



EBDOG CONFERENCE'10

18 & 19 November 2010

PEDAGOGY, SPACE, PLACE

EDUCATION BUILDING DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS GROUP -
CONFERENCE REPORT

In association with

EC HARRIS
BUILT ASSET
CONSULTANCY

Introduction

EBDOG has existed for many years and is an informal group of Local Authority Education Officers and property professionals who are responsible for the effective planning, development and asset management of schools, children's services facilities and other premises within their own Local Authority. EBDOG convenes and organises twice yearly National Conferences and regional seminars for building and development officers from Children's Services Authorities (CSAs). These conferences and seminars provide the opportunities for building and development officers to meet and discuss the impact of proposed changes in policy and the issues arising, and to share experience, knowledge and professional development. EBDOG represent nationally and locally the interests of CSAs in discussion with the Department for Education and other Government Departments and Agencies in relation to buildings and provision issues relevant to children and young people. We work in a complex political environment with the need to balance local and national perspectives to ensure that children and young people have access to a quality and appropriate environment that will enable teachers to teach and learners to learn. We like to think of ourselves as a 'critical friend' as we challenge and contribute to the debate for change.

Our web page is available at: <http://ebdog.technologyforge.com/>

There are significant changes underway in the education sector. We are all experiencing very difficult, austere and challenging times: 60% cuts in capital allocations; the cancellation of the BSF and Primary Strategy funding streams; significant cuts in staffing; the increasing backlog maintenance and poor condition of our buildings and a growing Basic Need in primary provision. There is also the uncertainty over the process for allocating capital across an increasingly diverse sector of educational provision at the same time the challenge is to provide "more with less". This is not the time to consider minor changes to the way we work or how we can trim a little bit here and save a little bit there. We need to be focused, start with a fresh sheet of paper, be determined to learn from the mistakes made and think the unthinkable. It therefore seemed absolutely right at our November 2010 conference organised by the London Borough of Havering, to go back to first principles and consider the links between pedagogy, space and place within the context of what is known and anticipated from Government Policy, the James Report and the White Paper.

Education Building Officers have made significant progress and achieved considerable success in contributing to the debate and the delivery of transformational and inspirational learning spaces to support the changes in pedagogy both now and in the future. We have ensured that educational buildings are placed appropriately within the community and that they are places that the community, staff, and children appreciate and enjoy. The links between pedagogy, space and place are therefore fundamental to what we do. The process of engagement with our clients, has in itself been a driver for change; encouraging schools to look at pedagogy and the way learning spaces can enhance the delivery of the curriculum; contributing to the improvement in achievement. Through our EBDOG twice yearly conferences and our local and regional seminars we have shared good practice, enhance our professional development and celebrated our achievements of which we are justifiably proud.

This document attempts to capture the passion and enthusiasm that colleagues demonstrated as they tackled this difficult and complex dilemma. It is a view of almost two hundred delegates collated together, rather than a measured response to the Department on policy which is as yet unclear. However it does demonstrate the 'can do' attitude that we have grown to expect from EBDOG colleagues. We look forward to contributing further to the debate following the receipt of the James Report and the White Paper.

I would like to thank all of those involved, Michal Cohen, Stephen Heppell, Marcus Orlovsky, Simon Lucas and Dylan William for their inspiring conference presentations; Simon Lucas and the team at EC Harris who facilitated the data collection; the delegates who gave generously of their time and experience; the team at the London Borough of Havering led by David Tomlinson and John Farry, supported by Janice Beck who designed the format, organised the conference and hosted the two days impeccably, Wendy Mason who drafted this report and the Executive Committee who offered their editorial comments. I would also like to thank Stuart Miller who represented the DfE and admitted to some trepidation in attending the conference but survived the experience, giving an excellent presentation on the current position and as much information as he was able to give at this stage of the Capital Review. We look forward to an ongoing dialogue with him and his return visit to our next conference in Reading on Friday 13th May 2011.

**Graham Olway
Chair EBDOG**

Five presentations were given during the day, after each presentation delegates on each of the nineteen tables considered a series of prompt questions and one person on each table acted as the scribe. The ninety five response sheets were then collected and drafted into this conference report.

The following section of the report contains a very brief summary of the presentations given by the guest speakers, followed by a summary of the discussions held during the 'table talk' sessions that took place after each presentation.

Session 1 Michal Cohen, Walters and Cohen architects

The relationship between Pedagogy, Space and Place

Michal paid tribute to the work of Kenn Fisher and others who recognise the importance of place as an enabler of learning; not for children to be taught at, but more that they are given the right places for learning through 'trying and doing' that are not driven by Building Bulletins definitions of space. Places need to be sustainable; easy to maintain; and a pleasure to use; they need to be beautiful and comfortable. The environments in which schools operate will vary significantly and it is essential to understand the context that the school will operate in. Design does count; pupils are proud of their learning environment, the process of engagement enables Headteachers to embrace the vision of new learning methods; explore different spaces and how they can be used; the output is beautiful and fit for purpose now and in the future. Over the past few years we have produced transformational buildings with very stimulating, flexible, adaptable and agile spaces developed through real engagement. The 'retailer' solution of one model fitting all will struggle to provide the right environment. Examples of buildings based upon alternative approaches to learning were illustrated, such as Raholt School in Norway, designed without corridors, but with a series of interlocking spaces described as main streets, narrow paths, open squares, light wells and gardens in the manner of a 'village'. There is scope for increasing use of modular construction but it needs volume to deliver the savings, and need to be sufficiently adaptable to meet the needs of individual schools and circumstances. We should learn from these lessons through comprehensive post occupancy evaluation but with the austerity we now face, where do we go from here? Building Bulletins (98/99) have less relevance to the incredibly diverse and creative education settings being proposed.

Table Talk Discussion 1

Buildings and learning spaces need to be capable of transformation over time as pedagogy, curriculum etc continues to develop and change. There are many aspects we must not lose such as the open, flexible, adaptable spaces. We still need to keep spaces for exhibitions, display, performance and student social spaces but these may need to be capable of being used for other purposes during the school day and throughout the school year.

We should consider how the 'shed' design approach might be developed, to create large uninterrupted flexible spaces divided up by non load bearing interior walls to give future proofing and maximum adaptability. Careful planning of heating, lighting, ventilation, services etc. will need to be considered to allow for future changes.

Some elements of school buildings could be modular to keep costs down, e.g. toilets, and kitchens brought in as 'pods'. The market hasn't taken advantage of this in recent years, is it possible to stimulate the market to overcome the high up front costs and make production cheaper. Other elements of the building should be carefully evaluated, e.g. do we really need an expensive kitchen in every school. Can we make better use of what we have such as the elimination of corridors to form more useable spaces?

Is it time to re-investigate the 'kit of parts' where schools can be constructed from a number of pods that come complete with services and wiring? Extra pods can be added as funding allows. This would give some element of choice back to the schools although it is recognised that this would be very limited. It could be a recognition that the 'one size fits all' approach is very difficult for many to accept. It would also stop the re-inventing the wheel process which is very expensive on design fees and building costs. Where volume production with standard components can be achieved, reduced costs and improve quality can follow.

Speeding up the build time will in itself reduce costs. This can be done with modular methods of construction. The build cost can be reduced because of the reduction in the contract time and prelims i.e setting up costs. However the set up costs for the factory and the long term maintenance of the construction type to keep life cycle costs down may be a concern. Some LAs were impressed with the 60 year life cycle offered by the industry and the fact that external cladding could be matched to existing buildings.

Framework working verses competitive tendering? How do we ensure that we are getting value for money? Tenders often come in at a lower figure than pre-tender estimates when contractors are hungry for work. This may not always be a good thing as the construction industry needs to be sustainable, several big and many small contractors have recently gone into liquidation. The industry already has to use expensive bonds. Uncertainty exists as to whether schools will have to take out what they will see as 'expensive' bonds to protect against this possibility. Open book contracts have been successful in reducing litigation and reducing the cost of construction is it time to go back to a more competitive construction industry, which may be more litigious.

We need to make good use of framework contractors and design and build contracts to ensure good value for money. In our experience the use of framework contractors and design and build contracts to ensure good value for money is evident. These procurement methods and contracts have removed the very high costs of claims and litigation that masked the true cost of construction in the 1980's and 90s. However it is important to recognise the excellent service we have received from local architects and building contractors and it is important that this is acknowledged and built into the new procurement processes in some way.

Who will be involved in the standardisation of designs, who and what will influence this discussion? Will there still be a possibility for some local, stakeholder engagement and choice in our experience schools very often feel 'done to'? If they are not involved we will lose that sense of pride and involvement that ensures the buildings are appreciated and 'loved' and cared for after hand-over. Is it possible to move the engagement process into the pre-feasibility, output specification and procurement process? Many LAs are engaging schools in these early stages already but should this be expanded to all? Well thought out requirements should ensure that appropriate quality and value for money is built into the specification and reduce costly change orders.

Capital to build new schools has been driving the debate with Headteachers, encouraging them to explore the benefits of new and different curriculum delivery. We are keen to use this experience to ensure that this debate continues so that more efficient curriculum models are accepted.

Building Officers continue to have considerable pressure from schools when new buildings are developed to increase the footprint of the buildings over and above BB98/99. In future we will need to be able to convince schools that the provision should be approximately 14% smaller. It is acknowledged that in the past size has sometimes increased and quality reduced but this will no longer be possible with a 60% reduction in Capital allocations and when we are being told that we are expected to build each project at 40% less. This is very difficult to achieve without fundamental changes to existing standards, not only space as set out in BB98/99 but also BB93 acoustics and ventilation, and a time when there is a drive to make carbon savings. How do we manage expectations in the future and convince schools that there is a need to go back to basics with multi function and multi purpose spaces, and far less end user dedication of space, especially if they have less involvement in the design process? Should we as building officers be helping teachers to understand these concepts better during their teacher training or inset days?

We need to do more work on post occupancy, with pupil involvement, to establish what has really worked well over the past few years. We also need to learn from the well designed schools that are practical, and a delight rather than some 'iconic' buildings that may have won awards for the architects but might prove difficult in use. We should learn from our mistakes and establish a forum for celebrating good practice, perhaps on the EBDOG website.

One simple success has been the involvement of pupils in post occupancy evaluation that has demonstrated that open plan bathroom facilities with full privacy cubicles but shared wash basins open to the corridor area are greatly appreciated and do reduce bullying. This is a practical solution that can be replicated and avoid endless re thinking.

The standard of finish is important, making schools robust enough to allow for school and community use. Getting this right has reduced life cycle costs. Cutting costs with cheaper finishes and less thought on detailing is a false economy. We should also ensure that furniture is not only robust but also comfortable. We should not return to the poor building standards of the 60's and 70's but instead look at less space but better quality buildings, multi purpose use of space and quality of materials with maximum value for money.

We acknowledge that with less money the industry will need to turn to cheaper construction which will have a lower life expectancy and require more refreshes. This will not be unlike the retail, housing or commercial sectors. However the school sector was once like this in the 60's and 70's and even today after a large investment programme these inbuilt reinvestment requirements are still with us. It will still be our advice that we look at less space but better quality buildings, multi purpose use of space and quality of materials with maximum value for money over the long term to avoid causing another financial problem in the future.

We also need to continue with the protection of ring-fencing outside landscaping costs which always appear to slashed as funding becomes squeezed. The outdoor classrooms and interesting play areas are extremely important to pupils and should not be lost.

Schools have not always grasped the concept of asset management or master planning their requirements for small scale iterative developments. We should therefore continue to work with each school to evaluate their property needs and priorities to develop individual school schedules for improvement.

Session 2 Stephen Heppell

New ways of working

Stephen gave an inspiring presentation to demonstrate how learning can be transformational and exhilarating in a world that is radically changing. Space needs to be agile not just flexible illustrated by instead of having walls that open, remove them. He shared his belief and demonstrated how:

"Peer to peer, mixed age, global, unlimited, shared, stage not age, project based learning, spurred along by mutuality, exhibition, challenge and a shared ambition, really, really works".

(Taken from Stephen's web page at: <http://www.heppell.net/>)

Size should not matter, he shared with us the details of a school that was started with 4 pupils and has now grown to 12. Age should not matter, he talked about the benefits of the 0 to 21+ school with a stage not age approach which overcomes the 'dip' experienced by many pupils as they change schools. Learning should be ambitious and the model of learning needs to change to ensure that all young people benefit (the example of children as carer was cited). What was also highlighted was the training of teachers which often takes place in relatively sterile antiquated rooms which needs to be addressed. He also shared with us his belief that Michael Gove's policy on free schools and Academies was to encourage and support learner centric schools that would revolutionise learning and demonstrated how this had been achieved in many of the schools he has been working with.

Table Talk Discussion 2

There needs to be more understanding and exploration of how and when our secondary students learn, why do we not allow more home learning? The facility can always be withdrawn if it is abused.

There should be more research driving policy, not relying on subjective rhetoric. We should understand more about the impact of ICT on outcomes. There are good examples of where improved buildings have improved results but other new schools have not achieved as well. Is this due to the build process itself taking time and focus away from Headteachers, is it because so many Headteachers leave after a school is completed and the change in leadership affects the grade or is it something else?

Are amalgamations / federations good for learning and do they work over time? Is it better to develop families of schools or networks that may be more sustainable? Should we be looking at more All Through Schools, with stage not age learning. If we move to exams being taken when children are ready and not at a set age we need to ensure that the performance tables are adjusted to reflect this, or should they be scrapped or replaced.

Will every school become an academy and if so, with less inspection and no School Improvement Partners or LA educational advisors how will we then ensure that personalised learning is explored and developed to its maximum potential.

Are free schools the solution? Can such small schools offer the full range of facilities without excessive, expensive or unsustainable travel? Would students experience appropriate social experiences with such a small cohort? Can limited teaching numbers supply the range of experience that would benefit a young child? What happens when the children of the parent promoters leave from the school, will the school remain viable?

How do we get the balance right unless the location of free schools is co-ordinated to match basic need? If they are able to draw children from schools that are already experiencing surplus places, low numbers of pupils and viability issues what will happen to those small schools when Councillors will not entertain school closures? We need to work with potential free school providers to help with basic need issues.

Buildings are only a small part of the process, we need to ensure that everyone is on board and embraces the need to change, educational visions need to be revised. Perhaps we should throw away the terminology of 'school' it should be all about learning spaces.

Session 3 Marcus Orlovsky, Bryanstone Square

Achieving more with less, changing educational and building paradigm

Marcus gave a very moving personal account of his own childhood and concluded that he should have become a statistic, at best a NEET, but sheer determination had created his success. He challenged us that in education it was not enough to incrementally increase the A* to C GCSE's to 60%, what about the other 40% we are failing? Failure should not be tolerated. He also challenged us to think again, we should not be negative about lack of possibilities during the credit crunch; opportunities are out there we just need to look. If we want schools to be focussing on enabling our young people to be inquisitive, kind, helpful, creative, hopeful, and healthy we need to think of better KPI's that measure that success. We should not be hampered by disability (40% of the staff at a famous search engine establishment are autistic). We need to look at ways in which different buildings can deliver the right environment – look at other service models that deliver agile spaces such as airports and Department stores. We should be developing an interesting and dynamic young population, not sleepwalking into a disaster and becoming a third world country. Now was not the time to be paralysed by what was happening around us but to take up the challenge.

Table Talk Discussion 3

How do we measure the outcomes in a school other than by GCSE's or Ofsted reports, especially if schools are not inspected? How will they be challenged to explore exciting and innovative curriculum, especially if Capital funds are no longer available to encourage and drive the debate?

We need to ensure that we raise the aspirations of the disadvantaged. In the past pupil engagement on new schools or Sorrell projects has contributed to this. We need to look at ways of continuing this engagement, perhaps developing and prioritising refurbishments or changing and adapting learning environments. We also need to work with local and national entrepreneurs to encourage the development of the knowledge, motivation, spirit and courage that our young people need to start their own businesses. Pupils should have more opportunity to experience real work environments.

Are schools ready for this brave new world? How do we ensure that all schools are able to change, innovate and embrace the need to develop the pedagogy and learning spaces to meet the needs of our young people?

There needs to be recognition of the amount of new schools that have already been delivered in deprived areas. If future revenue funding is focussed on schools in deprived areas and capital / DFCG is drastically reduced how will we begin to address the backlog condition in non BSF LAs where only essential maintenance has been possible for the years we have been marking time awaiting BSF? Poor or badly maintained buildings are de-motivating even for the best staff and the highest achieving students.

Teacher training should be developed further or revolutionised to ensure that teachers are continuing to respond to individual needs and rely less on traditional teaching methods. Teachers should be given the space and encouragement to throw out the rule books and experiment. They should be encouraged more to visit other lessons to pick up good practice, explore different learning environments, or be encouraged to change classroom layouts to reflect the changes needed in teaching style. They should also be encouraged to explore teaching, culture and learning spaces in different countries such as Scandinavia and Japan.

There is a need to change attitudes in some cases, to ensure that buildings we have delivered are used to their maximum potential. How do we prevent individuals from putting up posters on glass partitions which were intended to create an open and transparent approach to learning? How do we prevent furniture being used to carve up learning spaces, or should we? How can we continue to encourage Headteachers to be creative in their learning spaces once we hand the building over?

Furniture is important in our schools, why should we expect children to sit on uncomfortable chairs for hours every day?

Session 4 Simon Lucas, EC Harris

More for less and embracing innovation

Simon encouraged us to reflect on the fact that we may not yet be clear on the policy but the real driver by necessity has to be the poor condition of our schools, the bulge in population we were experiencing, the acute lack of money and the fact that we are likely to be delivering many small projects and few large ones.. He demonstrated some interesting statistics on the amount of backlog condition £15.8B; the 163,900 extra school places needed to meet basic need by 2014, the 40% under-utilisation of schools; the vast amount of empty retail and public buildings; the length of time it takes to build new schools compared with John Lewis who move from greenfield to trading within 22 weeks; the size and cost of new build which will need to be 15% smaller and 40% cheaper in future; the fact that we spend a lot of time engaging with Headteachers but that 21% leave shortly after the building is completed. His recommendation was to look at building costs of less than £1,000 per square metre, to consider moving away from the culture of who knows best; to look at co-location of services with a new management committee structure; utilising retail spaces; spending less on the fabric of buildings and concentrating the funding on the interior. He also challenged us to think about the ownership of buildings, could we lease, rent or raise bonds as they do in the USA.

Table Talk Discussion 4

Is it viable and appropriate to adapt non educational buildings; is it cheaper than building new? This could be a good opportunity to accommodate an increased demand for places or to develop a very small school. Minimal standards will need to be maintained eg. H&S; DDA; acoustic; sustainability; ventilation; temperature; etc.

There needs to be some thought on the revenue budget for schools developed to cover need in the short term. How and who should pay for rented or leased property? Could we create the shopping mall with the school above shops, hairdressers, nursery, library, fitness suite facilities etc, with the school children getting real work opportunities in the premises and the rent / income contributing to the rent for the school premises?

Should we be looking at new models of governance with more funding streams across the public sector brought together?

We also have very little space in urban situations to build new schools. We therefore need to re-focus our thoughts, planning and attention on re-furbishing and expanding existing schools. It is much cheaper to expand a 1 form entry school to a 2 or even 3 form entry than it is to build new schools. This may require us to build on playing fields and re-think their provision or to consider building into roof spaces or putting up steel frames over existing single floor schools to support a second floor. We need to look at the whole asset portfolio, for example do we have secondary schools in rural areas that could become all through schools with a primary school in the surplus space, do we have redundant office buildings or could we make better use of those spaces and create the space for new primary places to meet the basic need issues?

Is the increase in the birth rate we are currently experiencing a blip or will it continue; should we be looking at temporary solutions or will this be sustained over a longer period of time? If it is short term it could have a detrimental affect on early years provision as often spare accommodation in the school has been offered to pre-school providers. However increased pupil numbers are now causing many schools to re-consider and withdraw that provision. Will the DfE reconsider the reception limit of 30 per class during this period of rapid growth? There needs to be transparency and fairness in relaxing regulations that LAs are bound by, to coincide with the relaxation in free schools.

Should we be looking at making better use of the school buildings we have, if usage is only 40% could we double that by having the Primary teaching in the mornings and Secondary in the afternoons with out of school activities and child care off site? Should we be looking at changing the school year, could we have 4 weeks of teaching followed by 4 weeks of practical activities and holiday which could double the pupil numbers in the school with the practical activities delivered in a variety of ways and venues?

The operational cost of city centre property and the security issues need to be factored into any consideration of using redundant building stock. Schools can be placed in areas to help with regeneration and bring an area back to life e.g. the example of the shopping mall in Alaska or New College Nottingham taking over an inner city Lace Market building to develop a new campus.

Safeguarding issues need to be managed but should not become a barrier or an obsession. Children in Christchurch, New Zealand and in T Max, Singapore enjoy their school being on the top floor of a department store. They feel safer knowing they have adults around in the building if there is an issue and the air is less polluted.

There is a lot of naivety with parents and even schools on building development and there is a need for good advisors but will new providers recognise this. Is there a role for the DfE/PfS in partnering new providers with experienced building development professionals?

We accept that the world and the culture have changed and we need to move on but guidance on direction is at the moment a bit of an abyss, no clear steer. Are we in danger of ‘throwing out the baby with the bathwater’ ‘change for change sake’?

We will need to retain responsibility for quality assuring the ‘commissioning processes’ on building projects to ensure not only the quality of work but also the value for money aspects. We also need to retain a role in pupil place planning and ensuring that funding is allocated to priority criteria. Local knowledge is still central to getting this right. We should not return to a bidding culture.

Parents are understandably very protective of their children and would not wish for them to be the subject of ‘experiment’. They would need to be persuaded that there is a benefit to any new school being developed in a redundant building. How better than to involve them in the process, true engagement that is informed?

It may be appropriate and even necessary to use the admissions procedure to refuse parental choices of popular schools forcing them to fill up surplus places elsewhere before expanding or building new schools. However the impact on transport costs, sustainability, and dissatisfaction needs to be acknowledged. Councillors see it as a political issue if children are refused their choice of school place.

The impact of a place on its community needs to be considered, such as travel to school (distance and congestion impact), parking and drop off facilities. The former use of the building could have a negative impact on the perception of the new school for example the suggestion of funeral parlours being brought back into use as a new school could be difficult for the local community to accept. The impression of the building is thought to be important; one of the key aspects that the children have said was important to them when their schools were being designed was that they want to feel proud when they welcome people to their school. This may be difficult to achieve in a redundant MFI building without some impressive re-engineering but old civic style buildings, hospitals or Victorian buildings could possibly be seen as quite imposing. It has been said that an educational building should ‘say’ something about how important education is perceived by the local community and this should be borne in mind when choosing a redundant building to re-engineer as a school.

The location, facilities, potential cost and suitability of the building for adaptation should all be carefully considered before any decision is made on bringing a redundant building back into use as a school.

There is still a need for good outdoor spaces; children need exercise and to ‘let off steam’, can these be accommodated, either on site, close by, by sharing, renting or leasing, or by building MUGAs? Sport England need to be brought into this debate, but all involved will need to think the unthinkable and work to deliver the most appropriate sporting facility for the setting.. Do we need playing fields in every school or could children be taken to the local park, if this is the option how do we deal with dog fouling on public open spaces? Two schools could use the same space either at different times to foster and improve the competitive nature of sport. We could invest in excellent leisure facilities that are shared by all schools in the area and the local community.

Fitness can be delivered in doors, on MUGAs and through subjects that pupils enjoy e.g. dance and yoga.

If there is a relaxation of the need for playing fields or a relaxation on the premises regulations for ‘free schools’ should we also be looking at this relaxation for schools that are currently under LA control? Should Section 77 and the need to get Sport England approval for the sale or alternate use of playing fields be removed?

There needs to be recognition of the amount of new schools that have already been delivered in deprived areas. The condition data on schools is collected differently in LAs (e.g. a mobile classroom could be recorded as backlog maintenance or replacement cost) so how will capital allocations be transparent and equitable. How do we overcome the ‘planning blight’ and the cessation of Headteacher engagement on planning transformational learning as a consequence of promises under BSF no longer being realisable?

Session 5 Dylan William, Deputy Director Institute of Education

How do we design for pedagogy?

Dylan shared some interesting research statistics which demonstrated the fact that success was 93% to do with demography and only 7% to do with the school a pupil attended. A good teacher early in a child's schooling could make a difference but the home environment and the learning that took place there had much more significance. Peer group effects within a school are also very powerful and that can also support the drive for higher attainment. Private schools perform better but when you eliminate the factor of social class achievement is the same and when you consider they are taught in smaller classes it could be argued that this demonstrates the belief that smaller classes do not work. With a relatively weak linkage between attainment and class size, a reduction in class size might risk of recruiting the less able teachers. This would counter any benefits gained from teaching in smaller groups and cost large sums of money both in extra teachers and in the building of the additional classrooms required. It would be better to put larger groups together with the best teachers supported by others giving individual support to learners. Good teaching makes the biggest difference, and is most likely to overcome the impact of social class and disadvantage.

Motivation is the output not the input, if we have high challenge with low capability we get anxiety. If we have high capability and low challenge we get boredom. If we get the correct mix the concentration is infinite.

Table Talk Discussion 5

If the home environment is such a large factor in a child's educational development should we be doing more to educate parents? Children's centres, Adult Education and pre-natal classes go some way towards this but could more be done? What about the example given by Stephen Heppell on 'Mumology' courses?

We need to change parental perceptions about school performance and the impact they themselves can have on their child's future. We also need to improve the regard and status of good teachers in our culture and society.

If a good teacher can make a measurable difference should we be putting much larger classes together with those teachers with TA support? Should we have excellent teachers teaching across schools more?

Behaviour management needs more consideration, is it always the fault of the child or a symptom of poor teaching. Do the buildings respond / contribute to poor behaviour e.g. bullying in corridors or toilets? Hopefully this has been designed out in our new schools but we need to explore how this can be achieved in our older schools which are still the majority. A key question is if good teaching makes such a difference to outcomes, how can good buildings help to support teachers and deliver better outcomes? e.g. acoustics, ventilation, space, sight lines, light, colour, form.

Can we do more to encourage aspiration through role models? Can we do more with the Big Society agenda by ensuring that schools meet the needs of parents and communities but also benefit from their input and support?

Should we be doing more at an earlier stage to improve key skills?

Conclusion

Good quality, targeted, developed and well managed infrastructure and buildings should be focussed on the enhancement and enrichment of the teaching and learning experience. In the current context of very limited funds, we still have an absolute duty to:

- Deliver at the most affordable level and maximise value for money
- Explore the opportunities to maximise the benefits of improved, cost effective and quicker procurement routes
- Explore the opportunities to integrate and co-locate services and funding streams
- Re-examine our current buildings creatively and apply the same principles that we have with our new build projects and schools, putting pedagogy first to provide the agile learning spaces and environments that are inspirational, multi purpose and can transform over time
- Ensure that buildings are sustainable and efficient with low running and life cycle costs
- Develop facilities that recognise the centrality of the school in its community
- Consider and explore our approach to models for ownership of infrastructure
- Explore and support ways to create diversity of provision
- Ensure that the teachers of tomorrow are taught in the classrooms of tomorrow.

Organisation	Delegate name		
ADP	Simon Kneafsey	Herts County Council	Kate Maguire
Archdiocese of Westminster	Nigel Spears	Herts County Council	Pauline Davis
Atrium	Terry Pitt	Hunters	Kirsty Henderson
Atrium	James Scott	Hunters	Steve Sands
Bath & NE Somerset	Fiona Randle	Institute of Education	Dylan William
Bath & North East Somerset	Chris Kavanagh	ISG Jackson Ltd	Mark Tomlinson
Birmingham City Council	Chris Gilbert	ISG Jackson Ltd	Tom Trainer
Birmingham City Council	Steve King	Isle of Wight	John Brocklehurst
Blackpool Borough Council	Vicki Mathews	John K Wood Limited	John Wood
Bracknell Forest Council	David Watkins	Kel Computing	Oliver Freedman
Bracknell Forest Council	Chris Taylor	Kent County Council	Bruce MacQuarrie
Brighton & Hove City Council	Gillian Churchill	Kent County Council	Heather Knowler
Brighton & Hove City Council	Martin Hucker	Kent County Council	Robin Colyer
Bryanstone Square	Marcus Orlovsky	Keith Lane Consulting	Keith Lane
Bury Council	Christine Thompson	Lancashire County Council	Ray Baker
Bury Council	Ruth Taylor	Lancashire County Council	Rob Muirhead
Calderdale	Alan Winstanley	Leicester City Council	Rob Thomas
Cambridgeshire County Council	Colin Carter	Leicestershire County Council	Bob Dutton
Cambridgeshire County Council	Steve Alderton	Lightspeed Technologies	Graham Breakenridge
Central Bedfordshire	Keith Armstead	Lightspeed Technologies	Gemma Dunn
Consultant	Keith Hutt	LB Barking & Dagenham	Mike Freeman
Consultant	Tony Blackman	LB Barking & Dagenham	Steve Benning
Cornwall Council	Wendy Mason	LB Brent	Nitin Parshotam
Coventry City Council	Judith Applegarth	LB Camden	Rodger Bennett
Cumbria County Council	Jan Cameron	LB Camden	Sarah Bourne
Cumbria County Council	Sue Simpson	LB Ealing	Kwasi Ofori-Amoako
Derbyshire County Council	Kevin Firth	LB Ealing	Tony Daley
Derbyshire County Council	David Humphrey	LB Enfield	Alan Donald
DFE	Stuart Miller	LB Enfield	John West
Devon County Council	Vic Ebdon	LB Harrow	Allen Gibbons
Doble, Monk & Butler	Shane Richards	LB Havering	David Tomlinson
Doble, Monk & Butler	Adam Turner	LB Havering	John Farry
Doble, Monk & Butler	Paul Andrew	LB Havering	Ada Egot
Doble, Monk & Butler	Martin Shaw	LB Havering	Annie
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Paul Bird	LB Havering	Angela Ferdinand
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Paul Collins	LB Havering	Jo Hunter
East Sussex County Council	Melanie Griffin	LB Havering	Clive
East Sussex County Council	Sean Hambrook	LB Havering	Sue Butterworth
EC Harris	Simon Lucas	LB Havering	Dignitaries
EC Harris	Marcus Fagent	Heppell.net	Professor Stephen Heppell
EC Harris	Kevin De Groot	LB Hillingdon	Ian Downer
EC Harris	Melanie Hilton	LB Hounslow	Kam Bhari
Education Leeds	Tony Palmer	LB Hounslow	Natalie Dartnall
Essex County Council	Claire Hayden	LB Hounslow	Paul Hancock
Essex County Council	Alan Waters	LB Hounslow	Peter Williams
Fordingbridge	Stuart Ward	LB Islington	Henry Holman
Fordingbridge	Ray Taylor	LB Merton	Bisi Ogunbambi
Fordingbridge	Edward Way	LB Merton	Tom Procter
Hampshire County Council	Chris Holt	LB Newham	Peter Richardson
		LB Newham	John Cochrane
		LB Redbridge	Jagdish Bimrah
		LB Redbridge	Keith Mattacks

LB Redbridge	Rupinder Sandhu	Solihull MBC	Selina Timmins
LB Richmond upon Thames	Beverly Butler	Solihull MBC	Sue Pearce
LB Richmond upon Thames	Claire Briggs	Solihull MBC	David Dunkley
LB Sutton	Nigel Simms	Somerset County Council	Mike Lewis
LB Sutton	Caroline Warwick	South Gloucestershire Council	Pat Casey
London Borough of Tower Hamlets	Calvin Coughlan	South Gloucestershire Council,	Clare Medland
Morgan Sindall	Ray McAuley	Southend-on-Sea Borough Council	Alastair Robertson
Morgan Sindall	Rob Whitham	Southwark	Iain Johncock
Manchester	Ged Mitchell	Space Craft	Laura Irving
Manchester	Tony Farrow	Spatial Intelligence	Julie Alcock
Medway Council	Clive Mailing	Spatial Intelligence	Jeremy Pilgrim
Mouchel	Brendan Pritchard	Spatial Intelligence	Adam Watson
North East Lincolnshire	Wendy Fisher	Staffordshire	Andrew Darby
North East Lincolnshire	Tony Brumfield	Staffordshire	Julie Nash
North Lincolnshire Council	Sandra Burniston	Staffordshire	Clare Collins
North Lincolnshire Council	Nolan Bennett	Stockton on Tees Borough Council	Lionel Danby
North Yorkshire County Council	Suzanne Firth	Stockton on Tees Borough Council	Richard Pratt
Northamptonshire County Council	Kay Ringwood	Stuart Parry Educational	Stuart Parry
NPS	Tracy Wright	Suffolk County Council	Lindsay Martin
NPS	Richard Bradford	Surrey County Council	Mark Burton
NPS South West Ltd	Steve Daw	Swindon Borough Council	Gareth Cheal
NPS Stockport Ltd	Joanne Prophet	Tameside MBC	Elaine Todd
NPS Stockport Ltd	Louise Richardson	Technology Forge	Miranda Pocock
Nottinghamshire County Council	Shaun Haggarty	Technology Forge	Alastair Kinnear
Peterborough City Council	Alison Chambers	Telford & Wrekin Council	Mal Yale
Peterborough City Council	Isabel Clark	Thurrock	Mike Singleton
Plymouth City Council	Gareth Simmons	Waters & Cohen Architects	Michal Cohen
Plymouth City Council	Les Allen	Warwickshire County Council	Philip Astle
Reading Borough Council	Myles Milner	Wates	Matt Warhurst
Reading Borough Council	Jennifer Mendonca	Wates	Paul Lewis
Reading Borough Council	Jane Horne	Wates	Eamonn Wall
Reading Borough Council	Andy Lockwood	Wates	Stephen Beechey
Reading Borough Council	Jeff Fisher	West Berkshire Council	Mark Lewis
Re:d_space	Daniel Plunkett	West Sussex County Council	Graham Olway
RIBA Schools Client Forum	Andy Thompson	West Sussex County Council	Peter Proudley
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea	Robert Rush	West Sussex County Council	Sarah Thorp
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea	Richard Carroll	Willmott Dixon	Bob Athroll
Rydon Group Limited	Jonathan Rowland	Willmott Dixon	Joan Hillcock
School Planning Consultancy	Janice Beck	Willmott Dixon	Ian Wilson
Sheffield City Council	Tricia Slater	Willmott Dixon	Paul Nathan
Sheffield City Council	Mark Sheikh	Willmott Dixon	Alan Coole
Sheffield City Council	Rachael Hamilton	Wiltshire Council	Nigel Hunt
Shropshire Council	Norrie Porter	Wokingham Borough Council	Mark Redman
Shropshire Council	David England	Wolverhampton City Council	Gail Summerfield
Shropshire Council	Jane Pittaway	Wolverhampton City Council	Marc Webb
Shropshire Council	Jenny Crowder	Worcestershire County Council	Alison Cartwright
Solihull MBC	Anthony Watson		

About EC Harris

EC Harris is a leading international built asset consultancy. We help our clients generate positive outcomes by finding ways to maximise their investment in and expenditure on building, operating, using and owning built assets.

In education, our goal is to help our clients to achieve the best possible outcomes for learners and the community through the creation of excellent facilities, effective services, and infrastructure which support teaching, learning and well being. We do this by delivering lower cost and higher impact through innovation.

Our reputation for delivery - adding significant value to new, reconfigured and refurbished facilities - is underpinned by our passion for ensuring that facilities deliver the greatest enhancement to the work of teachers and other key school professionals in enabling all learners to achieve their potential.

EC HARRIS
BUILT ASSET
CONSULTANCY