROPOSAL AND IF YOU THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA WHY?

- Support for the idea that the new school could have facilities not currently available at Musselburgh Grammar
- Majority in agreement the new school was a good idea

#### WHAT TYPE OF FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THE NEW SCHOOL?

- Football Pitches
- Better technology
- Library
- Swimming pool
- Net books for all
- Sports hall
- Gym hall for indoor activities in the winter

#### IS THERE ANYTHING WHICH WOULD WORRY YOU ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL? E.G. TWO SEPARATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA.

- Concerns about being split from their friends
- In regard to sport it was felt there could be rivalry between schools created by playing against each other
- Question asked if the existing Grammar would be updated in line with the new school

#### HAVE YOU ANY IDEAS HOW THE TWO SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA COULD WORK TOGETHER?

- Joint sport team
- Joint orchestra
- Joint choir
- Joint school trips
- A suggestion was made regarding having a joint school badge for the two secondary schools. This would be designed to show two hands clasping together in friendship with the two school names on it.

**THERE WILL BE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACCESS SOME OF THE NEW FACILITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOL OUTWITH THE SCHOOL DAY EG SPORTS HALL/LIBRARY ETC IS THIS SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO DO AND WHAT FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE?**

- Majority though being able to access the new facilities would be good
- Would like to be able to access clubs and activities only available at the new school
- Big Gym hall
- New computers

**STUDENT CONSULTATION**  
**MUSSELBURGH GRAMMAR SCHOOL**  
**9 June 2016**

**David Scott (DS) and Val McIntyre (VMc) gave the background to the consultation proposal.**

**VMc - Do you think there will be rivalry? Yes**

- Not fighting but if better facilities, seen as a better school.

**DS - Both schools will be part of a Musselburgh Learning Community, common timetable, better choice of subjects. Enhanced learning opportunities – pupils think this is good. Pupils from MGS could access courses at the new secondary school that aren't run at MGS and vice versa.**

**Q - Facilities in new school?**

A - MGS currently has facilities to deliver the curriculum.

A - New school will also have community facilities that can be used by whole Musselburgh Community, this may also include all-weather pitches.

A - Existing MGS is under a PPP contract, therefore school must be maintained to the original standard for the period of the contract.

**DS - Issues with existing building?**

- Only 6<sup>th</sup> year dining hall is only place for 6<sup>th</sup> year. Not encouraging for study periods. Feel that senior pupils have nowhere to go. 5<sup>th</sup> years don't have anything.

**Q - If liked that school while doing a course there, could you move during S6?**

A - This would be subject to following the normal placing request policy.

**Q - What if none of their friends go to new school?**

A - Again a placing request could be made.

**Q - Lunches at new school – no High Street?**

A - New school will be able to accommodate pupils at lunchtime, but plans for a town centre with retail units as part of the local development plan. If demand, inevitable that food places will move into the area.

**VMc - Dual school badging for new schools – views?**

Pupil - But same logo for 100 years?

A - but could combine. Maintain but enhance. Primary pupil has suggested design incorporates handshake.

**Q - Associated with the other school if one school was less well regarded in community – could be annoying for the well regarded schools?**

A - something to be considered

**Q – Teachers go to new school?**

Distinct cohort of staff for each school. But staff will work closely together. Management Team for new school will be in place before the new school opens to work on the transition phase based at MGS.

**Q – Provision to have pupils involved in decision making process after the new school has opened?**

Yes – can still have input. A User Reference Group will be established – which will include Pupils.

**Val - How many have discussed with parents?** Some.

**Val - How many completed questionnaire?** One. Encouraged to do so.

**Q – If better school and bigger school will staff move?**

A - Schools are to be of equal size. Teachers take a number of factors into consideration when applying to work in a school. New school buildings are not often a main factor. Existing MGS staff can move if they want but through the standard recruitment process.

**Q – Head Boy and Head Girl shared as no S6 in new school initially?**

A - Good question – could be considered

DS – Another possible way to integrate the two schools could be each schools Pupil Council's but meeting regularly to discuss common areas (perhaps Community issues?)

**Q – is funding the same for both schools?**

A - Yes – same for all schools via the DSM

**Q – Rivalry – same sports teams? Orchestra's combining at times**

A - Good to have separate teams but maybe combine at other stages.

**Q – How about having the same houses and have big house games together?**

A – Another good idea

**Q – Seniors in MGS could still work with junior pupils in new school during initial period. Work as buddies.**

A - Yes – good idea.

**Q – Support Base in other school?**

A – Still to be determined.

**Q – Probationer teachers in MGS – seems to be a lot of them?**

A - Always a high number in larger schools, not unusual. HT requests the number of NQT's each year.

**Q – if new school had better music studio, PE etc, should MGS get upgraded? Get a grant?**

A - There may be opportunities for this in time.

**Q – Will schools have same trips?**

A - Again has been raised by other pupils. Something for schools and pupils to work on in the future. Often depends on purpose of excursion.

**Q – More spaces on trips if both school combine together in S1 and S2?**

A - Again this might be something for schools to look at.

**Q – Sports centre for swimming is currently close to MGS?**

A - Swimming pool at the new facility would be something for the User Reference Group to consider. MGS fortunate that swimming pool is very close. Not the same in many secondary schools in East Lothian/Scotland.

**Q – Combined trips would be good. Was one with PL and still friends with some of the pupils.  
Good way to form relationships.**

A – Again this might be something for schools to look at.

**Q – Try to get complimentary teachers so certain subjects could be offered at both schools to give choices.**

A - Again this might be something for schools to look at.

## **STUDENT CONSULTATION**

### **PINKIE ST PETER'S PRIMARY SCHOOL P1 –P7 PUPIL COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES**

#### **WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE PROPOSAL AND IF YOU THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA WHY?**

- Good idea as there will be a nice new school
- It will be good that we will meet new people
- The building of the new school will bring more jobs to the area
- Feel excited about it – will be with all my friends

#### **WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THE NEW SCHOOL?**

- Nice bright pictures
- More people
- Playing fields, football pitches - Astro turf
- Duke of Edinburgh opportunities

#### **HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT POTENTIALLY GOING TO A DIFFERENT SCHOOL FROM THE SCHOOL WHICH YOUR BROTHERS OR SISTERS ATTEND?**

- Would be ok as will still be with friends
- Would prefer to stay at MGS, would be difficult for families if children are at different schools

#### **HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT WALKING TO WALLYFORD TO ATTEND YOUR NEW SCHOOL?**

- Not keen on having to walk to school if it's a long walk
- Might be a problem for parents who work

#### **WHAT DO YOU FEEL WOULD BE THE BEST THING ABOUT MOVING TO A NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL?**

- Making new friends

#### **WHAT WOULD WORRY YOU MOST ABOUT MOVING TO A NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL?**

- Worried about the rivalry between schools
- Will the building work be up to standard – 7 schools in Edinburgh shut because of the building works.

#### **HAVE YOU ANY IDEAS HOW THE TWO SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA COULD WORK TOGETHER?**

- Have sports teams that join together rather than one from each school
- Joint school trips
- Good idea for pupils from both schools work together to come up with ideas of how to work together

- Could have dual school badges

## **QUESTIONS?**

What will the new school be called? *'MUSSELFORD'*

## STUDENT CONSULTATION

### **STONEYHILL PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS** **P1 –P7 PUPIL COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES**

7 June 2016

David Scott and Val McIntyre gave the background to the proposals.

#### **WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE PROPOSAL AND IF YOU THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA WHY?**

- What about the name? – still to be decided
- Can use the facilities after school – this is good
- Schools would work together
- Good idea – not enough space and people from other countries could move to Musselburgh. Could be too crushed if not a new school.
- Super school would be too big.
- Bad idea – will miss friends if they go to new school.
- School will be closer for Wallyford pupils so don't need to travel. Can walk to school.

#### **WHAT TYPE OF FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THE NEW SCHOOL?**

- Sports facilities

#### **IS THERE ANYTHING WHICH WOULD WORRY YOU ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL? E.G. TWO SEPARATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA.**

- Two schools might be in competition
- Rivalry – *something that we need to consider and raised by others*
- Is it definitely Pinkie and Wallyford Schools for new school? *Yes, we need to form catchment areas and have enough for a viable a school roll.*
- What if more people need places in new school? *We have worked out what the numbers will be based on the housing and only allow a set number of houses to be built.*
- Will MGS get extended? *- no plans as projected numbers can be accommodated in the existing school*
- Same lessons as MGS? *Yes – need to make sure that pupils get the same education although perhaps there might be more subjects available across two school.*
- Will there be play areas? *Yes – there will be a number of good facilities that all the community can use.*

#### **HAVE YOU ANY IDEAS HOW THE TWO SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA COULD WORK TOGETHER?**

- The facilities could be shared
- Joint teams



- Joint shows

**THERE WILL BE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACCESS SOME OF THE NEW FACILITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOL OUTWITH THE SCHOOL DAY EG SPORTS HALL/LIBRARY ETC IS THIS SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO DO AND WHAT FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE?**

- This was considered a positive

#### **OTHER QUESTIONS**

- **Q - I live in Wallyford – do I need to go to new school? I'm in P5.**

You will move to the new school as you will be in S3. Younger brother will also go to new school. In 2020 only S1-S3 initially and then grows. Reason for that is because sitting exams in S4-S6 and could be disruptive. If parents want you to stay at MGS for S3, they can make a placing request.

## STUDENT CONSULTATION

### WALLYFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS

#### 2 PUPILS FROM EACH YEAR GROUP

#### WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE PROPOSAL (WALLYFORD PRIMARY AND CATCHMENT AMENDMENT) AND IF YOU THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA WHY?

- Brilliant because we need new stuff
- Things are starting to get old in the school
- Toilets need updating
- Good – new school needed

#### WHAT ARE THE ISSUES WITH THE CURRENT SCHOOL?

- No dining hall – have to have lunch in the gym hall. Sometimes have to stand and wait until a seat is available.
- Playground needs to be bigger
- Cloakroom too small
- People can climb over the gates
- Feels like the playground is closed in
- Younger pupils and older pupils in the same playground at break times, younger pupils get hurt.

#### WHAT'S THE BEST THING ABOUT WALLYFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL?

- Teachers are very good and supportive
- Football pitches

#### WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN YOUR NEW SCHOOL?

- Better school dinners – like input into menu's
- Bigger and better dining hall
- Bigger classrooms
- Bigger playground
- Separate dining hall and gym hall
- Games room
- More decoration on the walls – different colours that the pupils can help paint
- More playground equipment, slide, monkey bars
- Trampoline
- Soft sitting area outside to read
- Better football pitch (Astro)
- Bigger library with new books

#### WHAT DO YOU WANT TO KEEP FROM THE OLD SCHOOL?

- Keep Team Wallyford – sense of belonging

- The teachers
- School trips
- Whiteboards, ipads, netbooks
- Keep the same classes
- Football pitch
- Friends
- Containers to keep all the playground stuff in
- All the work that has been displayed on the walls
- Keep the Rainbow Room – would be difficult for the children who currently use it to be in the classrooms all the time
- Drama shows
- Soft Start
- Class Dojo
- Scooter parking
- Fresh start – for pupils with dyslexia
- Swimming lesson and skiing lessons

**HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT MOVING TO THE NEW SCHOOL?**

- Scared
- Good
- Confused about where everything will be
- Might get lost
- Happy
- Will be strange because we have been in this school for a long time
- Nervous – not know everybody who will be at the school

**HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE SIZE OF YOUR NEW SCHOOL?**

- Might be lots more classes
- Could be too big

**HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL POSSIBLY HAVING A SECONDARY SCHOOL ADJACENT TO IT?**

- Think it will be good
- Good if you have younger brothers and sisters as they will be close
- Would like secondary school to be separate – will be a separate school
- Won't have far to walk when going to secondary school

**THERE WILL BE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACCESS SOME OF THE NEW FACILITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOL OUTWITH THE SCHOOL DAY EG SPORTS HALL/LIBRARY ETC IS THIS SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO DO?**

- Yes would like to do this

## STUDENT CONSULTATION

### WHITECRAIG PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS P1 –P7 PUPIL COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES

#### WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE PROPOSAL AND IF YOU THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA WHY?

- General understanding for the need for the new school after discussion regarding house build.
- Considered on the whole a good idea due to the new facilities that would become available after the school was completed.

#### WHAT TYPE OF FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THE NEW SCHOOL?

- Different range of sports
- Dance studio
- Library
- Football pitches
- Tennis courts
- Running track
- Hockey pitches
- Gymnasium
- Basketball court

#### IS THERE ANYTHING WHICH WOULD WORRY YOU ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL? E.G. TWO SEPARATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA.

- Friends potentially going to different school
- The new secondary may be too close to the primary school and could lead to secondary pupils coming into the primary

#### HAVE YOU ANY IDEAS HOW THE TWO SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE MUSSELBURGH AREA COULD WORK TOGETHER?

- The facilities could be shared
- Competition between sport teams
- Possible to consider the idea of a united name

#### THERE WILL BE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACCESS SOME OF THE NEW FACILITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOL OUTWITH THE SCHOOL DAY EG SPORTS HALL/LIBRARY ETC IS THIS SOMETHING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO DO AND WHAT FACILITIES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE?

- This was considered a positive
- Access to sports facilities at the new school
- Access to school clubs and after school hours activities

## Appendix 7: Financial Information

Comparison of Single School for Musselburgh Cluster and proposed Additional, Second Secondary School

<b>Capital Costs / (Savings)</b>	<b>£M</b>
Second Secondary School for part of Musselburgh Area	£35m
Single Secondary school for whole of Musselburgh Area	£65m
Difference in build cost	£30m
Savings from removal of PPP contract	(£12m)
Net Additional Capital cost arising from build of one school for whole of Musselburgh Area	£18m

<b>Revenue Costs / (Savings)</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Teaching Staff	£0
Single Status Staff	(£100,000)
Transport Costs	£195,000
Catering	(£11,000)
Cleaning and Janitorial	(£124,000)
Property Maintenance	£200,000
Net additional revenue costs arising from build of one school for whole of Musselburgh Area	£160,000

## Appendix 8: Transition Chart

The grid below shows which children living in the Pinkie St Peter's Primary School and Wallyford Primary School catchment areas are affected by the proposed secondary catchment boundary changes by the age group or Education Stage that they are in during the 2015/16 academic session through to the Education Stage that they will be going in to for the 2020/2021 academic session.

Legend:

Age or Education Stage of Pupils affected
Age or Education Stage of Pupils not affected

Children's CURRENT Age group/Education Stage	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
New born				Ante Pre-School	PS	P1
1 years old			Ante Pre-School	Pre-School	P1	P2
2 years old		Ante Pre-School	Pre-School	P1	P2	P3
ELC* (Ante Pre-School)	PS	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5
ELC* (Pre-School)	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6
P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7
P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	S1 New school
P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	S1 MGS	S2 New school
P4	P5	P6	P7	S1 MGS	S2 MGS	S3 New school
P5	P6	P7	S1 MGS	S2 MGS	S3 MGS	S4 MGS
P6	P7	S1 MGS	S2 MGS	S3 MGS	S4 MGS	S5 MGS
P7	S1 MGS	S2 MGS	S3 MGS	S4 MGS	S5 MGS	S6 MGS
S1	S2 MGS	S3 MGS	S4 MGS	S5 MGS	S6	Left School
S2	S3 MGS	S4 MGS	S5 MGS	S6 MGS	Left School	
S3	S4 MGS	S5 MGS	S6 MGS	Left School		
S4	S5 MGS	S6 MGS	Left School			
S5	S6 MGS	Left School				
S6	Left School					

\*ELC = Early Learning & Childcare

\*MGS = Musselburgh Grammar School

## Appendix 7: Education Scotland Report

### Report by Education Scotland addressing educational aspects of the proposal by East Lothian Council to establish a new secondary school at Wallyford, within the Musselburgh cluster area.

#### 1. Introduction

1.1 This report from Education Scotland has been prepared by HM Inspectors in accordance with the terms of the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the amendments contained in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*. The purpose of the report is to provide an independent and impartial consideration of East Lothian Council's proposal to establish a new, additional, secondary school at Wallyford, within the Musselburgh cluster area, by August 2020, or as soon as possible thereafter. Section 2 of the report sets out brief details of the consultation process. Section 3 of the report sets out HM Inspectors' consideration of the educational aspects of the proposal, including significant views expressed by consultees. Section 4 summarises HM Inspectors' overall view of the proposal. Upon receipt of this report, the Act requires the council to consider it and then prepare its final consultation report. The council's final consultation report should include a copy of this report and must contain an explanation of how, in finalising the proposal, it has reviewed the initial proposal, including a summary of points raised during the consultation process and the council's response to them. The council has to publish its final consultation report three weeks before it takes its final decision. Where a council is proposing to close a school, it needs to follow all legislative obligations set out in the 2010 Act, including notifying Ministers within six working days of making its final decision and explaining to consultees the opportunity they have to make representations to Ministers.

#### 1.2 HM Inspectors considered:

- the likely effects of the proposal for children and young people of the Musselburgh cluster area; any other users; children likely to become pupils within two years of the date of publication of the proposal paper; and other children and young people in the council area;
- any other likely effects of the proposal;
- how the council intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects that may arise from the proposal; and
- the educational benefits the council believes will result from implementation of the proposal, and the council's reasons for coming to these beliefs.

#### 1.3 In preparing this report, HM Inspectors undertook the following activities:

- attendance at the public meeting held on 30 May 2016 in connection with the council's proposals;

- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written and oral submissions from parents and others; and
- visits to the sites of Musselburgh Grammar School and Ross High School and Campie, Musselburgh Burgh, Pinkie St Peter's, Sanderson's Wynd, Stoneyhill and Wallyford Primary Schools, including discussion with relevant consultees and representation from Loretto RC Primary School.

## **2. Consultation Process**

2.1 East Lothian Council undertook the consultation on its proposal with reference to the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010* and the amendments in the *Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014*.

2.2 The statutory consultation period ran from 3 May 2016 to 15 June 2016. During this period, the council held a public meeting in Musselburgh's Brunton Hall which was attended by over 40 parents and other members of the community. As part of the consultation process, the council sought the views of a wide range of stakeholders. Information about the consultation was placed in a local newspaper, on the council's website and at various schools, libraries and other centres across the Musselburgh area.

2.3 The council provided stakeholders with a short online or paper questionnaire and also made good arrangements for receiving additional written responses. The council received over 400 responses to its questionnaire. A clear majority of respondents to the questionnaire (approximately 60%) support the proposal. Around 35% of questionnaire respondents oppose the proposal.

2.4 The council received 11 written submissions to its consultation from individuals and groups. Of those that expressed a preference, a narrow majority favoured the proposal. Written responses were received from the Parent Councils of several schools within the Musselburgh cluster area. Almost all of these Parent Councils expressed support for the proposal or were undecided. Only Musselburgh Grammar School Parent Council opposed the proposal.

2.5 During the consultation period, council officers visited several schools within the Musselburgh cluster area, providing good opportunities for pupils and staff to discuss their views. Overall, pupils, particularly at the primary stages, showed support for the proposal.

## **3. Educational Aspects of Proposal**

3.1 This proposal offers educational benefits for young people of secondary school age across the Musselburgh cluster area. As a result of a significant number of planned new houses, the roll of Musselburgh Grammar School is expected to exceed the capacity of the school by the year 2020. Further increases in secondary school roll are expected beyond 2020 leading to a potential roll of over 2300. By building a new, additional, school, this



proposal offers an alternative to the difficulties of overcrowding and resultant losses of space for learning and socialising. Children at Pinkie St Peter's and Wallyford Primary Schools who will move on to the new school as a result of the proposal will benefit from learning in a modern, purpose-built learning environment. The creation of an additional secondary school within the Musselburgh area offers the potential for joint planning and greater breadth of provision in the curriculum and in wider activities which will benefit all young people within the Musselburgh learning community.

3.2 Across the primary schools in the Musselburgh learning community, most parents, children and staff who met with HM Inspectors were positive about the proposal and understood the benefits which it could bring. The same groups of stakeholders from Musselburgh Grammar School who met with HM Inspectors were less positive, with most parents and staff opposing the proposal and sharing some common concerns.

3.3 Across the Musselburgh learning community some stakeholders have concerns that the creation of a second secondary school could lead to a split within the community. The council has already indicated its commitment to ensuring that, within the proposal, both secondary schools would work strongly in partnership, for example, through consideration of joint timetabling to provide all of Musselburgh's young people with broader choices. In taking its proposal forward, the council should continue to engage with stakeholders to investigate further ways in which the schools can work together for a united community.

3.4 Parents are appreciative that the council has made necessary arrangements to allow younger siblings of pupils attending Musselburgh Grammar School, at the effective date, to have the option to attend Musselburgh Grammar School with their older brother or sister, if they wish. Most parents, too, are appreciative that young people entering Musselburgh Grammar School at S4 would be able to continue their education there throughout their senior phase (S4-S6). The council should now give full consideration to ensuring that planning for appropriate transition arrangements for affected pupils, especially the most vulnerable, takes place in good time for the expected start in August 2020, or as soon as possible thereafter.

3.5 In its proposal document, the council has committed to ensuring that the new school will have its senior management team and those staff necessary to secure a smooth pastoral and curricular transition in place three months prior to the opening of the school. The council should also develop and share its plans, in due course, for ensuring that a suitably wide range of staff is in place to deliver a broad curriculum for the first cohort of learners at S1-S3.

3.6 The proposal has the potential to reduce the level of traffic around Musselburgh Grammar School. The council should continue to work with stakeholders to establish and develop safe routes to the new secondary school.

3.7 In taking its proposal forward, the council needs to ensure that stakeholders are provided with greater detail, once this is possible, on the financial costs and implications of its proposal.

3.8 Stakeholders from Loretto RC Primary School who met with HM Inspectors were dissatisfied that the proposal did not provide any opportunity for a joint campus with denominational provision, particularly since there is currently no secondary denominational provision in East Lothian. In its final consultation report, the council should clarify its policy for secondary denominational provision within the Musselburgh cluster area.

3.9 During the consultation period the council was notified of alleged inaccuracies or omissions in the proposal. The council will need to ensure that it takes the necessary steps to investigate these alleged inaccuracies or omissions. In its final consultation report, the council will need to set out the actions it has taken to address any alleged inaccuracies and omissions notified to it.

#### **4. Summary**

The council's proposal to establish a new, additional, secondary school at Wallyford, within the Musselburgh cluster area, by August 2020, or as soon as possible thereafter, has educational benefits for the young people within this area. Significant projected increases in the school roll will result in Musselburgh Grammar School becoming overcrowded and, eventually, well over-capacity. If the proposal is implemented, children living in the catchment zones of Pinkie St Peter's and Wallyford Primary Schools will attend the new, purpose-built school and this has the potential to address issues of overcrowding at Musselburgh Grammar School. In taking its proposal forward, the council should address the legitimate concerns of some stakeholders, including: the proposal possibly leading to an adverse 'split' within the community; ensuring that transition arrangements are well planned and implemented; providing safe routes to the new school; and providing greater clarity and detail, once this is possible, over the financial implications of the proposal. In its final consultation report, the council will need to set out the actions it has taken to address any alleged inaccuracies and omissions notified to it.

**HM Inspectors  
Education Scotland  
August 2016**