



Department
for Education

Prioritising schools for the School Rebuilding Programme

Government consultation response

February 2022

Contents

Foreword from Baroness Barran	4
Introduction	5
About the consultation	5
Who this consultation was for	5
Consultation period	5
Background	6
Summary of responses received and the government's response	8
Main findings from the consultation	8
Government response summary	9
Main findings from the consultation and government response	12
The definition of rebuilding need	12
Question 1	12
Government response	12
Question 2	14
Question 3	14
Government response to questions 2 and 3	15
Question 4	15
Government response	16
Question 5	17
Question 6	18
Government response to questions 5 and 6	18
School characteristics	19
Question 7	19
Question 8	19
Question 9	19
Government response to questions 7, 8 and 9	20
Question 10	20
Government response	21
Question 11	22
Government response	22

The process for prioritising projects	23
Question 12	23
Question 13	23
Question 14	24
Government response to questions 12, 13, 14	24
Question 15	25
Question 16	26
Government response to questions 15 and 16	26
Question 17	27
Government response	28
Question 18	28
Question 19	28
Question 20	29
Government response to questions 18, 19 and 20	29
Sequencing projects for delivery	29
Question 21	29
Question 22	30
Government response to questions 21 and 22	31
Question 23	31
Government response	32
Equalities	32
Question 24	32
Government response	33
Next steps	34
Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation	35
Annex B: List of questions and full quantitative responses	39

Foreword from Baroness Barran

I am delighted to set out the government's response to the consultation on how we will prioritise schools for future rounds of the School Rebuilding Programme.

I want to thank everyone who read and responded to the consultation. We received 205 responses from a wide range of stakeholders, as well as feedback from our online engagement events. Your views have helped to shape our plans to tackle the school buildings most in need of replacement or significant refurbishment.

This programme will rebuild or refurbish the poorest condition buildings at 500 schools over the next decade, transforming education for hundreds of thousands of pupils. I have seen first-hand the impact of good facilities in supporting a quality education for all pupils. The new buildings we deliver through the programme will not only be net zero carbon in operation, but also modern, efficient and accessible.

We will make the best use of available places in the programme by prioritising schools with buildings in the poorest condition, with significant issues that could pose a risk of closure. In addition to our building programmes, we also support the school sector with annual capital funding and have allocated £11.3 billion to improve the condition of the school estate since 2015.

The first projects in the programme are now under construction, and I know that the finished buildings will bring pride to the students, staff and communities who use them. The programme also represents a close partnership with the construction sector, enabling us to invest in skills, drive growth and build back better as we recover from the Covid-19 pandemic.

I look forward to more pupils and teachers being able to benefit from the School Rebuilding Programme as we open the next round of prioritisation. The approach we are putting in place for prioritising schools will allow academy trusts, local authorities and other bodies responsible for school buildings to put forward schools for consideration in a straightforward way that minimises burdens on the school sector. This updated approach also harnesses local insight into the schools with greatest need and maximises value to the taxpayer.

Detailed guidance on this process will be published on GOV.UK and we plan to announce the next group of successful schools later in 2022.

Thank you for taking the time to support us with this programme.

Baroness Barran

Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (Minister for the School System)

Introduction

About the consultation

The department consulted on how schools should be prioritised for future rounds of the School Rebuilding Programme.

We sought views on the objectives of the programme, the process we could use to prioritise schools for a rebuilding project and the data and evidence that could be considered. We also asked questions about how we might deliver the programme and the impact on individuals with protected characteristics.

We received 205 responses in total, of which 201 were via the online questionnaire and 4 via email.

The consultation document is available [here](#).

Who this consultation was for

This was a public consultation. The department was particularly keen to hear the views of:

- bodies responsible for school and sixth form college buildings, including academy trusts, local authorities and voluntary aided school bodies (including dioceses)
- head teachers and school senior leaders
- school business professionals
- other representative education sector bodies and special interest groups.

Consultation period

The consultation took place from 19 July 2021 to 8 October 2021. It was conducted online using the government's online consultation platform. Alternatively, respondents were able to email or post a response form.

The department also held a range of engagement sessions with different stakeholder groups, including a public webinar and sessions for representative education sector bodies, trusts, local authorities, dioceses and schools.

Background

The Prime Minister announced the School Rebuilding Programme (SRP) in June 2020. The programme launched with a commitment to rebuild or significantly refurbish buildings at 500 schools over the next decade. The goal of the programme is to identify and carry out projects at the school buildings most in need of major rebuilding or refurbishment.

The programme is one part of wider capital funding invested in the school system.

The department provides access to funding to support capital investment in the estate. Organisations with responsibility for school buildings are referred to as responsible bodies. Responsible bodies (and their schools) are responsible for maintaining their buildings in safe, operational condition and complying with relevant regulations. These organisations vary in type and size, and typically include local authorities, Voluntary Aided (VA) school bodies, multi-academy trusts and single academy trusts. Major rebuilding and refurbishment of existing schools has been supported through phase one and two of the Priority School Building Programme and now the School Rebuilding Programme. Further information is available on [GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk).

We also provide capital funding for local authorities to fulfil their statutory duty to make sure there are enough school places for children in their local area. Further information is available on [GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk).

The first 100 schools were selected for the rebuilding programme by considering consistent, comparable data held by the department from the Condition Data Collection. We also included schools with Laingspan and Intergrid construction types. This allowed us to make rapid progress on projects at schools in very poor condition, without requiring responsible bodies to apply for the limited number of projects available in the first two rounds. Further details on the methodologies used to prioritise schools in the initial rounds and lists of the schools are available on [GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk).

This consultation concerned how future places in the programme should be prioritised. It set out a range of factors that could be considered to assess which schools are most in need of rebuilding; choices about the data and evidence used to make those assessments; and different ways the process could work. We want to develop a prioritisation approach for the schools in the remainder of the programme which is fair, robust, makes comparisons between schools consistently, enables rapid delivery and, as far as possible, minimises burdens on the school sector.

The Condition Data Collection (CDC)

The [Condition Data Collection](https://www.gov.uk) (CDC) is a comprehensive and consistent set of data on the condition of schools in England. It was commissioned by the department to provide a robust evidence base on the relative condition of schools and to enable the department to target the capital funding it provides for maintaining and rebuilding school buildings. Information

was collected through non-intrusive, visual assessment carried out by building surveyors and did not, for example, include inspection for structural issues.

The programme ran from 2017-19 and collected data on 22,031 schools¹, comprising 63,942 teaching blocks across England. A report with an overview of the findings has been published on [GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk). A new CDC started in 2021, which will provide updated condition data over the next five years.

¹ Including maintained nurseries, infant/junior/primary/middle schools, secondary schools, sixth form colleges and 16-19 academies, special schools, alternative provision. In total 22,031 schools or 99.8% of government funded schools were visited in the programme. The exceptions were privately owned and operated nursery schools that did not share their buildings with schools. 46 schools were not visited as there were ongoing rebuilding works.

Summary of responses received and the government's response

Main findings from the consultation

We received 205 responses to the consultation, from a wide range of stakeholders. A list of respondents is at Annex A and the quantitative results are at Annex B.

92% of respondents replied on behalf of an organisation, with 7% responding as an individual. Of those who replied on behalf of an organisation, 51% represented a responsible body and 39% responded on behalf of a school. 8% responded on behalf of another type of organisation, for example, representative bodies or unions.

A summary of the responses is below. Not every respondent answered every question or offered a comment where there was the opportunity to do so. Percentages given, unless stated otherwise, represent the proportion of total respondents (205) rather than the number who responded to that particular question. Due to rounding, not every set of percentages total 100.

The process for selecting schools for the programme

The consultation put forward three possible approaches to prioritising schools for future places in the programme, with approach B the lead proposal:

***B** - Invite expressions of interest from responsible bodies (such as local authorities or academy trusts), nominating the schools they would like considered for the programme. We would then prioritise from this group, informed primarily by CDC data. For schools with significant need for rebuilding that CDC does not capture, we would accept and assess supplementary information from responsible bodies and prioritise severe cases.*

The majority of respondents (60%) put Approach B as their first choice.

The approach to prioritising schools for the programme

Overall, respondents thought we should focus on the condition of buildings. The majority agreed or strongly agreed with the department's proposed definition of rebuilding need, including that we should prioritise structural and safety issues that would force a building to close imminently. Respondents also agreed that that we should compare schools for rebuilding need based on intensity (severity) of condition need in buildings rather than total amount of condition need across a site.

Overall, respondents also thought we should focus on an objective assessment of the condition of buildings rather than prioritising particular construction types or ages of buildings in our methodology. Similarly, the majority of respondents thought we should prioritise projects with the greatest need for rebuilding, not controlling for school type (e.g. mainstream, special school, alternative provision), school phase (e.g. primary or secondary) or location.

While more than half of respondents thought the department should consider education performance as a factor in decision making at least to a small extent, the majority view was that condition should be the primary factor for prioritisation.

Most respondents suggested additional factors which could be included in the definition of rebuilding need, or should be targeted by the programme. These included environmental sustainability, the suitability of buildings, the needs of rural schools and faith schools, and the capacity of the responsible body to undertake capital works.

Government response summary

Safe, well-maintained school buildings are vital to support schools and teachers in delivering a high-quality education, so that pupils gain the knowledge, skills and qualifications they need. Both the consultation and our engagement sessions showed support for the goal of the programme; to rebuild or significantly refurbish school buildings in the poorest condition.

We plan to prioritise future places in the programme based on approach B in the consultation, which also had the most support from respondents.

This approach will allow responsible bodies to submit an expression of interest for their schools with greatest condition need to join the programme, with our prioritisation from this group largely informed by consistent data from the CDC. There will be an opportunity for responsible bodies to submit professional evidence of severe need not captured by CDC, such as structural and other issues, which could cause imminent closure of a building.

We also consulted on how we should compare different schools' need for rebuilding. This included asking whether respondents agreed that we should prioritise schools based on intensity of need (severity of condition in buildings) rather than volume of need across a site. This is the approach we took in the first two rounds of the programme, and has the benefit of ensuring that the programme would not simply favour larger schools.

We plan to continue prioritising schools with higher intensity need (i.e. with concentrated areas of extremely poor condition) over schools with the greatest volume of need across their site. We do not plan to specifically target buildings of certain ages or of particular

construction types in the programme, but will consider data and evidence on each project, including evidence of severe need not captured in CDC. This will include evidence of structural issues and other types of safety risk. We expect that many buildings prioritised for the programme are likely to date from the 1940s to 1970s.

We plan to allocate places on the programme based on the condition of buildings and significant safety issues. At this stage, we do not plan to factor in wider school characteristics, including education performance. We want to ensure that the programme remains focussed on condition need and, as a priority, tackles the school buildings with issues that mean they are the most likely to need to close imminently, or pose a significant health and safety risk. We may review this at a later stage in the programme.

We intend to conduct at least two further selection rounds: one in 2022, for the majority of the remaining places on the programme, while reserving some places on the programme for a future round which will be announced at a later date. Schools selected will be informed that they have been provisionally allocated a place on the programme, and projects will then enter delivery at a rate of 50 a year.

Guidance on how responsible bodies can put schools forward for the next selection round will be published on [GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk).

Throughout the consultation, some respondents mentioned themes or issues which they thought should be considered by the programme. Where relevant, we have responded to these points below, such as how the programme supports environmental sustainability, accessibility and will improve the suitability of buildings. Broader points, such as views on the overall level of capital funding available, or the wider system, have been noted and will be fed into wider policy thinking.

We have made our plans for future selection rounds based on experience of the first two rounds of the programme, feedback through this consultation and our own policy development work. We will continue to monitor the cases that are brought to our attention through the prioritisation process and where necessary, will modify our approach to selecting schools to ensure the most urgent rebuilding cases are prioritised.

We will also reserve the right to add schools into the programme in exceptional circumstances where we consider that they have critical condition need that cannot wait for consideration in the next prioritisation round.

Equalities

We asked for views on how the programme may impact on users of school buildings with protected characteristics. We received a range of comments, which are summarised at question 24. Our conclusions on the impact of this programme on individuals with protected characteristics are summarised in the [Equalities Impact Assessment](#) published alongside this document. Overall, our assessment is that the selection process will have a positive

impact on all users of the school buildings which will be included in the programme, including individuals with protected characteristics.

Main findings from the consultation and government response

The responses to each question are summarised below, and full quantitative results can be found at Annex B.

The definition of rebuilding need

Question 1

To what extent do you agree with the department's proposed definition of rebuilding need?

In the consultation document, we confirmed that the goal of the programme is to rebuild or significantly refurbish schools with the greatest need for rebuilding. Our broad definition of rebuilding need focusses on structural and safety issues that mean a building is not fit for use, and issues that could cause a building to fail or close imminently. We will identify buildings where the severity of need means that a total rebuild or significant refurbishment is the most efficient way to return a building to good condition.

We heard strong support for the department's proposed definition of rebuilding need with 88% of those who answered strongly agreeing or agreeing.

The majority of comments received suggested factors that could be considered or prioritised in our definition of rebuilding need, including:

- health and safety or environmental factors such as flood risk, fire safety, or the presence of asbestos
- a school's energy efficiency and readiness for net zero carbon operation
- a school's suitability for delivering the curriculum
- the local area's educational needs, such as whether schools require expansion alongside a rebuild
- consulting local authorities on their priorities.

Government response

We heard strong support for our definition of rebuilding need from consultation respondents and we plan to maintain this definition of rebuilding need. This will ensure the programme focuses on addressing significant condition issues, particularly those that could pose a risk to safety or the continuing operation of a building, to the extent that a building could be deemed unfit for use and requires a rebuild to resolve.

We will primarily consider buildings with significant issues with the structure or fabric of a building, or mechanical and electrical systems that require a rebuild to resolve. Where they pose a significant risk to health and safety or the potential closure of the school and need rebuilding to resolve, we will also consider wider safety issues. This may include extensive, poor condition asbestos that cannot be effectively managed in situ, meaning that the building (or part-building) is at imminent or urgent risk of being taken out of use without remedial action.

While this will be a condition-focussed programme, we may also consider other issues in rare cases where they pose a risk to the health and safety of building users, and where the only solution to the issue is a large refurbishment project or rebuild².

Many consultation respondents raised the issue of the suitability of buildings for delivering the curriculum throughout the responses to the consultation. We understand that suitability of facilities is an important concern for schools and that this can require a large investment to rectify. However, suitability issues do not pose risks to ongoing safe operation of school buildings in the same way as condition issues. In a programme of this scale, therefore, we agree with the majority of respondents that it is right to continue to prioritise schools based on condition need.

Some wider factors suggested by respondents included how efficient buildings are to operate, net zero readiness, accessibility, or the performance of the responsible body in maintaining its buildings. These would be more difficult to measure in a fair and objective way or would move away from the essential focus on condition and safety. We are, therefore, not planning to consider these as factors for prioritisation. The new buildings delivered by the programme will, however, provide fit for purpose accommodation.

Once a school has been selected for the programme, the project scoping stage will consider the whole site and determine the works that will be included³. Projects provided via the programme will meet modern accessibility standards and will provide suitable accommodation for pupils and teachers. New buildings delivered via the programme will also be net zero carbon in operation and more resilient to the effects of climate change, such as overheating (see response to question 4).

² For example, this may apply in rare cases where a flood risk assessment identifies a significant risk to the school which may result in frequent closure or a risk to life. This would require that other approaches to reduce the risk to an appropriate level have been explored or rejected. Further details will be set out in guidance

³ The department will consider the needs of the school when scoping projects and aim to provide sufficient good-condition accommodation to support current, agreed pupil admission numbers, built to DfE standards. Local authorities have the opportunity to contribute basic need funding if they would like an expansion included in a project (to maximise efficiency by combining works into one project); or to agree removal of surplus places.

We will continue to work closely with responsible bodies, including local authorities to determine the scope of projects.

Question 2

In your view, should the programme target buildings of specific construction types or designs?

There were mixed views on whether the programme should target buildings of specific construction types or designs.

43% thought we should not target buildings of specific construction types or designs, with the most common reason given that the department should assess schools on their individual condition need, rather than by specific building characteristics or types.

41% thought we should target specific construction types or designs, with the most common buildings being:

- types of system builds, such as CLASP or SCOLA⁴
- temporary mobile classrooms
- listed buildings.

15% either did not express a preference or did not respond to this question.

Question 3

In your view, should the programme target buildings of specific ages?

50% of respondents said that the programme should not target specific building ages, citing the following reasons:

- concerns that prioritising specific ages or era of buildings could mean that buildings with higher condition need, but which are not of the targeted age(s), would not be included in the programme
- that building age and condition are not necessarily correlated.

36% of respondents thought the programme should target specific building ages, and the most common answers about which building ages to target were:

⁴ These are examples of system build designs from the post-war period.

- buildings from the 1950s/1960s or post-war period
- pre-war buildings
- Victorian buildings.

14% either did not express a preference or did not respond to this question.

Government response to questions 2 and 3

A building's age and construction type can be a signal that it is more likely to need rebuilding or refurbishment. A more reliable assessment of a building's remaining lifespan, however, usually depends on how well it has been maintained or upgraded over time, or whether it has specific structural or other issues. System builds and other buildings from the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s may be at a stage where patch and mend refurbishments are less cost effective.

In line with the consultation responses, we do not plan to specifically target buildings of specific ages or construction types in the programme, but will assess schools on their condition and risks. We will consider evidence submitted about severe need not captured in CDC, including structural issues, which will be a high priority for the programme. We expect that many buildings prioritised for the programme are likely to be from the 1940s to 1970s, and the additional evidence will allow us to assess risk including condition need and construction methods.

Question 4

Are there any other factors that should be included in the definition of rebuilding need, or targeted by the programme?

Respondents put forward a range of factors that could be considered in the definition of rebuilding need, or targeted by the programme. These included:

- health and safety risk factors such as flood risk and fire safety
- the presence of modular buildings which may be beyond their design life
- a building's environmental performance and readiness for net-zero
- considerations of local educational needs, for example where two schools could be merged or other pupil place planning considerations
- quality of ventilation.

Government response

We intend to prioritise schools with the most severe building condition or health and safety issues, as set out above in response to question 1.

Some respondents raised the issue of energy efficiency, both from an environmental and financial point of view. They pointed out that some school buildings are inefficient to heat or cool and that this is difficult to rectify without significant refurbishment. Overheating may also increase over time due to climate change. While we do not intend to use building energy efficiency or thermal performance as a factor in our prioritisation methodology (as it would move us away from tackling condition and health and safety concerns as a priority), all new buildings delivered by the programme will be modern designs that will be net zero carbon in operation⁵. These buildings will contribute to the government's sustainability targets, reduce energy use and be more resilient to the effects of climate change, such as overheating. We also expect that the buildings prioritised for replacement by the programme to be predominantly older stock, with poor energy efficiency.

More broadly, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy offers grant funding for heat decarbonisation and energy efficiency measures for public buildings, including schools through the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme⁶.

We heard concerns about poor condition modular/temporary buildings and their need for rebuilding. In rounds 1 and 2 of the programme, and in our proposals for future rounds, modular buildings have the same opportunity to qualify for rebuilding as any other type of block.

Once a school has been confirmed in the programme, we will engage with local authorities which will have the opportunity to contribute Basic Need funding if they would like a pupil places expansion included in a project. This will help maximise efficiency by combining planned works into one project. Where appropriate, we will also consider removing surplus places to reduce unnecessary operating and maintenance costs. Projects requesting a change to their pupil numbers as part of a rebuilding project may need to undergo the appropriate process for a significant change.

Where ventilation issues are identified, schools would typically be expected to plan and prioritise any necessary mitigating works within existing budgets. We have provided CO₂ monitors to state-funded education settings, including early years, schools and further education providers, backed by £25 million in government funding. The department has also

⁵ More details on the department's net zero specification for new buildings can be found here: [School design and construction - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/school-design-and-construction)

⁶ More details can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/public-sector-decarbonisation-scheme>

provided information on how to use CO₂ monitors to better manage ventilation to education settings directly.

In the very few cases where an area of poor ventilation (sustained CO₂ readings above 1500ppm) has been identified and this cannot be resolved through opening windows and doors or minor repair works, an air cleaning unit can be considered as an additional mitigation whilst further remedial work is undertaken to improve ventilation. The Department for Education has announced that it will make up to 9000 DfE-funded air cleaning units available for poorly ventilated teaching spaces.

An online 'marketplace' is also available to state-funded education settings. The marketplace provides a route to purchasing air cleaning units directly from suppliers at a suitable specification and competitive price.

Question 5

To what extent do you agree that we should prioritise schools based on intensity of condition need rather than total amount of condition need?

Most respondents supported the view that the programme should prioritise schools based on the intensity of condition need rather than the total amount of need, with 78% strongly agreeing or agreeing. Comments from those who agreed included:

- general support for prioritising schools based on intensity of condition need
- this approach would be more likely to include the poorest condition buildings, including those at smaller schools.

9% of responses either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Comments from those that disagreed with this approach expressed a range of views, including:

- that the department should consider a block-based programme
- that the department should prioritise projects by the number of pupils who would benefit
- that the department should consider the proportion of the school site with severe need
- concern that very small schools would not be considered under this approach.

Question 6

To what extent do you agree that we should compare sites based on the intensity of condition need across the same surface area of their buildings (GIFA), considering the buildings in the poorest condition on each site?

There was strong support for comparing condition across the same surface area of buildings, with 64% strongly agreeing or agreeing and 15% strongly disagreeing or disagreeing.

Of the respondents who disagreed with this approach, views included:

- that the department should consider the average need across a whole site or the proportion of a site with urgent condition need
- the risk of small schools being overlooked by the programme.

Government response to questions 5 and 6

In comparing the need for rebuilding across schools, and in line with the majority of consultation responses, we plan to continue prioritising schools with higher intensity need (extremely poor condition) over schools with the greatest amount of need across a site. When considering how we compare condition need across a range of school sizes, types and phases, we maintain the view that this is the fairest basis for comparison. Focusing on intensity of need will ensure that we focus on those schools with buildings that have severe condition need.

We do not think we should focus on schools with the greatest overall amount of condition need as this would favour larger schools, such as secondary schools, and would be detrimental to smaller sites that may have more intense and urgent need.

When assessing condition data, we plan to compare the intensity of need on each site across a consistent surface area in order to establish an objective comparison of rebuilding need. The majority of respondents in the consultation agreed that we should compare schools this way. This will allow an equal assessment of sites of different types and sizes. We will set out further details in the guidance.

Schools smaller than the area used for comparison will be considered based on the condition of their whole site, as in the first two rounds of the programme.

Once a school has been prioritised, the area used for comparison does not limit the size of an eventual project, as a feasibility study will determine the scope of the project.

School characteristics

Question 7

(Please select your preference form the following two statements) As regards special schools and alternative provision:

- **the department should allocate a proportion of projects to special schools and alternative provision with the most severe condition need to ensure schools of those types are included in the programme**
- **the department should allocate projects to schools with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for type.**

The majority of respondents (73%) thought that the programme should prioritise condition and not control for type of school, although 20% thought that special and alternative provision should have a minimum quota.

Question 8

(Please select your preference form the following two statements) As regards school phase:

- **the department should allocate a proportion of projects to each school phase (e.g. primary, secondary)**
- **the department should allocate projects to schools with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for phase.**

The majority of responses (80%) indicated that the department should allocate projects to schools with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for the phase of schools.

Question 9

(Please select your preference form the following two statements) As regards school location:

- **the department should allocate a proportion of projects to each region**
- **the department should allocate projects to schools in the country with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for location.**

The majority of responses (64%) thought the programme should prioritise the schools with the greatest need for rebuilding, regardless of location.

Government response to questions 7, 8 and 9

We heard from respondents that they would rather we allocate projects to the schools with the greatest condition need, rather than reserving a number of projects for different school phases, types or locations. We plan to adopt this approach to ensure that we are prioritising projects which need a rebuild for structural or health and safety reasons, and that we mitigate the risk of schools in the worst condition missing out on a place in the programme.

We do not plan to introduce quotas for school phase or location. Regarding school phase, we believe that focusing on intensity of condition need should help ensure a wide range of the worst condition buildings at different sizes of schools are included in the programme. We also considered whether to allocate a proportion of projects to each region to ensure an even distribution of the benefits of the programme. As different regions have different levels of condition need across their schools⁷, this could risk some buildings in very poor condition in one region losing out to a better condition building elsewhere.

Regarding school type, we used minimum quotas to ensure a number of special and alternative provision schools were prioritised in the first two rounds of the programme, broadly in line with their overall representation in the school estate. We will continue to ensure that these types of school are included in the programme and will confirm arrangements for this in due course. We do not intend to set a specific quota at this stage, so that we can consider the severity of need across the range of projects under consideration.

More broadly, the government has committed £2.6 billion over the next three years to deliver new places and improve existing provision for pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities or who require alternative provision. This will help improve the lives of many of the nation's most vulnerable children. Further information on high needs capital funding can be found [here](#).

Question 10

Are there other school characteristics that the department should consider, when looking at the balance of projects?

The most common responses were that the department should:

- consult local authorities about local educational needs
-

⁷ Condition of School Buildings Survey, May 2021:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/989912/Condition_of_School_Buildings_Survey_CDC1_-_key_findings_report.pdf

- consider disadvantaged pupils as a priority factor
- consider the suitability of school buildings to deliver the curriculum.

Other responses included the following factors:

- the responsible body's track record of maintaining its buildings
- accessibility concerns in older buildings
- impact on sustainability by replacing inefficient school buildings
- the ability of the school or responsible body to self-fund the project
- including measures to give equal consideration to rural schools or small schools
- health and safety criteria, and especially considering fire safety
- presence of asbestos
- school type, to include rural schools, faith schools or grammar schools.

Government response

We have considered the range of other factors raised by consultation respondents. As our primary objective for the programme is to address schools in the poorest condition, and safety issues, we do not propose to take additional factors (beyond condition and safety) into account in the approach to prioritisation. The programme will deliver significant rebuilding projects, which in most cases are likely to be unaffordable by responsible bodies. Some factors suggested would also be difficult to measure or assess on a consistent basis across a large number of schools.

We received a number of responses raising building suitability as an issue, particularly in older or listed buildings and in special and alternative provision, as unsuitable facilities can pose challenges to delivering the curriculum. We recognise that this can be a challenge for some schools and may often be found alongside poor condition. While we intend to focus on condition need and safety as the priorities for the programme, all new buildings and refurbishments delivered will provide suitable accommodation to support delivery of an effective education.

Some of the factors suggested were not linked to condition need, for example, grammar school, faith school or rural school status. We expect the prioritisation approach to include different types of schools in the programme on the basis of their condition need. We do not, however, propose allocating a proportion of projects to these school types because it risks not addressing schools most in need of rebuilding projects.

Question 11

To what extent do you think that educational performance, and the potential for capital investment to improve it, should also be included as one of the factors considered to prioritise which projects are included in the programme?

61% of respondents thought the department should consider educational performance to varying extents. 14% thought it should be considered to a great extent, 32% to some extent and 15% to a small extent. 31% of respondents thought education performance should not be considered at all, and 8% either expressed no preference or did not provide an answer.

Respondents who were supportive of factoring in educational performance commented that:

- this would be helpful for underperforming schools to raise standards, especially where local schools are in better relative condition
- improving building condition is important to improving educational outcomes for pupils, including where facilities are not suitable for delivering the curriculum
- high-performing schools should be prioritised in the approach to selecting schools in the programme.

Respondents who disagreed shared views including:

- concerns that schools with poor buildings rated Good or Outstanding by Ofsted would lose out, and the focus on prioritising condition need would be lost
- that school performance can change much more rapidly than condition, and as buildings would be used for decades to come, this would be an unfair basis for comparison
- that the department could instead consider prioritising schools with high numbers of deprived pupils.

Government response

We heard from respondents that they are supportive of using education performance as a factor in prioritising schools for the programme, at least to a small extent. We recognise that modern buildings can help support an effective education and underpin wider actions to support school improvement. We considered whether education performance could be used as an additional factor alongside condition need, in order to support school improvement, but we are not at this stage planning to do so. While there are reasons why a rebuilding project could support school improvement, using this as a key factor for prioritisation would risk schools with greater condition or urgent safety needs not being prioritised. We may review this at a later stage, once we have assessed the scale of interest and severity of need of buildings put forward for consideration by the programme.

The process for prioritising projects

Question 12

To what extent do you agree that the objectives identified for the process are appropriate?

The objectives we identified for the process to prioritise schools for the programme were to:

- a) use information that allows robust assessment of the need for rebuilding
- b) use information that is comparable across schools to make a fair assessment of relative need
- c) minimise burdens on responsible bodies in having to obtain and submit new information
- d) make the process accessible for responsible bodies of all sizes.

There was clear support for the objectives proposed to underpin the process for prioritising projects, with 81% strongly agreeing or agreeing.

Respondents suggested some additional objectives for the process. These included that the department should:

- consider allowing local delivery of projects which can be managed by the responsible body rather than the department
- allow use of additional condition surveys responsible bodies may hold (to supplement or replace data from the CDC)
- include views from responsible bodies to ascertain their priority build order, working with local authorities, academy trusts and dioceses to prioritise across larger groups of schools
- focus on those schools historically lacking investment
- consider bids in context with other capital projects to be delivered and/or funded e.g. decarbonisation projects
- consider bids in terms of their impact in supporting pupil place planning or local education provision in the round e.g. by amalgamating smaller schools
- consider a route which specifically supports special schools.

Question 13

In what order of priority would you place the stated objectives?

The majority of respondents thought the objectives should be prioritised in the order A, B, D, C (see full results in Annex B).

Question 14

Are there any other objectives for the prioritisation process that you think we should adopt?

The most common views expressed were that the department should accept additional evidence of condition need, that the department should allow responsible bodies and/or the local authority to share their views as part of the process, and that the department should prioritise resolving immediate health and safety issues.

Additional comments included views that the department should consider:

- ensuring the process is transparent, to allow responsible bodies to plan the use of their condition funding effectively and to understand the minimum requirements for securing a place on the programme
- local educational priorities and place planning.

Some further comments echoed responses to other questions, such as suggesting the department consider suitability of facilities, environmental sustainability/energy efficiency, or affordability of the works for a responsible body.

Government response to questions 12, 13, 14

We plan to adopt an approach to prioritisation underpinned by the objectives in Question 12. This will also support some of the wider objectives expressed by consultation respondents. For example, we plan to invite responsible bodies to nominate the schools and blocks they understand to be most in need of rebuilding due to poor condition or safety issues. We also plan to provide an opportunity for responsible bodies to submit additional professional evidence of severe need for rebuilding.

We will also engage with local authorities to look at opportunities to combine rebuilding work with planned expansion projects funded with Basic Need allocations. As in previous sections, while the programme will be based on an objective assessment of condition, buildings delivered will be suitable to support an effective education and be net zero carbon in operation.

We expect the majority of projects to be delivered by the department to maximise efficiency and value for money.

We are committed to running an objective and clear process and will communicate clearly with schools and responsible bodies during the selection and delivery of projects. We will publish guidance for responsible bodies on how to nominate schools for the programme.

Question 15

Which would be your preferred approach, in order of preference, from options A, B and C?

We consulted on 3 broad approaches to prioritising projects for the programme:

- **approach A:** Base prioritisation primarily on CDC condition data analysis. Accept supplementary information from responsible bodies only where it evidences severe types of rebuilding need that CDC does not capture
- **approach B:** Invite expressions of interest from responsible bodies, nominating the schools they would like considered for the programme. We would then prioritise from this group, informed primarily by CDC data. For schools with significant need for rebuilding that CDC does not capture, we would accept and assess supplementary information from responsible bodies and prioritise severe cases
- **approach C:** Invite responsible bodies to submit comprehensive evidence of rebuilding need and assess this evidence using a scoring system.

Approach B was the clear preference for prioritising projects with 60% putting it as their first choice. Approach C was second with 26% choosing that approach.

Where respondents expressed support for approach A, comments included that:

- this approach would ensure that responsible bodies would not be disadvantaged if they lack the resource to obtain surveys or write applications
- they support this approach as long as additional evidence would be accepted by the department, or if the quality of CDC surveys can be assured.

Answers from respondents who supported approach B commented that:

- this approach would give responsible bodies the opportunity to put forward their highest priority schools, and that this option best reflects the objectives set out in question 12
- it is important that the department adopts an approach where responsible bodies are not penalised for lacking the capacity to commission additional evidence, and that CDC is a consistent data set for decision making
- that they had some reservations about the use of CDC data, and supported approach B as the department would also accept additional evidence of severe need.

Respondents whose first choice was approach C commented that

- they would appreciate the opportunity to submit evidence already held by the responsible body
- they would prefer that CDC data were not used due to the visual nature of the survey and the age of some of the data.

General comments included:

- we heard some concerns about the use of CDC from a number of respondents due to some limitations with the data
- that the department should run a process that is as simple as possible for responsible bodies to participate in
- that the department adopts a standardised return for submissions to ensure schools can be compared consistently
- that the process should be joined up with other condition funding routes, such as School Condition Allocations and the Condition Improvement Fund.

Question 16

Do you have any suggestions for other approaches that we have not identified?

Responses included that the department should:

- adopt an approach where responsible bodies could put forward an expression of interest alongside additional information
- consult all responsible bodies, including local authorities, academy trusts and dioceses, to ascertain their top priorities for rebuilding.

Many of the comments received touched on the definition of need for rebuilding, such as considering a school's suitability for delivering the curriculum or net zero readiness, which have been addressed in other questions above.

Government response to questions 15 and 16

We plan to base the approach to prioritising future projects in the programme on approach B. By prioritising from nominated schools, the department can take account of responsible bodies' priorities in the process, while using CDC data which provides a consistent, comparable assessment of relative need between schools. This approach avoids the need for responsible bodies to submit detailed evidence for the majority of the schools they consider in scope, minimising burdens on the school sector.

CDC is the only consistent, national-level data on the condition of the school estate in England. It is a valuable tool in understanding the condition of the estate and the relative condition of schools. We recognise that since CDC data reflects condition at the time the survey was carried out, with the earliest visits taking place over four years ago, improvements or further deterioration to buildings could have occurred in the intervening period. The nomination process will enable responsible bodies to take this into account and put forward for consideration their buildings and schools which currently have the greatest condition need.

Responsible bodies will also be able to identify schools which have severe condition or safety issues not captured by CDC and put forward professional evidence to demonstrate this. This will allow us to identify and prioritise schools with need that CDC may not capture, such as structural issues, or critical condition issues that have arisen since a school's CDC visit. Only exceptional cases of severe condition need or safety issues risking imminent closure, which need a rebuilding to resolve, will be considered in this way.

We will set out further details on how responsible bodies can nominate schools and provide evidence of severe need in published guidance.

The department will communicate clearly with responsible bodies and schools, and provide a straightforward online process for schools to be nominated.

As described in the consultation document, the department will reserve the flexibility to include schools in the programme outside of the prioritisation process described above, where we become aware of severe and urgent need for rebuilding.

Question 17

Do you agree or disagree that the proposed criteria for assessing severe rebuilding need (which is not captured in CDC) are appropriate?

The criteria we proposed in the consultation document were:

- buildings require rebuilding because they are unfit for occupation or condemned, or due to become so imminently
- the affected building or groups of buildings are essential to the delivery of the school curriculum and have a minimum total GIFA (gross internal floor area) suitable for a large rebuilding or refurbishment project
- evidence is provided by professional surveyors as relevant to the issue(s) affecting the building(s).

The majority of respondents supported the proposed criteria for assessing severe need for rebuilding, with 72% strongly agreeing or agreeing and 14% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

The most common theme of responses to this question addressed the types of evidence the department would consider. Comments included:

- support for responsible bodies to be able to submit additional evidence of need
- requests that the department fund any additional surveys needed and should ensure that assessment of the evidence provided is independent and robust
- that the department should consider responsible bodies' track record of managing buildings and prior investment when prioritising schools for the programme.

Other comments were not specific to this question and addressed wider points made earlier about the definition of rebuilding need.

Government response

We will set out more information on the criteria for assessing severe rebuilding need in the guidance on how responsible bodies can participate in the next prioritisation round. This is due to be published shortly.

We expect the criteria to mainly allow for critical condition issues that are unlikely to be identified by CDC and need to be addressed imminently through a rebuilding project, such as issues with the structure of a building. We will also consider severe issues that pose a risk to the health and safety of building users, where the only solution is a rebuild or large refurbishment project. This may include extensive, poor condition asbestos that cannot be effectively managed in situ. We will expect responsible bodies to provide clear, objective evidence of such issues provided by suitably qualified professionals.

Question 18

Do you or your responsible body have access to evidence of rebuilding need, in the form of surveys completed by professional surveyors, available to share with the department?

See full responses in Annex B.

Question 19

How many schools is your organisation responsible for?

See full responses in Annex B.

Question 20

How many of them do you expect would meet the criteria for severe rebuilding need?

See full responses in Annex B.

Government response to questions 18, 19 and 20

Responses to these three questions have helped us to plan the practical aspects of the prioritisation process to ensure this is manageable for responsible bodies, and deliverable by the department. Guidance on how responsible bodies can participate in the next prioritisation round will be published on GOV.UK.

Sequencing projects for delivery

Question 21

In timetabling the selection process, would you prefer the department (please select one option):

- **selects all remaining projects in a single selection round**
- **selects the majority of the 400 projects in a single selection round, but reserves a reasonable number for later in the programme's life**
- **selects 50 projects every year**
- **other [please state].**

There was support (56%) for selecting the majority of projects in a single round, while reserving some for later in the programme.

From the respondents who preferred that the department selects the majority of the remaining projects in a single selection round, while reserving a reasonable number for later in the programme, comments included:

- that this approach will enable schools and responsible bodies to plan their estates management in the long term
- that this option would ensure there is flexibility to select projects later in the programme, particularly if their condition need changes and more up-to-date data is available
- that this option would incentivise responsible bodies to continue investing in school condition as they would have certainty about whether their schools were included in the programme.

Respondents who preferred that the department selects 50 schools per year commented that this would give flexibility across the life of the programme as school circumstances change.

Comments from those who preferred the option of selecting all remaining projects in a single round gave reasons such as improving the ability of responsible bodies to plan for the long term, improving prioritisation of works across their estate, and a desire for the department to move quickly to replace schools in the worst condition.

Other suggestions included that the department should:

- select in different sized rounds to those suggested, e.g. two rounds of 200 schools, or three rounds of: 250, 100 and 50 schools
- increase the total number of schools being rebuilt
- if selecting the majority of schools now, the department should announce the remainder no later than three or four years into the programme's duration, to give responsible bodies certainty.

Question 22

In sequencing projects for delivery, should the department take account of (please select one option):

- **urgency of condition need only**
- **batching projects by urgency of condition need, but also taking into account factors that would allow more efficient delivery, such as location, project size, school phase, or type of project**
- **other.**

47% of respondents thought that urgency of condition need while also taking into account factors that would allow for more efficient delivery should be the main criteria for sequencing projects. Comments included:

- that this option may provide better value for money across the programme
- that this may have benefits for procurement
- that while they agreed with this option, this should not be at the expense of urgent condition need
- that local issues and construction projects should also be considered
- that the department should deal with urgent cases first and deliver the remainder in batches.

43% thought we should sequence projects by urgency of condition need alone. The most common comments were that:

- urgency of need should come first, for example where there are health and safety risks
- a national rebuilding programme may already offer sufficient efficiencies to ensure the programme can deliver at pace.

More general comments covered views that the department should consider how best to provide clarity to responsible bodies and local authorities, and that batching smaller projects together may generate efficiencies.

Government response to questions 21 and 22

In deciding the best approach to timetabling future selection rounds, the priority will be to deal with urgent condition need and health and safety factors. We are also working to balance the need to give schools and the construction sector the ability to plan for the long term, with the need to allow for changes in the condition of schools over a long-term programme.

We intend to conduct at least two further selection rounds, prioritising the majority of schools in 2022 and the remaining projects later in the programme. Schools selected will be informed that they have been provisionally allocated a place on the programme, and projects will then enter delivery at a rate of 50 per year.

By conducting a larger selection round up-front, we will be able to give many schools and responsible bodies certainty over inclusion in the programme so that they can plan wider investment in their buildings. This will also minimise unnecessary spend on those due to be replaced. It will also help our construction suppliers to plan. By reserving some places until a later date, we will be able to take account of schools' changing condition need over the programme. We will keep the size and frequency of rounds under review.

We plan to batch projects by urgency of condition need, but where possible will also take into account factors that will allow more efficient delivery, such as our procurement approach and timing. This will ensure we prioritise safety, but also support effective delivery and value for money.

Question 23

Do you have any further comments on the proposals for prioritising schools for future rounds of the school rebuilding programme?

Most of the themes raised in answers to this question had been made in response to earlier questions (e.g. building suitability for delivering the curriculum, factoring in local priorities and pupil place planning). Respondents underscored the importance of health and safety concerns including problems with system builds.

Other issues raised by respondents included that:

- the department should be transparent about the chosen prioritisation approach and why schools were or were not successful in gaining a place on the programme
- more support is needed for responsible bodies to improve management of their estates
- there may be ways that the department can join up other schemes such as funding for decarbonisation/energy efficiency and funding from housing developers to support education infrastructure (such as section 106 funding).

Government response

We have taken account of wide range of views expressed in the consultation and through sessions held with stakeholders. As set out in our response, the programme will prioritise condition and safety issues, which need a rebuilding project to resolve.

We are committed to running a fair and transparent process for prioritising projects for the programme. We have published the methodology used for prioritising the first two rounds of projects on GOV.UK. We will set out more detail for responsible bodies on how they can nominate schools and provide additional evidence of severe condition need for the next prioritisation round.

As set out in previous questions, we will work with local authorities to join-up rebuilding projects with local authority pupil place expansion projects where feasible.

The department provides a range of guidance and support about how to effectively manage the school estate, including safety issues, as well as providing access to our procurement frameworks. Further information is available in [Good Estate Management for Schools](#).

Equalities

Question 24

Do you have any comments about the potential impact of our proposed approach to prioritisation in the School Rebuilding Programme on individuals, on the basis of their protected characteristics?

The majority of comments thought that the programme should benefit users of school buildings who have protected characteristics, as the new and refurbished buildings will meet Building Regulations and Department for Education standards, and improve the suitability of buildings for all users.

Specific comments included:

- that many schools, especially those in older buildings, have accessibility issues and building users of both sexes would benefit from updated toilet blocks
- not all schools with need will receive a rebuild or refurbishment due to limited places on the programme, so will not share the benefits of the programme
- that responsible bodies should be able to raise equalities issues as a factor for being prioritised for a place on the programme
- some groups requested that the department considers faith schools and their likelihood of being prioritised to ensure that the programme does not disadvantage individuals on the basis of faith.

We received some responses specific to the concerns of special schools and alternative provision:

- that the department should specifically consider suitability at special schools and alternative provision settings with a view to addressing equalities and accessibility considerations
- that in setting the floor area to be considered in the “intensity of need” calculation, the department may be unfairly excluding nurseries, pupil referral units and specialist provision, which could impact negatively on individuals with protected characteristics (due to the correlation between disability and attending special schools or alternative provision).

Government response

We have published an [Equalities Impact Assessment](#) for the School Rebuilding Programme alongside this response document, which we will keep under review as the programme progresses. Our overall assessment is that by improving the building condition at the schools with greatest condition need, this programme should have a positive impact on a wide range of pupils and teachers, including those with different protected characteristics. New and refurbished buildings delivered by the programme will meet Building Regulations and [Department for Education standards](#) and the project scope will be discussed with the school in advance to help ensure facilities are fit for purpose.

As we set out in the response to questions 5 and 6, where a school is smaller than the area we will use for comparison, the condition assessment will consider the whole school site. Schools of all sizes will remain eligible for consideration.

The programme design should not directly discriminate against any protected group as the prioritisation approach will be based on an objective assessment of rebuilding need.

Next steps

We will set out further details of the programme, including guidance on the process for submitting expressions of interest and additional professional evidence for consideration by the programme.

Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation

Below is an analysis of who responded to the consultation and a list of organisations who gave permission for their names to be published.

Are you replying on behalf of an organisation or an individual?

Response	Total	Percentage
Individual	15	7
Organisation	189	92
Not Answered	1	0
Total	205	100

If you are replying on behalf of an organisation, are you part of:

Response	Total	Percentage
A body responsible for buildings at multiple schools	96	47
Another type of organisation (Please state)	15	7
School/educational setting	74	36
Other	2	1
Not Answered	18	9
Total	205	100

If you are replying on behalf of a school/educational setting, is it a/an:

Response	Total	Percentage
Post-16	2	1
Primary school	26	13
Secondary school	36	18
Special school	3	1
Other educational setting (please state)	7	3
Not Answered	131	64
Total	205	100

If you are replying on behalf of a school/educational setting, what is its status?

Response	Total	Percentage
LA maintained	26	13
Multi-academy trust	19	9
Single-academy trust	19	9
Voluntary aided	10	5
Not Answered	131	64
Total	205	100

If you are replying on behalf of a body responsible for buildings at multiple schools, is it a/an:

Response	Total	Percentage
Diocese / VA school body	15	7
Local authority	42	20
Multi-academy trust	37	18
Not Answered	111	54
Total	205	100

What is your role?

Response	Total	Percentage
Buildings professional	39	19
Executive leader	28	14
Governor/trustee	11	5
Headteacher or senior leader	30	15
School business professional	40	20
Other (please state)	43	21
Not Answered	14	7
Total	205	100

Where respondents answered “other”, their roles included Chief Financial Officer, Education Director, Capital Programme Manager and other managerial roles.

65 organisations gave permission for their names to be published in this response:

Academy Transformation Trust
Arcadis (Design, engineering and management consulting company)
ASCL
Association of School and College Leaders
Bellevue Place Education Trust
Cambridge Meridian Academies Trust
Cambridgeshire County Council/Peterborough City Council
Casterton College
Catch22 Multi Academies Trust
Chatham & Clarendon Grammar School
Catholic Education Service
Church of England Education Office
City of York Council
CLEAPSS (Consortium of Local Education Authorities for the Provision of Science Equipment)
Clifton Diocese
Cornwall Council
Creative Education Trust
Cumbria County Council
Delta Academies Trust
Diocese of Bath & Wells
Diocese of Exeter
Diocese of Middlesbrough
Diocese of Westminster
Diptford Parochial Primary School
Diverse Academies Trust
Ealing Council
Educational Building and Development Officers Group
Framwellgate School Durham (Excel Academy Partnership)
Gloucestershire County Council
Haileybury Turnford School
Harrow Council
Harrytown Catholic High School
Highcliffe School
Holy Trinity Church of England
Keystone Knowledge
Leicestershire County Council
Lighthouse Schools Partnership
Link Academy Trust
Little Sutton Primary School
Liverpool Church of England Diocese

Lum Head Primary School
Manchester Diocese Board of Education
NAHT (National Association of Head Teachers)
NASUWT
Newman Community Special School
North Yorkshire County Council
Oakwood Park Grammar School
Oxfordshire Schools Forum
Pope Francis Multi Academy Trust
Pope Francis Multi Academy Trust
Pupils 2 Parliament
Risedale School
St John Paul II Multi Academy
St Leonard's C E Primary School
St Ralph Sherwin Catholic Multi Academy Trust
The Catholic Education Service
The Federation of St Joseph's Catholic Junior, Infant and Nursery Schools
The Harmony Trust
The Holy Trinity Church of England Secondary School, Crawley
The Inspiration Trust
The Otter Valley Federation, Tipton St. John and Feniton Church of England (VA) Primary Schools
The Society of County Treasurers
Thomas Mills High School
West Berry Federation
West Sussex County Council
Whickham School
Wodensfield Primary School

Annex B: List of questions and full quantitative responses

Due to rounding, not every set of percentages total 100.

Question 1

To what extent do you agree with the department's proposed definition of rebuilding need?

Response	Total	Percentage
Strongly agree	69	34
Agree	111	54
Neither agree nor disagree	7	3
Disagree	9	4
Strongly disagree	3	1
Not Answered	6	3
Total	205	100

Question 2

In your view, should the programme target buildings of specific construction types or designs?

Response	Total	Percentage
Yes	85	41
No	89	43
No preference	26	13
Not Answered	5	2
Total	205	100

Question 3

In your view, should the programme target buildings of specific ages?

Response	Total	Percentage
Yes (Please give details below)	74	36
No	103	50
No preference	21	10
Not Answered	7	3
Total	205	100

Question 4

Are there any other factors that should be included in the definition of rebuilding need, or targeted by the programme?

Response	Total	Percentage
Yes (Please give details below)	147	72
No	47	23
Not Answered	11	5
Total	205	100

Question 5

To what extent do you agree that we should prioritise schools based on intensity of condition need rather than total amount of condition need?

Response	Total	Percentage
Strongly agree	70	34
Agree	89	43
Neither agree nor disagree	22	11
Disagree	14	7
Strongly Disagree	5	2
Not Answered	5	2
Total	205	100

Question 6

To what extent do you agree that we should compare sites based on the intensity of condition need across the same surface area of their buildings (GIFA), considering the buildings in the poorest condition on each site?

Response	Total	Percentage
Strongly agree	40	20
Agree	91	44
Neither agree nor disagree	37	18
Disagree	21	10
Strongly Disagree	10	5
Not Answered	6	3
Total	205	100

Question 7

(Please select your preference form the following two statements) As regards special schools and alternative provision:

- the department should allocate a proportion of projects to special schools and alternative provision with the most severe condition need to ensure schools of those types are included in the programme
- the department should allocate projects to schools with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for type

Response	Total	Percentage
Allocate a proportion of projects to special schools and alternative provision with the most severe condition need to ensure schools of those types are included in the programme.	42	20
Allocate projects to schools with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for type	150	73
No preference	6	3
Not Answered	7	3
Total	205	100

Question 8

(Please select your preference form the following two statements) As regards school phase:

- the department should allocate a proportion of projects to each school phase (e.g. primary, secondary)
- the department should allocate projects to schools with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for phase

Response	Total	Percentage
Allocate a proportion of projects to each school phase	30	15
Allocate projects to schools with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for phase	164	80
No preference	5	2
Not Answered	6	3
Total	205	100

Question 9

(Please select your preference from the following two statements) As regards school location:

- the department should allocate a proportion of projects to each region
- the department should allocate projects to schools in the country with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for location

Response	Total	Percentage
Allocate a proportion of projects to each region	65	32
Allocate projects to schools with the greatest rebuilding need, not controlling for location	132	64
No preference	2	1
Not Answered	6	3
Total	205	100

Question 10

See summary in consultation response above.

Question 11

To what extent do you think that educational performance, and the potential for capital investment to improve it, should also be included as one of the factors considered to prioritise which projects are included in the programme?

Response	Total	Percentage
To a great extent	29	14
To some extent	66	32
To a small extent	30	15
No preference	7	3
Not at all	64	31
Not Answered	9	4
Total	205	100

Question 12

To what extent do you agree that the objectives identified for the process are appropriate?

The objectives we identified for the process to prioritise schools for the programme were:

- a) Use information that allows robust assessment of the need for rebuilding
- b) Use information that is comparable across schools to make a fair assessment of relative need
- c) Minimise burdens on responsible bodies in having to obtain and submit new information
- d) Make the process accessible for responsible bodies of all sizes.

Response	Total	Percentage
Strongly agree	46	22
Agree	121	59
Neither agree nor disagree	18	9
Disagree	13	6
Strongly Disagree	0	0
Not Answered	7	3
Total	205	100

Question 13

In what order of priority would you place the stated objectives?

When considering the process for prioritising schools for rebuilding, we listed as our objectives that the department should:

- a) Use information that allows robust assessment of the need for rebuilding
- b) Use information that is comparable across schools to make a fair assessment of relative need
- c) Minimise burdens on responsible bodies in having to obtain and submit new information
- d) Make the process accessible for responsible bodies of all sizes.

Objective	First choice (total)	Second choice (total)	Third choice (total)	Fourth choice (total)
A	124	51	13	7
B	45	81	48	22
C	9	23	69	95
D	18	41	66	71
Total	196	196	196	195 ⁸

	First choice (%)	Second choice (%)	Third choice (%)	Fourth choice (%)
A	63	26	7	4
B	23	41	24	11
C	5	12	35	49
D	9	21	34	36
Total	100	100	100	100

Question 14

Are there any other objectives for the prioritisation process that you think we should adopt?

See summary in consultation response above

Question 15

Which would be your preferred approach, in order of preference, from options A, B and C?

We consulted on 3 broad approaches to prioritising projects for the programme:

Approach A: Base prioritisation primarily on CDC condition data analysis. Accept supplementary information from responsible bodies only where it evidences severe types of rebuilding need that CDC does not capture.

Approach B: Invite expressions of interest from responsible bodies, nominating the schools

⁸ Not every respondent answered each part of this question.

they would like considered for the programme. We would then prioritise from this group, informed primarily by CDC data. For schools with significant need for rebuilding that CDC does not capture, we would accept and assess supplementary information from responsible bodies and prioritise severe cases.

Approach C: Invite responsible bodies to submit comprehensive evidence of rebuilding need and assess this evidence using a scoring system.

	First choice total	Second choice total ⁹	Third choice total	First choice percentage	Second choice percentage	Third choice percentage
Approach A	30	69	98	15	35	50
Approach B	119	65	15	60	33	8
Approach C	51	62	83	26	32	42
Total	200	196	196	100	100	100

Question 16

Do you have any suggestions for other approaches that we have not identified?

See summary in consultation response above.

Question 17

Do you agree or disagree that the proposed criteria for assessing severe rebuilding need are appropriate?

The criteria we proposed in the consultation document were:

- buildings require rebuilding because they are unfit for occupation or condemned, or due to become so imminently
- the affected building or groups of buildings are essential to the delivery of the school curriculum and have a minimum total GIFA suitable for a large rebuilding or refurbishment project

⁹ Not all respondents answered this question, and some only selected a first choice.

- evidence is provided by professional surveyors as relevant to the issue(s) affecting the building(s).

Response	Total	Percentage
Strongly agree	38	19
Agree	110	54
Neither agree not disagree	20	10
Disagree	18	9
Strongly disagree	11	5
Not Answered	8	4
Total	205	100

Question 18

Do you or your responsible body have access to evidence of rebuilding need, in the form of surveys completed by professional surveyors, available to share with the department?

Response	Total	Percentage
Yes	135	66
No	47	23
Don't know	15	7
Not Answered	8	4
Total	205	100

Question 19

How many schools is your organisation responsible for?

We asked that only responsible bodies respond to this question.

Number of schools meeting criteria	Total	Percentage
1-5	11	12
6-10	10	11
11-15	4	4
16-20	9	9
21-25	6	6
26 - 30	4	4
31 + (maximum reported was 462)	51	54
Total	95	100

Question 20

How many of them do you expect would meet the criteria for severe rebuilding need?

We asked that only responsible bodies respond to this question. We received 88 responses to this question and answers ranged from 0 schools to 100. The table below shows the answers received (percentages have been rounded up to whole numbers). Most responses indicated that responsible bodies who responded have between 1 and 5 schools with severe rebuilding need.

Number of schools meeting criteria	Number of responsible bodies in this band	Percentage
0	7	8
1 – 5	59	67
6 - 10	10	11
11 - 15	2	2
16 – 20	4	5
21 – 25	1	1
26 – 30	1	1
31+	4	5
Total	88	100

Question 21

In timetabling the selection process, would you prefer the department (please select one option):

- **Selects all remaining projects in a single selection round**
- **Selects the majority of the 400 projects in a single selection round, but reserves a reasonable number for later in the programme's life**
- **Selects 50 projects every year**
- **Other [please state]**

Response	Total	Percentage
Selects all remaining projects in a single selection round	29	14
Selects 50 projects every year	34	17
Selects the majority of the 400 projects in a single selection round but reserves a reasonable number for later in the programme	115	56
Other [please state]	17	8
Not Answered	10	5
Total	205	100

Question 22

In sequencing projects for delivery, should the department take account of (please select one option):

- Urgency of condition need only
- Batching projects by urgency of condition need, but also taking into account factors that would allow more efficient delivery, such as location, project size, school phase, or type of project
- Other

Response	Total	Percentage
Urgency of condition need only	88	43
Batching by urgency of condition need, but also taking into account factors that would allow more efficient delivery	97	47
Not Answered	9	4
No preference	11	5
Total	205	100

Question 23

Do you have any further comments on the proposals for prioritising schools for future rounds of the school rebuilding programme?

See summary in consultation response above.

Question 24

Do you have any comments about the potential impact of our proposed approach to prioritisation in the School Rebuilding Programme on individuals, on the basis of their protected characteristics?

See summary in consultation response above.



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2022

This document/publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/consultations



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk